Fall 2015

A Preliminary Study Investigating Motivational Factors Influencing Part-time Faculty to Seek Employment at Community Colleges

Philip Eugene Pons Jr.
Old Dominion University

A Preliminary Study Investigating Motivational Factors Influencing Part-time Faculty

To Seek Employment at Community Colleges

By

Philip Eugene Pons, Jr.
B.S. June 1962, United States Military Academy
M.S. August 1972, Purdue University
M.A., March 1978, Webster University

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of Old Dominion University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEADERSHIP

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY

December 2015

Approved By:

_____
Dr. Dana D. Burnett (Chair)

_____
Dr. Mitchell R. Williams

_____
Dr. Tisha M. Paredes

_____
Dr. Daniel W. Lufkin

Abstract

A Preliminary Study Investigating Motivational Factors Influencing Part-time Faculty to

Seek Employment at Community Colleges

The purpose of this qualitative study was to discover the motivational factors influencing part-time faculty employment within the community college through the perspective of the part-time faculty. The study was guided by the question "What are the motivational factors given by part-time faculty for seeking employment at the community college?" Further, the study examined these motivational factors for differences influenced by ages, gender, and employment status. A survey was distributed to a random sample of part-time faculty members at a community college in the Southeastern United States. Participants were asked to respond to some categorical demographic questions and scaler questions to determine satisfaction levels. Three open-ended question were presented to obtain information identifying the motivational factors leading to part-time employment at the community college. The results showed part-time faculty to be motivated to work within their discipline, work with students, and achieve personal satisfaction. The study confirmed a consensus of the literature findings towards dissatisfaction with wages, support, professional development, and collegial relationships. The results of the study revealed a highly motivated part-time faculty willing to engage students even in perceived less than favorable working conditions. This study warrants replication with a larger number of colleges representing different demographics. The results may provide administrators with the suggestions that may improve these working conditions.

Keywords: part-time faculty, part-time employment, motivational factors, recognition, working with students.

Acknowledgements

This dissertation is dedicated to my wife Dianne, who has supported my many adventures over the last fifty-three years of marriage. Without her support and tolerance, this latest adventure would not have been possible.

To many faculty members at Old Dominion University who have assisted, pushed, and encouraged me through this process, you have my everlasting gratitude. It would not be right if two were not singled out as significant to my success. Dr. Mitchell R. Williams has been with me from the first day. In fact, he was the faculty member presenting my first class, and he has not missed an opportunity to support me throughout the process. Dr. Dana D. Burnett proved to be my lucky break. I could not have had a better Chair. He kept me on track. This trip has been an experience.

Table of Contents

Lists of Tables

Chapter I

Overview

Community colleges employ part-time faculty because they are inexpensive to hire, have expertise in highly specialized fields, and provide the college with flexibility (Bannachowski, 1996; Cohen & Brower, 2008; Eagan, 2007; Nutting, 2003). Within the community college system in the United States, approximately 66% of the teaching faculty is part-time employees (Beach, 2011; Eagan, 2007; National Center, 2003-2004; Wallin, 2005). The challenge for community college leaders is to meet the demands of open access and offer a comprehensive curriculum despite declining state funding for their institutions (D'Amico, Katsinas, & Friedel, 2012; Katsinas, 2005). Adding to the challenge, community college leaders recognize community colleges neither need nor can support a full-time faculty geared to a comprehensive yet thinly spread curricula meeting the needs of a small contingency (Altbach, 2005; Bailey & Morest, 2006; Bannachowski, 1996; Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Gappa, 1984). These challenges encourage community college leaders to increase rather than decrease the hiring of part-time faculty (Pearch & Marutz, 2005).

Part-time faculties vary with needs of each institution, as there are not set guidelines for establishing the ratio between full-time and part-time faculty (Greive, 2000). For example, the policies of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSA) do not specify guidance for the numbers of part-time faculty. Whereas, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACS/COC, 2014) acknowledges part-time faculty members can provide expertise to enhance the educational effectiveness of the institution. SACS/COC policy concerning the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty appears to be limited to a reference that reads, "...the institution's mission with respect to teaching, research, and service requires a ***critical mass of full-time, qualified faculty to provide direction and oversight of academic***

programs" [emphasis in original text] (SACS/COC, 2014). Greive (2000) suggests there is a myth that accreditation of institutions are being challenged by the use of part-time faculty.

Many references support the monetary savings from the use of part-time faculty (Christensen, 2008; Green, 2007; Pearch & Marutz, 2005; Purcell, 2007). Not only are part-time faculty paid less than full-time faculty, but they also do not receive benefits and seldom receive professional development funding (Caruth & Caruth, 2013; Purcell, 2007; Ruiz, 2007; Wallin, 2007). The community college, like most of academe, has become a bifurcated academic profession with two faculties: the full–time "haves" and the part-time "have-nots" (Caruth & Caruth). Whether described as invisible, freeway flyers, working poor, vagabond workers, or accidental faculty, adjunct faculty have a lower status regarding salary, support, recognition, and respect (Purcell, 2007; Twombly & Townsend, 2008).

Since the full-time faculty and the institution benefits from this bifurcation, there is a stake in maintaining it (Christensen, 2008; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). It is unlikely the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty will move towards more full-time faculty. Rather, fiscal constraints will likely dictate more, not fewer part-time faculty (Altbach, 2005; Beach, 2011; Eagan & Jaeger, 2008; Katsinas, Tollefson, & Reamey, 2008). In addition to dwindling funding, a second issue affecting the ratio of part-time to full-time faculty is funding instability. This instability results in the inability to plan for staffing and further contributes to a reliance on part-time faculty (Bailey & Morest, 2006).

While the literature is replete with discussions concerning the pros and cons of part-time faculty, less attention focuses on the support part-time faculty receive or should receive from the institutions or the full-time faculty. This support encompasses the need to ensure that part-time

faculties are (1) properly selected for the position, (2) oriented to the position, and (3) given developmental and training support to ensure maximum benefit to the institution and more importantly, to student performance (Burnstad, 2002; Christensen, 2008; Diegle, 2013; Lyons, 2007; Smith, 2007). As the question of part-time efficacy continues to surface, it is important that community college leaders explore the role of part-time faculty and implement effective professional development to promote part-time faculty success and ultimately, student success (Diegle, 2013; Gappa & Leslie, 1972, 1993; Green, 2007; Lyons, 2007).

It 's hard to classify part-time faculty as one entity, and it is impractical to study that group as one. First, they are not alike in the reasons they seek part-time positions, their role on the faculty, or their long-term employment aspirations (Eagan, 2007; Gappa, 1984; Lyons 2007). In fact, research has found that part-time employees are not similar enough to be regarded as one group. Rather, research suggests there are at least four distinct groups, job attitudes, work congruence, family characteristics, and organizational commitment, with enough differences between them to justify separate studies (Wittmer & Martin, 2010). The popular stereotype of part-time faculty members as being "freeway flyers" seeking full-time employment does not find support in fact (Leslie & Gappa, 2002). In fact, many part-time faculty members tend to hold full-time jobs in other professional fields (Eagan, 2007). Consequently, the framing of any study of the attitudes and self-reported opinions of part-time faculty must start with an understanding that the attitudes and self-reported opinions are a product of diverse individuals' circumstances that do not fit into a single grouping (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Wittmer & Martin, 2010).

Studies on the satisfaction level of part-time faculty indicate a variety of perspectives. For example, a study by Wagner (2004) found the satisfaction levels of part-time faculty aligned

with business and industry tends to be higher than those aligned with traditional academic disciplines. Studies show part-time faculty have higher job satisfaction than full-time faculty although studies focusing only on community colleges show few significant differences between full-time and part-time job satisfaction (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Perhaps some of the job satisfaction for full-time faculty members results from the full-time faculty at community colleges having a shorter workweek when compared to full-time faculty at four-year institutions (Twombly & Townsend, 2008).

A contributor to job dissatisfaction is community college faculties view their administrators as more autocratic than do faculty at four-year colleges (Thaxter & Graham, 1999; Twombly & Townsend, 2008). Studies reference the negative influence of a lack of shared governance. When administrators in community colleges do involve their faculty in governance, they do so to serve the institutional management and not the interests of the faculty (Thaxter & Graham, 1999; Twombly & Townsend, 2008).

In general, community college part-time faculty, while enjoying higher levels of satisfaction than part-time faculty in four-year institutions, command a lower level of respect in the academic community (Twombly & Townsend, 2008). This finding is not limited to being held in lower respect by the faculty of four-year institutions. Colleagues hold faculties at community colleges in disrespect across disciplines at the community college. For example, colleagues hold faculty teaching development programs and career and technical programs in lower esteem than faculty in the "academic" disciplines (Twombly & Townsend, 2008). Moreover, because of market forces, faculty members in some disciplines receive higher pay than those in others disciplines resulting in a strained collegiality (Study Group, 1984).

Part-time Employment

The nature of employment contracts in common usage between institutions and part-time faculty limits employment to remunerated contact teaching hours. Moreover, higher education faculties are normally not required to receive training in education. Therefore, part-time faculties rely upon the mentoring of experienced faculty for guidance. A significant issue results from the nature of the part-time employment contract, which limits time on the campus to contact hours in the classroom. The limitation to contact class hours translates to a lack of faculty-to-faculty mentoring opportunities and to part-time faculty assimilation into the community colleges teaching and learning culture (St. Clair, 1994). The part-time faculty is not engaged in the extracurricular duties performed by full-time faculty (Bannachowski, 1996; Bippis, Brooks, Plax, & Kearney, 2001; Christensen, 2008; Twombly & Townsend, 2008). As the economics of faculty costs drive the ratio of part-time to full-time faculty towards an increase in the number of part-time faculties, the burden of fulfilling extracurricular duties necessarily falls on a shrinking number of full-time faculty (Beach, 2011; Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Current research finds student success relates to student access to faculty members (Eagan & Jaeger, 2009). An opportunity for contact with students outside of the classroom in either mentoring or involvement in student extracurricular activities contributes to student retention, transfer, and grade point average (Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Scheutz, 2002). Studies show counseling, advising, and developmental education is crucial to the success of community college students and the limited number of full-time faculty impacts the college's ability to perform these functions (Jacoby, 2006). Bippis et al. (2001) study found students report a general perception of part-time faculty being unreliable about office hours. This

perception of unreliability might be a result of another of their findings that part-time faculty are not invited to serve on committees or advise students and are not well-integrated into the organizational culture of the college. Since they receive little or no secretarial support, it is difficult for students to contact them via telephone (Bippis et al., 2001).

Part-time faculty find it difficult to meet the need for access to students for a number of reasons. Many teach while holding another job or they teach at more than one institution in order put together a living wage and to compensate for the low salary paid part-time faculty (Lyons, 2007; Stoops, 2000). Even those having the time to give to students contact lack the office space or a designated space suitable for meeting with students (Hacker & Dreifus, 2010; Stoops, 2000). Finally, since adjunct faculty are usually paid by the contact hour for each course, time spent preparing for classes, attending meetings, and holding office hours amounts to uncompensated hours for a part-time faculty member.

A study by Umbach (2007) revealed part-time faculty student-faculty interaction was less than full-time and contributed to part-time faculty being less effective in working with undergraduates. Umbach found that part-time faculties spent less time preparing for class and less time advising their students than do full-time faculty. Part-time are 68% less likely to participate in teaching workshops (Umbach, 2007, 2008).

A problem facing community colleges is maximizing the efficacy of the part-time faculty. Numerous writings are available suggesting steps administrators should take to integrate fully and optimize the contribution of part-time faculty. For example, Lyons (2007a) book contains 15 chapters, written by a practitioner suggesting methods for supporting part-time faculty. The first chapter in the book, Lyons (2007b) presents the argument that a step to

maximizing the potential of part-time faculty is to understand them beyond recognizing them as a diverse group. He acknowledges the difficulty in understanding part-time faculty is a result of this diversity. Understanding the diversity is essential to managing and providing leadership to a diverse workforce (Chrobat-Mason & Ruderman, 2004).

They are of four categories, each with different motives for being on the faculty; some are specialists, experts, or professionals; some are freelancers employed at many institutions; some are career enders; and some are aspiring academics (Gappa & Leslie, 1972, 1993; Lyons, 2007b). It is to the task of understanding the motivational factors influencing part-time faculty to teach in the community college that this study was focused. In the past, little attention is given to understanding the part-time faculty. The lack of attention to part-time faculty began to change in 1993 with the publication of *The Invisible Faculty* by Gappa and Leslie. The work of Gappa and Leslie was perhaps the first attempt to develop a typology of part-time instructors by examining their lifestyles and their motivation (Lyons, 2007b). Since that time, there have been some studies dealing with part-time faculty and some concerning the attitudes of these faculties. However, most, if not all deal with the level of satisfaction of the part-time faculty. However, knowing the satisfaction level of these faculties does not the same as fully understanding them. Moreover, it is recognized in the literature dealing with subject of motivation that one may be motivated to perform while being dissatisfied with extrinsic issues such as pay. The question becomes one of determining if the *satisfaction* referred to in the literature speaks to the motivation to teach, the commitment to student engagement, the desire to be part of the professorate, or the desire to improve as professional teachers.

Job satisfaction is often referred to as if it were a single variable; it is not. Job satisfaction is a "complex set of variables" (Vroom, 1995, p 117). Knowing the satisfaction level of faculties simply places them on the continuum being satisfied to be not satisfied, a distinction made clear by Herzberg's studies. Herzberg's theory proposed that the primary determinants of satisfaction be intrinsic to the work being performed. These determinants are recognition, achievement, responsibility, advancement, and growth in personal competence (Bateman, et al. 2016; Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 2010). Studies reveal that workers may be dissatisfied with working conditions but satisfied and motivated with the task. Herzberg explained this by his *two-factor theory* in which job environment and factors such as pay and supervision were classified as hygiene factors that led not to motivation but dissatisfaction. Consequently, an individual may report satisfaction in the job at the same time as being dissatisfied with the working conditions (Herzberg, 1987; Herzberg et al., 2010). Herrzberg (1987), in a retrospective commentary to his earlier works states hygiene or environmental factors can at best create no dissatisfaction. It should be remembered that these hygiene factors are *extrinsic* to the work itself and studies show the factors leading to motivation are inherent in the work. Other studies on motivation suggest professional growth is a leading factor followed by personal development, social interaction, community, or professional service as motivators for part-time faculty (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). A better understanding of the motivational drivers of the part-time faculty will more likely enable college administrators to understand the best environment needed to motivate part-time faculties for maximizing performance and contributing to the colleges and student success.

This study was driven by the need to understanding the motivating factors of part-time faculty. The study focused on issues relating to those job characteristics that foster a motivating environment. Such issues are the individual's sense of having some control over the work content, governance, curriculum, feelings of inclusion, feeling as being part of a professoriate, and a sense of contributing to student success (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Part-time Faculty and Student Success

There are two general perceptions of adjunct faculty: part-time instructors who bring valuable real-life experiences to the classroom or inexpensive, disposable, replacements for full-time faculty. While many view the part-time faculty as adding to the quality of the education (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Green, 2007), others maintain a preference for replacing part-time with full-time faculty (Eagan & Jaegar, 2009; Hacker & Dreifus, 2010). Some regard part-time faculty as providing lower-quality instruction, as being disconnected from the campus culture, and as fostering grade inflation (Diegel, 2013). According to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the increasing numbers of part-time faculty may harm the quality of higher education (AAUP, 2003 Contingent; Zusman, 2005). Eagan and Jaeger (2009) found students exposed to part-time faculty were less likely to transfer than students exposed to full-time faculty. In 2009, a study by Kirk and Spector found students exposed to full-time faculty in basic economics courses were more likely to select economics as a major. Those taking advanced economics courses from full-time did significantly better than those with exposure to part-time faculty. However, it is of some importance to consider that both the Kirk and Spector study and the Burr and Park study took place in four-year institutions.

Burr and Park (2012) showed adjunct instructors had a positive effect on subsequent enrollment in a given subject, but they concluded that while adjuncts may teach effectively in entry-level courses, they do not appear to help integrate first-year students into a major. Studies reveal students desire time with faculty for seeking advice and clarifying class matters (Ochoa, 2012) while other studies show contingent faculty interact less with their students than do full-time faculty as many have other occupations preventing participation in the full faculty life (Lyons, 2007b; Nutting, 2003).

Jaeger and Eagan (2009) found the more courses students took from part-time faculty at community colleges, the less likely these students were to transfer to a four-year college and graduate. Jacoby (2006) revealed increases in the ratio of part-time faculty at community colleges have a highly significant and negative impact on graduation rates. This is an important finding because it supports the findings of others that interaction with faculty enriches the student's undergraduate experience that would likely lead to continuance and graduation (Hagedorn, Moon, Scott, Maxwell, & Lester, 2006). A few studies indicated there is no significant difference between student successes of those exposed to part-time faculty with those exposed to full-time faculty (Landrum, 2009; Ochoa, 2012). Moreover, Leslie and Gappa (2002) found there was no significant difference in the quality of teaching between part-time and full-time faculty despite little support for part-time faculty at most institutions. Finally, a study by Bippis, Brooks, Plax, and Kearney (2001) revealed students were unaware of the employment status of their instructors.

Professional Significance

The past changes in the ratios of full-time to part-time faculty and the effect of these changes have provoked a number of writings, some positive and some negative in the assessment of the consequences of a large part-time faculty participation. This study moved past these early concerns and focused on the present. This study may provide information upon which administrators may be able to use the insights gleaned from the current study to base adjustments to the status of the part-time faculty. It may provide information upon which administrators may base adjustments that can influence the part-time faculties' commitment to the community college.

The numbers of part-time faculty are likely to change. However, the numbers are unlikely to decrease for the reasons mentioned. The significant question is how does the academy maximize the potential of the large numbers of part-time faculty? This study finds significance in understanding the motivational factors of part-time faculty. Administrators, from college presidents to at least their direct reports, need to be interested developing a fully professional and committed faculty. If for no other reason, it is important to understand that although an institution may project an ethos to define itself, the people within the institution define the institution (Cohen & Brawer, 1972). Bandura (1983) and Wood and Bandura (1989) make this point even more clearly in their social cognitive theory (SCT) in which they explain psychosocial functioning regarding triadic reciprocal causation. In essence, the individual operates in an interacting environment in which the individual learns and changes but at the same time the individual has an effect on the organization. "Within the model of triadic reciprocal causation, both the personal and organizational factors operate through a bidirectionality of influence" (Wood & Bandura, 1989, p. 380). Data from this study should assist community

college leaders in understanding part-time faculty. Further, significance rests in the effect these motivational factors have on student learning and student success. It must be remembered that part-time faculty make up the majority of faculty and account for 66% - 67 % of the student-faculty contact hours (Beach, 2011; CCCSE, 2009; Wallin, 2005).

Purpose Statement

This purpose of this qualitative study was to discover the motivational factors influencing part-time faculty employment within the community college. The study also examined possible differences of motivational factors influencing employment of part-time faculty across academic discipline clusters as well as differences between individuals working full-time or part-time in another profession.

Research Questions

This study was guided by the following research questions:

1) What are the motivational factors given by part-time faculty for seeking employment at the community college?

2) Do these motivational factors of part-time faculty differ between academic discipline-specific clusters?

3) Do these motivational factors differ by Gappa and Leslie's (1993) typology of part-time faculty?

4) Do these motivational factors of part-time faculty differ by:

    a. Gender.

    b. Age.

    c. Years of teaching experience at college.

        d.   Reason for employment

        e.   Full or part-time employment.

Overview of Methodology

        Limitations. A potential limitation existed in that the survey was administered by soliciting voluntary submission. This invited the bias of self-selection or *response bias*. Response bias means that if the non-respondents had responded, their response would substantially change the result (Creswell, 2009; Rea & Parker, 2005). A further limitation might result from various levels of motivation to complete the survey. A second limitation exists in *coverage error* as not all the population was successfully accounted for in that some last minute additions or deletions were possible due to changes in faculty assignments up to and including the actual date of class starts. This is a recognized problem in the assignment of part-time faculty. A third limitation is *no-response error* that in this case amounted to 34% of the selected participants failed to respond to the survey.

        Delimitations. The study's delimitations fell mainly in the selection of a single community college. The community college selected is part of the Virginia Community College System (VCCS) and conforms somewhat to a centralized management system. Consequently, this study omitted data from other community colleges in areas of the Country where policies and practices governing part-time faculty may differ significantly from the one used in the study.

        A second delimitation fell in the method of research. Ideally, this study would have employed a mixed-method research. To gain an in-depth understanding motivational factors and attitudes of both full-time and part-time faculty using a quantitative study following a qualitative study that would have facilitated solid quantitative research. Individual and group interviews are

an ideal method of adding to the findings of this study. However, this study was limited to qualitative research using an open-ended questionnaire survey instrument to obtain data.

Definition of Key Terms.

Artifacts are defined as including the entire phenomenon one sees, hears, or feels when one encounters an organizational culture. It includes the procedures by which behavior becomes routine, by which structural elements such as formal descriptions of how the organization works are documented, and by which the organization is depicted by organizational charts (Schein, 2010).

Accessibility is defined as having two dimensions: physical accessibility, or the degree to which students view instructors as being present and available for outside-of-class interaction; and social accessibility, which refers to the degree to which students view instructors as being socially available, or seem interested in informal interaction (Bippus et al., 2001).

Attitude is defined as a state of mind, a person's disposition to act in a certain way. The cluster of beliefs, assessed feelings, and behavioral intentions towards a person, object, or event. (Drafke, 2006; McShane & Von Glinow, 2010; Schermerhorn, 2013).

Contact hours refer to those hours an instructor experiences in face-to-face contact with students in prescribed curriculum hours.

Discipline-specific clusters were defined by academic disciplines as follows: Natural and physical sciences, Social sciences, Mathematics, English and Humanities, Business, Computer technologies, Engineering and Iindustrial Terchnology, Health Technologies, Nursing, and Other.

Feelings of inclusion when used in conjunction with part-time or adjunct faculty refer to a need to attain satisfactory relations in the domains of interaction and association (Madlock, & Booth-Butterfield, 2012). Knapp and Vangelisti (1999) argued that people with strong inclusion needs tend to be socially active, seek out opportunities to interact with others, are often cheerful.

Full-time faculty are those faculty employed at either a one-year contract or a ten-month contract to teach at the community college. No delineation is made for those on one-year versus multiple year contracts.

Organizational culture is defined as "a pattern of shared basic assumptions learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, which worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems" Schein, 2010, p.18). Organizational culture both describes and prescribes participant behavior.

Part-time faculty and adjunct faculty when used in this study, referred to the same entity. Part-time or adjunct faculties were defined as those hired as hourly employees without benefits and with no guarantee of continuous employment. However, at many community colleges the two terms convey subtle differences in meaning. An *adjunct* faculty member refers to one employed on a per term basis with no guarantee of being rehired for the next academic year or term. Part-time faculty members, on the other hand, are defined as one who teaches from term to term and year to year literally becoming a "permanent" part-time faculty member. For the purpose of the following discussion, however, the terms *adjunct* and *part-time* are the same and denote faculty hired on a contingency basis as temporary, non-tenure track faculty employed less than full-time (Cohen & Brower, 2008; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Pearch & Marutz, 2005).

Perception refers to the process of organizing stimulus input and giving it meaning. It influences which information we are to notice, how we are to categorize this information, and how we interpret this information within the framework of our existing knowledge (Drafke, 2006; McShane & VonGlinow, 2010). Perception is influenced by expectations and/or by our perceptual schema (Passer & Smith, 2004).

Professionalism is multidimensionally relating to public perception, training, work responsibilities, the degree of organization, codes of ethics, and licensure (Cowen & Brower, 2008). Key elements of professionalism and maturation are "self-management, independence, self-evaluation according to the ability to cause learning, and the provision of discrete services to a distinct client" (Outcalt, 2002, p. 110).

