

A STUDY OF ADJUNCT FACULTY

by

Donna Mae Bergmann

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

Doctor of Education

in

Education

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

July 2011

©COPYRIGHT

by

Donna Mae Bergmann

2011

All Rights Reserved

APPROVAL

of a dissertation submitted by

Donna Mae Bergmann

This dissertation has been read by each member of the dissertation committee and has been found to be satisfactory regarding content, English usage, format, citation, bibliographic style, and consistency and is ready for submission to The Graduate School.

Dr. Betsy Palmer

Approved for the Department of Education

Dr. Jayne Downey

Approved for The Graduate School

Dr. Carl A. Fox

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a doctoral degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library. I further agree that copying of this dissertation is allowable only for scholarly purposes, consistent with “fair use” as prescribed in the U.S. Copyright Law. Requests for extensive copying or reproduction of this dissertation should be referred to ProQuest Information and Learning, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106, to whom I have granted “the exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my dissertation in and from microform along with the non-exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my abstract in any format in whole or in part.”

Donna Mae Bergmann

July 2011

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I wish to express my gratitude to my dissertation committee members, Dr. Betsy Palmer, committee chairperson, Dr. Art Bangert, Dr. Marilyn Lockhart, and Dr. Carrie Myers for your support and encouragement through this learning process.

Second, I wish to express my gratitude to my husband, Dave, for his love, patience, and encouragement through this long learning process.

Third, I wish to express my gratitude to my brother, James Whittington, and to my colleagues, Dr. James Ballard and Dr. Terri Torres, who gave of their time and shared their experience to help me reach my dream of completion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY.....	1
Problem, Purpose, Questions	11
Statement of the Problem.....	11
Purpose of the Study	12
Research Questions.....	12
Methods.....	13
Significance of the Study	13
Definition of Terms.....	13
Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations.....	14
Assumptions.....	14
Limitations	14
Delimitations.....	15
Chapter Summary	15
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	16
Synthesis of the Literature	16
Demographic Characteristics of Adjunct Faculty in the United States	16
Adjunct Faculty Concerns and Challenges.....	21
University Concerns and Challenges	29
Summary.....	36
3. METHODOLOGY	38
Introduction.....	38
Design	39
Details of Methodology	39
Population/Sample	40
Variables	40
Dependent Variables.....	40
Independent Variables	40
Instrumentation	41
Data Collection	41
Data Analysis.....	42
Internal/External Validity	43
Chapter Summary	44
4. RESEARCH FINDINGS	45
Introduction.....	45
Problem, Purpose, Questions	45

TABLE OF CONTENTS – CONTINUED

Statement of Problem.....	45
Purpose of Study.....	46
Research Questions.....	47
Sample Demographics	47
Results of Data Analysis.....	48
Chapter Summary	61
5. CONCLUSIONS.....	62
Introduction.....	62
Summary of Problem and Research Questions.....	63
Methods.....	64
Limitations of the Study.....	65
Summary of Results	66
Comparison of Results to Literature	70
Suggestions for Further Research	71
Recommendations and Discussion	72
Chapter Summary	75
REFERENCES	77
APPENDICES	83
APPENDIX A: Letter to Department Chairs and Consent Form	84
APPENDIX B: Survey Instrument	88
APPENDIX C: Additional Services Requested	96

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Proportion of Part-Time Faculty in each Teaching Field	8
2. Percent of Total Faculty Positions that are Contingent vs. Percent of Female Faculty by Academic Field, 2003	32
3. Table of Specifications: Adjunct Faculty Support at OIT	41
4. Demographic Data by Total Number of Respondents	48
5. Services Provided by OIT	50
6. Services Used	50
7. Frequency Meeting with Personnel	52
8. Chi-Square Tests of Services Used by Demographics	54
9. Degree that Resources Improve Teaching	57
10. How Having Additional Support Would Improve Teaching	59
11. Ranking of Additional Support Requested by Importance	60

ABSTRACT

Adjunct faculty who teach part-time comprise about half the professoriate, making them essential to the operation of academic programs. On campuses which utilize adjunct faculty extensively, underestimating the support needs of adjunct faculty could translate into difficulty creating and maintaining a highly qualified adjunct workforce and diminished educational experiences for students. A review of the literature revealed there was very little data investigating the variables affecting the perceptions adjunct faculty had regarding support and services provided to them in relation to their performance as teachers. Therefore, the purpose of this quantitative descriptive research study was to investigate the services and support provided to, and utilized by adjunct faculty at Oregon Institute of Technology (OIT), and how they perceived that various types of support affected their teaching. In addition, this study investigated whether adjunct faculty perceptions of services and support provided by OIT differed on the basis of demographic variables such as age, gender, number of years employed as an adjunct, educational degrees, and department or discipline. The sample for this research included 106 adjunct faculty who taught at OIT's Klamath Falls and Portland campuses. An on-line survey was sent to each of these adjunct faculty. Descriptive statistics and Chi-Square analysis were used in this research study. Results indicated most of the respondents did not engage in support activities at OIT, although they reported feedback on their teaching and developing curriculum improved their teaching. There was no significant difference of perceptions of services and support on the basis of the demographic variables.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the Study

The movement to employ adjunct faculty began in the 1960's on community college campuses. The demand for evening classes was so great that administrators had to find a quick and viable solution, and they hired from the professional community. These professionals became known as adjunct or part-time faculty, and they have become essential to the operation of academic programs (Wickun & Stanley, 2000).

Adjunct faculty, part-time faculty, and contingent faculty refer to instructors hired on a contingent (term-by-term) basis. Some authors use these terms interchangeably, while others make distinctions between the two. Most of the faculty classified as part-time actually teach a full load. A college may limit the number of courses an adjunct can teach, but they often teach at multiple colleges. So this part-time status means they are ineligible for benefits and are paid much less than full-time faculty per course (McCarter, M., 2011). Baron-Nixon (2007) compares part-time and adjunct employment. Part-time refers to faculty who occupy a faculty line on a part-time basis and who may, therefore, receive proportionate benefits, while adjunct refers to individuals who are paid out of general operating funds and do not receive any benefits. Adjunct faculty are part-time instructors who usually have established careers outside of teaching, and at OIT, they have an adjunct contract, which is term-by-term, with no benefits and less than .5 FTE. Umbach (2007) defines contingent workers as those who do not have a contract for long-

term employment and pairs the two terms: adjunct and part-time. In this study, the terms were used interchangeably.

Adjunct or part-time faculty now comprise almost half of all instructional professionals in American colleges and universities (Baron-Nixon, 2007). Nationwide, 48% of the coursework in the first two years of college and university education is taught by adjunct faculty (Leatherman, 1997). The expansion of enrollments and program offerings in community colleges has driven the rise in part-time faculty. From 1970 to 1995, the number of faculty members at two-year institutions grew by 210 percent, compared with 69 percent at four-year institutions (Schneider, 1998). In public comprehensive universities, the proportion of faculty teaching part-time increased from 34 percent to 44 percent from 1997-2007 (American Federation of Teachers, 2009). John W. Curtis, the director of research and public policy for the American Association of University Professors, said that while the number of tenured and tenure-track professors has increased by about 25 percent over the past 30 years, they have been swamped by the growth in adjunct faculty (Finder, 2007). Many state university presidents say tight budgets have made it inevitable that they turn to adjuncts to save money (Finder, 2007). The rise in adjunct or part-time faculty paralleled increasing financial stress in many colleges and universities, especially with the dramatic leveling off of state support for higher education in the 1990's and beyond. Because of financial hard times, universities have had to hedge on their commitments to long-term employment of full-time, tenure-track faculty (Leslie, 1998). The number of adjunct or part-time faculty is increasing, yet there is an ever-growing distinction between two segments of faculty, the full-timers and

the part-timers (Baron-Nixon, 2007). Part-time/adjunct faculty members are about evenly split between two groups, those who prefer part-time teaching (50 percent) and those who would like to have full-time teaching jobs (47 percent). For this study, there are no long term adjunct faculty included; they are all employed term-by-term (fall, winter, and spring). It is increasingly common for adjunct faculty to deliver more than half of the course sections offered by an institution. Evening and weekend students at some colleges and universities may graduate having had every one of their courses taught by a part-timer (Lyons (2007).