Summary

Given the present economic situation facing education, the reduced funding, the unpredictability of funding, and the demand for higher success rates, it is unlikely the numbers of part-time faculty will decline. Rather, it is more likely the numbers will increase. With the trend towards greater dependence on part-time faculty and the possibility of resulting negative effects on students, community college leaders need to examine institutional processes to create policies and practices enabling part-time faculty to more fully engage within the college (Kezar & Sam, 2013). It seems part-time faculty have dispelled the pronouncements of being less committed employees, of less effective teachers, and less credentialed faculty. Student evaluations show them to be as effective in the classroom as full-time faculty. However, in most institutions, part-time faculties continue to be marginalized (Bradley, 2004; Coalition, 2010; Purcell, 2007; Wyles,

1998). They have no voice in curriculum development, in textbook selection, or in governance in general (Bradley, 2004; Nutting, 2003; Wyles, 1998).

The body of research shows the makeup of the community college is dynamic. The ever-increasing numbers of new faculty hired are part-time. The new faulty comprise a population diverse in both opinions and capabilities. This "evolving landscape demands continued study to document the changing facets of this key group in relation to full-time community college faculty (Wallin, 2004, p.19). Once again, this was the goal of this study.

An issue remaining is one of maximizing the efficacy of part-time faculty. Maximizing the efficacy of part-time faculty requires they be properly selected, oriented to the community college system, trained and developed in effective teaching methods, and accepted as respected members of the academy (Coalition, 2010).. Understanding the motivational factors influencing part-time faculty to seek employment at the community college is a significant aspect to maintaining a quality part-time faculty. The next chapter will explore, in depth, the role of the part-time faculty and their continued value to the community college. It will also examine the literature relating to the value currently placed on part-time faculty as well as the view of part-time faculty by full-time faculty.

Chapter II

Overview

This literature review consists of references gathered from a number of sources. The primary source is the Old Dominion University Perry Library with access to resources such as but not limited to academic journals, EBSCOhost, ERIC, Wiley On-Line, and full-text dissertations. Other sources consist of published books and journals. In this chapter, the literature review focuses on five general areas: (a) the role of the community college in the United States; (b) a basis for understanding the wide usage of part-time faculty; (c) the extent to which prior research documents the relationship between the community college and the part-time faculty; (d) current research on the impact of the community college relationship on part-time faculty performance, sense of inclusion and student contact; and (e) the current literature concerning part-time faculty motivation.

To frame this study and the following literature review properly, it is useful to begin with an understanding of the importance of the community college contribution to the productivity and welfare of the United States. It is also important to understand not only the magnitude of part-time faculty usage but also, the reasons for this high percentage of part-time faculty and the reasons the situation is not likely to change. Lastly, it is important to understand the impact of having a majority of faculty employed part-time.

This literature review established a background designed to answer the research questions. The literature review also sought to develop a grounded theory that fostered a better understanding of the part-time faculty and their motivation to seek employment at a community college. This study did not attempt to resolve the debate surrounding the usage of part-time

faculty. The study suggested a need for further research on the impact of part-time faculty attitudes on part-time faculty performance as well as on student success.

The Community College in the United States

The literature often refers to community colleges as America's college; the community colleges are a uniquely American contribution to higher education (Mellow & Heelan, 2008). Recent emphasis on the importance of the community college to providing a skilled labor force to meet the needs of the United States is placing greater than ever pressure on the community college's mission. The following quotation supports the emphasis on the mission of the community college.

American community colleges are much like the nation that invented them. "They offer an open door to the opportunity to all who would come, are innovative and agile in meeting economic and workplace needs, and provide value and service to individuals and communities" (Boggs, 2012, p. 2). Half of the students entering post-secondary education system will come through the doors of the community colleges (Boggs, 2012). The community colleges provide a tripartite mission of transfer, workforce development, and access (Bailey & Morest, 2006; Mellow & Heelan, 2008). Cohen and Brower (2008) expand upon this by listing the curricular functions as academic transfer preparation, vocational-technical education, continuing education, developmental education, and community service. In more than 1,150 public, independent, and tribal community colleges, six million full- and part-time students take courses for credit. More than four out of every ten undergraduates and another five million part-time students attend noncredit courses. Community colleges have emerged as a dynamic and important part of the

postsecondary education system in the United States (Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Mellow & Heelan, 2008; Phillippe & Gonzalez Sullivan, 2005; Shaffer, 2008).

A number of factors prompt students to attend community colleges. One such factor is the opportunity to earn credits at an institution that is typically less expensive than a four-year institution. The ability to transfer these credits to a four-year college is an additional economic attraction (Mellow & Heelan, 2008). Community colleges offer low-cost vocational training adjusted to meet community needs (Giloth, 2004; Mellow & Heelan, 2008; Phillippe & Gonzalez Sullivan, 2005; Stone & Worgs, 2004). Open access continues to be a strength of the community college system as well as an attraction for many students and expresses democratic values of inclusiveness, meritocracy, and opportunity for all citizens (Bailey & Morest, 2006; Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Mellow & Heelan, 2008). Community colleges revolutionize the higher educational system and without them, there would be less of a middle class and more of a financial disparity between classes (Mellow & Heelan, 2008). Finally, for many "...students in a two-year institution, the choice is not between the community college and a senior residential institution; it is between the community college and nothing" (Cohen & Brawer, 2008, p. 58).

The Culture of the Community College

Little in the literature refers to the impact of organizational culture on the acceptance, development, and performance of part-time faculty at the community college. However, there is ample research related to the subject of organizational structure, culture, and behaviors and its effect on employees in general. The research examines the behaviors of individuals and groups within organizations and the impact of organizational culture on performance. Organizational cultures both define the organization and prescribe individual and group behavior within the

organization (Bateman, Snell, & Konopaske, 2016; Drafke, 2006; Nelson, & Quick, 2013; McShane, & Von Glinow, 2010; Schein, 2010; Schermerhorn, 2013).

Organizational culture helps employees make sense of themselves in relation to the organization and hence provides the mental framework from which employees approach their tasks (McShane & Von Glinow, 2010; Millard & Haslam, 2013; Schein, 2010). The culture provides a sense of identity to members that may increase or decrease their level of commitment. Culture provides a way for members to interpret the meaning of policies and events, and it serves as a control mechanism for shaping behavior (Bateman et al., 2016; Nelson, & Quick, 2013; McShane, & Von Glinow, 2010; Schein, 2010; Schermerhorn, 2013).

The organizational culture also influences the organization's learning. How well the organization recognizes and adjusts to the changes in the surrounding environment is a function of the organization's openness to learning (Argyris & Schon, 1996). Argyris and Schon (1996) use the term *theories-in-use*-as a cultural norm and suggest organizations that are constrained by inquiry-inhibiting theories-in-use fail to assess accurately conditions of threat or embarrassment. In essence, they fail to recognize and adjust to changes in the environment that may have an impact on the organization.

The studies on organizational culture make the point that culture may have either a positive or a negative effect on organizational effectiveness. Corporate cultures not only describe behavior, but they also prescribe behavior. The organizational culture is "…the system of shared beliefs and values that shapes and guides the behaviors of its members" (Schermerhorn, 2013, p. 296). Schein (2010) defines culture as "…a pattern of shared basic assumptions learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal

integration, which has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to these problems"(p. 18). Whether through tacit values, explicit or implicit policies, day-to-day practices, or prescriptive directives, employees readily learn about the culture and the behaviors acceptable to the culture (McShane & Von Glinow, 2013; Schein, 2010). If the organizational culture has these effects, what affect does the culture of the community college, with its two-tier system, have on the performance of the part-time faculty? This study concerned itself with the organizational culture of the community college as far as it affects the motivational factors influencing part-time employee participation and attempted to provide a better understanding of these factors.

Part-time Faculty and the Community College

Within the community college system in the United States, approximately 67 % of the teaching faculty is part-time faculty (Beach, 2011; National Center (USDOE), 2003-2004; Mazurek, 2011; Wallin, 2005). This number has grown significantly in recent years and by all indication, the trend continues. Part-time or adjunct faculties are crucial to the community college's ability to adjust rapidly to fluctuating enrollments as well as changing demands for curricula (Akroyd & Caison, 2005; Bannachowski, 1996; Christensen, 2008; Gibson-Harmon, Rodriquez & Haworth, 2002; Marti. 2005). Community colleges "neither need nor can afford to invest heavily in permanent faculty whose specializations interest only a thinly spread constituency" (Gappa, 1984). Budget constraints, decreasing state support and fluctuating enrollments justify the need for part-time faculty (Katsinas, 2005). Moreover, part-time faculty serve as a buffer to full-time positions in that money saved by hiring part-time faculty may support full-time faculties (Christensen, 2008; Wallin, 2005). As Cohen and Brawer (2008)

write, "Part-time instructors are to the community colleges what migrant workers are to the farms" (p. 95.). In one instance, a provost was heard to say, "…adjuncts were like fine wine at bargain prices that could be poured down the drain in the event of a problem" (Caruth & Caruth, 2013, p.3). Purcell (2007) uses the term *Limbo* to describe the state in which part-time faculty find themselves; "…they are not able to end their state of oblivion, either to go back or to go forward. They can only leave if something happens. But that something is entirely outside their control" (p. 121). Often, the irony is that full-time faculties that may question the efficacy of part-time faculty, at the same time, welcome their presence as a means to conserve funding (Green, 2007). Wallin (2005) notes that adjunct faculty, while recognized for contributing to the increasing demands of higher education, are "… frequently treated as disposable commodities, an expendable contingent work force" (p. 13).

Due to lower wages, community colleges benefit from having a large number of part-time faculty in comparison to the full-time faculty and because of pay differences, the more classes the part-time faculty teach, the more money the college saves (Green, 2007). Conserving funding by using part-time faculty is also necessary in terms of overall faculty expenditures. At least one source suggests faculty is simply a line item and a decreasing amount of the overall budget. Mazurek (2011) points to overall university spending increases of 148% while, during the same period, administrative funding increased 235% while instructional spending increased only 128%.

A less obvious influence on the continuance of hiring part-time faculty is the possible influence of for-profit institutions. The for-profit model has been successful through marketing and a wide variety of course offerings. One reason this model has been able to meet the needs of

a large, diverse audience is the use of part-time faculty. The model has appeal in that it is not only successful; it has profitability rather than cost to show for its existence. Consequently, it puts pressure on community college boards and administrators (Ochoa, 2012).

The practice of relying on part-time workers is not unique to community colleges. Since 1969, there has been a gradual increase in the part-time workforce in the United States (Bradley, 2004; Larson & Ong, 1994). By 2010, approximately 30% of the United States workforce consisted of part-time employees (BLS, 2010). At the same time, the workforce age has increased (Moslsa & Hipple, 2006). Older workers are more likely to accept part-time work, as they often do not require benefits. The increase in the numbers of part-time workers is not likely to change as many companies are limiting employment hours for economic reasons (Involuntary part-time, 2008).

With the enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA), this trend toward part-time workforce is likely to increase. From a cost perspective, the workforce implications are clear. The law mandates that employers with more than 50 employees must offer coverage to employees working 30 hours or more or face monetary penalties (Boerner, 2013; Watts, & Gaertner, 2013). Employers must face balancing costly benefits with issues of productivity and profitability. The major factor effecting these decisions is the 30-hour workweek (Watts & Gaertner, 2013). Significantly, 51% of employers indicate they will change their workforce strategy to one where fewer employees work more than 30 hours a week (Watts, & Gaertner, 2013). The community college system is not exempt from the PPACA, and already, the Act has had a significant impact on the number of teaching hours for adjunct faculty.

At the end of the day, the academy must accept the place of part-time faculty as they carry a significant part of the teaching load in postsecondary education (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Wallin, 2005). It is also important to recognize that although part-time faculties make up two-thirds of the faculty, they teach approximately one-third of the course load (Twombly & Townsend, 2008). Finally, it is unlikely that the economic forces compelling the use of part-time faculty will change in the near future (Katsinas, 2005; Katsinas, Tollefson, & Reamey, 2008). None dispute part-time faculty add diversity to the community college staff by bringing with them connections to the community, real world experience, internships and job opportunities for students, and a connection to the world of work (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Finally, students appreciate these part-time faculty assets (Green, 2007).

The issues are many and varied, not the least of which is part-time faculty present confusing and heterogeneous picture of themselves (Wagner, 2007). Gappa (1984) and Gappa and Leslie (1993) categorizes part-time faculty into four groups:

(a) career enders (many retired and coming from established careers;

(b) specialists, experts, and professionals (have full-time employment elsewhere);

(c) aspiring academics (generally seeking full-time); (d)

(d) freelancers (implement their part-time with other jobs or involved in homecare and work for extra money)

Due in large part to economic factors, in the near future it seems unlikely that part-time faculty will be afforded competitive salaries, physical accommodations, or developmental opportunities. The research makes it clear, part-time faculty are less costly, are rarely promoted to higher-paid positions – they are stuck at entry level placement – or less prestigious positions,

and they cost virtually nothing in benefits (Bradley, 2004; Banachowski, 1996; Gappa, 1984; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Wyles, 1998).

Divergent views on part-time efficacy. There are two general perceptions of adjunct faculty as being part-time instructors who bring valuable real-life experiences to the classroom (Gappa & Leslie, 1993) or inexpensive, disposable, replacements for full-time faculty (Phillips & Campbell, 2005). Many view the part-time faculty as adding to the quality of the education (Gappa & Leslie, 1993) while others maintain a preference for replacing part-time with full-time faculty (Eagan & Jaegar, 2009; Hacker & Dreifus, 2010). Others find there is no significant difference between student successes of those exposed to part-time faculty with those exposed to full-time faculty (Landrum, 2009). Clearly, views vary on the efficacy of part-time faculty.

While some consider the faculty as well qualified as full-time faculty (Friedlander, 1979; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Leslie & Gappa, 2002), others believe that part-time faculty degrades the academic profession or adversely affects student performance (Jaeger & Eagan, 2009). Burton R. Clark, the Allan M. Cartter Professor Emeritus of Higher Education**,** University of California, Los Angeles**,** states, "Nothing deprofessionalizes (*sic*) an occupation faster and more thoroughly than the transformation of full-time posts to part-time labor" (Clark, 1988, p. 11). Eagan and Jaeger (2008) found that students exposed to part-time faculty were less likely to transfer than students exposed only to full-time faculty. According to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the increasing numbers of part-time faculty may harm the quality of higher education (Zusman, 2005). "Quality is not served by the current practice of choosing part-time faculty for cost purposes rather than for educational purposes" (Pearch & Marutz, 2005, p. 36). Jacoby (2006) found increases in the ratio of part-time faculty at community colleges have a

highly significant and negative impact on graduation rates. Umbach (2007, 2008) concludes the appointment of part-time faculty has negative effects on student success. Umbach (2007) finds that part-time faculties are underperforming in the delivery of instruction, interacts with students less frequently, uses active and collaborative techniques less often, spend less time preparing for classes, and has lower academic expectations for students. It is useful to temper Umbach's findings with the understanding his research was conducted in four-year institutions. However, Umbach's study gains relevance to the community college system as it focuses upon undergraduate students (Umbach, 2007). In the end, there are multiple judgments concerning the value of part-time faculty (Levin, 2007).

Part-time faculty compensation and support

Compensation and support have never been more of a critical consideration as states struggle with annual budgets. In the majority of states, higher education remains the largest discretionary item in the budget (Katsinas, Toffelson, & Reamey, 2008). However, it is difficult to generalize compensation and support as contracts, pay, benefits, and support for part-time faculties vary from institution to institution (Green, 2007; Purcell, 2007; Wallin, 2005). In general, part-time faculties receive one-third or more less than full-time faculties for teaching the same course. In many cases, part-time faculties do not earn enough to live on and are eventually forced to leave the profession or obtain part-time work elsewhere (Caruth & Caruth, 2013). Also, for this, they are expected to feel lucky when they feel deeply unlucky. While they may have a very legitimate feeling of frustration, rage, and bitterness, they must instead express gratitude and "collegial good cheer" (Purcell, 2007, p. 127).

Hand-in-hand with the trend to hire *cheaper* labor is a reluctance to spend additional monies on part-time faculty support both regarding physical support such as office space and in clerical support. A typical example of this situation is an encounter similar to the following scenario. When asking for space to meet with students, Dreifus, a part-time faculty member, was told that none existed as "…regular faculties have taken everything…couldn't you meet in the cafeteria? Or the hallway? There are a couple of lounge chairs by the ladies' room." (Hacker & Dreifus, 2010, p. 46). Dreifus protested, and the situation came to "Listen here, Ms. Dreifus, you're an adjunct! Do you get that?" (Hacker & Dreifus, p. 47). Research by Yoshioka (2007) supports the notion, the best way to ensure student success is for students to "…have timely and frequent access to their teachers…."(p. 44). This is usually possible only when students and part-time faculty meet in hallways and other public areas and then, on a volunteer basis on unremunerated contact hours (Christensen, 2008; Yoshioka, 2007). In doing so, part-time faculty perpetuate the exploitation of their position (Yoshioka).

Part-time faculty professional development. "The label 'temporary' pinned on part-time faculty has, in many cases, been used to legitimize the neglect of their professional development and the withholding of support…" for part-time faculties (Sandford, Dainty, Belcher, & Frisbee, 2011, p. 49). Some authors point to the lack of funding or administrative support for part-time faculty development (Gibson-Harman, Rodriques, & Haworth, 2002). Moreover, there is rarely funding to compensate required developmental activities (Wallin, 2005) and consequently, developmental activities are nonexistent. However, the lack of adequate funding is is not an insurmountable problem. Sandford, Dainty, Belcher, and Frisbee (2011) found part-time faculty in community colleges were not only willing to attend

professional development, but they also welcomed the opportunity. Approximately half of those part-time faculty surveyed expressed a willingness to attend professional development without the benefit of a salary with many expressing the belief that personal growth should be the reward. They did seek such remunerations as per diem and travel expenses, credit towards professional certificates, and the like (Sandford, et al., 2011). The findings from these studies suggest the issue might then be one of an institution not taking the time to present professional development for contingent faculty rather than an issue of funding.

Professional development is important to all faculty in the community college but especially to part-time faculty who traditionally do not have extensive backgrounds in teaching (Gappa & Leslie, 1972, 1993). The person who identifies as a teacher, as does one who identifies with any profession, identifies with a purpose – knowing what one's goals and directions are (Gappa & Leslie, 1972). Gappa and Leslie (1972) offer that adequate training and development "…puts the person in a position to focus on tasks rather than oneself---it hastens the transition from student to professional perspective" (p. 147.). They also suggest that development programs offer the opportunity to solidify one's choice or reject it and to build upon self-knowledge, which is a prerequisite to efficient functioning.

Part-time faculty as disposable. Often, part-time faculties are placed in a position of denying their feelings and pretending all is well (Kezar & Sam, 2013). Should they express concern or allude to discontentment, they are labeled as "ungrateful, not collegial, a troublemaker" (Purcell, 2007, p. 127). A question often asked is there truly a *two-tier system* concerning the support given part-time faculty within the community college system. A synthesis of the literature would indicate there is (Greenberg, 2013; Meixner, Kruck, & Madden,

2010; Purcell, 2007). With few exceptions, part-time faculty do not enjoy the use of office space, administrative assistance, and in some colleges, the issuance of name tags given full-time faculty to indicate membership on staff (Greenberg, 2013; Hacker & Dreifus, 2004; Stoops 2000). Realistically, however, there are real barriers to eliminating this two-tier system.

As stated, the barrier of the cost is perhaps a primary factor in the employment of part-time faculty (Phillips & Campbell, 2005). Another significant barrier is less obvious but equally as damaging; institutions view part-time faculty of minimal importance and hire them on a fluctuating needs basis (Bradley, 2004; Wyles, 1998). A third barrier is the lack of communication between administrators and part-time faculty, many of whom teach at hours when most full-time faculties have ended their workday (Outcalt, 2002). A complicating factor in determining the needs of part-time faculty is the diversity of the part-time faculty. Part-time faculty needs vary depending on the individual's background (Phillips & Campbell, 2005).

Part-time faculty as professionals. Some authors have called attention to the subject of professionalism within the academy of community colleges. In *Confronting Identity,* Cohen and Brawer (1972) suggest the rapid growth of community colleges has resulted in a system that has not achieved an identity and consequently, maturity. They use the term *identity* to refer to "…*awareness* of self, of *personality*, and of *individuality*" (Cohen & Brawer (1972, p. 1.). Moreover, Cohen and Brawer call for the need to have in the college a mature faculty that they define as one comprised of individuals who, in the search for identity, have successfully merged awareness of self with a realistic relationship to the institution and the demands of others in the academic-social-cultural milieu. Cohen and Brawer (1972) contend the role of the community college and the people within it are in inchoate and have not yet attained professional maturity.

Cohen and Brower offer this view not as a criticism, but as a recognition of the consequences of rapid growth and the many functions thrust upon the community colleges. Cohen and Brawer (2008) describe "professionalism as multidimensional; it relates to public perception, training, work responsibilities, degree of organization, codes of ethics, and licensure" (p. 106). They argue that the disciplinary affiliation among community college faculty is too weak, and the context of the community college demands too diverse and varied to promote a corps professionalism. As the identity of the institution is determined by the identities of its faculty, the identity of the individual is strongly influenced by the identity of the institution. Cohen and Brawer (1972, 2008) maintain the community college has not yet achieved an identity.

Part-time faculties have a difficult time identifying with an institution that does not fully embrace or include part-time faculty. This difficulty in identifying begins with a hiring system that usually is decentralized and does not mirror the rigorous searches conducted for full-time faculty (Wallin, 2005; Wyles, 1998). Frequently hiring and continuing employment is contingent on the good will of a single person. Faculty service is based not only on the good will of a single person; but the service is also judged by infrequent observations of classroom mannerisms and presentation skills (Wallin, 2005). Gappa and Leslie (1972) label this manner of rating effectiveness as *second order inferences* based on what the people "…*seem* to be or by what they apparently do, rather on the basis of the effects of their efforts…and this bespeaks an immature profession..." (p. 194.)

A significant though often obscure identifiable barrier to the full assimilation of part-time faculty is the subtle existence of attitudes and behaviors that distinguish part-time from full-time faculty. The names by which part-time faculties are known, *part-time, adjunct, contingent,*

temporary, and disposable do not reflect a professional status nor a positive connotation (Yoshioka, 2007). There appears to be no research documenting the effect of these titles on the attitudes and behaviors of part-time faculty in academe. However, there is ample research elsewhere that documents the effects of titles and typing on the performance of workers. For example, if the title or typing of a person carries a negative connotation, consciously or unconsciously, behavior toward that person may reflect that connotation. This process, known as the *self-fulfilling prophecy,* begins with an assumption of the person based on a preconceived image (Champoux, 2006; Knapp, & Vangetisti, 2009; McShane & Von Glinow, 2010). In the case of the part-time faculty member, many might assume the person is not as "professional" as the full-time, professional faculty member. A cycle begins by placing the part-time faculty member in a position supporting the negative connotation and continues with a conscious or unconscious selection of behaviors of performance that reinforce the negative perception (Knapp & Vangeltisti, 2009).

It would be erroneous to establish a connection or a cause-effect relationship between the perceptions acquired through the self-fulfilling prophecy and adjunct performance. One aspect bringing the cause-effect relationship into question is the nature of the community college part-time faculty. The community college enjoys a unique benefit of having many of its part-time faculty holding permanent, professional, and often highly paid employment outside the community college. These persons are frequently high-expectancy employees with successful work records enjoying high self-esteem. High self-esteem is defined as the emotional dimension of self-perception, the process by which people develop a view of themselves (Bateman et al., 2016; Champoux, 2006; Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 2012). Consequently, these persons

enjoying highly regarded professional status outside the community college may be unaffected by titles or positions assigned by the community college.

Lastly, a further possible influence on part-time faculty attitudes and possibly their behaviors is *social identity theory* (SIT). SIT suggests persons tend to define themselves largely by the groups to which they belong. This possibly shapes the person's self-concept as well as how the person perceives others. SIT argues that the social groups to which one belongs help to define one's place in a social setting (McShane, & Von Glinow, 2010; Stroh, Langlands, & Simpson, 2004).

A question warranting further research is the effect of status difference on the performance of the part-time faculty. Do students suffer from the lower status level bestowed on the part-time faculty? Although not specifically addressing the status level of part-time faculty, studies show that students whose first course is taught by full-time faculty were better prepared for the second and subsequent courses (Jaegar & Eagan, 2009). In a study by Tinto (1997), a key variable, the student perception of the faculty was one of the significant predictors of student persistence. At least one study found students are unaware of the employment status and rank of their instructors (Bippus, Brooks, Plax & Kearney, 2001). Faculty status is not a salient issue and students "do not appear to believe that part-time instructors provide them with an inferior educational experience…" (Bippus et al., 2001, p. 20). Nevertheless, community college leadership needs to be concerned with this issue of status difference and determine its effect, if any, on the performance of part-time faculty and ultimately, student success (Twombly & Townsend, 2008). This study should offer some insight to the issue by providing data that either supports or fails to support part-time faculty perceptions of employment status.

Part-time Faculty Engagement. Gappa and Leslie (1993) write, "part-timers have very strong feelings about whether they are or are not "connected" to or "integrated" into campus life. For the most part, they feel powerless, alienated, invisible, and second-class….and they are able to cite many instances of neglect" (Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 180). In many instances they work under conditions of isolation from others, are less likely to belong to professional organizations, and spend less time on campus (Outcalt, 2002; Umbach, 2007). In 1984, The Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education found, "The higher the proportion of part-time faculty, the more difficult it becomes to maintain collegiality…" (Study Group, 1984, p. 11).

Wittmer and Martin (2010) examined the involvement, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, job attitudes, and turnover rate of part-time faculty. Wittmer and Martin build upon Katz and Kahn's (1978) partial inclusion theory (PIT), which describes employees as members of multiple social systems and argues that employee involvement in any one role may lessen involvement in another. The study examined four large universities and several smaller colleges. The purpose of the study was to gain a greater understanding of the PIT as it relates to part-time worker's involvement in the part-time or focal work. The results of the study supported the PIT in that part-time faculty exhibited less work involvement, less positive work attitudes, and a higher turnover rate (Katz & Kahn, 1978; Wittmer & Martin, 2010). The more time spent, the less flexibility over the time spent, and the more psychological involvement a part-time faculty member has outside of the focal employer (in this case, the college), the less the part-time employee will be involved in the focal employment. A significant finding of Wittmer and Martin's (2010) findings, as they relate to this study, is "factors within the focal workplace

may play a larger role in the formation of job attitudes for part-time employees than outside or work involvement" (p.781).

Umbach (2007) hypothesizes that part-time exhibit lower levels of commitment and will engage others, including students, less. He supports this hypotheses using Blau's (1960, 2008) social exchange theory, which posits that individuals form relationships with those who can provide valuable resources. Thus, individuals in egalitarian relationships manifest mutual attraction whereas; those in a commanding or superordinate relationship of social differentiation suffer the lack of social integration (Cook & Rice, 2003). This social differentiation and lack of social integration tend to lessen engagement (Blau, 1960, 2008). Umbach suggests the lessening of engagement has negative consequences for student success. For example, Ehrenberg and Zhang (2005) found that there was a negative relationship between the employment of part-time faculty and student graduation rates.

A phenomenological study by Diegle (2010) would seem to contradict the work by Wittmer and Martin (2010) and others in that Diegle's study suggests part-time faculty seek greater involvement in the workplace. However, Diegle's study focuses on administrative support and is limited to a single college that already fosters a culture of part-time faculty inclusion and support; numerous examples within the study exhibit a strong inclusion culture. Such a limited study may not be an accurate representation of the majority of the colleges. Never-the-less, Diegle's findings and recommendations support the argument that part-time faculty may experience emotional involvement if given support. This support includes material for teaching, inclusion in curriculum decisions, assigned designated mentors, and access to department chairpersons. A key finding of the study was that part-time faculty members enjoy

strong two-way communications with administrators and in particular, their department chairperson (Diegle, 2010). It would seem the part-time faculty might be seeking more involvement but are not finding that possible. Wallin (2004) suggests, "It is clear that many adjunct faculties are committed both to their discipline and their college. It is sometimes less clear that colleges are committed to adjunct faculty" (p.383).

Motivation

The literature supports the heterogeneous nature of part-time faculty (Eagan, 2007; Gappa, 1984; Lyons 2007). For this reason, it is hard to arrive at a single set of factors that motivate part-time faculty to seek employment. However, it is safe to assume these part-time faculty members share the same motivational drives, as does any other person. Motivation is simply the driving force within the individual to achieve some goal. These forces account for the level, direction, and persistence of effort to achieve these goals (McShane & Von Glinow, 2010; Schermerhorn, 2013).

There are many definitions or theories of motivation and the factors leading to motivation. This study will use the definition that paraphrases most of those found in the literature. Motivation describes forces within an individual that account for his or her direction, intensity, and persistence of voluntary behavior (Bateman, Snell, & Konopaske, 2016; Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 2012; Lawler, 1969; Nickels, McHugh, & McHugh, 2016; Schermerhorn, 2013). Motivation explains why people behave in a certain manner (Lawler, 1969). The literature suggests motivation is the result of the individual's desire to fulfill needs. One of the pioneers of this school of thought, Abraham Maslow, contended the individual seeks to satisfy a hierarchy of needs beginning with survival or physiological needs and culminating with self-

actualization needs (Bateman et al., 2016; Hughes et al., 2012; Nickels et al., 2016; Schermerhorn, 2013; Terpstra, 1979). Alderfer advanced Maslow's theory with the ERG theory postulating three sets of needs operating simultaneously: *Existence* needs satisfying physiological desires; *Relatedness* needs in involving relationships and mutual sharing; and *Growth* needs that motivate people to be productive or creative to change themselves or their environment (Bateman et al., 2016; McShane & Von Glinow, 2014; Schermerhorn, 2013).

Two-factor Theory. A second need-based theory of motivation is Herzberg's dual-factor or motivation-hygiene theory. Herzberg (1987, 2010) collected data from over 400 engineers and accountants and concluded that there were two basic factors with which employees were concerned: hygiene and motivators. Hygiene factors dealt with a lower order or physiological needs such as working conditions, pay, security, and personal life. These extrinsic hygiene factors are significant and could lead to dissatisfaction. However, Herzberg maintained that those factors did not serve as motivators. The factors that serve as motivators include needs for achievement, recognition, responsibility, advancement, growth, and the work itself (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 2010; Nickels et al., 2016; Schermerhorn, 2013; Terpstra, 1979). It should be noted that some theorists question Herzberg's theory suggesting the lack of rigorous research and the fact those studied represented a stratified level of educated and professional participants and not the general working population (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 2010).

Expectancy Theory. Any explanation as to why people behave in a certain manner includes a discussion of the expectancy theory. Vroom (1995) and others link motivation to expectancy that Vroom defines as an effort-reward probability. The effort-reward probability is

the first of two variables that state if one performs a task, the performance will result in a reward. The second variable concerns the value of the reward. Expectancy is defined as the perceived likelihood that *effort* will lead to performance; it is the individual's assessment of the probability that effort will lead to performing the task correctly. Expectancy is a momentary belief on the part of an individual that acting in a particular manner, performing a task, will lead to a given outcome. *Instrumentality* is defined as a perception that a given performance will lead to the desired reward. *Valence* is defined as the value of the expected reward to the individual (DuBrin, 2013; Vroom, 1995). An often over-looked aspect of this later variable is that the value of the reward is determined by the individual's perception and not by the person designing the reward (Bateman, et al., 2016; Behling & Starke, 1973; DuBrin, 2013; Lawler, 1969; McShane & Von Glinow, 2014; Nickels, et al., 2016; Schermerhorn, 2013; Terpstra, 1979). Vroom (1995) and other theorists emphasize the objective utilities associated with outcomes of performing at a certain level are not as important as is the individual's perception of the satisfaction or dissatisfaction with performing at a certain level (Behling & Starke, 1973). The rewards may be either extrinsic (bestowed by others) or intrinsic (stemming directly from the performance and are internally mediated). The extrinsic rewards are generally thought of as applying to lower order needs while intrinsic rewards satisfy higher order needs such as self-esteem and self-actualization that stems from feelings of achievement, using and developing one's skills, and accomplishment (Bateman, et al., 2016; Lawler, 1969; McShane & Von Glinow, 2010, 2014; Nichols et al., 2010; Schermerhorn, 2013). Theorists also link the strength of motivation or motivational forces to the expectancy theory. The strength of the motivation is a product of the intensity of the valence of the reward (Behling & Starke, 1973; Vroom, 1995).

Equity theory. Equity theory is also applied to the theories of motivation. Equity theory is a social comparison process. Equity theory postulates that employees compare their inputs and outcomes with others, commonly called referents, in the workplace. When employees believe they are treated equitably or fairly, they will perform to their best ability. When employees believe they are not treated equitably or fairly, they will adjust their input to a level that restores equitability (Bateman et al., 2016; DuBrin, 2013; Nickels et al., 2016; Schermerhorn, 2013). The equity theory has implications for organizations that frequently hire part-time employees and pay them less than full-time employees for the same tasks or pay them less than an equitable amount.

Any discussion of intrinsic motivation should include a discussion of the perceived locus of causality (PLOC) (Ryan & Connell, 1989). Internal PLOC is not to be confused with an internal locus of control as internal PLOC primarily refers to the *interpersonal* perception of *personal causation*, the critical feature of which is the intention. The distinction lies in the individual's ability to control the outcome. This ability to control the outcome differs from impersonal causation in which the environment, independent of the individual's intentions, causes an event (Ryan & Connell, 1989). The ramification of this distinction between the personal and impersonal causation is a differentiated nature of self-knowledge. This self-knowledge influences whether the individual is motivated out of guilt or obligation (impersonal causation), or whether the individual is motivated or driven by what one wants, or chooses (personal causation) (Kernis, Zuckerman, & McVay, 1988; Ryan & Connell, 1989). A study by Kernis et al. confirmed persons who attribute success to their actions perform better, and they will be more highly motivated by subsequent tasks. Moreover, when given feedback concerning

performance, those with an internal locus of causality benefited more than those with an external locus of causality, as they were able to attribute the feedback to their actions (Kernis et al.).

Four-factor theory of motivation. Lawrence and Nohria (2002) in *How Human Nature Shapes our Choices* first advanced the four-factor theory of motivation. Using the evolutionary process of human development as a basis, the authors present an argument that human motivation stems from a desire to satisfy over time a set of drives acquired to ensure the survival of the species. Since these drives are the basis for human motivation, understanding these human drives is essential to understanding the motivation to perform. Why are humans motivated to engage in an activity and to what degree are they willing to commit to performing that activity? Motivation in this context refers to intrinsic task motivation, which involves positively valued experiences that individuals derive directly from a task. Task refers to a set of activities directed towards a purpose; a task can be assigned or chosen. Thus, it can include both activities and a purpose (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). Thomas and Velthouse define intrinsic task motivation as "positively valued experiences that individuals derive directly from a task" (p. 668).

Drive to acquire. Hobbes, in *Leviathan,* would argue that to survive in this world, one must face a world of divisive struggle in which the rights of each is to decide what each person needs, what each is owed, and what is right, and to pursue these ends by enforcing one's beliefs when one can. To Hobbes, the state of nature would become a war of all against all. An innate drive in the minds of humans is a drive to acquire. We seek to obtain and control objects we value **(**Lawrence & Nohria, 2002**)**. In the *Republic***,** Plato refers to the appetitive or *epithymetikon* parts of the soul in which we experience

a need or seek to acquire items of our desire. The dark side of the drive to acquire is there is never enough. Fortunately, we can ameliorate this problem through relative status. One might not acquire all that he or she wants but as long as it is more than another gets, the need to acquire is satisfied (Lawrence & Nohria,2002). The drive to acquire might well include the desire for power, empowerment, and for achievement.

Drive to bond. Lawrence and Nohria (2002) question the definition of the drive to bond as being similar to terms like love, caring, and the like. This likens the drive to bond to being an emotion. Rather, they maintain the drive to bond is more than an emotion; the drive to bond is an innate drive (Lawrence & Nohria, 2002). The research of Baumeister and Leary (1995) defines the need to belong or the drive to bond as a pervasive drive to form and maintain lasting and significant interpersonal relationship that supports this need.

Drive to learn. Humans have a drive to satisfy their curiosity. Humans are continuously pursuing the understanding of their surroundings and their need to make sense of the world around them (Lawrence & Nohria, 2002). This drive to acquire knowledge has enabled a human to not only survive but also to continuously improve their lives.

Research supports empowerment as being a strong motivator. Empowerment is defined as a "psychological concept in which people experience more self-determination, meaning, competence, and impact regarding their role in the organization" (McShane & Von Glinow, 2010, p.182). Empowerment increases one's self-efficacy that in turn influences the individual's initiation and persistence in task

accomplishment. Empowerment influences the cognitive task assessments or intrinsic task motivation (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). Understanding the factors contributing to intrinsic task motivation enables organizations to provide opportunities for individuals to be motivated to perform.

Drive to defend. All mammals have a drive to defend, but human beings go beyond the drive to defend as the need to remain alive and well. We have a desire to defend our social groups to which we belong. We have a drive to defend our pride, our reputation, our self-image, our belief systems, and our hopes. We have a drive to defend strangers, else why would we build hospitals (Lawrence & Nohria, 2002; Lawrence, 2010)?

These four drives are innate and universal; they are hard-wired in our brains. They are independent; consequently, there is no hierarchy of drives. One drive is neither dependent upon another nor inferior to another. Except the drive to defend, the other drives are proactive – we are continuously trying to fulfill them. The four-drive theory states the four drives determine which emotions are tagged to incoming stimuli (Lawrence & Nohria, 2002; Lawrence, 2010; McShane & Von Glinow, 2014). McShane and Von Glinow (2014) provide the example "…you arrive at work one day to see a stranger sitting in your office chair; you might quickly experience worry, curiosity, or both. These emotions are automatically created by one or more of the four drives" (p. 93). The emotions produced are likely to demand attention and motivate action.

The topic of motivation has been studied for many years and over time, the thinking has shifted to embrace a paradigm in which bureaucratic controls have given way to relaxed or broad controls. This paradigm shift has resulted in the realization that the "pull" of the task of meaningful work yields more positive results than the "push" of management (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). The fundamental basis for this paradigm shift is the better understanding of intrinsic task motivation. These positively valued experiences are the result of a cognitive model of the individual that identifies generic conditions that pertain to the task and that produce motivation and satisfaction. This study to strives to identify and understand these cognitive conditions.

Job satisfaction as motivating criteria. There are few studies of part-time job satisfaction in community colleges. One reason might be the difficulty of studying a group that the literature presents a picture of part-time faculty as confusing and heterogeneous (Wagner, 2007). The referencing of job satisfaction as being indicative of motivation to teach is not only confusing but also, misleading. For example, a study by the American Federation of Teachers revealed 57 % of part-time faculty members say they are in their jobs primarily because they like teaching, not for the money (AFT Higher, 2010). The same study reveals a significant majority of part-time faculty believe their working conditions are inadequate.

Job satisfaction measures are categorized as either affect influences or cognitive aspects of the job (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011). This study posits that the job satisfaction frequently referred to in the literature does not speak to the cognitive issues such as salary, working conditions, levels of support, and job security. These issues, while important, are not considered to be determinants of motivation or intrinsic effect issues (Dressler, 2008; Herzberg, 1987;

Herzberg et al., 2010; Nickels et al., 2016; Schermerhorn, 2013). Moreover, studies referencing part-time faculty at community colleges frequently cite those with full-time outside employment, often at high salaries, who teach for personal satisfaction and enjoyment (Twombly, & Townsend, 2008). It is useful to note that many of the studies referencing satisfied part-time faculty are studies of the faculty at four-year institutions (Bannnachowski, 1996; Diegle, 2010; Purcell, 2007; Twombly & Townsend, 2008).

An examination of the many studies citing part-time faculty satisfaction levels suggests the finding of *job satisfaction* usually refer to lower-order needs such as salary, hours worked, material support, and job security. These lower-order needs are defined in the literature as *hygiene factors* that are not in and of themselves motivators to performance (Dressler, 2008; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 2010; Nickels et al., 2016; Schermerhorn, 2013). From the literature, there remains the question of whether or how part-time job satisfaction effects part-time performance and student learning (Twombly, & Townsend, 2008).

Beginning with the early work of Frederick Herzberg in the development of the two-factor theory, studies support the notion that job satisfaction as a motivating factor comprise higher-order factors that focus on achievement, meaningful work, sense of accomplishment, recognition, and the possibility of advancement (Dressler, 2008; Herzberg, et al., 2010; Nickels, et al., 2016; Schermerhorn, 2013). This study attempted to examine those factors leading to motivation; this study did not explore issues such as contentment with work schedules, physical surroundings, and commute times. Moreover, with the diversity of backgrounds found within the part-time faculty community, it is would have been difficult to determine a consistent trend concerning these issues. For example, frequently work schedules are selected by the part-time

member to meet other obligations of the part-time member. Consequently, this study, 2010 focused on the higher order needs contributing to the satisfiers (or motivator factors) that account for the level, direction, and persistence of effort expended at work (Bateman, et al., 2016; Cook, Hepworth, Wall, & Warr, 1981; Herzberg, et al., 2010; McShane & Von Glinow, 2014; Schermerhorn, 2013).

The topic of motivation has been studied for many years and over time; the thinking has shifted to embrace a paradigm in which bureaucratic controls have given way to relaxed or broad controls. This change in thinking is a result of realizing that the "pull" of the task of meaningful work yields more positive results than the "push" of management (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). The fundamental basis for this paradigm shift is the understanding of intrinsic task motivation. These positively valued experiences are the result of a cognitive model of the individual that identifies generic conditions that pertain to the task and that produce motivation and satisfaction. Once again, it is the goal of this study to identify and understand these cognitive conditions.

Part-time Faculty and Legal Issues

Some studies have addressed the subject of academic freedom, particularly concerning part-time faculty. Umbach (2007) reports a few researchers argue the shrinking number of full-time faculty and the increase in part-time faculty will "…erode academic freedom and irreparably damage the academic profession" (p. 92). The threat to academic freedom is not likely to be blatant attacks but rather, the silent self-censorship that comes from holding a tenuous position on faculty (Bradley, 2004). A part-time faculty person relying upon the goodwill of a department chair for employment is in a tenuous position.

Coercion is natural; freedom is artificial. Freedoms are socially engineered spaces where parties engaged in specific pursuits enjoy protection from parties who would otherwise naturally seek to interfere in those pursuits. One person's freedom is therefore always another person's restriction: we would not have even the concept of freedom if the reality of coercion were not already present (Menand, 2001, p.409)

These socially engineered spaces connote boundaries, and the issue becomes one of defining the boundaries relating to part-time faculty. Who determines the boundaries, who monitors them, and who arbitrates differences? Louis Menand's words are a fitting reference point to begin a discussion of the boundaries and legal issues facing part-time or adjunct faculty in America's community colleges. These legal issues encompass academic freedom, questions of fair and just compensation and benefits, and issues concerning work hours entitled to remuneration

Academic freedom. Academic freedom echoes John Stuart Mill's belief that truth is best served by free expression in a "marketplace of ideas." Justice Holmes, in dissent in *Abrams v. United States* (250 US 616, 1919), established the marketplace of ideas as a legal concept when he wrote:

> …they may come to believe even more than they believe the very foundations of their own conduct that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas -- that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market…I think that we should be eternally vigilant against attempts to check the expression of opinions that we loathe…Only the emergency that makes it immediately

dangerous…warrants making any exception to the sweeping command, "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech"….(*Abrams v. United States,* 1919)

In *Sweezy v. New Hampshire* (354 US 234, 1957), a faculty member, Sweezy, refused to answer questions concerning the content of a lecture he had given at the University of New Hampshire about his knowledge of the Progressive Party, both of which he believed were not pertinent to an inquiry by the State Attorney General. Sweezy was held in contempt of court, which was upheld by the New Hampshire State Supreme Court and overturned on review by the United States Supreme Court as a violation of Sweezy's constitutional right of Due Process under the Fourteenth Amendment. In the majority opinion, the Court wrote:

To impose any strait jacket upon the intellectual leaders in our colleges and universities would imperil the future of our Nation. No field of education is so thoroughly comprehended by man that new discoveries cannot yet be made. Particularly is that true in the social sciences, where few, if any, principles are accepted as absolutes. Scholarship cannot flourish in an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust. Teachers and students must always remain free to inquire, to study and to evaluate, to gain new maturity and understanding; otherwise, our civilization will stagnate and die.

The Court stated further:

It is particularly important that the exercise of the power of compulsory process be carefully circumscribed when the investigative process tends to impinge upon such highly sensitive areas as freedom of speech or press, freedom of political association, and freedom of communication of ideas, particularly in the academic community.

Sweezy is held as significant in protecting the academic freedom of faculty in higher education (Murphy, 2000). Although Sweezy is based on the Fourteenth Amendment, the Court made a definite pronouncement on the First Amendment rights in academe as well. Of course, the academic freedom outlined thus far speaks to the protection of the United States Constitution. Academic freedom as envisioned by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) that expands upon constitutional rights but also imposes restrictions. These policies are and have been embraced by higher education since AAUP's 1925 Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

- The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) defines academic freedom in the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, which in essence states:

- Teachers are entitled to "full freedom in research and in the publication of the results."

- Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom "in discussing their subject."

- When writing or speaking as citizens, teachers "should be free from institutional censorship or discipline."

- Speech by professors in the classroom at public institutions is generally protected under the First Amendment and under the professional concept of academic freedom if the speech is "germane to the subject matter" (AAUP, 2003).

Academic freedom in the community college is questionable since the system generally relies upon periodic renewals of contracts and not faculty tenure, and this begs the question, can a contingent faculty in such a tenuous position feel secure in speaking contrary to the position

held by one's superiors (Bradley, 2004; Coalition, 2010; Hoeller, 2014; Ochoa, 2012). The AAUP has this to say concerning part-time faculty and academic freedom:

- The insecure relationship between contingent faculty members and their institutions can chill the climate for academic freedom, which is essential to the common good of a free society.

- Contingent faculty may be less likely to take risks in the classroom or scholarly and service work.

- The free exchange of ideas may be hampered by the fear of dismissal for unpopular utterances so that students may be deprived of the debate essential to citizenship.

- They may also be deprived of rigorous and honest evaluations of their work (AAUP, 2014).

A further concern over academic freedom is the threats arising from the increasingly popular *political correctness* movement (Altbach, 2005). Altbach (2005) contends the debates over the politics of race, gender, and ethnicity has influenced curricula, and some faculty believes they are inappropriately influenced by these debates. Moreover, some see these debates leading to intolerance on the campuses. Perfect examples of these threats to academic freedom have been the numbers of speakers canceled after having been invited to speak for fear their presence would offend a portion of the academy.

The question of academic freedom, as it applies to the community colleges, is germane to this study in that the community college essentially operates outside of the benefit of a tenure system as taken for granted in four-year institutions. This lack of tenured employment appears to

be a consistent finding during a random search of community college policies (Coalition, 2010; Galveston, 2014; AAUP, 2014; VCCS, 2014). Even within colleges in union contracts, there is no mention of protecting part-time faculty (AAUP, 2014). Not only is this an example of the threat to academic freedom in the community college, the champion of academic freedom, the AAUP, infrequently references community colleges. Another example of AAUP's lack of concern for the community college is of the approximately 209 endorsers of AAUP's policy, only four are remotely linked to community colleges. The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) is notably missing as an endorser (AAUP, 2003). Clearly, security, or the lack thereof, threatens the adjunct's academic freedom; a faculty member beholding to a per-course contract is not likely to feel free to speak their mind in the classroom (Ochoa, 2014).

Recently, there have been examples of part-time faculty turning to unions and to the courts to force change. There are examples of community college part-time faculty involvement in efforts to improve pay (Ruiz, 2007). In California, the faculty successfully lobbied the legislature to enact a resolution to increase the number of full-time faculties and improve the ratio of tenured and non-tenure track faculty (Bradley 2004). In Washington State, the community college system settled in court for $12 million alleging the system failed to compensate the part-time faculty fairly for out-of-class work hours. This successful suit was not new to Washington State as the members of Part-Time Faculty Association of Washington Community and Technical Colleges have been mobilized to since 1998 (Ruiz, 2007).