Post-secondary institutions and their students can benefit from the proactive use of part-time faculty. Employing part-time faculty is a positive decision to expand the talent pool from which full-time faculty are drawn. Often, they have a very broad background of experience, deep and productive career records, and highly specialized knowledge that is scarce in the overall faculty work force. (Gappa & Leslie, 1993) Many are skilled teachers, but moreover, their real world experience and connections bring an added dimension to the classes they teach. Many have depth in the clinical aspects of their fields and often help students locate and benefit from internships; in fact, some part-time faculty have more current contact with the research frontiers of their fields than do full-time faculty. These part-time faculty want to help students realize their aspirations (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

In addition, tenure-track faculty may also benefit from the use of adjunct instructors. Adjunct faculty are often employed to teach high-enrollment lower-division courses, thus allowing tenure-eligible faculty to teach upper-division and graduate courses which are

smaller and more enjoyable to teach (Benjamin, 2003; Brand, 2002; Cross and Goldenberg, 2002). Tenure-track faculty like the lighter teaching loads because it provides them with time for the research and scholarly work that they must produce to receive tenure (Meyer, 1998).

However, there is a downside to increased reliance on part-time/adjunct faculty. Some researchers argue that the shrinking numbers of tenure-track positions will erode academic freedom and irreparably damage the academic profession (Clark, 1987; Finkin, 2000; Tierney, 1998). Blau (1964) applied social exchange theory to studying contingent workers. Social exchange theory posits that individuals form relationships with those who can provide valued resources. In exchange for these resources, individuals will reciprocate (Gouldner, 1960) by providing resources and support. Thus, individuals will exhibit greater commitment to an organization when they feel supported and rewarded (Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001). These part-time/adjunct/contingent faculty exhibit an increase in performance and other work behaviors that benefit the organization with this greater commitment. However, because of the limited relationships between contingent workers and their employers and the lack of support, many times, they do exhibit lower levels of commitment and performance. This would indicate that contingent workers are less committed to their employers and perform at lower levels than more permanent workers (Connelly & Gallagher, 2004; Liden et. al., 2003; Pearce, 1993).

Results of a study conducted by Umbach (2007) indicate that, in general, contingent or part-time status is negatively related with faculty job performance related to

undergraduate education. Part-time faculty use active and collaborative techniques less frequently than tenured and tenure-track faculty. They also challenged their students significantly less and spent significantly less time preparing for class than their more permanent peers. Part-time faculty reported interacting with students .43 of a standard deviation less than tenured and tenure-track faculty. Contingent faculty are underperforming in their delivery of undergraduate instruction, which is no surprise because many faculty in contingent appointments earn low wages, receive little support for professional development, and work in environments that marginalize them (Umbach 2007).

There are also benefits to being employed as an adjunct or part-time faculty. Graduate students hired as adjunct faculty gain valuable teaching experience, while those who are professionals employed outside the institution gain additional income, personal enjoyment, and perhaps prestige due to their association with the university or college (Schuster and Finkelstein, 2006; Gappa, Austin, and Trice, 2007).

Finally, there are benefits to the institution as a whole. The primary benefit for many institutions is the economic benefit gained through salary savings (Benjamin, 2003b; Brand, 2002; Cross and Goldenberg, 2002). Another institutional benefit is the flexibility that adjunct faculty appointments offer; great flexibility is gained in hiring decisions (meaning whom they hire) and the duration of employment. Adjunct faculty are hired on an as-needed basis, sometimes only a few days before their course is set to begin, and with little or no preparation (Gappa, Austin, and Trice, 2007; Benjamin, 2003b). What

this really means is the ability to bring in adjunct faculty for particular curricular needs and professional skills without making a long-term commitment (Thedwall, 2008).

As stated in Merriam-Webster's dictionary (1997), adjunct is defined as: appendage, not of the core, something joined or added to another thing but not essentially a part of it. Because many full-time faculty and administrators see adjunct faculty as something added to another thing but not essentially a part of it, many universities treat their adjunct or part-time faculty as a casual work force. But because the numbers are steadily growing, and many of these part-timers become long-term members of the faculty, administrators are beginning to pay closer attention to contingent faculty. At many institutions, part-time faculty are the "packhorses" of lower-division undergraduate teaching. They teach the least desirable courses at the least desirable times for the lowest pay. As a result, institutions can absorb more students and protect the security and preferred work assignments of the tenured faculty (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Adjunct faculty are requested to assume responsibility to teach while at the same time are often encumbered by inadequacies in the areas of orientation, service and support systems, and understanding colleges and departmental policies. These inadequacies in services and support to adjunct faculty may affect academic quality and relationship between faculty and students (Leslie, et al., 1982). Universities strengthen themselves through the wise use of part-time faculty.

According to Gappa & Leslie (1993), there is a fine line between using a resource wisely and using it up. Exploitive use of part-timers is short-sighted and avoids the need for faculty to develop good lines of communication, a sense of shared purpose, and a high

level of professional trust. It reinforces the illusion that part-time faculty are hired as a temporary bridge during hard times (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

According to Baron-Nixon (2007), part-time faculty are a permanent and important part of teaching and learning at all colleges and universities. Institutional growth and continued success depend, to a large extent, on “doing it right” when it comes to working with part-time faculty. The political and financial implications of not treating part-time faculty in an equitable and professional manner ultimately may prove costlier than near term expenditures to support these individuals. These faculty possess real potential to influence the quality of education locally and nationally (Baron-Nixon, 2007).

Institutions should address the issues of part-time faculty employment from a foundation of self-interest. Relatively small investments in part-time faculty now will pay off in the future. Part-time faculty represent a source of energy, commitment, and creativity that colleges and universities can use to make academic programs stronger (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Adjunct faculty members are hired each year from different disciplines and have different goals. There are four categories from which most adjunct faculty identify themselves.

- Aspiring academics—Teach part-time while developing their credentials and teaching and research skills in preparation for an anticipated full-time teaching career.
- Freelancers—Maintain more than one part-time employment position by choice (examples: professional musicians, soccer moms, consultants).
- Specialists, experts, or professionals—Teach primarily for the ability to network themselves into their communities and grow their careers.

- Career enders—About to retire from full-time work; motivated to teach as a way to give something of themselves back to their careers. (Lyons, 2007)

Individual disciplines also use part-time or adjunct faculty in different proportions (see table below).

Table 1: Proportion of Part-Time Faculty in each Teaching Field

Teaching Field	Part-time/Adjunct Faculty	Full-Time Faculty
Total	41.6%	58.4%
Agriculture/Home Econ	19.5%	80.5%
Business	46.5%	53.5%
Education	45.3%	54.7%
Engineering	32.3%	67.7%
Fine Arts	50.9%	49.1%
Health Sciences	36.0%	64.0%
Humanities	44.8%	55.2%
Natural Sciences	37.3%	62.8%
Social Sciences	36.8%	63.2%
All Other Fields	49.3%	50.7%

Source: NCES, 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF)

Law (61.4 percent), fine arts (50.9 percent), English and literature (50.5 percent), computer sciences (49.5 percent) and mathematics and statistics (49.2 percent) account for the specific teaching fields in which 49 percent or more of the faculty were part time.

All other mainly represents vocational fields taught mainly at community colleges. Agriculture and home economics (19.5 percent), economics (23.7 percent), political science (24.7 percent), biological sciences (25.5 percent), and physical sciences (27.3 percent) were teaching fields with the lowest levels of part-time faculty.

The potential for adjunct or part-time faculty for contributing to an institution's effectiveness extends far beyond their teaching alone by driving support toward the institution. Because the largest ratio of adjunct faculty members are specialists, experts, or professionals, many of them provide connections to community employers who might provide internships and jobs for students, support specialized programs, and serve on various board and committees. Adjunct instructors who are career enders tend to be opinion leaders with long-term ties to citizens who have the resources needed to support fundraising activities (Lyons, 2007). When a new instructional program or fundraising initiative has been implemented, what better group of folks could be engaged to reach a tipping point of support than your adjunct faculty members (Gladwell, 2002)? They have established relationships with civic, spiritual, and business organizations that have potential to move such initiatives toward successful outcomes much more quickly than would have otherwise been possible (Lyons, 2007).

Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron (1995) state that because part-time faculty play such an influential role in instruction, the quality of their teaching and the opportunities they have for professional development should be key concerns for academic leaders. However, given the variety of logistical and economic roadblocks associated with adjunct faculty development programs, most institutions never mount an offensive. Lyons (2007)

adds that because most adjunct faculty have weak ties to the institution, some educators argue that the benefits of such programs are inconsequential.

Part-timers need equal opportunities to grow and develop as professionals. Adjunct instructors:

should be integrated into the college community and recognized as increasingly important players in the teaching and learning process in the interest of providing quality instruction to the growing number of full- and part-time students who will sit in their classrooms, in the interest of appreciating the investment value of the part-time faculty, and ultimately in the interest of establishing and maintaining the college's reputation for teaching excellence. (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, p. 120)

The sheer number of classes assigned to adjunct professors makes a powerful argument that responsible colleges and universities should invest in their teaching lives. If good teaching that produces evidence of student learning is to be anything other than random, instructional policies must deliberately support the development of all instructors (Lyons 2007). Many institutions adhere to this path by providing resources and training for their full-time faculty, but if these programs ignore the adjunct instructors, a large gap in educational quality is likely to appear (Grubb & Associates, 1999). Lyons (2007) adds that a key to the future success of higher education institutions lies in their ability to change part-time teaching into a rewarding, collegial experience.

A study of the adjunct faculty at a Florida college (Lyons, 1996) found that part-time instructors require:

- A thorough orientation to the institution, its culture, and its practices
- Adequate training in fundamental teaching and classroom management skills
- A sense of belonging to the institution

- Both initial and ongoing professional development
- Recognition for quality work that is perceived as appropriate and adequate

Problem, Purpose, Questions

Even though the number of adjunct faculty is increasing, many are treated as appendages and are often over-looked, left-out, and generally, not given much attention. However, adjunct faculty members who are more involved in the university, who meet regularly with other faculty and department chairs, who attend training, and who are welcomed and made to feel more a part of the campus community would seem to be more effective teachers.

Statement of the Problem. Adjunct faculty are expected to be fully prepared to teach their courses. Many receive a short orientation from their department chair, while others receive no orientation. On campuses which utilize adjunct faculty extensively, underestimating the support needs of adjunct faculty could translate into difficulty creating and maintaining a highly qualified adjunct workforce and diminished educational experiences for students.

Oregon Institute of Technology (OIT) is a public, state-supported, four-year undergraduate and graduate teaching university. An enrollment of about 3,300 allows for a student-to-faculty ratio of 19:1. The curriculum focuses on engineering, but also includes humanities and social sciences, management, and health-related degrees. OIT has two colleges, the College of Engineering, Technology, and Management (ETM) and the College of Health, Arts, and Sciences (HAS). The university hires adjunct faculty to

teach approximately 41% of courses throughout a year (three terms). There is not much research about adjunct faculty support and services at institutions similar to OIT, and OIT is lacking research studying the support and services provided to adjunct faculty. If we do not understand the support services and training desired by adjunct faculty, some individuals may feel left out of the university community. Understanding their needs may improve their teaching performance, contributions to their department, and contributions to the university. Students may also benefit because adjunct faculty may have an office where they could connect and develop relationships.

Purpose of the Study. The purpose of this quantitative descriptive research study was to investigate the services and support provided to and utilized by adjunct faculty and how they perceived that various types of support affected their teaching. This study investigated whether adjunct faculty perceptions of the adequacy of services and support provided by OIT differed on the basis of such variables as age, gender, number of years employed at OIT, educational degrees, and department or discipline. These results indicated job satisfaction level of adjunct faculty at OIT.

Research Questions. The research questions were:

1. What perceived teaching support services do adjunct faculty at OIT report having been offered to them?
2. What perceived teaching support services do adjunct faculty at OIT report using?
3. In addition to the support services that are currently offered to adjunct faculty at OIT, what additional support would they like to have offered to them to assist in improving teaching?
4. Do adjunct faculty differ in their use of support services provided by OIT on the basis of:
 - a. Age?

- b. Gender?
 - c. How long employed at OIT as an adjunct faculty member?
 - d. Education?
 - e. Department/discipline?
5. How do adjunct faculty perceive additional support would improve their teaching performance?

Methods

This survey was administered via Zoomerang.com using OIT's adjunct faculty email addresses. Survey participants were required to 'opt in' or agree to take the survey. There was an informed consent document, and by completing the survey, participants agreed to the informed consent.

Significance of the Study

The research for this study added to the limited research knowledge associated with adjunct faculty. Through understanding how an institution supports the teaching of adjunct faculty, the university is able to enhance student learning via support for teaching. Administrators and policy makers at OIT and other institutions could use this research to facilitate improvements to adjunct faculty concerns both prior to hiring and during their teaching experience.

Definition of Terms

Adjunct faculty: Faculty who teach term-by-term, course-by-course and are also referred to as part-time faculty. For purposes of this study, adjunct faculty were not considered full-time.

Oregon Institute of Technology: Referred to as OIT. This was a four-year, undergraduate and graduate teaching university.

Perception of support: For the purpose of this study, perception referred to how adjunct faculty saw, felt about, or perceived the support and services received at OIT.

Self-evaluation of teaching: How adjunct faculty perceived their teaching.

Tenure-track: Faculty who were hired on tenure-track and worked towards tenure.

Full-time faculty: Faculty who were permanently employed on a full-time contract.

Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations

Assumptions: This researcher assumes:

Participants completed the survey accurately and truthfully, and that the survey accurately measured perceptions/usage of services so faculty could reasonably evaluate their own teaching performance.

Limitations: This researcher sees the limitations as:

The number of those surveyed who responded used a survey that was not tested on other populations, and the institution was a technology focused institution. Results may not reflect the perceptions of adjunct faculty at liberal arts, community colleges or research universities.

This research was only concerned with teaching support and not other services that may support other roles and responsibilities of adjunct faculty.

Delimitations: This researcher sees the delimitations as:

The survey looked only at adjunct faculty from the current academic year and did not explore the impact of discipline beyond “college” aggregate because of the sample size, which was limited only to OIT.

Adjunct faculty have taken on other roles at the university, which were not included as part of their contract to teach.

Chapter Summary

Adjunct faculty who teach part-time comprise about half the professoriate, making them essential to the operation of academic programs. This research investigated the perceptions adjunct faculty at OIT had regarding support and services provided to them in relation to their performance as teachers. The research investigated whether adjunct faculty perceptions differed on the basis of variables such as age, gender, number of years employed at OIT, educational degrees, and department or discipline.

Chapter two presents the literature supporting the perceptions of adjunct faculty in relation to their teaching experiences at various universities and colleges across the nation. Specifically, demographics of adjunct faculty and their concerns and challenges, as well as challenges to the universities and colleges are included.

Chapter three details and explains the methodology. In chapters four and five, results of the research will be discussed as well as recommendations and conclusions.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

IntroductionSynthesis of the Literature

The literature selected for inclusion in this research was of a scholarly nature. The literature was either from published texts, journals, or dissertation and theses work. Primary sources of work were used whenever possible. Three main topics are discussed in this chapter. The first topic is demographics of adjunct faculty, which includes who make up the adjunct or part-time faculty. The next topic is adjunct faculty concerns and challenges, which looks at what the concerns are of adjunct faculty and the challenges adjunct faculty face, and the third topic is university concerns and challenges, which looks at the challenge of including adjunct faculty in the college community family.

Demographic Characteristics of
Adjunct Faculty in the United States

Most Americans would be surprised to learn that almost three-quarters of the people employed today to teach undergraduate courses in the nation's colleges and universities are not full-time permanent professors but, rather, are instructors employed on limited-term contracts to teach anything from one course to a full course load. These instructors now teach the majority of undergraduate courses in U.S. public colleges and universities. Part-time/adjunct faculty members account for 47 percent of all faculty, not including graduate employees. The percentage is even higher in community colleges, with part-

time/adjunct faculty representing almost 70 percent of the instructional workforce in those institutions (American Academic, 2010).