The compensation level afforded part-time faculty has been a topic of discussion for a long time and remains as a contentious issue (Jacoby, 2005; Wallin, 2004). The argument has, as do most arguments, two sides both of which have validity. An argument can be made that part-

time teach the same courses as do full-time faculty. Consequently, they should receive equal compensation or at least, an equitable compensation (Wyles, 1998). Another argument can be made full-time faculties have many additional duties not required of part-time faculty, and this justifies higher compensation (Wallin, 2004). Further complicating the part-time faculty compensation issue is the lack of retirement and health benefits. Finally, the tenuous position and their "…limited power, desire for full-time appointments, or commitments to another full-time profession result in their reluctance to seek redress for administrative mistreatment, even when it is egregious" (Welfel, 2000, p. 102).

As previously discussed, part-time faculty serve at the pleasure of departments chair or some other decision maker (Wyles, 1998). Even with a written employment letter, they are hired for a definite term. Part-time faculty are placed in the category of *at-will* employees subject to termination for any cause at any time. Legally, courts have determined at-will employees have no property interest in continued employment and consequently no standing for grievance (Murphy, 2002). In *Perry v. Sindermann* (408 US 593, 1972), the Court found that a contingent faculty member could state a property right or claim to continuing employment if there were precedence that implied continued employment known as a *common law of re-employment.*

A more recent court case speaks to the issue of the First *Amendment*. In an October 2014 decision, *Meade v. Moraine Valley Community College* (770 F. 3d 680, 2014), The United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit found Meade was unfairly fired, and her First Amendment rights violated. Meade wrote a letter, which she signed as president of the Moraine Valley Adjunct Faculty Organization. In the letter, Meade leveled multiple charges of unfair treatment of adjunct faculty that Meade claimed harmed Moraine Valley's students. Two days

later, Meade was fired and two weeks after that she was notified her presence on campus

constituted criminal trespass. The Court of Appeals found Meade's "speech" to be of public

concern and as such, Meade could not be fired for exercising her right to free speech. Secondly,

the Court found Meade's right to due process was violated in that her employment contract

contained language that "otherwise evinces" a mutual understanding of employment be

enumerating course numbers and corresponding dates that define work for a specific period and a

specific amount of pay. This understood agreement has long been recognized as a property

interest, which cannot be extinguished without conforming to due process. This case is an

example of the challenges facing community colleges as they struggle with issues of funding and

the employment of minimally paid adjunct faculty. As nearly all community colleges are public

institutions and as such are governmentally governed and supported, they fall under the United

States Constitution and the findings in *Meade v. Moraine Valley Community College* (Murphy,

2002).

Community college leaders often neglect training in legal issues. This practice of

ignoring these areas can prove costly. Perry and Marcum (2010) make this point when they

suggest that taking steps to educate faculty on the legal issues can avoid steps in the courtroom.

Effects of Adjunct Instructors on Student Success.

Faculty are the core of the academic workforce. As such, their status, morale,

collegiality, and commitment to their institutions are critical to student success (Coalition, 2010;

Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Nutting, 2003). Highly involved students demonstrate their commitment

in a variety of ways, one of which is frequently interacting with faculty (Study Group, 1984).

The Study Group (1984) recommends students, in particular first-year students, be provided

adequate opportunities for intense intellectual interaction with faculty, be assigned the best instructors, and be provided with a stable body of the faculty. The motive behind this recommendation is student involvement. "Strong faculty identification with the institution and strong faculty involvement with the student requires a primary commitment" part-time faculty has difficulty in making especially those who teach while holding a full-time job elsewhere (Study Group, 1984, p. 36). This difficulty in commitment is an important finding because interaction with faculty enriches the student's undergraduate experience (Arum & Roksa, 2011). Students desire this time for seeking advice and clarifying class matters (Ochoa, 2014). Part-time faculties are not available to serve in an advisory role to students (Study Group, 1984). This should be a concern of administrators as the numbers of part-time faculties increase.

Many studies find no significant difference between the effectiveness of part-time and full-time faculty (Friedlander, 1979; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Other studies find differences in the effectiveness of part-time faculty as compared to full-time faculty (Clark, 1988; Eagan and Jaeger (2008); Jaeger & Eagan, 2009; Roach, 1995; Umbach, 2007; Zusman, 2005).

Work by Jaeger and Eagan (2009) suggests students who have few interactions with part-time faculty members or who have few meaningful connections with this faculty may become dissatisfied with their experience and leave college early. Works by Chickering (Chickering & Gamson, 1999) and others make it clear that:

Extensive and varied interaction among faculty and students facilitates development. Students need to see faculty in a variety of situations involving different roles and responsibilities. Such interaction leads students to perceive faculty as real people who

are accessible and interested in them beyond the classroom (Evans, Forney, Guido, Patton, & Renn, 2010, p. 70).

Current research finds student success relates to student access to faculty members (Eagan & Jaeger, 2008; Umbach, 2007). Opportunities for contact with students outside of the classroom in either mentoring or involvement in student extracurricular activities contribute to student retention, transfer, and grade point average (Eagan & Jaegar, 2008; Scheutz, 2002; Tinto, 1997).

Community college faculties have teaching as their primary responsibility. The faculties is not required to do research, and they do not receive rewards for doing so. If they do research, they are encouraged to research ways to improve teaching methods (Twombly & Townsend, 2008). The responsibility to teaching is not limited to the classroom as additional responsibilities include holding office hours to work with and advise students, acting as sponsor clubs, participating in community service projects, and other extracurricular activities (Twombly & Townsend, 2008; Vaughan, 2006). The nature of employment contracts in common usage between institutions and part-time faculty limits employment to remunerated contact teaching hours. Thus, part-time faculties are not engaged in the extracurricular duties performed by full-time faculty. As the economics of faculty costs drive the ratio of part-time to full-time faculty towards an increase in the number of part-time faculties (Beach, 2011; Eagan & Jaeger, 2008; Gappa & Leslie, 1993), the burden of fulfilling extracurricular duties necessarily falls on a shrinking number of full-time faculty. The shortage of full-time faculty to serve in extracurricular activities should be of concern. The results of the shortage of full-time faculty

speaks to the nature and culture of the institution; "… the faculty in fact *becomes* the institution" (Cohen & Brawer, 1972, p. 11).

In an effort towards mitigating the negative relationship between part-time faculty exposure to students and student's likelihood of transferring, Eagan and Jaeger (2009) suggest institutions allocate additional money for compensation for office hours. They also recommend part-time faculty be encouraged to make time for students outside of the classroom by providing office space or a similarly designated area affording privacy. A recommendation made by Eagan and Jaeger (2009) in the conclusion of their study suggests, "community colleges must learn to work within the system that they have perpetuated by identifying ways to tap into the talents offered by part-time faculty members" (p. 185). The Study Group (1984) recommends hiring more full-time faculty by suggesting it is better to have one more full-time faculty than three more part-time faculty.

A frequent recommendation is for administrators to have hiring procedures in place to ensure a sufficient number of trained, competent, and qualified part-time faculty (Coalition, 2010). This recommendation requires specificity of teaching credentials and pedagogical competency levels. The process of hiring is continuous; it begins with the thought that goes into advertising the position, the procedures of the interviewing process, the orientation to the requirements and the culture of the college, and the setting of attainable expectations for performance (Green, 2007). The process continues with monitoring of part-time faculty syllabi and classroom performance. When appropriate, it includes corrective action as well as developmental support (Green, 2007).

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this qualitative study was to discover the motivational factors influencing part-time faculty employment within the community college. The study examined possible differences of motivational factors influencing employment of part-time faculty across academic discipline clusters as well as differences between individuals working full-time or part-time in another profession.

Chapter Summary

The situation in which adjuncts find themselves is unlikely to change, as it is reflective of the *New Economic Labor Reality*. In this new economy found throughout society, the individual workers are isolated while institutions increase efficiency. In this economy, work is individualized, and societies are fragmented. Individuals fend for themselves in the marketplace (Wagner, 2007). The ratio of part-time to full-time is not only likely remain the same; it may change to a higher ratio of part-time faculty as community colleges continue to experience a reduction in funding. Studies of part-time faculty efficacy are mixed. What is, or should be of importance to administrators is what can be done to maximize the effectiveness of part-time faculty. Studies show the part-time faculty brings meaningful everyday work experience, flexibility, working world connections, current experience, and student's appreciation for these qualities to the community college. The studies also show a need for improved support for part-time faculty. For example, some studies show a lack of teaching experience or pedagogical training as a hindering factor. It also appears efforts to include the part-time faculty into the fabric of the college would improve feelings of inclusion and belongingness. It is no longer appropriate for institutions to administer as though full-time faculty were the norm (Outcalt, 2002).

Gappa and Leslie, (1993) offer some suggestions for integrating the part-time faculty into the fabric of the college. Among them, they recommend better pay, a salary scale that is progressive, compensation for time spent outside of assigned class time, and better professional development. Umbach (2008) suggests such a move should lead to an increase in part-time faculty commitment, trust, and performance. Meeting the needs of all faculty will not require new programs as much as a new attitude towards part-time faculty. A change in attitudes would have a positive impact on performance.

Chapter III

Method

The purpose of this study was to understand the motivational factors leading to part-time faculty seeking employment at the community college. Part-time faculties seek employment for a number of reasons. Therefore, it is difficult to identify the motivational factors that cause them to seek part-time employment. The issues are many and varied, not the least of which is part-time faculty present confusing and heterogeneous picture of themselves (Wagner, 2007). The literature generally categorizes the part-time into four groups: (a) career enders (many retired and coming from established careers); (b) specialists, experts, and professionals (have full-time employment elsewhere); (c) aspiring academics (generally seeking full-time); (d) freelancers (implement their part-time with other jobs or involved in home care and work for extra money) (Eagan, 2007; Gappa, 1984; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Lyons 2007).

Problem Statement.

This study suggests the need to understand better the factors contributing to the motivation of part-time faculty to seek employment at the community college. The goal of this study is to provide community college administrators with additional information concerning part-time faculty motivation to seek employment so that, where possible, institutional practices may be adjusted to maximize the efficacy of part-time faculty. The study will attempt to enhance the understanding of the complexity of motivations surrounding the employment of part-time faculties by relying upon the views of those most intimately involved, the part-time faculties.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this qualitative study was to discover the motivational factors influencing part-time faculty employment within the community college. The study examined possible differences of motivational factors affecting employment of part-time faculty across academic discipline clusters as well as differences between individuals working full-time or part-time in another profession.

Research Questions

This study was guided by the following research questions:

1) What are the motivational factors given by the part-time faculty for seeking employment at the community college?

2) Do these motivational factors of part-time faculty differ between academic discipline-specific clusters?

3) Do these motivational factors differ by Gappa and Leslie's (1993) typology of part-time faculty?

4) Do these motivational factors of part-time faculty differ by:

   a. Gender.

   b. Age.

   c. Years of teaching experience at college.

   d. Reason for employment.

   e. Full or part-time employment.

Research Design

The study design was based on the nature of the problem and the relevant issues (Creswell, 2009; Rea & Parker, 1997). In this study, the nature of the problem was to seek a

better understanding of part-time faculty motivation to teach at the community college. This study is a qualitative design to explore the factors motivating part-time faculty to seek employment at the community college. Through inductive analysis, the researcher attemted to present, from the perspectives of the individuals concerned, the motivational factors leading to part-time employment. The study does not attempt to test a preconceived hypothesis (Hays & Singh, 2012; Plano Clark & Creswell, 2010). This approach is similar to a grounded theory in that it captures the views of the participants" (Creswell, 2009; Hays & Singh, 2012).

The persons studied were the part-time faculty of a selected community college. The instrument for gathering data was an e-mail, structured survey containing demographic questions, a number of *scaled* questions designed to seek information on levels of satisfaction or areas of importance to the individual, and open-ended questions designed to obtain data in the words of the participants. The selection of the e-mail venue facilitated reaching a sufficiently large number of part-time faculty who are normally not present at the selected community colleges except for contracted face-to-face teaching hours. The e-mail responses negate the need to have oral interviews transcribed yet provide an accurate written record of responses. Web-based surveys have the advantage of the convenience, rapid data collection, cost effectiveness, and ease of follow-up (Dillman et al., 2009, 2014; Rea & Parker, 2005).

The survey was designed to obtain limited demographic information needed to address the research questions and contains structured opened-ended questions that allowed for control over the line of questioning. The response to the open-ended questions provided documentation of the interview without the need to transcribe spoken word. The fact that the participants were

active faculty indicated both access to the internet and suggested a comfort level with using the internet.

A disadvantage of using an e-mail survey was some respondents may not have been willing to expend the time to answer open-ended questions without the presence of an interviewer to encourage them. However, evidence shows that respondents provide better open-ended responses containing more information in web-based surveys than do those in pen and paper surveys (Dillman et al. 2009, 2014). The number of open-ended questions was held to a minimum as the excessive length may thwart responses.

Although the purpose statement was written to guide this study, as in all qualitative studies, refining the initial purpose statement remained an option should more information and data become available. Research is a dynamic process, not a static process. Ideas beget other ideas; more data create new questions and new research opportunities (Dillman et al., 2014).

Context of study. The study took place in the environment of the surveyed persons. Once contact with the college was established at the appropriate level, the selected college Institutional Review Board (IRB) was contacted to solicit approval for the administration of the survey. The college participating was guaranteed that the identity of the college would not be associated with the study findings. The college was requested to provide postal addresses, email addresses, and academic disciplines of the participants. All persons surveyed were guaranteed anonymity and assurance that all data linking individuals to the survey will be used only for the administration of the survey and destroyed upon the completion of the research. The responses of the participants would be kept confidential.

The survey working population for this study consisted of a random sample of part-time faculty at a selected community college. The community college was one of the larger institutions from within the Virginia Community College System (VCCS).

The study population. The study data was based upon the sample survey process to explore the factors influencing employment of a larger population (Dillman, 2009, 2014; Rea & Parker, 1997; Schutt, 2012). The population in this study was defined as the part-time faculty of VCCS. The sample frame of the population was defined as a random sample of the part-time faculty of a selected community college. The institution was selected from one of the larger institutions within the system and one that presents multiple campuses. The study sample was designed to ensure a sufficient number of responses within each academic discipline. This aspect of the plan proved to be more difficult than anticipated and there was not an ideal situation for a more detailed analysis of academic disciplines. However, some diversity was possible in assessing academic disciplines. This will be discussed further in Chapter IV. It was recognized the ideal diversity sample would consist of the whole population in the sample institution (Jansen, 2010).

The survey consisted of demographic questions, a number of *scaled* questions, and three open-ended questions. The survey questions were tested before administering them to the sample population. The test consisted of submitting the questions to a small (10 or less) group of faculty. Follow-up to the administering of the questions to the test group consisted of cognitive interviews of the participants to determine the following: (a) comprehension – making sense of the questions and what information is being asked; (b) retrieval – the bringing to mind information which may be influenced by survey question wording, definitions, and emotions; (c)

judgment – the cognitive tasks to retrieve and willingness to report this information; (d) response – how the respondents choose to respond and their tendency to edit to fit a preconceived notion of a desired response (Ryan, Gannon-Slater, & Culbertson, 2012). This follow-up was conducted through face-to-face interviews as well as phone conversations. Following the testing of the questions, a final survey was prepared for submission.

Study protocol. Each person selected was sent an introductory letter explaining the research purpose and informing the recipient of the survey. The letter informed the recipient of a forthcoming email that would contain a link to the survey. The letter contained a new $2.00 bill as a small novelty token of appreciation for their participation in the survey. In a study conducted by Dillman, Smyth, and Christian (2014), the introductory letter with a small, $2 incentive accounted for an 8% increase in the response rate for the first week. This monetary incentive also supports the notion that a small monetary token of appreciation will elicit a sense of fairness that leads to completing the survey (Dillman et al., 2009, 2014). The sense of equity or the creation of an obligation finds support in the social exchange theory (Blau, 1960; Cook & Rice, 2003; Cosmides, 1989; Emerson, 1976). Social exchange theory begins with the hypothesis that "(1) humans have algorithms specialized for reasoning about social exchange; (2) these algorithms will have certain structural properties, predicted by natural selection theory; and (3) these algorithms are innate….(Cosmides, 1989, p 260). According to the theory, those receiving the $2 might be driven to respond to the survey out of a sense of a cost-benefit structure that is satisfied by completing the survey.

One week after the postal letter was sent, the first email was sent containing a brief summary of the purpose of the study and a reiteration of the voluntary nature of participating in

the study. This email contained a link to the survey. On the following week, a second email was

sent to those who completed the survey thanking them for their participation. At the same time,

a reminder email was sent to those who had not completed the survey again asking for their

participation. On the day of and the day following this reminder, an additional seven surveys

were completed. Finally, on the third week a second reminder email was sent encouraging those

who had not responded to respond. This email contained the link to the survey and notice that

the survey would close within one week. This email also contained an encouragement to

respond so that "your voices may be heard at this institution." This process from beginning to

end lasted 21 days. This protocol follows the model suggested by Dillman, Smyth, and Christian

(2014).

      Data collection procedures. Data was collected from a structured survey. The survey

was introduced by a letter and within the first email explaining the survey's purpose, the

procedures to protect confidentiality, and encouragement for respondent participation.

      Social desirability is of concern since the participants are closely linked to the topic of

the questions. Participants may have been influenced by a desire to either justify their

employment or not be willing to admit the lack of motivational factors (Dillman et al., 2014). By

using open-ended questions, respondents were able to answer as they desired without limiting

their response (Dillman et al.) Questions were designed to avoid asking about behaviors or The

survey (*Appendix A*) solicited an open-ended response to three questions relating to the

participants reasons or motives for soliciting employment at the community college. Once

collected, the survey's open-ended questions were placed in categories, coded, and analyzed.

Although the survey questions are structured, a large variety of response categories was

expected. This is an inherent disadvantage of open-ended questions, non-interviewer controlled surveys and was recognized by the researcher. The contents of the emails were reduced to categories and then coded. In doing so, care was taken to ensure the data retained alignment to a specific individual. A code number was assigned to each survey thereby ensuring the data would not be linked to specific part-time faculty thus identifying the individuals (Hays & Singh, 2012).

Analysis. The data was compiled using accepted practices for developing qualitative data to produce a theory or themes to answer the research questions. The first step in this process was to develop a codebook. This was done before compiling data with the understanding the code book could be modified or added to once the data was reviewed. The first step to developing a code book was to establish codes, sub-codes, and patterns. Each code was described and defined. The coding was refined as data was coded, and patterns emerged. New codes were added when data did not fit an existing code. The development of the codes was guided but not constrained by the research questions. Once the data was coded, and not before, steps to collapse codes into groups occurred (Hays & Singh, 2012).

Following the compilation of data by codes and subcodes, higher order codes of identifying themes and patterns were developed by "chunking" codes. This chunking of codes identified the relationships among codes or patterns and structure (Hays & Singh, 2012). The principle objective was to create a consistent and well-ordered scheme that supported the research aims (Jansen, 2010). From schema, themes, and patterns emerged the theoretical constructs explaining the motivational factors leading part-time faculty to seek employment at the community college (Dillman, 2014; Jansen, 2010). In this study, the emergence of themes was heavily influenced by the use of accepted terminology used to describe motivational factors.

The anticipated number of respondents was small (n < 10) for some disciplines and in those instances, no effort was made to report frequencies. That decision is based upon two cautionary points concerning frequency counting in qualitative studies. First, frequency counts must be considered in context and in this study the number of participants is small. Second, "…themes with low-frequency counts (e.g., 1 or 2) may be just as meaningful as those with high-frequency counts (e.g., 50 or 55)" (Hays & Singh, 2012, p. 312). Also, the validity of the study is the truthfulness of the findings and the conclusions based on the maximum opportunity to hear the participant's message. It is also important that the researcher find and acknowledge "holes" in the research design (Hays & Singh, 2012).

Limitations. The population from which the sample was drawn was incomplete. The rosters of adjunct faculty were accepted as is at the time human resources released the name and addresses of part-time faculty. The decision was made to accept the roster at that time as the researcher was assured the roster would have little change as the semester progressed. Although some part-time might be deleted due to classes eliminated and others added due to newly added classes, the final number, based on experience would fall between 300 and 350. Consequently, the roster containing 311 names was accepted from which 103 part-time faculty were randomly selected.

A second limitation is the procedure by which the selected college groups faculty. The faculty is placed into one of four divisions which do not necessarily contain those academic disciplines normally thought of as being grouped together. As a result, the researcher individually placed faculty into groups to answer the research question: Do these motivational factors of part-time faculty differ between academic discipline-specific clusters?

Summary

This study examined four research questions designed to gain insight into the motivational factor that lead a part-time faculty member to seek employment at the community college. The study was carried out at a selected community college within a state community college system.. The coding and grouping of coded data were used to develop schema leading to the formation of theoretical patterns of motivation for seeking employment.

Chapter IV

Findings and Interpretations

This chapter presents the findings of the study survey administered to a random sample of the population of part-time faculty at a public community college located in the Southeastern United States. In this case, the findings were influenced by the a priori design of the survey that was constructed independently of the findings. This a priori design is justified in that the focus of the study was to determine motivational factors. These motivational factors are documented in numerous studies from the field of study of motivation and job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The motivational factors used in this study are consistent with the terminology and definitions used in recognized studies of motivation (Bateman, Snell, & Konopaske, 2016; Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 2012; Lawler, 1969; McShane & Von, Glinow, 2010, 2014; Nickels, McHugh, & McHugh, 2016; Schermerhorn, 2013). The researcher also relied upon years of study and working with issues of motivation and the understanding of motivational factors. One of the challenges of this study has been to bracket the researcher's bias and assumptions about the study's focus and to refrain from "reading into" participant's comments. The design of the survey and the analysis of responses are discussed in more detail within this chapter. As a preliminary study, the population studied was intentionally smaller than would have been ideal.

The survey questions are guided by the research questions

1. What are the motivational factors given by part-time faculty for seeking employment at the community college?

2. Do these motivational factors of part-time faculty differ between academic discipline-specific clusters?

3. Do these motivational factors differ by Gappa and Leslie's (1993) typology of part-time faculty?

4. Do these motivational factors of part-time faculty differ by:

    a. Gender.

    b. Age.

    c. Years of teaching experience at college.

    d. The reason for employment.

    e. Full or part-time employment.

The survey. The survey was administered to a random sample from a population of part-time faculty of a community college. Initially, 349 names were provided constituting the population of the part-time teaching faculty of the college. A crosscheck of names submitted with a list of full-time staff also working as adjuncts revealed 37 full-time faculty seeking extra earnings by teaching an overload. The names of these persons were deleted from the population as it was assumed their relationship to the college would have a biasing effect on the responses. The resulting population of 312 was utilized as the population from which 120 names were randomly selected. This number was further reduced to 103 participants as 17 additional names were identified as persons having full-time staff positions at the college. These 17 names were deleted for the same reason as stated above. The remaining 103 persons were accepted as the sample population.

Letters (*Appendix B*) were sent to sample population informing them of the forthcoming survey and soliciting their participation. The letter included a brief summary of the importance of the survey. Further, the letter provided information on the dissemination of the survey results,

the safeguards of the data, the steps taken to ensure anonymity and confidentiality, and the right to refuse to participate in the survey. Each letter contained a new $2 bill as a *novelty* inducement to generate interest and to build a sense of fairness towards completing the survey (Dillman et al., 2009).

One week after mailing the letter to participants, the first email containing a link to the survey was sent reiterating the importance of the study. One week after the first email, a second email with the link to the survey was sent as a reminder to those not completing the survey. At the same time, an email containing a "thank you note" was sent to those completing the survey. The following week, another reminder email with a link to the survey was sent to those not yet completing the survey. This final email contained a notice of the end date of the survey and encouraged those persons to complete the survey so that their input would be in the final data. At the close date of the survey, 68 of 103 completed the survey for a completion rate of 66%. One person opted out of the survey.

Demographics. The following tables provide an overview of the demographics of the sampled participants.

Table 1.