The number of part-time faculty has grown at an explosive rate over the past two decades. In the 1970's, only about 22 percent of higher education faculty in the United States were not tenure-track or tenured professors. By the beginning of the 1980's, the number rose to 32 percent; however, part-timers were still only 33 percent of the faculty. By the early 1990's, part-time faculty had increased to 42 percent of the higher education faculty, and by the mid to late 1990's, it had grown to about 46-47 percent (Charfauros & Tierney, 1999).

Part-time/adjunct faculty members are about evenly split between two groups, those who prefer part-time teaching (50 percent) and those who would like to have full-time teaching jobs (47 percent). Among those under age 50, the percentage preferring full-time teaching work increased to 60 percent. About 46 percent of the respondents have previously sought full-time college teaching employment (American Academic, 2010).

A majority (59 percent) of part-time/adjunct faculty work at four-year institutions, with one in three (33 percent) working at public four-year institutions, and one in four (26 percent) working at private four-year institutions. Also, a significant proportion (41 percent) of these faculty work at two-year colleges. Overall, part-time/adjunct faculty members are an even mix of men (52 percent) and women (48 percent). By institution type, there are breaks by gender: Women make up the majority (54 percent) of contingent faculty at two-year colleges, while men are the majority (56 percent) at four-year institutions. Four-year private school part-time/adjunct faculty members are largely

male (63 percent male; 37 percent female), while gender proportions at public institutions are more balanced (51 percent male; 49 percent female) (American Academic, 2010).

Most contingent faculty are white non-Hispanics (84 percent), with the remainder being 4 percent black, 3 percent Hispanic, 2 percent Asian, and 3 percent other. About half of the adjunct faculty workforce (46 percent) are under age 50; however, the majority (83 percent) have either a master's degree (57 percent) or a Ph.D./professional degree (26 percent), with 13 percent indicating they have only a four-year degree.

Adjuncts at four-year universities are more likely to have a Ph.D. (33 percent) than those from two-year colleges (16 percent) (American Academic, 2010).

Part-time/adjunct faculty members have varying degrees of seniority at the institutions where they work. More than half (57 percent) of adjunct faculty members have been teaching at their institution for 10 years or less, breaking down to one in four (25 percent) who has worked for five years or less, and one in three (32 percent) who has worked for six to 10 years. About one in four contingent faculty (28 percent) have been teaching 11 to 20 years, with 13 percent teaching at his/her institution more than 20 years (American Academic, 2010).

The primary employment status of part-time/adjunct faculty also vary. One in three (34 percent) has only one job, while two in three (66 percent) work two or more jobs. Some have another teaching job (28 percent) but more have nonteaching-related jobs (38 percent). One in seven (24 percent) has two teaching jobs and a nonteaching-related job. Among those who have an additional teaching job, three in four (77 percent) teach part

time at both jobs, with the rest (23 percent) teaching full time at one teaching job and part time at another (American Academic, 2010).

Faculty who responded to the National Center for Education Statistics' National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) in 1992 indicated the mean age of adjunct faculty was 45.8 years, compared to 48.0 years for full-time faculty. This same study indicated the mean household income of part-time faculty was \$67,637, compared to \$81,248 for full-time faculty. Both groups lived in households of just under three members (Leslie, 1998).

Individuals may choose to accept adjunct teaching positions for a variety of reasons. First, there are the professionals active in their fields who teach a course or two on the side. Their motivations may include interest in keeping up with the academic side of the profession, altruism—helping to prepare the next generation of professionals, or recruitment to provide students early exposure to practitioners in the disciplines. Some even serve as goodwill ambassadors for the school in the larger community. Second, there are the academicians who for one reason or another have put together the equivalent of a full-time career out of teaching part time at several schools. Third, there are the individuals who are not interested in a full-time career, and who teach for the joy of teaching or to stay involved with the discipline (Baron-Nixon, 2007).

Adjunct teaching is considered by some individuals to be the grunt work of academe: low-paying, part-time jobs filled by highly educated scholars who travel from campus to campus because they can't find full-time work in one place (Wilson, 2009).

Approximately one third of the people who responded to a Chronicle survey indicated

that they fit this profile. Half of the survey respondents said they preferred part-time work because it fits with the demands of their family life (Wilson, 2009). Other adjuncts are unemployed high school teachers or instructors from smaller, less prestigious institutions who are attempting to parlay their adjunct position into a full-time appointment (Wickun & Stanley, 2000).

Nationally, doctors, attorneys, bankers, engineers, psychologists, and ministers comprise a large sector of the adjunct pool. These professionals have full-time employment already and teach because they receive a high degree of satisfaction from relationships with students. Teaching gives them an opportunity to share wisdom gathered over years of professional experience and to engage in intellectual stimulation. Some teach as a strategy for developing credibility in the marketplace and/or a client base for a full-time job. For yet others, they teach to meet and interact with a rich cross-section of bright citizens—both students and college employees—establishing primarily personal relationships. Adjunct faculty who are retired pursue teaching as a new career and as a supplement to personal income. Many individuals are having a variety of their needs satisfied through adjunct college/university teaching. Many even define themselves in terms of their part-time teaching role (Lyons, Kysilka, Pawlas, 1999).

Veteran adjuncts report they derive their principal satisfaction from the intrinsic rewards of teaching—the intellectual challenge, the social interaction, and the opportunity to play a role in the development of others. Over time, they find their self-efficacy and confidence levels improve as they immerse themselves in the rich dynamics of the academic culture (Lyons, Kysilka, Pawlas, 1999).

Students reap the benefits of adjunct faculty expertise; these faculty are the ones out working in the trenches and dealing with the day-to-day activities. The educational community also reaps the benefit of gaining recognition and respect from the adjunct's association with the university. The wide variety of adjunct expertise enables the institution to offer not only the required courses but additional courses that would not ordinarily be scheduled. Adjunct faculty members compliment the full time faculty by enriching the overall curricula. In addition, the professionalism of most adjunct professors is consistently exceptional, which lends further credibility to the institution's reputation (Wickun & Stanley, 2000).

Adjunct Faculty Concerns and Challenges

Satisfaction with working conditions of adjunct faculty varies by institution type. Adjunct faculty at two-year colleges are very satisfied (68 percent very or mainly), and adjunct faculty at private four-year institutions are also very satisfied (67 percent) with their working conditions. Faculty from public four-year universities are considerably less happy, with just half (50 percent) very (20 percent) or mainly (30 percent) satisfied (American Academic 2010).

Adjunct faculty who report that they cannot find full-time work are less satisfied than those who are employed full-time elsewhere. According to a study conducted by the American Council on Education (1992), just over 65 percent of the adjunct faculty in the fine arts and 61 percent of those in the humanities reported teaching as adjuncts because full-time work was not available. These percentages are higher than in other fields, suggesting that too many potential faculty are chasing too few jobs in these fields.

Almost one-third (32.2 percent) of those teaching in the humanities reported overall dissatisfaction with their jobs, as did 27 percent of those in the fine arts—much higher than the overall levels of dissatisfaction among adjuncts in all fields. Overall, adjunct faculty who feel trapped teaching as an adjunct and unable to find full-time work in their field were also the least satisfied (Leslie, 1992).

More recent research presents a similar picture. Faculty who would prefer full-time teaching positions are considerably less satisfied with working conditions. Less than half (49 percent) of faculty preferring full-time positions are satisfied, with 32 percent just somewhat satisfied and 19 percent not satisfied (American Academic, 2010).

Looking on the past few years, a majority (53 percent) of part-time/adjunct faculty members say conditions at their institutions did not improve or worsen, but stayed about the same (American Academic 2010). Many adjunct faculty are concerned about job security. Because they are hired on a term-by-term basis, they can be dropped from the payroll at the end of any term. Walker (1998) says that adjunct faculty can be dropped from the payroll at the stroke of a vice presidential pen. So when departmental budgets must be reduced, or tenure-track lines reduced, adjunct faculty can be hired to replace tenure-track positions. “Institutions can save 60-75 percent on faculty costs” by hiring part-time faculty (Hickman, 1998, p.14). Administrators have more control when adjunct faculty numbers increase because there is a reduction of faculty contributing to the shared governance of the institution (Haeger, 1998). Some faculty are less concerned about this aspect of the job. Fifty-six percent of adjunct faculty members are satisfied with job security, although 41 percent say it is falling short of expectations. Satisfaction levels

differ by institution type: most adjunct faculty from four-year private institutions are satisfied (62 percent), as are those from two-year colleges (57 percent). However, adjunct faculty from four-year public colleges are divided on job security, with 49 percent saying it is at least as good as can be expected, and 48 percent saying that it is falling short (American Academic 2010).

Lack of security was also one of the key themes from another study. A total of 343 full- and part-time non-tenure track faculty participated in 24 ninety-minute focus groups. Faculty were concerned with being employed term-by-term, with short notice of renewal or non-renewal, with the over-reliance on student evaluations. Some adjunct faculty also perceived they needed to take on administrative tasks to become indispensable. Others indicated they had no contract, and they didn't see much difference between a tenure-track position and theirs (Waltman, Hollenshead, August, Miller, Bergom, 2010).

If adjunct faculty are hired late, they may not be able to prepare adequately for courses and become familiar with the course syllabus and other resource materials. Or, if their hoped-for contract falls through, they may be delayed in securing other employment or in applying for unemployment benefits. Even if adjunct faculty perform in an exemplary manner, they have no guarantee they will be rehired (Charfauros & Tierney, 1999).

Adjunct faculty almost always come with excellent technical credentials, but they have little or no teacher training or knowledge of learning principles and cognitive psychology. According to Gosink (2000), for adjunct faculty to develop membership in the university community, they must understand the mission, traditions, and goals of the

university. In addition, they must be given the essential information relating to the academic/clerical logistics of teaching, such as location of and procedure for obtaining classroom supplies, telephone with voice-mail training, parking, writing a syllabus, etc. Support for teaching excellence is essential. Adjunct faculty need training in this area as well in order to enhance their performance as a teacher. Their teaching performance affects the overall quality of academic programs (Gappa, 1984).

A 2000 survey of 1,500 full- and part-time faculty nationwide, found that

Although part-time faculty are generally well-qualified to perform their duties...it can be argued that part-timers are more weakly linked to their students, colleagues and...institutions than full-timers...less familiar with the availability of campus services [and so]...less likely to sustain extracurricular student-faculty interactions. (Schuet 2002)

Further literature review indicates that the majority of adjunct faculty have no offices for students to visit, telephones, or mailboxes in which students can leave messages; thus, communication is limited (Haeger, 1998). Without communication, even pedagogical effectiveness can be affected. Haeger (1998) supposes many questions, including the following: 1) How can adjunct faculty adequately assist and be accessible to students?; 2) Should adjuncts have to provide their home telephone numbers to students?; and 3) How are adjuncts' integrated into the academic culture, as well as into the casual, social exchanges, or collegial interaction? Continual lack of departmental respect, academic freedom, efficacy, affirmation, and inclusion results in less than effective employees (MacMillan, 1999). According to Wyles (1998), "the overarching problem is not the growing number or the overall proportion of adjunct faculty; rather, it is the institutional

neglect of this critical mass—not so much their neglect as their exclusion from the teaching-learning enterprise.” (p. 92)

Bousquet (2008) indicates the problem is not with the intellectual quality, talent, or commitment of the individual persons working on a nonprofessorial basis; it’s the degraded circumstances in which higher education management compels them to work: teaching too many students in too many classes too quickly, without security, status, or an office; working from standardized syllabi; using outsourced tutorial, remedial, and even grading services; providing no time for research and professional development.

A conceptual model of faculty satisfaction would include several areas:

- Belongingness and Respect
 - Being treated with respect by colleagues
 - Not being seen as second tier
 - Knowing who they are; not being invisible
- Hiring and Continuing Employment
 - Offer multiyear appointments
 - Adequate timeframe for notification of contract renewal or non-renewal
- Career Development and Advancement
 - Offer opportunities such as workshops, mentoring relationships, attending conferences
 - Offer opportunities to take on administrative responsibilities
 - Offer opportunities to be members of departmental and university committees
 - Offer opportunities to apply for teaching awards
- Integration into Departmental and Institutional Life
 - Encourage collaborations between full-time faculty and part-time/adjunct faculty to develop curricula, to plan and teach a course
 - Be included in departmental and institutional-level governance
 - Be included in faculty retreats and other departmental events
 - Provide opportunities to get together with other part-time/adjunct faculty and learn from one another
 - Create an environment where tenure-track and part-time/adjunct faculty feel engaged and connected to each other and to the department’s work

- An office to call their own (or at least shared equitably)
 - An office where they can hold office hours
 - A phone where students can get in touch with them
 - A place to grade papers and prepare for teaching

The above suggestions would help to create a more inclusive and equitable work environment for the entire college/university community (Bergom & Waltman 2010).

Some would say salary is the main drawback to teaching as an adjunct. However, according to Hart Research Associates, compensation appeared not to be a major expectation of part-time/adjunct faculty. Only one in four (26 percent) teach part-time because it provides important income and benefits. The majority (57 percent) say they teach because they enjoy teaching, and compensation is not a major consideration. This does not mean that the majority of them believe their compensation is appropriate or adequate, but rather that most do not expect significant compensation for their work.

Research also indicated that adjunct faculty are dissatisfied with salaries at their institutions with 57 percent saying salaries are falling short. Those who teach three or more classes are particularly dissatisfied with salaries (65 percent), while those who teach only one course are less dissatisfied (47 percent). According to research completed by JBL Associates (2008) for the AFT, adjunct faculty members receive an average of \$2,758 per course, which is only a quarter of what average full-time (tenured and tenure-track) faculty members receive on a per course basis if their full salaries are divided by the average number of classes they teach. It is understandable that a full-time faculty member earn more than an adjunct because full-time faculty have other responsibilities on the campus, such as serving on committees, maintaining some office hours, and conducting research. Even though full-time faculty have responsibilities that adjunct

faculty don't, they still think they are underpaid, and some are even insulted at the amount they are paid (Fountain, 2005).

Older faculty members are more likely than younger to say they teach simply because they enjoy teaching. Two in three (64 percent) part-time/adjunct faculty members age 50 and above say their primary reason for teaching is because they enjoy teaching. Only one in three (35 percent) say they teach because of benefits (28 percent) or full-time teaching opportunities (7 percent). For those under age 50, however, half (49 percent) say they teach because they enjoy teaching, with the other half (48 percent) saying they teach because of benefits (24 percent) or full-time teaching opportunities (24 percent) (American Academic, 2010). Love of teaching was cited by the faculty interviewed in the Waltman, et. al. survey, (2010). They said they enjoyed working with students and wanted to make a difference in students' lives; many chose part-time work over tenure track because they just love teaching.

Further research indicates that most adjunct faculty want to be considered as one of the faculty, to be valued for their knowledge and work experience, to be invited to faculty meetings, training sessions, faculty forums, and be welcomed by the "meet at 4:00 for a drink" group. They want equal pay for equal work, retirement savings, better administrative support, more lead time to prepare for a course, and a closer adjunct to permanent staff relationship. The bottom line is adjuncts want to be involved in decision making and the educational system in general (Fountain, 2005). They really want not to be "treated as colleagues," but instead to "be colleagues" (Bousquet, 2008). Status is important to all, whether teaching one course or a full load. What about empowering

adjunct faculty? Empowerment is respect for each individual based on each person having a valuable contribution to make and each having a unique voice regarding his or her unique experiences. Do institutions of higher education empower or disempower their adjunct faculty?

Respect and inclusion, as well as professional growth opportunities were also themes in Waltman, et. al. (2010) study. Two ways of looking at respect and inclusion were a perceived lack of respect from colleagues as well as from chairs and deans, exclusion from meetings, voting, curriculum design, etc. Many felt supported within their program but did not feel valued or respected outside their program. On the other hand, some faculty indicated chairs or colleagues treated them as equals. They felt part of their department and didn't have any sense of being different. These same faculty expressed the desire for more opportunities for professional growth. They would like funding to attend workshops or present at conferences, or be given release time to write and research – maybe eligibility for university awards and grants.