Demographics

Variable		Response	%
Gender	Male	27	40%
	Female	41	60%
	Under 30	3	4%
	31-40	14	21%
Age	41-50	10	15%
	Over 51	41	60%

	Yes, full time	27	40%
Employment full or part-time	Yes, part-time	14	21%
in another occupation	No, not employed	26	38%
	Prefer not to answer	1	1%

Those surveyed were asked to select one of four categories; career-enders, specialists/professionals, aspiring academics, and free-lancers, as groups accepted within the literature (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). The following table depicts the responses of the faculty responding to the survey.

Table 2. Categories of respondents.

The literature categorizes part-time into four groups. In which group do you most closely fit?

Answer	Response	%
Career ender (Retired and coming from established careers).	21	31%
Specialists, experts, and professionals (have full-time employment elsewhere	26	38%
Aspiring academics (generally seeking full-time status)	14	21%
Free-lancers (complementing their part-time work with other jobs or involved in home and work for extra money)	7	10%

An overview of responses to the demographic segment of the survey produced little surprises. With few exceptions, the demographic data closely aligns with the descriptions presented by Leslie and Gappa (2002) and others, as well as more current data presented in the Community College Survey of Student Engagement: Institutional Report, 2015 Cohort (CCCSE, 2015). The gender of part-timers in the study population (60% female, 40% male) is not equally balanced as presented by Leslie and Gappa but is more aligned with current data from the

CCCSE, 2015 (56.8% female, 43.2% male). The gender of the sample population as well as those completing the survey aligned with the overall population of the institution studied.

Seventy-five percent of the sample population of part-timers are 41 years of age or older with only 3% being under 30 years old. This percent of older part-time faculty also aligns closely with national data, as 78% of part-time faculties are over 40 years of age in the national study (CCCSE, 2015). This can be explained in part by correlating these numbers with the findings from this study in which a higher numbers of part-timers categorized themselves as career-enders (31%, $n = 21$) or specialists/experts/ professionals/ having full-time jobs elsewhere (38%, $n = 26$). These findings are consistent with those found in the literature.

Table 3.

How long have you worked at this college?

Answer	Response	%
less than one year	1	1%
1 -5 years	34	50%
6 - 10 years	15	22%
more than 10 years	18	26%
Total	68	100%

One-half of the part-timers worked at the college between one and five years while an additional 48% ($n = 33$) worked at the college six years or more. This differs from the national findings of a studied population ($N = 30,594$) in which 59% reported over five years teaching experience (CCCSE, 2014). It should be recognized that this study only asked for teaching experience at their present institution whereas the national study asked for total years of teaching

experience. Never the less, the percentages of teaching experience at this institution align closely with the data from the national study.

Forty percent (n = 27) of the respondents indicated full-time employment elsewhere, and another 21% (n = 14) had part-time employment elsewhere. These numbers are reflective of a workforce having a background in or currently working in a professional field outside of the community college. This is consistent with findings in numerous studies that stress the community colleges rely upon a professional workforce as a source of part-time faculty teaching on a part-time basis. In essence, the above-cited percentages are consistent with the literature.

The story. Most of the research and studies on part-time faculty tells only a portion of the story. The typical study found in the literature deals with faculty efficacy, student engagement, student success, part-time faculty profiles. The portion of the study missing is one of the motivational factors that lead part-time faculties to teach in the community college. This study attempts to fill in that missing portion of the story.

As stated in the opening of this chapter, the issue of categorizing and coding the study findings requires comment. Normally, responses would generate categories that then are coded and emerge. "'Data do not emerge.' We are researchers who 'identify' findings" (Hays & Singh, 2012, p .339). These findings tell the story. For this study, a data analysis plan was established ahead of time, and the data analysis activities are aligned with this scheme. The plan was based on a theoretical framework arrived from years of academic study and practical work experience in the field of motivation and in seeking answers to the question of what are the factors that provide an environment in which one would be motivated. For example, if one uses the accepted expectancy theory of motivation presented by Vroom (1995), a person approaches

the task with three questions: can I accomplish the task, is there a reward associated with the ask, and is the reward of value. This study concerns itself with the question, what outcomes for teaching are valued by the part-time faculty. Part-time faculties work in generally unfavorable circumstances and for little financial reward. Understanding the participant's reasons for valuing their experience as part-time faculty members is essential to recognizing the most efficient application of resources needed to support part-time faculty. This is the reason this study was initiated, this is the reason for gathering this data, and this is the reason for telling their story.

Finally, the telling of their story uses the generally accepted terminology for categorizing motivational factors. Motivation describes forces within an individual that account for his or her direction, intensity, and persistence of voluntary behavior (Bateman, Snell, & Konopaske, 2016; Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 2012; Lawler, 1969; McShane & Von, Glinow, 2010, 2014; Nickels, McHugh, & McHugh, 2016; Schermerhorn, 2013). The literature suggests people are motivated to tasks that provide one or more of five factors: skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback (Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 2012).

 The survey contained three open-ended questions designed to give the respondents the opportunity to freely and without prompts, submit their reasons for seeking employment at the community college. The responses were coded and placed in categories of similar statements. In addition, the categories were designed to reflect the accepted definitions of motivational factors found in the literature such as value of one's contribution, ability to make a difference (task significance), improve one's skills (personal growth), and link recognition to performance (Bateman et al., 2013; Hackman & Oldham, 1974, 1976; Herzberg, 2010; Nickels et al., 2016;Vroom, 1995). Hackman and Oldman (1976) specifically link task identification and task

significance to high internal work motivation. As previously written, motivation describes forces within an individual that account for his or her direction, intensity, and persistence of voluntary behavior (Bateman, Snell, & Konopaske, 2016; Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 2012; Lawler, 1969; McShane & Von, Glinow, 2010, 2014; Nickels, McHugh, & McHugh, 2013; Schermerhorn, 2013). Responses were grouped into themes supporting the factors described in the literature as accepted terminology describing motivational factors (Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 2012). The terms used for each grouping of motivational factors follows.

Skill variety different job activities requiring several skills as well as the opportunity for skill growth and achievement. An example would be developing and delivering courses designed to engage students.

Task identity the completion of a whole, identifiable piece of work. The opportunity to identify with a specific class and group of students.

Task significance Is the task of value to self and society and has a positive impact on the lives of others.

Autonomy independence and discretion in making decisions.

Feedback information about the job performance from others to include students.

Research question 1: What are the motivational factors given by part-time faculty for seeking employment at the community college?

A number of the questions within the survey ask either directly or indirectly seeking information concerning the opinions and feelings towards various aspects of the part-time faculty relationship with the college. The first question presented below seeks to obtain information

about the reason part-time faculty seek employment at the community college. Participants were

asked to choose three areas therefore, percentage totals are meaningless.

Table 4

Choose the three most important areas to you as an adjunct

Answer	Response	%
Teaching in my discipline/profession/career field	53	78%
Being part of this college community	6	9%
Opportunity to work with students	46	68%
Professional development	15	22%
Supplement my salary	28	41%
Work toward becoming a full-time faculty member	19	28%
Personal satisfaction	37	54%
Other	1	1%

Note: *Other," supplementing household income" The above responses were from a total n = 68 participants.*

To the question, "…choose the three most important areas to you…" three of eight

possible responses stood above the others. Seventy-eight percent (n = 53) of respondents chose

"teaching in my discipline/profession/career." Sixty-eight percent (n = 46) listed "opportunity to

work with students," and another 54% (n = 37) listed "personal satisfaction." Of those reporting

age over 51 years, 76% listed the opportunity to work with students as a reason for employment.

The opportunity to work with students was chosen by 70% (*n* = 7) of those in the 41 – 50 years

of age bracket and 75.6% (n = 31) of those in the over 51 years of age bracket. This would

indicate the older faculties are inclined to seek employment as a way of *giving back* to the

community. Of significance to the focus of this study, one may subsume all three responses

under the accepted definitions of factors leading to motivation. Using one's skill and knowledge

towards a task deemed important in an environment in which one feels personally satisfied are

key factors leading to the motivation to be engaged in a task ((Bateman et al., 2013; Herzberg, 2010; Nickels et al., 2016). Of the 78% (n = 53) that gave teaching in their discipline as the principle motivator, 60% (*n* = 32) were in the over 51 years of age bracket. This finding associated with ages may be a function of being established in a profession or are career–enders motivated by the feeling of giving back to the community. Also, individuals in the category of "career-enders" may find teaching as a way of continuing to feel useful to and engaged with the community.

The term job satisfaction usually refers to the affective orientation an individual holds toward their roles at work (Herzberg, 2010; Vroom, 1995). However, the variable of job satisfaction is not a single factor but is more general in that a person may be satisfied with the job content but be dissatisfied with wages or some other factors. Vroom (1995) suggests that job satisfaction is considered as some valences to which the individual assigns different levels of value. In any study of motivational factors, job satisfaction or dissatisfaction plays an important part. Persons may be satisfied with aspects of the task, and this contributes to the motivation to perform. However, they may also be dissatisfied with aspects of the job but find other factors of greater significance that override the dissatisfaction and provide for the motivation to perform the task. This seems to be true for this study at this institution. From the responses, there are numerous aspects that lead to dissatisfaction but these are more than compensated for by other aspects of the task that lead to part-time faculty willingness to engage the community college. Examples are shown in the following tables in which participants report low satisfaction or at best, neutrality with job recognition, feelings of inclusion within the community, wages, and relationship with the administration.

Table 5

To the survey question: "To what extent are you satisfied with…"

How well the College addresses the concerns of part-time faculty?

	Career enders	Specialists, experts, and professionals	Aspiring academics	Free-lancers	Total
Very Dissatisfied	0	1	3	0	4
	0.00%	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	0.00%	3.85%	21.43%	0.00%	5.88%
Dissatisfied	2	2	3	0	7
	28.57%	28.57%	42.86%	0.00%	100.00%
	9.52%	7.69%	21.43%	0.00%	10.29%
Neutral	5	9	3	3	20
	25.00%	45.00%	15.00%	15.00%	100.00%
	23.81%	34.62%	21.43%	42.86%	29.41%
Satisfied	12	11	5	3	31
	38.71%	35.48%	16.13%	9.68%	100.00%
	57.14%	42.31%	35.71%	42.86%	45.59%
Very Satisfied	2	3	0	1	6
	33.33%	50.00%	0.00%	16.67%	100.00%
	9.52%	11.54%	0.00%	14.29%	8.82%
Total	21	26	14	7	68
	30.88%	38.24%	20.59%	10.29%	100.00%
	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Sixty-four percent of the aspiring academics expressed dissatisfaction or neutral at best as being dissatisfied with the manner in which the college addressed their concerns. Only 35.71% expressed satisfaction with none reporting very satisfied with the manner in which their concerns

are addressed. This differed from the career-enders where 66.66% expressed satisfaction with the manner in which their concerns were addressed. This could be explained by the fact that they were more interested in pursuing their objectives of working with students and personal satisfaction and less concerned with attention from the administration.

Many (36.7%) of the part-time faculty reported being neutral to dissatisfied with their relationship with other members of the department and 54% (*n* = 37) stated they did not feel a part of the campus community. This speaks to feelings of inclusion within the community. While low feelings of inclusion may negatively effect job satisfaction, it would appear that this may not only be overshadowed by other factors, it may be accepted by part-time faculty whose presence on campus is mostly limited to teaching hours. Relationships with the department chair were reported to be positive with 74% stating they were satisfied to very satisfied with the relationship. Finally, 54.4% report satisfaction with how well the college addresses concerns of part-time faculty.

Table. 6

To what extent are you satisfied with the level of recognition for your contribution to the college?

	Career enders	Specialists, experts, and professionals	Aspiring academics	Free-lancers	Total
Very Dissatisfied	1	3	4	0	8
	12.50%	37.50%	50.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	4.76%	11.54%	28.57%	0.00%	11.76%
Dissatisfied	5	3	3	1	12
	41.67%	25.00%	25.00%	8.33%	100.00%
	23.81%	11.54%	21.43%	14.29%	17.65%

	4	11	3	3	21
Neutral	19.05%	52.38%	14.29%	14.29%	100.00%
	19.05%	42.31%	21.43%	42.86%	30.88%
	7	8	3	1	19
Satisfied	36.84%	42.11%	15.79%	5.26%	100.00%
	33.33%	30.77%	21.43%	14.29%	27.94%
	4	1	1	2	8
Very Satisfied	50.00%	12.50%	12.50%	25.00%	100.00%
	19.05%	3.85%	7.14%	28.57%	11.76%
	21	26	14	7	68
Total	30.88%	38.24%	20.59%	10.29%	100.00%
	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

A key factor of motivation cited in the literature is recognition. Herzberg (2010) suggests recognition can come from various sources such a supervisor, an individual in management, management as an impersonal force, a colleague, or a client (student as a client). Herzberg's premise is that recognition is not only a motivator, but it also serves as a lasting or long term motivator. The current study suggests a need to improve the recognition for part-time faculty at the community college with 59.2% (n = 16 of 27) of males and 60% (n = 25 of 41) of females reporting that they are very dissatisfied to neutral with the level of recognition. Only 11.76% of the part-time faculty reported they were very satisfied with the level of recognition.

Open-ended questions. To best understand the factors that motivate part-time faculty, it was determined that open-ended questions would provide the richest, in-depth opportunity to capture the participants views in their words. Three open-ended question were used to focus the

response into desired groupings. Where appropriate, the responses to these questions were linked to multiple choice and rank ordered questions within the survey.

What follows is a sample of the responses placed in groupings that support one or more of five factors: skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback (Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 2012). The responses are grouped within clusters aligned with each of the three open-ended questions. Some responses will show up more than once as the response can be considered as supporting more than one motivating factor. For example, the response "…especially like the challenge of students who are not very excited about the topic and finding the key to turning them around." supports the motivational factors of task significance, task identity, and autonomy.

It is also a strong possibility that one could read into the quoted response the factors personal satisfaction and recognition. The statement of one participant:

I believe there is a nice vision at this college, at least for the community and

the students therein. People at this school are nice to me and at least say that

they appreciate my efforts. Best of all, I love being a part of each student's

personal journey toward success.

supports multiple motivational factors. This response speaks to a belief of working towards a significant goal, a sense of accomplishment, and an awareness of being recognized for accomplishments.

The following presents a sample of the response to the open-end question. The comments are presented unedited and for the most part, contain the entire response to a given

question. Omitting parts of the response occurs only in cases where part of the response supports

a different category or when the portion retained sufficiently supports the research question.

Table 7.

Open-ended question 13: Tell us what motivates you to teach at a community college?

Motivating factor	Response
Skill variety	• The demographic diversity of students seeking to obtain and maintain a satisfying and successful career. • students who want to learn…push me to keep trying to find better ways to teach…. • an opportunity to challenge myself • The possibility of full- time employment as a lecturer or assistant professor in my field. • Try to keep current in the field. • It has been my goal since I was an undergrad. • the topics and subject matter I teach are constantly evolving and teaching gives me a platform to keep abreast of the latest technology…
Task identity	• Working with a student is a great motivation. • As a career educator…the personal satisfaction I receive creates the motivation to continue teaching part-time.
Task significance	• Serving a group of students self-motivated to continue their education…. • …interaction with a greater diversity of students, and be more helpful to a wider community. • …I do like serving this population and really enjoy my students here. • I want to make an impact on the community of students in my local area. • Believe it is important to give back to the community. • Desire to help our young people. • Making a difference in the lives of others who otherwise may not have had the opportunity to further their education.
Autonomy	• Teaching is part of my retirement activities.
Feedback	• People at this school are nice to me and at least say that they appreciate my efforts. • … respect for my experience and credentials.

Table 8.

Open-ended question: What is the most important factor that motivates you to teach at a

community college?

Motivating factor	Response
Skill variety	• Demographic diversity makes each class and each student a rewarding challenge. • To challenge myself and the students intellectually. • Getting better at my craft and teaching students • More use of my teaching and scientific talents and gifts to educate a more diverse group of people.
Task identity	• I love teaching and I love my discipline. • Getting better at my craft and teaching students. • I love teaching…. • A Greater sense of impact than at a 4 yr school. • The reward I get personally and professionally from being able to successfully teach others how to succeed in the field.
Task significance	• Give hope. • I love teaching and …I feel I can make the most difference in my students' lives. • Helping students. • Influencing students to success. • Getting better at my craft and teaching students • Honestly, this sounds ridiculous, but it is the money. • The success of the students I work with is the most important factor.
Autonomy	• Flexibility • convenience of locality. • Opportunity to teach part time.
Feedback	• The students and their recommendations of me to teach their friends. • this specific community college…they treat me really well, respect me as a professional, and the students are so appreciative. • I get positive feedback from my students and that makes me feel good...at community college, I only get it from the students but that is enough for me.

Research question 2: Do these motivational factors of part-time faculty differ between academic discipline-specific clusters?

This institution clusters academic discipline into four groups:

1) Business, Public Service, Information systems, and Mathematics (BPSISM).

2) Communications, Humanities, and Social sciences (CHSS).

3) Health Professionals (H Prof).

4) Science, Engineering, and Technology (SET).

The data from this study fails to establish significant differences between satisfaction levels and the academic disciplines. There is a higher degree of dissatisfaction in all areas within the CHSS group.

Research question 3: Do these motivational factors differ by Gappa and Leslie's (1993) typology of part-time faculty?

One area of particular interest in this study was to examine possible differences between groups as categorized in the literature: career-enders, specialists/experts/professionals, aspiring academics, and free-lancers (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).. Participants were asked to select the category in which of the four categories they most closely fit. The participants were also asked to choose the top three areas most important to them as an adjunct member. The following crosstab table shows the responses by category to the areas most important to the member. Again, the data from this study fails to establish significant differences in categories of part-time faculty fitting the Gappa and Leslie typology. However, a review of the data for part-time categories (career-enders, specialists, aspiring academics, free-lancers) cross-tabbed with levels of satisfaction in five areas reveals three noteworthy examples of either satisfaction or

dissatisfaction. The first is the expressed levels of satisfaction in the area of the how well the

college addresses the concerns of the part-time faculty. In this case, 55% of all part-time faculty

are satisfied or very satisfied with the manner in which their concerns are addressed at the

college and nearly 30% neutral.

Table 9.

Choose three most important areas to you as an adjunct.

	Career enders	Professionals	Aspiring	Free-lancers	Total
Teaching in my discipline	17	21	10	5	53
	32.08%	39.62%	18.87%	9.43%	100%
	80.95%	80.77%	71.43%	71.43%	77.94%
Being part of this college community	0	5	1	0	6
	0.00%	83.33%	16.67%	0.00%	100%
	0.00%	19.23%	7.14%	0.00%	8.82%
Opportunities to work with students	18	15	7	6	46
	39.13%	32.61%	15.22%	13.04%	100%
	85.71%	57.69%	50.00%	85.71%	67.65%
Professional Development	1	7	5	2	15
	6.67%	46.67%	33.33%	13.33%	100%
	4.76%	29.92%	35.71%	28.57%	22.06%
Supplementing my salary	6	15	4	3	28
	21.43%	53.57%	14.29%	10.71%	100%
	28.57%	57.69%	28.57%	42.86%	41.18%
Becoming full-time	1	4	12	2	19
	5.26%	21.05%	63.16%	10.53%	100%
	4.76%	15.38%	85.71%	28.57%	27.94%
	20	12	3	2	37

Personal	54.05%	32.43%	8.11%	5.41% 100%
satisfaction	95.24%	46.15% 21.43%	28.57% 54.41%

It also appears from the data that the part-time faculty enjoys a satisfying relationship with other members of their department. This might indicate that while 54% of part-time faculty do not feel part of the campus and another 31% indicate only a *somewhat* as feeling part of the campus, they do consider themselves as part of their discipline and perhaps, their department. However, this positive level of satisfaction with this aspect of their relationship is not reflected in the literature.

Table 10.

To what extent are you satisfied with your relationship with other members of the department in which you teach?

	Career enders	Specialists, professionals	Aspiring academics	Free-lancers	Total
Very Dissatisfied	0	2	0	0	2
	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	0.00%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%	2.94%
Dissatisfied	1	2	3	0	6
	16.67%	33.33%	50.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	4.76%	7.69%	21.43%	0.00%	8.82%
Neutral	7	4	4	2	17
	41.18%	23.53%	23.53%	11.76%	100.00%
	33.33%	15.38%	28.57%	28.57%	25.00%
Satisfied	5	12	6	2	25
	20.00%	48.00%	24.00%	8.00%	100.00%
	23.81%	46.15%	42.86%	28.57%	36.76%
Very Satisfied	8	6	1	3	18
	44.44%	33.33%	5.56%	16.67%	100.00%
	38.10%	23.08%	7.14%	42.86%	26.47%
Total	21	26	14	7	68
	30.88%	38.24%	20.59%	10.29%	100.00%

| | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

The responses to the question concerning recognition showed a lower satisfaction level than did the other four areas surveyed. The mean of the other four questions on a five-point scale is M = 3.66 whereas the responses to satisfaction with recognition have a mean of M = 3.1. The literature concerning motivation lists recognition as a significant factor. Sixty percent of the part-time faculty expressed less than satisfaction with the manner in which their performance is recognized. Those in the aspiring academic category expressed the highest degree of dissatisfaction while career-enders seemed to be the least concerned with the level of recognition. The unconcern would seem plausible as most career-enders are in the over 51 years of age group, and many come from successful careers to teaching as a way of giving back to the community. They are not likely to rely upon recognition from the college to motivate their performance.

Table 11.

To what extent are you satisfied with the level of recognition for your contribution to the college?

	Career enders	Specialists, professionals	Aspiring academics	Free-lancers	Total
Very Dissatisfied	1 12.50% 4.76%	3 37.50% 11.54%	4 50.00% 28.57%	0 0.00% 0.00%	8 100.00% 11.76%
Dissatisfied	5 41.67% 23.81%	3 25.00% 11.54%	3 25.00% 21.43%	1 8.33% 14.29%	12 100.00% 17.65%
Neutral	4	11	3	3	21

	19.05%	52.38%	14.29%	14.29%	100.00%
	19.05%	42.31%	21.43%	42.86%	30.88%
	7	8	3	1	19
Satisfied	36.84%	42.11%	15.79%	5.26%	100.00%
	33.33%	30.77%	21.43%	14.29%	27.94%
	4	1	1	2	8
Very Satisfied	50.00%	12.50%	12.50%	25.00%	100.00%
	19.05%	3.85%	7.14%	28.57%	11.76%
	21	26	14	7	68
	30.88%	38.24%	20.59%	10.29%	100.00%
Total	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Research question 4: Do these motivational factors of part-time faculty differ by gender, age, years of teaching experience at college, the reason for employment, or full or part-time employment? The motivational factors used to answer this research question are the responses to the survey question number 10 that asked a series of "to what extent are you satisfied with…" areas.

Gender. In general, females showed a higher percentage of responses in the neutral ranking (63.8% to males 36.2%) while males showed a stronger tendency to express *very dissatisfied*, 64.7% to females 35.3%. Females were more likely to rate areas in the *satisfied* and *very satisfied* category than were males. This finding contradicts the findings of a study by Bozeman and Gaughan (2011) in which they found no significant difference (less than 1%) between the satisfaction levels of males and females. This could be a result of this study's small sample of a single college

.

Table 12.

Areas of importance by Gender

	Male	Female	Total
Teaching in my discipline/profession/career field	23	30	53
	43.40%	56.60%	100.00%
	85.19%	73.17%	77.94%
Being part of this college community	3	3	6
	50.00%	50.00%	100.00%
	11.11%	7.32%	8.82%
Opportunities to work with students	17	29	46
	36.96%	63.04%	100.00%
	62.96%	70.73%	67.65%
Professional development	5	10	15
	33.33%	66.67%	100.00%
	18.52%	24.39%	22.06%
Supplementing my salary	10	18	28
	35.71%	64.29%	100.00%
	37.04%	43.90%	41.18%
Work toward becoming a full-time faculty member	6	13	19
	31.58%	68.42%	100.00%
	22.22%	31.71%	27.94%
Personal satisfaction	17	20	37
	45.95%	54.05%	100.00%
	62.96%	48.78%	54.41%
Other	0	1	1
	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	0.00%	2.44%	1.47%
	27	41	68
	39.71%	60.29%	100.00%
Total	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Note: Totals do not equal 68 as all were asked to select three areas of most importance.

Table 13.