The competition for a full-time, tenured position is intense. Thirty-five years ago, nearly 75 percent of all college teachers were tenurable; only a quarter worked on an adjunct, part-time, or non-tenurable basis. Today, those proportions are reversed. If you're enrolled in four college classes right now, you have a pretty good chance that one of the four will be taught by someone who has earned a doctorate and whose teaching, scholarship, and service to the profession has undergone the intensive peer scrutiny associated with the tenure system. Fewer tenured positions are available, so competition is tight to secure a tenured position. Many tenured professors blame the adjuncts or part-

timers for taking away tenurable positions and, thus, are not as supportive as they might otherwise be (Bousquet, 2008).

Some adjunct faculty report being told that they aren't needed at department meetings, or that they lack "the latest research" when jobs open up—even at colleges that are teaching institutions (*Inside Higher Ed*, August 11, 2008).

Policies governing adjunct faculty are very diverse. Some adjunct assignments are made as an afterthought to the distribution of class loads for permanent faculty. Other adjuncts carry the load of permanent faculty who have retired or resigned unexpectedly. They teach many of the foundation and core courses taken by first- and second-year students, teach professional courses in which their own life experiences are invaluable, and step in at short notice to fill-in for regular faculty engaged in research or away on sabbatical. They have become the lifeline of many universities (Baron-Nixon, 2007; Wickun & Stanley, 2000). Adjunct faculty provide expertise in critical courses that perhaps no full-time member on staff possesses; their evening and weekend availability enable class schedules to expand and serve time- and place-challenged students (Lyons, 2007).

University Concerns and Challenges

Because of the large number of adjunct faculty, there come new challenges and opportunities for professionalization of adjunct faculty. There are a variety of reasons for the rising number of adjunct faculty: (Baron-Nixon (2007)

- Budgetary constraints and expediencies.
- Increased enrollments.
- Course enrollment fluctuations.

- A changing student population.
- Desire to expand course offerings.
- Remediation and basic skills courses.
- Flexibility of place.
- Clinical supervision.
- Get around tenure.
- Enhance affirmative action profile

Part-time faculty are considered “cheap labor” because they are paid for teaching by the course, usually at a rate much lower than that of a full-time instructor. In addition, there is little or no overhead cost to employing part-time faculty. Since enrollment patterns reflect social realities and may shift dramatically within a short period, addressing them with part-time faculty becomes an expedient and attractive option. Enrollments also tend to be uneven at different times of the year, with more sections being required one term and less another. Most students enter college in the fall, so more sections of courses are needed that term in particular. To accommodate this need, administrators hire part-time faculty who are available on short notice to teach unplanned, extra sections (Baron-Nixon, 2007). However, the system of cheap teaching doesn’t sort for the best teachers; it sorts for persons who are in a financial position to accept compensation below the living wage. One of the downfalls to management’s irresponsible staffing is that students drop out, take longer to graduate, and fail to acquire essential literacies, often spending tens of thousands of dollars on a credential that has little merit in the eyes of employers (Bousquet, 2008).

There is an increase in adults completing unfinished degrees, second career pursuers, retirees, and the demand for expanded evening and weekend schedules has followed. Full-time faculty may be limited by collective bargaining agreements or contracts, but

part-timers often welcome the opportunity to increase their teaching load. Along these same lines, to meet changing student expectations and increasing enrollments, institutions are expanding the variety of disciplines they offer and increasing the diversity of majors beyond the traditional arts and sciences core. Institutions are recruiting experts as faculty and are becoming more comfortable with part-time faculty who are full-time professionals (Baron-Nixon, 2007).

With increasing enrollments, there come more students who may require remedial or basic courses to enhance skills formerly addressed in high school. Many of these courses are either part of the core curriculum or are prerequisites to core courses, and part-time faculty pick up the slack left by full-time faculty (Baron-Nixon, 2007).

Many institutions require their students to complete an internship or field experience. Part-time faculty, practicing professionals are called on to perform one-on-one instruction, group discussions, mentoring, assignment evaluation, testing and grading, and they can be hired to teach at off-campus sites (Baron-Nixon, 2007).

A case could be made that an increase in the number of part-time faculty is a reflection of institutional desire to reduce the number of tenured faculty. It makes sense both politically and economically, but because of its controversial nature, it is not discussed openly (Baron-Nixon, 2007).

To enhance the affirmative action pool, hiring female and minority part-time faculty may provide good “formal data” when combined with the full-time faculty pool. Figures collected by the U.S. Department of Education show that in 1991, full-time faculty ranks included 169,410 women and 366,213 men, while part-time faculty included 131,243

women and 159,386 men. In addition, in 1995, full-time faculty ranks included 190,672 women and 360,150 men, compared to 178,141 women and 202,743 men in part-time faculty ranks (Baron-Nixon, 2007).

The American Association of University Professors reported in 2006, women make up 52.4 percent of all non-tenure-track positions. Taking a look at the academic field and part-time faculty, fields that employ the highest proportion or have the largest increase in hiring over time tend to be comprised of more women. The table below shows the relationship between the degree of part-time hiring by academic field and the representation of women in these fields.

Table 2. Percent of Total Faculty Positions that are Contingent vs. Percent of Female Faculty by Academic Field, 2003

Field	% of All Positions that are Contingent	% of Women Hired
Education	55.5	60.9
Fine Arts	52.5	38.2
Business	51	31.6
Agriculture/Home Economics	30.2	35.4
Engineering	29.6	8.6
Natural Sciences	37.2	26.3

Sources: National Education Association, 2007. Part-time faculty: A look at data and issues. *Update* 11(3). Washington, DC; National Education Association Office of Higher Education; and National Center for Education Statistics, 2005. Part-time and full-time instructional faculty and staff in degree-granting institutions. *Digest of Education Statistics*. Washington, DC; U.S. Department of Education.

With more and more women being hired as adjunct faculty, the effect may be the long-term feminization of part-time labor. The effects of this disadvantage women in a couple of ways. First, as professions become feminized, pay tends to decrease. Second, as occupations become feminized, the rates of male entry fall which ensures that the

positions remain female-dominated. In academia, this is a vicious cycle: as part-time positions become mostly one gender, they then see the consequences of this gender composition. This creates a never-ending circle of replication (Finley, 2010).

Part-time faculty challenges are very important because part-time faculty are here to stay and in many cases serve as the lifeline of the school (Baron-Nixon, 2007). Because of this, they should be integrated into the institutional fiber in a manner that will provide opportunities for improved academic performance on all fronts. As Vincent Tinto (1987) states,

In a very real sense the faculty and staff serve as both representatives and mediators of the social and intellectual life of the institution. Their actions are important indicators to students of both the quality of that life and the degree to which the institution is concerned with the life of students.

The AAUP announced in September 2006 that it would be asking members to approve a detailed set of guidelines for adjunct instructors. Its three main provisions are:

- All part-time faculty members should receive the terms of appointment in writing and should have a right to a hearing in case of dismissal before the end of the period of appointment.
- Those who have served for three or more terms within three years should receive written notice of reappointment or non-reappointment no later than one month before the end of the existing term of appointment; receive written reasons, if requested, in case of non-reappointment; and have a right to appeal a non-reappointment that appears to be discriminatory, based significantly on considerations violating academic freedom or attributable to inadequate consideration.
- Prior to consideration of reappointment beyond a seventh year, part-time faculty members who have taught at least twelve courses or six terms within those seven years shall be provided a comprehensive review with a view toward (1) appointment with part-time tenure where such exists, (2) appointment with part-time continuing service, or (3) non-reappointment (AAUP, 2006, September).

It is a major undertaking to integrate part-time faculty into the total institutional fabric. The call to action should come from the highest levels of

administration so that they are both credible and supported with the appropriate tools and resources. The critical work, however, needs to be done by members of all segments and at all levels within the institution. For this program to be successful in the long run, the big picture must be established first, with corresponding short- and long-range plans articulated as well (Baron-Nixon, 2007). Sandra Elman, (2002, fall), executive director of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, states,

In short, colleges and universities must either work to create an institutional culture that embraces part-time faculty as credible, legitimate members of the academic profession or else not hire them at all. Failure to create an institutional culture that enables part-time faculty to be effective not only compromises the educational experience of students, it is not equitable. Absent such a culture, any use of part-time faculty risks undermining the integrity of the institution.

Higher education institutions cannot afford to marginalize adjunct faculty (Wyles, 1998). Some suggestions include:

- Inviting adjuncts with specified areas of expertise to share their training and skills in workshops, seminars, or at convocation.
- Providing opportunities for adjunct faculty to share research and pedagogical strategies with one another and with their full-time colleagues. Invite them to social activities or professional growth opportunities.
- Implementing adjunct faculty mentoring programs.
- Improving communication between the institution and adjunct faculty.
- Providing opportunities for campus and departmental involvement. Invite adjuncts to participate in campus orientations, faculty meetings, college committees, and community service.
- Consistent evaluations of adjunct faculty relevant to academic responsibilities.

Implementing some of the above suggestions could not only benefit the adjunct faculty, but also the full-time faculty and administrators. Baron-Nixon (2007) states that a sense of belonging and loyalty by part-time faculty can and should be fostered on two levels—departmental and institutional. So many part-time faculty teach at either uncommon hours or days or at off-campus locations and the challenge of inclusiveness cannot be underestimated. Most part-time faculty have their first contact with the institution through a specific academic department or program, but their success ultimately depends on their relationship with the institution as a whole. Adjunct faculty will continue to be a large presence on campuses; they deserve to be included in the campus community.

Bradley (2007), senior program officer at the American Association of University Professors, said that compensating only for classroom hours means hourly wages are quite low once other teaching activities are factored in. She suggests offering some funding for part-time faculty to develop a new course, supervise an independent study course, attend required meetings and orientations, and hold office hours. Students expect faculty to remain current in their fields, so offer some funding for attending a conference or presenting a paper, attending required professional development meetings and orientations, or keeping up membership in disciplinary associations. Other suggestions by Bradley include allowing contingent faculty to serve on committees and be part of governance (and pay them for doing so) and including them in the information pipeline.

Adjunct faculty members who want to improve their working conditions might be better off focusing less on bread-and-butter concerns and more on securing their place at

the table. A new study examined 30 North American colleges at which full- and part-time adjunct faculty members had gained benefits or some other improvement in their workplace. It concluded that adjuncts had made the most progress at colleges where they tried to transform the campus climate to be more inclusive of them, rather than fighting to change on employer practice at a time (Schmidt, 2009).

Where the overall campus climate has been changed so that adjunct faculty members are valued and included in decision making, colleges are naturally drawn to tend to adjuncts' concerns. Adjuncts at these colleges not only get better pay, benefits, and job security but also often find their institutions taking other steps, such as paying them for office hours, adopting policies intended to protect their academic freedom and intellectual-property rights, as well as providing mechanisms for them to get on the tenure track. Faculties were unionized at 22 of the institutions in this study, but the researchers concluded that when it came to adjuncts' working conditions, the differences between the unionized and non-unionized campuses they examined were few and minor (Schmidt, 2009).

Chapter Summary

Part-time/adjunct faculty represent almost 70 percent of the instructional workforce in U.S. public colleges and universities. Statistics show that these faculty are about evenly split between those who prefer part-time teaching and those who would like to have full-time teaching positions. Part-time/adjunct faculty are an even mix between men and women, with the majority being women at two-year colleges and men at four-year

institutions. Those at four-year institutions are more likely to have a Ph.D. than those at two-year institutions (American Academic, 2010).

These faculty choose to teach part-time for many reasons. Some are actively employed in their field and teach a course or two to help prepare the next generation of professionals, while others teach part-time at several institutions to make the equivalent of a full-time job, and yet a third reason is for the love of teaching (Baron-Nixon, 2007).

The concerns and challenges of adjunct faculty include less than desirable working conditions, little job security, being hired at the last minute with little time to prepare adequately for the course, not being valued for their knowledge and work experience (Fountain, 2005), and not being included as part of the department (Inside Higher Ed, 2008). Salaries are also a concern, with 57 percent saying their salaries are falling short (Fountain, 2005).

University concerns and challenges include how to deal with increased enrollment and decreased budgets. Part-time faculty are considered “cheap labor,” because they are paid at a rate much lower than that of a full-time instructor. Part-time faculty are here to stay and may serve as the lifeline of the school, so the challenge is to embrace these faculty and integrate them into the department and institution (Baron-Nixon, 2007).

The next chapter discusses the methodology of the study. This includes the specific research questions that were addressed and the design and details of the methodology. The population for the study was discussed, as well as variables and instrumentation. Specifics of the data collection and data analysis were also included in chapter three.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Plainly, part-time/adjunct faculty members now play a vital role in educating the nation's college students (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). These faculty vary considerably in the extent of their participation in the institution (AFT, 2010) and also differ in their motivations for accepting a position as an adjunct faculty member (June, 2009). Oregon Institute of Technology utilizes adjunct faculty extensively and yet lacks research studying the support and services desired by adjunct faculty. The purpose of this research study was to investigate the services and support provided to, and utilized by, adjunct faculty, how they perceived that various types of support affected their teaching. This study also investigated whether adjunct faculty perceptions of the adequacy of services and support provided by OIT differed on the basis of such variables as age, gender, number of years employed at OIT, educational degrees, and department or discipline.

The specific research questions addressed in this study were:

1. What perceived teaching support services do adjunct faculty at OIT report having been offered to them?
2. What perceived teaching support services do adjunct faculty at OIT report using?
3. In addition to the support services that are currently offered to adjunct faculty at OIT, what additional support would they like to have offered to them to assist in improving teaching?
4. Do adjunct faculty differ in their use of support services provided by OIT on the basis of:

- a. Age?
 - b. Gender?
 - c. How long employed at OIT as an adjunct faculty member?
 - d. Education?
 - e. Department/discipline?
5. How do adjunct faculty perceive additional support would improve their teaching performance?

Design

A quantitative descriptive research study was used to examine the relationship among adjunct faculty demographic characteristics, their utilization of and desire for support services and their self perception of teaching performance. The methodology used was an on-line survey administered spring term 2011 to 102 adjunct faculty who taught on the OIT Klamath Falls or Portland campus during academic year 2010-11. These faculty were members of one of two colleges: The College of Engineering, Technology and Management (ETM) or the College of Health, Arts and Sciences (HAS). The survey measured how the data compared across the groups, i.e. support services offered, use of support services, perceptions of support services they wish they had been offered and comparing those across gender, age, education, number of years teaching as an adjunct at OIT, department, and school in which they teach.

Details of Methodology

This survey was administered via Zoomerang.com using OIT's adjunct faculty email addresses. Survey participants were required to 'opt in' or agree to take the survey. There was an informed consent document, and by completing the survey, participants agreed to the informed consent.

Population/Sample

The population for this study was taken from the list of adjuncts who taught at OIT during the 2010-11 school year. The sample was taken from a list of 102 adjunct faculty who taught either Fall 2010, Winter 2011 or Spring 2011 terms at the Klamath Falls and Portland campuses (does not include the Boeing campus, the Sherwood campus or the OHSU campus). The response rate was 35% or 36 total respondents. These faculty volunteered via the informed consent included with the survey.

In addition, more adjuncts (69%) from the College of Engineering, Technology, and Management responded than from the College of Health, Arts, and Sciences (31%).

Variables

Dependent Variables. The dependent variables in this research were the types of services adjunct faculty reported having available as well as the types of services adjunct faculty reported using. These variables were measured comparatively across the groups, and the results were descriptive. For the final research question, the dependent variable was the self-perception of teaching improvement.

Independent Variables. The independent variables in this research were:

Gender (Male/Female)

Education Level (PhD/EdD, Masters, Bachelors, Other terminal degree)

Age (20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60+)

Longevity of teaching (16 or more, 11-15, 6-10, 2-5, Fewer than 2)

College in which they teach (ETM: College of engineering, Technology and Management or HAS: College of Health, Arts and Sciences)

Instrumentation

The instrument used was a survey of 22 questions, including demographic questions.