Career Categories by Gender

The literature generally categorizes part-time faculty into four groups. In which group do you most likely fit?	Male	Female	Total
Career enders	11	10	21
	52.38%	47.62%	100.00%
	40.74%	24.39%	30.88%
Specialists, experts, and professionals	10	16	26
	38.46%	61.54%	100.00%
	37.04%	39.02%	38.24%
Aspiring academics	6	8	14
	42.86%	57.14%	100.00%
	22.22%	19.51%	20.59%
Free lancers	0	7	7
	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	0.00%	17.07%	10.29%
Total	27	41	68
	39.71%	60.29%	100.00%
	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Recognition is regarded as a key factor in motivational studies. The lack of recognition is often seen as a dissatisfying factor. Recognition is not only a motivational factor, but it also one with lasting value Herzberg, 1993; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 2010. Herzberg (2010) suggests recognition can come from various sources such a supervisor, an individual in

management, management as an impersonal force, a colleague, or a client (student as a client).

Males (59.26%) and females (60.97%) reported dissatisfaction or at best, neutrality with the

level of recognition they receive for their contribution to the college.

Table 14.

Gender by level of satisfaction with recognition for contribution to the College.

	Male	Female	Total
Very Dissatisfied	4	4	8
	50.00%	50.00%	100.00%
	14.81%	9.76%	11.76%
Dissatisfied	5	7	12
	41.67%	58.33%	100.00%
	18.52%	17.07%	17.65%
Neutral	7	14	21
	33.33%	66.67%	100.00%
	25.93%	34.15%	30.88%
Satisfied	8	11	19
	42.11%	57.89%	100.00%
	29.63%	26.83%	27.94%
Very Satisfied	3	5	8
	37.50%	62.50%	100.00%
	11.11%	12.20%	11.76%
Total	27	41	68
	39.71%	60.29%	100.00%
	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

The levels of satisfaction with recognition varied between academic disciplines.

The following table provides an insight into these differences. Most noticeable is the level of

dissatisfaction within the CHSS department. Sixty percent of the part-time in the CHSS

department were dissatisfied to neutral concerning recognition.

Table 15

To what extent are you satisfied with the level of recognition for your contribution to the college?

	BPSISM	CHSS	H Prof	SET	Total
	2	6	0	0	8
Very Dissat	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	9.52%	17.14%	0.00%	0.00%	11.76%
	3	5	1	3	12
Dissatisfied	25.00%	41.67%	8.33%	25.00%	100.00%
	14.29%	14.29%	33.33%	33.33%	17.65%
	8	10	0	3	21
Neutral	38.10%	47.62%	0.00%	14.29%	100.00%
	38.10%	28.57%	0.00%	33.33%	30.88%
	5	10	2	2	19
Satisfied	26.32%	52.63%	10.53%	10.53%	100.00%
	23.81%	28.57%	66.67%	22.22%	27.94%
	3	4	0	1	8
Very Sat	37.50%	50.00%	0.00%	12.50%	100.00%
	14.29%	11.43%	0.00%	11.11%	11.76%
	21	35	3	9	68
Total	30.88%	51.47%	4.41%	13.24%	100.00%
	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

More males than females were in the career-ender category (40.74% to 24.39%) while

females exceeded males (39.02% to 37.04%) in the category of specialists, experts, and

professionals. Men exceeded women (22.22% to 19.51%) in the aspiring academics category.

Of those selecting free-lancers, all were females. This may be explained by the desire to complement part-time work or to be involved at home.

Age. When viewing the same questions by age, there are little differences in overall response with few exceptions. Those in the over 51 years of age group expressed the highest percent of *very dissatisfied* (41.66% of all groups) and the highest percent of *very satisfied* (70.32% of all groups). They also listed teaching in my profession (60.38%), working with students (67.39%) and personal satisfaction (75.68%) as their top three reasons for working as an adjunct. This can be explained by the fact that many in this group are also in the career-enders group and are not likely to be ambivalent or concerned with relationships with department chairs or deans or the politics of the institution; they are committed to teaching. Only 16.10% of those age 41 and over listed working to become full-time faculty as one of their three choices. This finding is in line with the national study that reported those age 50 and over (35%) prefer part-time employment (AFT Higher Education, 2010).

Years of teaching experience. When viewing years of teaching and levels of satisfaction, there is not a significant trend showing a difference accounted for by years of teaching experience. It does appear from the data that those teaching in the *6-10 years* and *more than ten years* categories are neutral or satisfied with most issues. Again, as mention previously, the data shows a general dissatisfaction with the level of recognition at the college.

Reasons for employment. Those seeking employment offer various responses. If one views *sources of income* as a reason, this study will produce no significant differences. As could be expected, those who give the *primary source of income* as a reason expressed the highest level of dissatisfaction. Most respondents (51%) give *a source of secondary income* as an income

factor. It is important to remember the data already presented to this question, and that respondents were asked to choose the three most important reasons for seeking employment. Only 28 out of 68 gave supplementing my salary as one of the three reasons for employment. Significant among the reasons are teaching in my discipline/profession/career (78%), opportunities to work with students (68%), and personal satisfaction (54%). The study by Bozeman and Gaughan (2011) of predominantly four-year academic institutions asked the question, "even if pay is important, are there other factors such as conditions of work, inherent interest in one's work, or work autonomy, that are even more important than pay" (p. 164)? The present study answers that question. Respondents do find areas that compensate for low wages. This finding is in line with the AFT Higher Education study (2010) where "only 1 in four (26%) teaches part-time because it provides important income and benefits" (p. 9). Furthermore, Vroom (1995), suggests wage expectations often provide a better explanation of job satisfaction than do wages. It is likely the part-time faculty, knowing in advance the salary levels, have no expectations for being paid more. The issue for management is that persons often equate their wages to the value the organization places on their service (Bozeman and Gaughan, 2011).

Full or part-time job elsewhere. Most of the part-time faculties are employed elsewhere with 40% full-time and another 21% part-time. A cross-tab of the employment status with the levels of satisfaction reveals that there is no significant difference between groups. Most responses are similar across categories and fall in the neutral to the satisfied range. Those not employed elsewhere do show a higher degree of satisfaction than do those employed full-time elsewhere. However, any inference from this result would be weak.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of the motivational factors that influence part-time faculty to seek employment at the community college. This study, utilizing a survey, has provided some additional insight into these motivational factors. The study confirms the diverse nature of part-time faculties. Most importantly, this study attempted to view the part-time faculty through their eyes as opposed to being studied regarding student success, graduation rates, and demographic variables. An unexpected finding of the study is the commonality found within the ranks of the part-time faculty notwithstanding their diverse backgrounds. For example, regardless of the background or employment status of the part-timers, the majority (78%) expressed a commitment to the students. This is not always apparent when reviewing the literature on part-time faculty. Moreover, many expressed an overall high satisfaction level in the face of a general discontent with the inequity of remuneration between full-time and part-time faculty. When given the opportunity to make recommendations towards increasing the motivation of part-time faculty, many offered positive suggestions that if implemented could improve the situation and more importantly, most of these suggestions did not require major funding.

A final open-ended question in the survey gave participants an opportunity to offer suggestions on a way to improve their situation at the community college. While not specifically addressing motivational factors, the responses did address issues that could affect the environment in which one would be motivated. While some comments were negatively slanted, the majority provided useful and helpful suggestions for improvements. Portions of the responses are presented below.

Table 16.

Open-ended question 15: If you were the president of a community college, or if you were empowered to make any changes that you deem necessary, what changes designed to increase motivation to teach as an adjunct instructor would you implement?

Motivating factor	Response
Skill variety	- Make sure adjuncts have a way to become full-time faculty. - make preferred class assignments available to adjuncts - don't assign adjuncts only the courses and sections full-time faculty doesn't want to teach. - Create a program for adjunct instructor an opportunity to grow in the college such as train to move in to a full-time position - Opportunity for adjuncts to attend conferences on their field for professional dev. Not just community college sponsored conferences but actual field specific PD.
Task identity	- Allowing all staff to be equals - full-time as well as part-time employees. - make the adjuncts more a part of the total CC process
Task significance	…communication so that adjuncts would know what was expected…they forgot to tell me that the textbook for my class had changed!
Autonomy	- Make a better effort to engage part-time faculty in the matters of course selection, development, and presentation. Currently, it is a "mystery" as to these issues. - Adjunct simply teach what they are told to teach. - consider the reasons behind such a stark gap in pay for workers doing the same job. - Generally treat the adjunct faculty with more respect…. …allow more classroom autonomy to those who have been teaching a long time - Do more to include adjunct faculty in curricular and other academic concerns of the college.
Feedback	…adjuncts and their personal issues are largely ignored at… - Do more to include adjunct faculty in curricular and other academic concerns of the college. - More recognition of contributions. - Have adjunct faculty representation in the Faculty Senate and important faculty committees.

	- More recognition of contributions. - Communicate direction of the college and role adjuncts play.
Job Dissatisfaction	- increase the financial compensation! - More money would be a big consideration. - more stability as well- knowing you'll be consistently offered classes would certainly take away a lot of the anxiety that goes along with adjuncting. - Probably increase in pay **PAY INCREASES.** Hands down…I get paid $2000 to teach a course when a full-time professor/instructor might make around $8000 to teach the same exact course. - There is very little cohesion or consistency between adjunct faculty teaching my discipline… students often take longer to complete their degree because they end up taking classes that weren't necessary.

Summary

The current reliance on the employment of part-time faculty in the community college and high probability of this situation continuing makes it all the more important that community college leaders understand fully the factors that draw part-time faculty to the institution and the factors that keep them there. This study attempted to discover, from the viewpoint of the adjunct, those factors that can influence the adjunct to seek employment and to remain with the college working to promote the success of the students. The findings presented in this chapter may contribute to a better understanding of the motivational factors leading to employment may provide insight into the issues affecting part-time faculty members.

Chapter V will provide a summary of the background of the use of part-time faculty, a discussion of the study and its findings, and recommendations for the application of these

findings. It will suggest changes that can benefit part-time faculty members that do not require additional funding nor major changes to the current system. The Chapter will also contain recommendations for future research.

Chapter V

Hundreds of articles and books have been written over the past forty years concerning part-time faculty in higher education. Many have included or even focused on the part-time faculty at the community college. However, few of these writings examine the subject of part-time faculty from the perspective of *why*, why do part-time faculty engage in a system that inadequately supports their service and offers poor wages. Rather, most studies of part-time faculty focus on issues of engagement, student success rates, and value to the community college system. While these are significant issues, they do not tell the story of the part-time faculty fully.

The studies found in the literature are both supportive and non-supportive of part-time faculty presence. They are both favorable and unfavorable in the assessment of part-time faculty effectiveness. Many of these writings point out the inequities found in part-time remuneration, support, and opportunities for professional development. The single area these writings seem to ignore is the motivational factors that lead the part-time faculty to seek employment. Merely suggesting the motivation is to earn income or to become a full-time faculty member does not adequately promote an understanding of the part-time persons desire to teach at a community college. It is from this position this study originated.

The purpose of this study was to generate knowledge that contributes to a better understanding of the motivational factors influencing part-time faculty to seek employment at the community college. The study provides insight into the perceptions, attitudes, and feelings of the part-time faculty leading to satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the position. The research suggests these perceptions, attitudes, and feeling are contributing factors influencing the part-time faculty feelings of engagement and commitment as well as the quality of their performance.

This study further illuminates the differences between the intrinsic and extrinsic factors influencing the performance of part-time faculty. As stated in the limitations of the study, this study does not suggest there are no other factors that might be motivational. This study merely offers a glimpse of the complex issues facing administrators as they adapt incentives to attract the highest quality part-time faculty.

Part-time faculty and the college. Gappa and Leslie (1972), as well as others, referred to four general categories for part-time faculty each with differing motives for being on the faculty. Some are specialists, experts, or professionals; some are freelancers employed at many institutions; some are career enders influenced by a desire to give something back to the community, and some are aspiring academics. Consequently, the framing of any study of the attitudes and self-reported opinions of part-time faculty must start with an understanding that the attitudes and self-reported opinions are a product of diverse individuals' circumstances that do not fit into a single grouping (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Wittmer & Martin, 2010). The diversity categories of part-time faculty are mirrored by a diversity of perceptions of others towards the efficacy of part-time faculty. Some, such as Gappa and Leslie (1993) and Green (2007), have expressed value in the real-life experience and quality of instruction brought to the institution by part-time faculty. Others such as Eagan and Jaegar (2009) suggest that full-time faculty should replace part-time faculty. A few studies found that part-time faculty have a positive effect on the students while other studies found part-time faculty resulted in lower performance or lower completion rates as a result of part-time faculty (Jacoby, 2006; Jaegar & Eagan, 2009). Still other studies found no significant differences between student successes of those exposed to part-time faculty with those exposed to full-time faculty (Landrum, 2009; Ochoa, 2012).

Moreover, Leslie and Gappa (2002) found there was no significant difference in the quality of teaching between part-time and full-time faculty despite little support for part-time faculty at most institutions. Finally, a study by Bippis, Brooks, Plax, and Kearney (2001) revealed that students were unaware of the employment status of their instructors.

It has long been recognized that part-time faculty suffer from low financial compensation and inadequate support such as no office space, little or no secretarial support, and few opportunities for professional development (Bippis et al., 2001; Leslie & Gappa, 2002). This situation is not likely to change as states struggle with finances, and higher education remains one of the largest discretionary budget items (Katsinas, Tollefson, & Reamey, 2008). Institutions exacerbate the lack of support and low wages when other factors lead part-time faculty to feel powerless, alienated, invisible, and second class (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). A key element of support is professional development. Not only is professional development not offered to part-time faculty at most institutions, when it is offered, there is also no money to compensate the individual for their time or travel, or it is offered at a time conflicting with employment elsewhere (Sandford, Dainty, Belcher, & Frisbee, 2011).

Perhaps the more significant reason contributing to the unprofessional and often negative treatment of part-time faculty is the perception of the part-time faculty as temporary and disposable (Phillips & Campbell, 2005; Yoshioka, 2007). Cohen and Brower (2008) liken the part-time instructors to the migrant worker and the farm. The irony of these perceptions is the temporary nature of the part-time faculty is at the same time, one of the strengths of the community college system. It allows the community college to adjust rapidly to student requirements regarding both numbers of classes offered and the extensive menu of courses

offered to students. Never the less, this two-tier system of those having and those have-nots results in a culture in which the part-time faculty many feel powerless, alienated, invisible, and second class (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Many part-time faculties feel as though they are not "connected" to or "integrated" into campus life (Gappa and Leslie, 1993; Outcalt, 2002).

Since the part-time faculty is heterogeneous, it is difficult for college administrators to arrive at a single approach to attracting them. However, determining a set of factors that motivate individual to seek employment at the college should not be difficult. It is safe to assume the factors motivating part-time faculty are similar to those of any other person. Motivation is simply the internal driving force within the individual to meet a need (Bateman, Snell, & Konopaske, 2016; Lawler, 1969; Nickels, McHugh, & McHugh, 2016; Schermerhorn, 2013).

Any study of part-time faculty should encompass a review of the legal issues surrounding their employment. Some researchers argue that the shrinking number of full-time faculty and the increasing number of part-time faculty threaten academic freedom (Unbach, 2007). The notion is that those who work on a non-contractual, or a class-by-class contract basis are unlikely to risk employment by expressing views contrary to the espoused views of the institution. Another legal issue receiving increased attention is property rights. Specifically, is the claim of continuing employment a property rights issue. Some court cases have ruled for part-time faculty claiming their continued year to year employment has established an implied contract or property right to employment.

Of particular importance to the issue of part-time faculty is student success. The Study Group (1984) recommends students, in particular, first-year students, be provided adequate

opportunities for intense intellectual interaction with faculty, be assigned the best instructors, and be provided with a stable body of the faculty. "Strong faculty identification with the institution and strong faculty involvement with the student requires a primary commitment" part-time faculty has difficulty in making especially those who teach while holding a full-time job elsewhere (Study Group, 1984, p. 36). Many studies find no significant difference between the effectiveness of part-time and full-time faculty (Friedlander, 1979; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Nevertheless, some other studies do find differences in the effectiveness of part-time faculty as compared to full-time faculty (Clark, 1988; Eagan and Jaeger (2008); Jaeger & Eagan, 2009; Roach, 1995; Umbach, 2007; Zusman, 2005).

Summary of the Study

Overview of the problem. This study suggests that it is important to know and reflect upon the factors contributing to the motivation of part-time faculty to seek employment at the community college. The goal of this study is to provide community college administrators with additional information concerning part-time faculty motivation to seek employment so that, where possible, institutional practices may be adjusted to maximize the efficacy of part-time faculty.

Purpose statement and research questions. The purpose of this qualitative study was to discover the motivational factors influencing part-time faculty employment at the community college. The study examined possible differences of motivational factors affecting employment of part-time faculty across academic discipline clusters as well as differences between individuals working full-time or part-time in another profession. The following research questions guided this study:

1) What are the motivational factors given by the part-time faculty for seeking employment at the community college?

2) Do these motivational factors of part-time faculty differ between academic discipline-specific clusters?

3) Do these motivational factors differ by Gappa and Leslie's (1993) typology of part-time faculty?

4) Do these motivational factors of part-time faculty differ by:

   a. Gender.

   b. Age.

   c. Years of teaching experience at college.

   d. Reason for employment.

   e. Full or part-time employment.

Methodology.

A survey approach was chosen to discover the motivational factors influencing part-time faculty employment. The survey provided the part-time faculty with an opportunity to provide in their words, the reason for engaging as a part-time faculty member. The data gleaned from the surveys was coded and categorized under accepted terms in the literature describing motivation and motivational factors. Through exploratory analysis, the researcher attempted to understand the motivational factors leading to part-time employment and did not attempt to test a preconceived hypothesis (Plano Clark & Creswell, 2009, Creswell, 2010; Hays & Singh, 2012).

The views of the participants were obtained from the responses to a survey administered to a sample of the population of a community college part-time faculty. A letter was mailed to

all the sample members alerting them to the future survey and explaining the importance of the study. The letter also explained the terms of participating to include the right to opt-out of the survey. The following week the first of three electronic messages were dispatched, each with a link to the survey. The survey was available for 22 days during which time two reminders were sent to those not completing the survey. Of the 103 surveys distributed, 66% ($n = 68$) were returned. The survey contained the necessary demographic questions needed to answer the research questions. The survey also included some scaled questions designed to seek information on levels of satisfaction or areas of importance to the individual. These questions were specific to address areas known to be associated with intrinsic motivational factors. Finally, the survey contained three open-ended questions designed to obtain data in the words of the participants.

Summary of findings. There were very few surprises in the survey findings when comparing them to the findings in most of the literature. A few differences may be attributed to the fact that many of the studies found in the literature are representative of part-time faculties in general and not specific to the community colleges. For example, that seeking full-time employment status seems to be more prevalent in four-year colleges. In a national study of part-time faculty with 59% representing four-year institutions, 47% indicated a desire for full-time employment. Among those under age 50, the percentage increased to 60% (AFT Higher Education, (2010). In this study of a community college, only 28% ($n = 19$) of the respondents chose "work towards becoming a full-time member" as an important reason for seeking employment at the community college.

A small number (22%, $n = 15$) selected professional development as one of the top three reasons for seeking a position at the community college. An even smaller number (9%, $n = 6$) consider being part of the community college community of importance. It is entirely possible this small percent considering it important to be part of the college community is linked to the finding that when asked if they feel part of the campus community, 50% (34 0f 68) chose not much, and an additional 4% chose not at all. These two responses concerning being part of the campus community are consistent with the literature studies that report that many part-time faculties feel as though they are not "connected" to or "integrated" into campus life (Gappa and Leslie, 1993; Outcalt, 2002). This finding is of interest as it differs from the findings in at least one study where faculty "sense of community" was a major reason for staying at the college even if the individual reported overall dissatisfaction or stress with remaining (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011).

To the item "Please choose the three most important areas to you as an adjunct faculty…," at least two responses stand out as different from what one may infer from the literature in general. Of the 68 respondents, the opportunity to work with students (68%, $n = 46$) and personal satisfaction (54%, $n = 37$) were selected as two of the top three important areas for seeking employment. These findings were unexpected as the literature contains few examples from the perspective of part-time faculty that they value the opportunity to benefit students. Most studies reflect the relationship from the perspective of the student receiving the benefits of the relationship. For example, many studies have been published concerning student success, student graduation rates, student engagement, and the like. The highest selection, that of teaching in my discipline/profession/career field (78%, $n = 53$), is probably not unlike data from

all of higher education. Reference to professions and career fields is to be found in greater number at the community college due to workforce development courses and career oriented certificate-awarding programs. As found in the literature, workforce development is a significant part of the charter of the community college and is stressed much more so than in four-year institutions. Community colleges offer some professional certificates that require the college hire professional as adjuncts for what is frequently a one or two courses per semester need.

It was expected the findings would show a dissatisfaction with wages. In response to the open-ended questions, some very pointed comments allude to inequity and unfairness of salary between full and part-time faculties for teaching the same courses. One responded mentioned teaching at more than one community college within the same system and geographic area and being salaried at different levels for the same course. She teaches the same courses at one community college at the instructor level and the other community college at the assistant professor level with a proportionate increase in wages. This study did not specifically ask for the satisfaction level concerning wages.

Wages are not always a determinant of satisfaction and motivation. The work of Herzberg is often criticized for ranking wages low in importance as a motivator (Nickels, McHugh, & McHugh, 2016). The criticism is based on the fact Herzberg's findings were based on professional and accountants and not on lower level workers. The argument is made that wages have less of an impact on the higher level, better paid professional worker. A study by Ryan and Deci (2000) support this argument. Their study suggests the motivators that are important are intrinsic, and that extrinsic "rewards made contingent on performance does, in fact, undermine intrinsic motivation" (p. 59). In a study by Bozeman and Gaughan (2011), the

university professor is used as an example of one willing to work for less than stellar wages. The motivating factors are the prestige connected with the position, the feeling of autonomy, job satisfaction, recognition, and time for leisure and family life and not wages. Bozeman and Gaughan stress the importance of these finding to the administrators of academic institutions as the industry offers high wages and benefits to compete for high quality educated workers.

The second area of dissatisfaction expressed by the participants of this study was the lack of recognition for performance. Thirty of 68 (44.1%) expressed dissatisfaction with the level of recognition for their contribution to the college. Twenty-one (30.9%) expressed neutrality and only 39.7% ($n = 27$) expressed satisfaction. In one academic discipline department, CHSS, only 40% of the faculty expressed satisfaction with the level of recognition. Recognition is not only a motivational factor, but it also one with lasting value Herzberg, 1993; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 2010). A recent study indicated 79% of employees who voluntarily left their jobs did so because of a lack of appreciation (Nickels, McHugh, and McHugh, 2016). Vroom (1995), cites numerous studies supporting his findings on the subject of recognition. Vroom refers to recognition as the behavior the supervisor exhibiting *consideration* or employee orientation. Those exhibiting consideration have workgroups with favorable attitudes towards the task. Finally, recognition is only effective as a motivator when it is linked to performance (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 20110; Hughes, Ginnett., & Curphy, (2012. These findings are significant and warrant administration attention; recognition is a motivational factor that requires little or no funding.

In sum, the findings from this study confirm much of what is known from the motivation literature. The exception is the finding that the part-time faculties at the studied institution are

dedicated to students to a greater degree than expected. A second unexpected and contradictory finding is that while members expressed dissatisfaction with the feeling of not being part of the community, most (6%) did not select it as important. This finding warrants further research. Lastly, personal satisfaction as a motivational factor appears to outweigh many of the extrinsic factors such as salary, lack of support, feeling part of the campus community, and relationships with those in supervisory positions. This finding corresponds to the literature concerning motivation. It supports the notion that motivating factors can and often do outweigh the dissatisfying factors referred to as hygiene factors (Herzberg, 1987; Herzberg, Mausner, Snyderman, 2010). The hygiene factors may cause dissatisfaction, but they do not dissuade the motivational factors leading part-time to seek employment at the community college.

Discussion of open-ended questions. The open-ended questions were designed to address specifically research question one, "What are the motivational factors given by the part-time faculty for seeking employment at the community college"? These questions were intended to give the respondents the opportunity to state freely their reasons without prompts or limitations.

Many of the responses to the question "tell us what motivates you to teach at the community college" and to the question "what is the most important factor that motivates you to…" were similar except for being declared "most significant" in the second question. The motivational factors that surfaced as a result of the open-ended questions support those found in the literature concerning motivation. Many respondents referred to areas in which they were able to experience the motivator *skill variety*. With statements such as "an opportunity to challenge myself" and "…the topics and subject matter I teach are constantly evolving and

teaching gives me a platform to keep abreast of the latest technology." are an example of the person placing value on the opportunity to use skills in a challenging environment. The motivating factors *task identity* and *task significance* are frequently cited in motivational studies as powerful motivators (Nickels, McHugh, & McHugh, 2016). This study produced several examples of faculty members not only identifying with the task but also attaching significance to the task; the following comments are examples:

- …interaction with a greater diversity of students, and be more helpful to a wider community.
- Making a difference in the lives of others who otherwise may not have had the opportunity to further their education.
- I do like serving this population and really enjoy my students here.
- I love teaching and …I feel I can make the most difference in my students' lives.
- I want to make an impact on the community of students in my local area.
- Believe it is important to give back to the community

Feedback is essential to motivation, and this study provides ample examples of the job giving feedback to the individual. It is important to note that feedback is not limited to someone directly expressing feedback, but it also entails one's ability to sense a regard for one's contribution. The following comments give examples of members sensing recognition and commenting on the positive influence of the feedback. It should be noted that these comments are not contradictory to the earlier reported dissatisfaction with the level of recognition. The earlier expressed dissatisfaction refers to the level of recognition offered by those in supervisory

positions, the institution, whereas the following statements refer to recognition from peers and more importantly, students:

- People at this school are nice to me and at least say that they appreciate my efforts.

- The students and their recommendations of me to their friends.

- … respect for my experience and credentials.

- I get positive feedback from my students, and that makes me feel good...I only get it from the students, but that is enough for me.

- Student caring. Want to help young students

- The interaction with the students….

- The reward I get personally and professionally from being able to successfully teach others….

Discussion of research question three. Overall, those categorizing themselves as career-enders or specialists are satisfied with most areas surveyed. When asked to select the top three most important areas to the individual as an adjunct faculty member, career-enders and specialist differed from all four categories. Teaching in my discipline was selected by 80.8% of career-enders and specialists while only 77.9% of the combined group. This pattern continued in the next two most selected reasons for working at the community college. Working with students was selected by 71.7% of career-enders and specialist versus 67.65% of the group, and personal satisfaction was selected by 71.69% versus 54.41% of the group. This same group reported less overall dissatisfaction than do the entire sample of 68 participants. When asked about their level of satisfaction for recognition for their contribution to the college, 70.73% of the career-enders and specialists expressed satisfaction or being very satisfied while the overall

group (39.7%) expressed satisfaction or being very satisfied. These findings may be a result of the fact that both the career-enders and the specialists are from a population that is teaching for the satisfaction that the experience brings, and that is somewhat indifferent to the institutional practices. They are either self-sufficient or gain their emotional support elsewhere or a combination of both factors. In many cases, they are in a professional career elsewhere or have completed a successful career both of which likely provides the basis for being satisfied with themselves and not requiring external praise. When examining the results of the satisfaction level in other areas, it becomes clear that many areas listed are of little consequence to career-enders and specialist. They expressed a high degree of neutrality on "relationship with department chair" and "relationship with others in your department." This might be explained by the fact that many of the specialists teach evening classes and frequently have no contact with full-time faculty or administrators.

Discussion of research question four. In general, females showed a higher percentage of satisfaction or neutrality (63.8% to males 36.2%) while males showed a stronger tendency to express *very dissatisfied*, 64.7% to females 35.3%. Females were more likely to rate areas in the *satisfied* and *very satisfied* category than were males. Age made little difference until the category of over 51 years of age. Those in the over 51 years of age group expressed the highest percent of *very dissatisfied* (41.66% of all age groups) and at the highest percent of *very satisfied* (70.32% of all age groups). They also listed teaching in my profession (60.38%), working with students (67.39%) and personal satisfaction (75.68%) as their top three reasons for working as an adjunct. This could be explained by the fact that many in this group are career-enders and are not likely to be ambivalent or concerned with relationships with department chairs or deans or

the politics of the institution. At the same time, they are motivated to give back to their community.

There were no significant differences in the levels of satisfaction with respect to years teaching. It does appear that those teaching the longest, over six years, express satisfaction or at least neutrality on most issues. The one exception to this finding is in the level of satisfaction with recognition for contribution to the college. As expected the few giving a source of income as one of the three top choices for seeking employment also expressed the highest level of dissatisfaction in other areas. However, overall dissatisfaction over wages was not a significant issue. This could be a consequence of low expectations; part-time faculty, knowing in advance the salary levels, has no expectations for being paid more. What is significant is persons often equate their wages to the value the organization places on their service.

The two categories of career-enders and specialists, experts, and professionals indicated the strongest motivation to be "teach in my discipline," to work with students and to enjoy personal satisfaction. Together, career-enders and specialists/experts/professionals the two categories comprised 71.7% ($n = 33$ of 46) of those indicating "Opportunity to work with students" as one of the three top reasons for seeking employment. On the other hand, only 13.04% ($n = 6$) freelancers gave working with students as a major reason for seeking employment. Career-enders and specialists/experts/professionals combined to account for 86.5% ($n = 32$ of 37) of those indicating personal satisfaction as a major reason for seeking employment. Overall, the findings show differences in the motivational factors between the four categories of part-time faculty: career-enders (coming from established careers); specialists/experts/professionals (have full-time employment elsewhere); aspiring academics

(seeking full-time); freelancers (complementing part-time work with other jobs, home care, extra money).

Recommendations. This study's finding supports the premise that much can be done to attract high-quality part-time faculty by instituting changes that are not contingent upon funding. Too often, suggestions offered to improve part-time faculty conditions are disregarded as being impossible due to budgetary conditions. This study gives examples where this is a false premise. The responses of participants to the open-ended questions offer some ideas that can be implemented with no additional funding. Some require only effort and time from those in a position to make changes. A significant example is in the area of recognition.

In the study, participants were asked to express levels of satisfaction on a number of areas (see Chapter 4). Thirty of 68 (44.1%) expressed dissatisfaction with the level of recognition for their contribution to the college. Recognition is not only a motivational factor, but it also one with lasting value Herzberg, 1993; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 2010). A key factor of motivation cited in the literature is recognition. Herzberg (2010) suggests recognition can come from various sources such a supervisor, an individual in management, management as an impersonal force, a colleague, or a client (student as a client).

Another issue surfaced that has no attachment to budgetary considerations is the manner in which courses are assigned. Some persons expressed dissatisfaction with what a few characterized as the "good old boy" system of assigning classes. Another suggestion that admittedly may impact budgets is the question some ask regarding the parking fees that are the same for a person parking for one or two nights a week but pays the same as a full-time employee.

A review of the literature suggests a need to have a more comprehensive understanding of the factors contributing to the motivation of part-time faculty to seek employment at the community college. The goal of this study is to provide community college administrators with additional information concerning part-time faculty motivation to seek employment so that, where possible, institutional practices may be adjusted to maximize the efficacy of part-time faculty. The study attempts to enhance the understanding of the complexity of motivations surrounding the employment of part-time faculties by relying on the views of those most intimately involved, the part-time faculties. Senior college administrators should become familiar with the motivational factors that influence part-time employment.

The following recommendations are based on the findings of this study. As much as possible, the recommendations are restricted to those requiring little or no additional funding and those requiring minimal increases in funding. This restriction is adopted with the realization that funding is a major issue in higher education in general and at community colleges specifically (Katsinas, 2005; Katsinas, Tollefson, & Reamey, 2008).

The recommendation that follows could be easily implemented with little or no additional funding:

1) Issues of inclusion. Make the part-time faculty feel more a part of the community. This may be in the form of extending invitations to all faculty, full-time and part-time to attend all college functions such as *All College days,* departmental meetings, and the Faculty Senate. Understanding that many part-time faculties may not be able to attend these functions is not as important as making the gesture to include them.

2) Include part-time faculty in department communications. Invite part-time faculty participate equally with full-time faculty to surveys and solicitations for input to decisions.

3) Improve the level of recognition from the institution. This recognition should not be limited to certificates and the like. Faculty leaders and higher should make an effort to know personally those teaching at the institution. For example, many part-time never are seen by anyone working full-time as full-time personnel usually leave the campus before the part-time faculty arrives to teach. A suggestion would be for those in leadership positions conduct an occasional visit to campus and tour the academic buildings after the normal workday hours. These small gestures require no additional funding.

4) Provide more stability in assigning courses to teach. Within the boundaries imposed on the institution by open access and late registration, attempt to do better at finalizing schedules at an earlier date and then assign instructors. Putting out class schedules with instructor TBA (to be announced) makes it difficult for part-time to adequately prepare for the course.

5) Work to remove the perception of some that an "ole boy" system influences teaching assignments. Full-time faculty are hired with care and usually after a search committee identifies the final candidates who then are interviewed for a position. Admittedly, this is an expensive and time-consuming practice and not practical for part-time hires. Nevertheless, there is a middle ground to the process where part-time are not hired by a single person influenced by personal bias. This study confirms that biased hiring practices exist at the community college.

6) Open professional development programs for part-time faculty. The literature makes frequent reference to the shortcomings of part-time faculty pedagogical preparation to teach. Assigning mentors to part-time faculty might be a no cost method of assisting part-time faculty preparation. In-house training could be offered at no additional cost. The key to any developmental activities is to schedule them when part-time faculty, particularly those holding outside employment are available and not at the convenience of the full-time faculty.

7) Reduced parking fees to recognize part-time faculty use parking for a couple of hours each week. This could be simply a token reduction with little loss of revenue, but it would speak to the recognition of the contribution of part-time faculty.

Researcher's bias. In qualitative research, much is left to the inferences of the researcher. This study is no exception. I acknowledge a strong bias influenced by a long-time, over 40 years, interest in studies of and the practical application of motivational factors. The bias in this study first shows itself in the construction of the survey designed to solicit specific information leading to an understanding of motivational factors. Moreover, interpretations of the findings are influenced by being seen through the eyes of one who believes the system needs fixing and more importantly, it can be fixed.

Given the opportunity to repeat this study, an effort would be made to work more closely with the human resources office of the community college to obtain the complete data needed to not only randomize the samples but also, to accurately stratify the population before determining a random sample.

Future research

There are two suggestions for future research. First, this study warrants replication. This study is a preliminary study. The follow-up to this study could improve the quality of the data thus far obtained by the following:

Obtain a larger population; five colleges should be a minimum. As an example, institutions representing different community demographics could be selected. The institutions should be of differing sizes thereby allowing for comparisons across size and socio-economic influences.

Ensure a stratified random sample is selected from each institution that is large enough to provide not only meaningful within college data but also between college data. These will allow for determining if responses may be generalized or if they are influenced by individual college practices.

Ensure samples are large enough to allow for some quantitative research.

Ideally, surveys should be supplemented by focus groups and follow-up interviews to survey data. However, this would likely be rejected by participating colleges due to the difficulty of gathering part-time faculty who must participate on a voluntary, unremunerated basis.

The second recommendation for future research is to include both full and part-time faculty members in a single study. The goal of this research is not only to determine motivational factors for employment but to determine if these factors differ between those employed full-time and those employed part-time. It would also examine difference between full and part-time faculty in areas of importance for being on the faculty and levels of satisfaction.

Concluding remarks

For many reasons, community colleges, along with most of higher education, have ignored the conditions in which part-time faculty work. One reason, frequently acknowledged is part-time faculty are cheaper than are full-time faculty. This situation of a two-tier system of those having and those have-nots is not likely to change in the foreseeable future. Funding for higher education is being reduced all across this Nation. At the same time, part-time faculty provide community colleges with an option to offer a wide variety of academic and workforce skills courses.

Community colleges are playing a more significant role than ever within the higher education community in the United States. Part-time faculty will continue to play a vital role that allow community colleges to be successful. Part-time faculty provides the community college with a valuable, dedicated, and motivated workforce.

Community college leaders need to find ways to motivate, compensate, develop, and properly utilize this key human resource (Jacobs, 1998). The issue becomes one of not only providing for the current environment that attracts high-quality part-time faculty but improving the current environment to reduce feelings of dissatisfaction. The irony of the situation is that many do not see a need to improve the environment as the current environment meets their needs.

This study suggests there are areas in which improvement can be made which could lead to a more dedicated part-time faculty. This study attempts to surface areas in which those in a position to influence the environment of the community college have information upon which changes to the environment can be thoughtfully implemented.

Meanwhile, the community college system is fortunate in that it enjoys the benefits of a highly dedicated part-time faculty. The motivational factors surfaced in this study support a conclusion that nearly two-thirds of the part-time faculty are motivated to teach by a desire to work with students, to work in their fields of expertise, and for personal satisfaction. Fortunately, these motivational factors are strong enough to overshadow the dissatisfaction of low wages, poor support, and lack of recognition.

References

AAUP (2003). Contingent appointments and the Academic profession. Retrieved from:

    http://www.aaup.org/file/contingent-appointment.pdf

AAUP, (2003). 1940 Statement of principles of academic freedom and tenure with 1970

    Interpretive comments. Retrieved from: http://www.aaup.org/file/principles-academic-

    freedom-tenure.pdf

AAUP, (2004). Academic freedom and professional speech: 25th Annual conference on law &

    higher education, Stetson University College of Law. Retrieved from:

    http://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/files/Stetson%20Academic%20Freedom%20Prese

    ntation%20-%20FINAL%20%28WEBSITE%20COPY%29_Jan_%202004.pdf

AAUP, (2014). Background facts on contingent faculty. Retrieved from:

    http://www.aaup.org/issues/contingency/background-facts#top

Abrams v. United States. United States Supreme Court, 250 U.S. 616 (1919). Retrieved from:

    ttp://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?court=US&vol=250&invol=616

AFT Higher Education, (2010). American academic: A national survey of part-time/adjunct

    faculty. Volume 2. *American Federation of Teachers.* Retrieved from:

    http://www.eric.ed.gov/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED512019

Akroyd, D., & Caison, A. L. (2005). Part-time community college faculty and their full-time

    counterparts. In D. L. Wallin (Ed.) *Adjunct faculty in community colleges: An academic*

    administrator's guide to recruiting, supporting, and retaining great teachers (pp.

    15-42). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Altbach, P. G. (2005). Harsh realities: The professoriate faces a new century. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, & P. J. Gumport (Eds.). *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (pp. 287-314). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Argyris, C., & Schon, D. A. (1996). *Organizational Learning II: Theory, Method, and Practice.* New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Arum, R. & Roksa, J. (2001). *Academically adrift: Limited learning on college campuses.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Bailey, T., & Morest, V. S. (2006). *Defending the Community College Equity Agenda.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bandura, A. (1983). Temporal dynamics and decomposition of reciprocal determinism: A reply to Phillips and Orton. *Psychological Review, 90.* 166-170.

Bannachowski, G. (1996). Perspectives and perceptions: The use of part-time faculty in community colleges. *Community College Review, Fall (24),* 49-62. DOI:10.177/009155219602400205 Retrieved from: ERIC Review.

Bateman, T. S., Snell, S. A., & Konopaske, R. (2016). *Management, 4th ed.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin,* Vol. 117, No. 3, 497-529. American Psychological Association, Inc. Retrieved from: http://blog.lib.umn.edu/stei0301/sp_bbk/BandM%20Need%20to%20Belong.pdf

Beach, J. M. (2011). Gateway to opportunity: A history of the community college in the United States. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Behling, O., & Starke F. A. (1973). The postulates of expectancy theory. *Academy of Management Journal Vol 16, No. 3,* 373-388. Retrieved from http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.proxy.lib.odu.edu/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=2&sid=79678 fb0-d3d0-451b-b686-ce7357445534@sessionmgr4001&hid=4110

Bippus, A., Brooks, C., Plax, T., & Kearney, P. (2001). Students' perceptions of part-time and tenured/tenure-track faculty: Accessibility, mentoring, and extra-class communication. *Journal of The Association for Communication Administration*, *30*(1), 13-23. Retrieved from: EBSCOhost.

Blau, P. M. (1960). A theory of social integration. *American journal of Sociology, Vol 65, No. 6 (May, 1960),* 545-556. Retrieved from: www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.odu.edu/stable/i328913

Blau, P. M. (2008). *Exchange & Power in Social Life.* Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.

Boerner, H. (2013). The adjunct debate. *Community College Journal, 83(6)*, 11-13. Retrieved from: EBSCOhost.

Boggs, G. R. (2012). Democracy's college: The evolution of the community college in America Prepared for: White Summit on Community Colleges. *Community College Journal*, *82*(4), 36-39.

Bozeman, B., & Gaughan, M. (2011). Job satisfaction among university faculty: Individual, work, and institutional determinants. *Journal Of Higher Education*, 82(2), 154-18. retrieved from: EBSCOhost

Bradley, G. (2004). Contingent Faculty and the New Academic Labor System. *Academe*, *90*(1), 28-31. DOI: 10.2307/40252585.

Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor, *Employed and unemployed full- and part-time workers by age, sex, race, and Hispanic or Latino ethnicity* (2010). Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat8.pdf

Burnstad, H.M. (2002). Part-time faculty development at Johnson County Community College. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 120,* 17-26.

Burr, K. L., & Park, K. (2012). Adjunct Faculty as to full-time professor: Two observations of construction management programs. *Review Of Higher Education & Self-Learning*, *5*(15), 155-167.

Caruth, G., & Caruth, D. (2013). Adjunct faculty: Who are these unsung heroes of academe? *Current Issues in Education, 16(3)*, 1-11. Retrieved from: EBSCOhost.

Center for Community College Student Engagement (CCCSE) (2009). Making connections: Dimensions of student engagement (2009 CCSSE Findings). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Community College Leadership Program.

Center for Community College Student Engagement: Special Report (CCCSE) (2014). Contingent commitment: Bringing part-time faculty into focus. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin. Retrieved from: https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/04/07/part-time-professors-teach-most-community-college-students-report-finds_2014.

Center for Community College Student Engagement (CCCSE) (2015). Contingent commitment:

    Bringing part-time faculty into focus. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin.

    Retrieved from: http://www.ccsse.org/survey/ccfsse.cfm

Champoux, J. E. (2006). Organizational behavior: Integrating individuals, groups and

    organizations. Mason, OH: Thomas Higher Education.

Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1999). Development and adaptations of the seven

    principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *New Directions For Teaching &*

    Learning, 80, 75-81. Retrieved from: http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.proxy.lib.odu.edu/ehost/

Christensen, C. (2008). The employment of part-time faculty at community colleges. *New*

    Directions For Higher Education, (143), 29-36.

Chrobat-Mason, D., & Ruderman, M. N. (2004). Leadership in a diverse workplace. In M. S.

    Stockdale, & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), *The psychology and management of workplace*

    diversity. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Clark, B.R. (1988). "*The Absorbing Errand*." Remarks Presented at National Conference of the

    American Association of Higher Education, Washington, D.C., on March, 1988.

    Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED297620.pdf

Clark, V. L. P., & Creswell, J. W. (2010). *Understanding research: A consumer's guide.* New

    York: Merrill.

Coalition on the Academic Workforce (2010). An Issue Brief on *One Faculty Serving all*

    Students. Retrieved from:

    http://www.academicworkforce.org/CAW_Issue_Brief_Feb_2010.pdf

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1972). *Confronting identity: The community college instructor.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (2008). *The American community college, (5th Ed).* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cook, J. D., Hepworth, S. J., Wall, T. D., & Warr, P. B. (1981). *The experience of work.* New York: Academic Press Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers.

Cook, K. S., & Rice, E. (2003). Social exchange theory. In J. Delamater (Ed.), *Handbook of social psychology.* New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers. Retrieved from http://scholar.google.com/scholar_url?url=https://campus.fsu.edu/bbcswebdav/institution/academic/social_sciences/sociology/Reading%2520Lists/Social%2520Psych%2520Prelim%2520Readings/I.%2520Classics/2003%2520Cook%2520Rice%2520-%2520Social%2520Exchange. pdf&hl=en&sa=X&scisig=AAGBfm2G-2MWj10nnJWSrpPVAnpxhr5BtA&nossl=1&oi=scholar

Cosmides, L. (1989). The logic of social exchange: Has natural selection shaped how humans reason? Studies with the Wason selection task. *Cognition. 31,* 187-276. Retrieved from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0010027789900231#

Creswell, J. W. (2009). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

D'Amico, M. M., Katsinas, S. G., & Friedel, J. N. (2012. The new norm: Community colleges to deal with recessionary fallout. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 36:8*, 626-631, DOI: 10.1080/10668926.2012.676506

Diegle, B. L. (2013). Perceptions of community college adjunct faculty and division

chairpersons: Support, mentoring, and professional development to sustain academic

quality. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 37:8*, 596-607.

Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2012.720863

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2009). *Internet, mail, and mixed mode

surveys: The tailored design method* (3d ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). *Internet, mail, and mixed mode

surveys: The tailored design method* (4th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Drafke, M. (2006). *The human side of organizations* (9th). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson-
Prentice Hall

Dressler, G. (2008). *Human resource management* (11th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ:
Pearson-Prentice Hall.

DuBrin, A. J. (2013). *Leadership: research findings, practice, and shills.* Mason, OH: South-
Western, Cengage Learning.

Eagan, K., (2007). A national picture of part-time community college faculty: Changing trends

in demographics and employment characteristics. New Directions for Community

Colleges, No. 140, Winter 2007, 5-14.

Eagan, M. R., & Jaeger, A. J. (2009). Effects of exposure to part-time faculty on community

college transfer. Research In Higher Education, 50(2), 168-188. Retrieved from:

http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.odu.edu/stable/29782913

Ehrenberg, R. G., & Zhang, L. (2005). Do tenured and tenure-track matter? The Journal of

    Human Resources 40(3), 647-659. Available from: Business Source Complete, Ipswich,

    MA.

Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social exchange theory. Annual Review of Sociology, Vol 2. 335-362.

    Retrieved from

    http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.odu.edu/action/doAdvancedSearch?ed=1976&c1=AND&q

    3=&sd=1975&f3=all&ar=on&c4=AND&f6=all&f0=all&c3=AND&f2=all&f5=all&q1=

    &acc=on&wc=on&c2=AND&f1=all&Search=&pt=Annual+review+of+Sociology&q2=

    &c6=AND&q5=&group=test&f4=all&isbn=&c5=AND&q0=Social+Exchange+Theory

    &q4=&la=eng+OR+en&q6=

Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., Guido, F. M., Patton, L. D., & Renn, K. A., (2010). Student

    development in college: theory, research, and practice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Friedlander, J (1979). Instructional practices of part-time and full-time faculty. Community

    College Review, 6: pp. 65-72. Retrieved from crw.sagepub.com at Old Dominion

    University Library.

Furnham, A. & Okamura (1999). Your money or your life: Behavioral and emotional predictors

    of money pathology. *Human relations 1999 (52),* 1157-1177.

    Doi:10.1177/001872679905200903

Galveston College (2014). Employee handbook. Retrieved from:

    http://www.gc.edu/images/gc/HR/Handbook/EmployeeHandbook.pdf

Gappa, J. M. (1984). *Part-time faculty: Higher education at a crossroads.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 3. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education,

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

Gibson-Harmon, K., Rodriquez, S., & Haworth, J. G. (2002). Community college faculty and professional staff: The human resource challenge. *New Direction for Community Colleges, 117,* 77-90. Retrieved from:

http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.proxy.lib.odu.edu/doi/10.1002/cc.55/pdf

Giloth, R. P. (2004). The "local" in workforce development politics. In R .P. Giloth (Ed.). Workforce development politics: Civic capacity and performance. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Green, D. W. (2007). Adjunct faculty and the continuing quest for quality. In R. L. Wagner (Ed.). The current landscape and changing perspectives of part-time faculty, New Directions for Community colleges, Number 140, Winter 2007, (pp. 29-39).

Greenberg, I (2013). Impossible unity: Adjuncts and tenure track faculty. *New Labor Forum, 23.* 11-13. Sage Publishing. DOI: 10.1177/1095796013512623.

Greive, D. (2000). Leadership issues in the new millennium. In D. Greive, & C. A. Worden (Eds.), *Managing adjunct & part-time faculty for the new millennium.* (pp. 19-44). Elyria, OH: Info-Tec.

Hacker, A, & Dreifus, C. (2010). Higher education: How colleges are wasting our money and failing our kids - and what we can do about it. New York: Henry Holt and Company, LLC.

Hackman, J., & Oldham, G.R. (1974). The job diagnostic survey: An instrument for the diagnosis of jobs and the evaluation of job redesign projects. *Technical Report No. 4 Department of Administrative Sciences Yale University.* Retrieved from: http://eric.ed.gov.proxy.lib.odu.edu/?id=ED099580

Hackman, R. J., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a Theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16,* 250-279. Retrieved from: https://odu-illiad-oclc-org.proxy.lib.odu.edu/illiad/illiad.dll?Action=10&Form=64

Hagedorn L. S., Moon, H. S., Scott, C., Maxwell, W. E., & Lester, J. (2006). Transfer between community colleges and 4-year colleges: The All-American game. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 30:3*, 223-242, DOI: 10.1080/10668920500322384

Hays, D. G. & Singh, A. A. (2012). *Qualitative Inquiry in Clinical and Educational Settings.* New York: The Guilford Press.

Herzberg, F. (1987). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review, September-October 1987.* Reprint 87507. Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (2010). *The Motivation to Work.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Hoeller, K. (2014). *Equality for Contingent Faculty: Overcoming the Two-Tier System.* Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.

Hughes, R. L., Ginnett, R. C., & Curphy, G. J. (2012). *Leadership: Enhancing the lessons of experience. 7th ed.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Involuntary part-time work on the rise (2008). Issues in labor statistics, Summary 08-08/ December 2008, U.S. Department of Labor, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Retrieved from: http://www.bls.gov/opub/ils/pdf/opbils71.pdf

Jacobs, F (1998). Using part-time faculty more effectively. In D. W. Leslie (ed.) The growing use of part-time faculty: Understanding causes and effects. *New Directions for Higher Education, 104,* 9-18. DOI: 10.1002/he.10401.

Jacoby, D. (2006). Effects of part-time faculty employment on community college graduation rates. *Journal of Higher Education 77(6),* 1081-1103. 'Retrieved from EBSCOHost.

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

Jansen, H. (2010). The logic of qualitative survey research and its position in the field of social research methods. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 11*(2). Retrieved from: http://www.qualitativeresearchnet/index.php/fqs/article/view/1450.

Katsinas, S. G. (2005). Increased competition for scarce state dollars. *New Directions For Community Colleges, (132)*, 19-32. Retrieved from ERIC.

Katsinas, S. G., Tollefson, T. A., & Reamey, B. A. (2008). *Funding issues in U.S. community colleges: Findings from a 2007 survey of the National State Directors of Community*

Colleges. American Association of Community Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. E0503505).

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The Social Psychology of Organizations, 2d ed.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Kernis, M. H., Zuckerman, M., & McVay, E. (1988). Motivational factors affecting performance: The impact of perceived locus of causality. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin 14,* 524-535. Retrieved from http://psp.sagepub.com.proxy.lib.odu.edu/content/14/3/524.full.pdf+html

Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2013). Institutionalizing equitable policies and practices for contingent faculty. *Journal Of Higher Education, 84(1)*, 56-87. Retrieved from: EBSCO Host.

Kirk, F., & Spector, C. A. (2009). A comparison of the achievement of students taught by full-time versus adjunct faculty in business courses. (Undetermined). *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal, 13(2)*, 73-81. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Knapp, M. L., & Vangelisti, A. L. (2009). *Interpersonal communications and human relationships.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

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

Larson, T., & Ong, P. M. (1994). Imbalance in part-time employment. *Journal of economic issues, Vol 28, No. 1*, 187-196. Retrieved from http://www.calstatela.edu /faculty/ larson/LarsonOngPartTime.pdf

Lawler, E. E. III (1969). Job design and employee motivation. *Personnel Psychology.* Vol. 22 (4), 426-435.

http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.proxy.lib.odu.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid
=3&sid=4e8b4a56-6871-430b-a65d-923a37e93d59%40sessionmgr114&hid=119

Lawrence, P. R., & Nohria, N. (2002). *Driven: How human nature shapes our choices.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lawrence, P. R. (2010). *Driven to lead: Good, bad, and misguided leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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

Levin, J. S. (2007). Multiple judgments: Institutional context and part-time faculty. In R. L. Wagner (Ed.) *The current landscape and changing perspectives of part-time faculty, New Directions for community colleges, 140,* 15-20. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lyons, R.E. (2000a). *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty.* Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Lyons, R.E. (2007b). Deepening our understanding of adjunct faculty. In R. E. Lyons (*Ed.*), *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty.* Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Madlock, P. E., & Booth-Butterfield, M. (2012). The influence of relational maintenance strategies among coworkers. *Journal Of Business Communication, 49(1)*, pp. 21-47. doi:10.1177/0021943611425237. Retrieved from: EBSCOhost.

Marti, E. J. (2005). Adjunct faculty as valued members of the academy. In D. L. Wallin (ED.) *Adjunct faculty in community colleges: An academic administrator's guide to recruiting,*

supporting, and retaining great teachers (pp. 43-52). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Mazurek, R. A. (2011). Academic Labor is a Class Issue: Professional organizations confront the exploitation of contingent faculty. *Journal Of Workplace Rights*, *16(3/4),* 353-366. Retrieved from: EBSCOhost.

McShane, S. L., & Von Glinow, M. A. (2010). *Organizational behavior: Emerging knowledge and practice for the real world* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

McShane, S. L., & Von Glinow, M. A. (2014). *Organizational behavior*, *2e*. New York; McGraw-Hill.

Meade v. Moraine Valley Community College. United States Court of Appeals For the Seventh Circuit No. 14-1217, decided October 30, 2104. Retrieved from: http://media.ca7.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/rssExec.pl?Submit=Display&Path=Y2014/D10-30/C:14-1217:J:Wood:aut:T:fnOp:N:1445104:S:0

Meixner, C., Kruck, S. E., & Madden, L. T. (2010). Inclusion of part-time faculty for the benefit of faculty and students. *College Teaching, 58.* 141-147. DOI: 10.1080/8756555.484032.

Mellow, G. O., & Heelan, C. (2008). *Minding the Dream.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Menand, L. (2001). *The Metaphysical Club: A Story of Ideas in America.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Millward, L. J., & Haslam, S. A. (2013). Who are we made to think we are? Contextual variation in organizational, workgroup and career foci of identification. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology 86,* 50-66. Retrieved from: EBSCOhost.

Moslsa, A., & Hipple, S. (2006). Trends in labor force participation in the United States.

    Monthly Labor Review October 2006, Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States

    Department of Labor. Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2006/10/art3full.pdf

Murphy, W. (2000). Legal issues concerning adjunct faculty and their mangers. In D. Greive, &

    C. A. Worden (Eds.), *Managing adjunct & part-time faculty for the new millennium.* (pp.

    119-141). Elyria, OH: Info-Tec.

National Center for Education Statistics (U.S. Department of Education (2003-2004).

    http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/200208.pdf

Nelson, D. L. & Quick, J. C. (2013). ORGB, Organizational Behavior. Mason, OH: Centrage

    Learning.

Nickels, W. G., McHugh, J. M., & McHugh, S. M. (2016). Understanding Business (11th ed.).

    New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nutting, M. M. (2003). Part-time faculty: Why should we care? New Directions for Higher

    Education, (123), 33-39. Retrieved from: EBSCOhost.

Ochoa, A. (2012). Contingent faculty: Helping or harming students? Journal of the

    Professoriate, 6(1), 136-151.

Outcalt, C. L. (2002). Toward a professionalized community college faculty. New Directions

    for Community Colleges, 118, 109-115. Retrieved from:

    http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.proxy.lib.odu.edu/doi/10.1002/cc.69/pd

Passer, M. W., & Smith, R. E. (2004). *Psychology: The science of mind and behavior.* New

    York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Pearch, W. J., & Marutz, L. (2005). Retention of adjunct faculty in community colleges.

    Community College Enterprise, 11(1), 29-44. Retrieved from: ERIC EBSCOhost.

Perry v. Sindermann, (1972). 408 U.S. 593 United States Supreme Court (No. 70-36).

    Retrieved from: http://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/408/593

Perry, S. J., & Marcum, T. M. (2010). Steps in the classroom to avoid steps in the courtroom: A

    guide to educating new faculty members about legal concerns in teaching. *Journal of*

    Academic Administration in Higher Education, (6)1, 33-40. Retrieved from:

    http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.proxy.lib.odu.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=3&sid=78e

    8a764-b0ff-4869-b608-3efd3b2e15b0%40sessionmgr115&hid=109

Phillippe, K. A., & Gonzalez Sullivan, L (2005). *National profile of community colleges: Trends*

    & statistics (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Phillips, K. D., & Campbell, D. F. (2005). Enculturation and development of part-time faculty.

    In D. L. Wallin (Ed.). *Adjunct faculty in community colleges: An academic*

    administrator's guide to recruiting, supporting, and retaining great teachers (pp. 53-70).

    Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Plano Clark, V. L. & Creswell, J. W. (2010). *Understanding Research: A consumer's guide.*

    Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc., publishing as Merrill.

Purcell, M. (2007), "Skilled, cheap, and desperate": Non-tenure-track faculty and the delusion of

    meritocracy. *Antipode*, *39*: 121–143. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8330.2007.00509.x Retrieved

    from Wiley Online.

Rea, L. M., & Parker, R. A. (2005). *Designing and conducting survey research: A*

    comprehensive guide. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ruiz, E. A. (2007). The stone that struck Goliath: The part-time faculty Association, Washing State Community and Technical Colleges, and class action suits. In R. L. Wagner (Ed.) The current landscape and changing perspectives of part-time faculty, *New Directions for community colleges, 140,* 15-20.

Ryan, R. M., & Connell, J. P. (1989). Perceived locus of causality and internalization: Examining reasons for acting in two domains. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology Vol 57, No. 5,* 749-761. Retrieved from http://selfdeterminationtheory.org/SDT/documents/1989_RyanConnell.pdf

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new direction. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25,* 54-67. Retrieved from: http://www.sciencedirect.com.proxy.lib.odu.edu/science/journal/0361476X/25/1

SACS/COC (2014). Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. *Core requirement 2.8 (Faculty).* Retrieved from: http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/081705/CR_2-8_Guideline.pdf

Sandford, B. A., Dainty, J. D., Belcher, G. G., & Frisbee, R. L. (2011). Perceptions of the willingness of part-time Instructors in community colleges in the U.S. to engage in professional development opportunities and the best method(s) of delivering these experiences. *Journal Of Career And Technical Education, 26(1),* 48-61.

Shaffer, D. F. (2008). Education policy Brief: The states and their community colleges. *The Nelson Rockefeller Institute of Government.* State University of New York. http://www.rockinst.org.

Schein, E. H., (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership (4th.).* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Scheutz, P. (2002). Instructional Practices of Part-Time and Full-Time Faculty. *New Directions For Community Colleges*, (118), 39-46. Retrieved from: EBSCOhost.

Schutt, R. K. (2012). Investigating the social world: The process and practice of research. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Schermerhorn, J. R. (2013). Management (12th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Smith, V. C. (2007). A systems approach to strategic success with adjunct faculty. In R. L. Wagner (Ed.) The current landscape and changing perspectives of part-time faculty, New Directions for community colleges, 140, 15-20.

St. Clair, K. L. (1994). Faculty-to-faculty mentoring in the community college: An instructional component of faculty development. Community College Review, 22, No. 3., 23-35.

Stone, C., & Worgs, D. (2004). Poverty and the workforce challenge. In R .P. Giloth (Ed.). *Workforce development politics: Civic capacity and performance.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Stoops, S. L. (2000). Evaluation of adjunct faculty in a process for effectiveness. In D. Greive, & C. A. Worden (Eds.), *Managing adjunct & part-time faculty for the new millennium.* (pp. 221-246). Elyria, OH: Info-Tec.

Stroh, L. K., Langlands, C. L., & Simpson, P. A. (2004). Shattering the glass ceiling in the new millennium. In M. S. Stockdale, & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), The *psychology and management of workplace diversity.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing

Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education. (1984).

Involvement *in learning: Realizing the potential of American higher education.*

Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from:

http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED246833.pdf

Sweezy v. New Hampshire, U.S. Supreme Court, 354 U.S. 234 (1957). Retrieved from:

http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?court=US&vol=354&invol=234

Terpstra, D. E. (1979). Theories of motivation--borrowing the best. *Personnel Journal (Pre-*

1986), 58(000006), 376. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.proxy.lib.odu.edu/

eric/ocview/203671875/fulltextPDF/99EE61E304A04B9CPQ/7?accountid=12967

Thaxter, L. P., & Graham, S. W. (1999). Community college faculty involvement in decision-

making. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice 23:7,* 655-674. DOI:

10.1080/106689299264521. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/106689299264521

Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An

"Interpretive" model of intrinsic task motivation. *Academy of Management Review, 15*,

No. 4. 666-681. Retrieved from: http://

www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.odu.edu/stable/pdfplus/258687.pdf?acceptTC=true&jpdConfirm

=true

Tinto, V. (1997). Classrooms as communities: exploring the educational character of student

persistence. *Journal Of Higher Education*, *68 (6),* 599-623. DOI: 10.2307/2959965.

Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Twombly, S., & Townsend, B. K. (2008). Community college faculty: What we know and need
  to know. Community College Review, 36(1), 5-24. Retrieved from:
  http://crw.sagepub.com.proxy.lib.odu.edu/content/36/1/5.full.pdf+html

Umbach, P. D. (2007). How effective are they? Exploring the impact of contingent faculty on
  undergraduate education. The Review of Higher Education, 30, 91-123. Retrieved from:
  http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.lib.odu.edu/journals/review_of_higher_education/toc/rhe30.2.h
  tml

Umbach, P. D. (2008, November). The effects of part-time faculty appointments on instructional
  techniques and commitment to teaching. Paper presented at the 33rd annual conference
  of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Jacksonville, FL. Retrieved from:
  http://www4.ncsu.edu/~pdumbach/part-time.pd

VCCS (2014). Virginia Community College System (VCCS), Policy manual, Section 3, Human
  Recourses. Retrieved from: http://www.vccs.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Sct32.pdf

Vaughan, G. B. (2006). *The community college story,* Washington, DC: Community College
  Press.

Vroom, V. H. (1995). *Work and Motivation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Wagoner, R. L. (2007). Part-time faculty satisfaction across missions and disciplines. In R. L.
  Wagner (Ed.) *The current landscape and changing perspectives of part-time faculty,*
  New Directions For Community Colleges, *Number 140, Winter 2007*, 75-81.

Wagner, R. L. (2007). Globalization, the new economy, and part-time faculty. In R. L. Wagner
  (Ed.) The current landscape and changing perspectives of part-time faculty. *New*
  Directions for community colleges, 140, 15-20.

Wallin, D. (2004). Valuing professional colleagues: Adjunct faculty in community and technical

   colleges. *Community College Journal Of Research & Practice, 28(4*), 373-391.

   Retrieved from:

   http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.lib.odu.edu/doi/pdf/10.1080/10668920490424087

Wallin, D.L. (2005). Valuing and motivating part-time faculty. In D. L. Wallin (Ed.) Adjunct

   faculty in community colleges: An academic administrator's guide to recruiting,

   supporting, and retaining great teachers. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Wallin, D. L. (2007). Part-time faculty and professional development: Notes from the field. New

   Directions For Community Colleges, (140), 67-73.

Watts, T., & Gaertner, S., (2013). Health care reform and the hourly challenge. Benefits

   Quarterly 29(2), 26-29. Retrieved from EBSCOHost.

Welfel, E. R. (2000). Ethical issues for adjunct faculty and their managers. In D. Greive, & C.

   A. Worden (Eds.), Managing adjunct & part-time faculty for the new millennium. (pp.

   101-117). Elyria, OH: Info-Tec.

Wittmer, J. L. S., & Martin, J. E. (2010). Work and personal role involvement of part-time

   employees: Implications for attitudes and turnover intentions. *Journal of Organizational*

   Behavior, 32(5)), 767-787. DOI: 10.1002/job.711. Retrieved from:

   wileyonlinelibrary.com.

Wood, R., & Bandura, A (1989). Social cognitive theory of organizational management.

   Academy of Management Review, 14. 361-384.

Wyles, B. A. (1998). Adjunct faculty in the community college: Realities and challenges. *New*

   Direction for Higher Education, Vol 1998, Issue 104, 89-93. DOI: 10.1002/he.10409

Yoshioka, R. B. (2007). Part-time faculty in California: Successes, challenges, and future issues.

New Directions for Community Colleges, (140), 41-47. doi:10.1002/cc.303

Zusman, A. (2005). Challenges facing higher education. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, & P.

J. Gumport (Eds.). American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social,

political, and economic challenges (pp. 287-314). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University

Press.

Appendix A

Informed Consent Form

Introduction

This study attempts to collect information and contribute to the understanding of the factors that motivate part-time faculty to seek employment at the community college.

Procedures The survey consists of 18 questions and will take approximately 20 minutes or less. Questions are designed to understand the part-time faculty and their motivation for teaching at the community college. This questionnaire will be conducted wth an online Qualtrics-created survey.

Risks/Discomforts Risks are minimal for involvement in this study.

Benefits There are no immediate direct benefits for participants. However, it is hoped that through your participation, administrators of the community college system will gain a better understanding of the motivational factors influencing part0-time faculty to seek employment.

Confidentiality All data obtained from participants will be kept confidential and will only be reported in an aggregate format (by reporting only combined results and never reporting individual ones). All questionnaires will be concealed, and no one other than then primary investigator and assistant researches will have access to them. The data collected will be stored in the HIPPA-compliant, Qualtrics-secure database until it has been deleted by the primary investigator.

Compensation There is no direct compensation.

Participation Participation in this research study is completely voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at anytime or refuse to participate entirely.

Questions about the Research If you have questions regarding this study, you may contact Dr. Dana Burnett, Professor of Educational Foundations, Old Dominion University at 757-683-3287 or dburnett@odu.edu or the assistant investigator, Philip E. Pons, Doctoral student, at ppons001@odu.edu.

Following are the survey questions for the research:

Which discipline do you teach?
{Choose one}
( ) Business, Public Services, Information Systems, and Mathematics (ACC, ADI, AST, BUS, CHD, ECO, EDU, FST, HMS, ITD, ITE, ITN LGL, MKT, MTE, MTH, MTT)

(   ) Communications, Humanities, and Social Sciences (ART, BSK, CHM, CST, DAN, ENF, ENG, ELS, FRE, GEO, HIS, HUM, MUS, PHI, PHT, PLS, PSY, REL, SOC, SPA)

(   ) Health Professions (DNH, MDL, NUR)

(   ) Science, Engineering and Technology (AIR, AUT, BIO, EGR, ETR, GOL, HLT, MEC, NAS, PED, PHY)

(   ) Student success and Retention (SVD)

How long have you worked at this college?
{Choose one}
( ) <1 year
( ) 1-5 years
( ) 6-10 years
( ) >10 years

What is your gender?
{Choose one}
( ) Male
( ) Female

What is your age?
(Choose one
       ( ) Under 30
       ( ) 31 – 40
       ( ) 41 – 50
       ( ) Over 51

The literature generally categorizes the part-time faculty into four groups. In which group do you most closely fit?

( ) Career enders (many retired and coming from established careers).
( ) Specialists, experts, and professionals (have full-time employment elsewhere).
( ) Aspiring academics (generally seeking full-time status).
( ) Free lancers (implement their part-time with other jobs or involved in homecare and work for extra money).

To what extent are you satisfied with the following…

How well the College addresses the concerns of adjunct faculty?
{Choose one}
( ) Great deal
( ) Somewhat

( ) Not much
( ) Not at all
( ) Don't know

Adjunct faculty's access to the College administration above the rank of department chair?
{Choose one}
( ) Great deal
( ) Somewhat
( ) Not much
( ) Not at all
( ) Don't know

Your relationship with other faculty members in the department in which you teach
{Choose one}
( ) Very satisfied
( ) Satisfied
( ) Neither
( ) Dissatisfied
( ) Very dissatisfied

Your relationship with your department chair
{Choose one}
( ) Very satisfied
( ) Satisfied
( ) Neither
( ) Dissatisfied
( ) Very dissatisfied

To what extent do you feel part of the campus community?
{Choose one}
( ) Great deal
( ) Somewhat
( ) Not much
( ) Not at all

To what extent are you able to get the information you need to do your job?
{Choose one}
( ) Great deal
( ) Somewhat
( ) Not much
( ) Not at all

Please choose the 3 most important areas to you as an adjunct faculty member?
( ) Teaching in my discipline/profession/career field
( ) Being part of a TNCC community
( ) Opportunities to work with students
( ) Professional Development
( ) Supplementing my salary
( ) Working toward becoming a full-time faculty member
( ) Personal Satisfaction
( ) Other [   ]

Is teaching as an adjunct...
{Choose all that apply}
( ) Your primary source of income?
( ) A source of secondary income?
( ) Your primary occupation?
( ) A secondary occupation?
( ) Not an income issue.
( ) Other [   ]

Are you employed full-time or part-time in another occupation?
{Choose one}
( ) Yes, full-time (> 30 hours per week)
( ) Yes, part-time (< 30 hours per week)
( ) No
( ) Prefer not to answer

If you were to leave this college within the next year, what would be the most likely reason?
{Choose one}
( ) To reduce my workload
( ) To find a better work environment
( ) To make more money
( ) To find a position that better fits with my knowledge and skills
( ) For career advancement
( ) To find a position with better supervision
( ) To find a position with better benefits
( ) Non-work issues (retirement, relocate with a spouse, health issues, marriage or divorce, parenting, caring for a family member, etc.)
( ) Other
If other, please explain.
{Enter text answer}

Your answers to the following questions are very important for understanding the motivational factors influencing people to seek employment at the community college.

1. Tell us what motivates you to teach at the community college.

2. What is the most important factor that motivates you to teach at a community college and discuss it.

3. If you were the president of the college, or if you were empowered to make any changes that you deem necessary, what changes designed to increase motivation to teach as an adjunct instructor would you implement?

Appendix B Introductory Letter

August 19, 2015

Dear { First name, }

I am writing to ask for your help with an important study that has its goal to understand better the motivation of part-time faculty who teach at a community college. Your College President, Dr. Dever, has given approval for me to conduct a survey of the adjunct faculty at Thomas Nelson. This survey is part of the research for a dissertation leading to the fulfillment of the requirements for a doctoral degree from Old Dominion University. The title of my dissertation is *Motivational Factors Influencing Part-time Faculty to Seek Employment at Community Colleges.*

The purpose of my study is to contribute to the understanding of the factors that motivate part-time faculty to seek employment at the community college. The literature is vague on this subject as part-time faculty come from very diverse backgrounds and experiences.

Specifically, I am asking that you complete a survey that will be sent to you in the next few days. You will receive an email with a URL linking you to the survey. This on-line survey should not take more than 15-20 minutes of your time. Your responses are voluntary, and I have taken all steps possible to ensure anonymity. Any publication resulting from this study will be reported in the aggregate. The number assigned to each survey is for the sole purpose of knowing who did or did not complete the survey so that gentle reminders may be sent out. At the conclusion of this study, the list of survey numbers connected to individual names will be destroyed.

By taking a few minutes to share your thoughts and opinions concerning your employment at the community college, you will be helping us a great deal and a small token of appreciation enclosed as my way of saying thank you.VictorDear Victor,VictorVictorVictorVictor

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me or my dissertation chair, Dr. Burnett, using the information provided below or me. Again, thank you.

Sincerely,

  Phil

Philip E. Pons Jr.	Dr. Dana Burnett
Adjunct Faculty	Professor of Educational Foundations
Thomas Nelson	Old Dominion University
ponsp@tncc.edu	Darden School of Education
	Office 757-683-3287
	dburnett@odu.edu