See table 3 below:

Table 3. Table of Specifications: Adjunct Faculty Support at OIT

Academic Factors	Survey Question Number	Research Question Number
1. Support Available	11	1
2. Support Used	12,13,15,20	2
3. Support Requested	16,17	3
4. Job Satisfaction	21	1,2,3,4,5
5. Salary	22	5
6. Resources to improve teaching	14,18,19	5
Demographics		
1. Personal Demographics	3,4	4
2. Educational Demographics	1,2,5,6,7,8,9,10,12	4

Data Collection

The researcher gained permission from Montana State University-Bozeman Human Subjects Committee to conduct this research. The researcher also gained the written permission of the Provost of OIT to access the adjunct faculty to participate in this study. Following this, the researcher sent the department chairs a letter explaining the study. Data was gathered spring 2011. The surveys were administered via Zoomerang.com. An informed consent document was part of the survey, and by completing the survey,

participants agreed to the informed consent. See Appendix A, letter to department chairs and informed consent and Appendix B, survey instrument.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics using proportions and graphs were used for each question on the survey. Each question was cross-referenced to other questions to determine associations between/among variables. A Chi-square test for independence was used to determine how many faculty fell into a particular category, relative to a different category. The data (frequencies) were measured at the categorical level, and the design was between groups so that each participant could be in only one group. Results were shown as percentages and proportions as well as in written data reporting. Results were shown in a cross-tabulation table.

Each survey question asked could relate to many other variables; the results analyzed those relationships to answer the five specific research questions. Research questions 1-3 were analyzed as descriptive statistics such as proportion of faculty who reported using a service.

For research question 4, chi-square tests were run for each sub category. The analysis determined how many people fell into a particular category relative to a different category. Each participant was only identified as belonging to a particular group or combination of groups. These tests of association gave the researcher comparison data on how adjunct faculty differed in their use of support services on the basis of age, gender, length of employment, education, and department relative to another category. These five variables were identified because there was national data for comparison to

OIT data. For example, there was not much difference between male/female gender proportions at public institutions (51% male/49% female) and OIT gender proportions (64% male/36% female). Nationally, about 57% of adjuncts have been teaching for 10 years or less, and at OIT, 58% have been teaching for 10 years or less.

Of the four categories from which most adjunct faculty identify themselves, OIT has adjunct faculty who come from all four categories. Some prefer part-time work because they are already employed full time; these would be the specialists, experts, or professionals who teach for the ability to network and grow their careers. Also, OIT had those who are semi-retired or fully retired, and teach to stay involved in academia and to give back what they have learned through their careers; these would be the career enders.

Research question 5 was reported using descriptive statistics such as additional support asked for and how job performance was perceived to improve given the additional support.

Internal/External Validity

This study asked adjunct faculty to give their perceptions only, so it is not known for sure if adjunct faculty were offered the services or just perceived they would not improve their teaching as a teacher if they did not use the services. The data is their report of what services were offered vs what was used.

Because of the small response rate, it would be difficult to know how the responses would transfer to a different time; these responses are only for this moment in time. The adjunct faculty surveyed were only from the 2010-2011 academic year, and considering the economic situation nationally, would the responses differ in a different point in time?

This researcher was employed at OIT and worked with these adjunct faculty. The question could be asked whether they honestly responded or just told the researcher what they thought she wanted to hear.

OIT is a unique institution because of its location in Klamath Falls, Oregon, and because of its technology base. Perceptions at other institutions may be different, and generalizing these results to all adjuncts would be inappropriate.

Chapter Summary

OIT utilizes adjunct faculty extensively and yet lacks research studying the support and services desired by adjunct faculty. The methodology described above was implemented and used to investigate the services and support offered to and utilized by adjunct faculty, as well as how they perceived that various types of support affected their teaching. The next chapter of this research describes the results from the data gathered after applying statistical analyses which investigated how the variables and survey questions determined answers to the specific research questions. The final analysis provided data to support the overall support and satisfaction of adjuncts at OIT.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Introduction

The primary objective of this research was to investigate the support services that adjunct faculty at OIT received compared to support services that adjunct faculty used and desired. This research also investigated how age, gender, number of years teaching as adjunct faculty, education, and department/discipline compared to the support services received, used or desired. In addition, this research investigated what resources adjunct faculty thought would improve their teaching.

Problem, Purpose, Questions

Even though the number of adjunct faculty is increasing, many are treated as appendages and are often over-looked, left-out, and generally, not given much attention. However, adjunct faculty members who are more involved in the university, who meet regularly with other faculty and department chairs, who attend training, and who are welcomed and made to feel more a part of the campus community would seem to be more effective teachers.

Statement of the Problem. Adjunct faculty are expected to be fully prepared to teach their courses. Many receive a short orientation from their department chair, while others receive no orientation. On campuses which utilize adjunct faculty extensively, underestimating the support needs of adjunct faculty could translate into difficulty

creating and maintaining a highly qualified adjunct workforce and diminished educational experiences for students.

Oregon Institute of Technology (OIT) is a public, state-supported, four-year undergraduate and graduate teaching university. An enrollment of about 3,300 allows for a student-to-faculty ratio of 19:1. The curriculum focuses on engineering, but also includes humanities and social services, management, and health-related degrees. OIT has two colleges, the College of Engineering, Technology, and Management (ETM) and the College of Health, Arts, and Sciences (HAS). The university hires adjunct faculty to teach approximately 41% of courses throughout a year (three terms). There is not much research about adjunct faculty support and services at institutions similar to OIT, and OIT is lacking research studying the support and services provided to adjunct faculty. If we do not understand the support services and training desired by adjunct faculty, some individuals may feel left out of the university community.

Purpose of the Study. The purpose of this quantitative descriptive research study is to investigate the services and support provided to and utilized by adjunct faculty and how they perceive that various types of support could affect their teaching. This study will investigate whether adjunct faculty perceptions of the adequacy of services and support provided by OIT differ on the basis of such variables as age, gender, number of years employed at OIT, educational degrees, and department or discipline. These results will indicate job satisfaction level of adjunct faculty at OIT.

Research Questions. The research questions are:

1. What perceived teaching support services do adjunct faculty at OIT report having been offered to them?
2. What perceived teaching support services do adjunct faculty at OIT report using?
3. In addition to the support services that are currently offered to adjunct faculty at OIT, what additional support would they like to have offered to them to assist in improving teaching?
4. Do adjunct faculty differ in their use of support services provided by OIT on the basis of:
 - a. Age?
 - b. Gender?
 - c. How long employed at OIT as an adjunct faculty member?
 - d. Education?
 - e. Department/discipline?
5. How do adjunct faculty perceive additional support would improve their teaching performance?

Sample Demographics

The sampling frame for this research project included 102 adjunct faculty who were teaching the 2010-2011 academic year at Oregon Institute of Technology. The response rate for this survey was 35 percent or 36 respondents.

Twenty seven respondents (76%) were employed full-time separate from their adjunct teaching at OIT. The primary reason they worked as an adjunct was because they already had a full-time job. Some other reasons for teaching only part-time as an adjunct included maintaining a semi-retired status, desired to teach only one course in their specialty, enjoyed making some extra money, were evaluating teaching as a career change, and fulfilled a need in the department that no one else had the knowledge to teach.

Fourteen (41%) respondents taught two or fewer courses during the 2010-2011 academic year, and twenty five (69%) taught courses in their major. Of the two colleges at OIT, twenty four (69%) primarily taught in the College of Engineering, Technology, and Management, while eleven (31%) taught in the College of Health, Arts, and Sciences. See appendix C for specific results to survey questions.

Results of Data Analysis

Respondents were asked to indicate their membership in different demographic categories in questions one, two three, four, and eight. The results from these questions are reported in table 4 below.

Table 4: Demographic Data by Total Number of Respondents

Demographic Category	Percentage of Total Respondents
	n (%)
Age	
30-39	8 (23)
40-49	9 (26)
50-59	7 (20)
60+	11 (31)
Gender	
Female	13 (36)
Male	23 (64)

Table 4: Demographic Data by Total Number of Respondents, continued

Demographic Category	Percentage of Total Respondents
How Long Employed as Adj at OIT	
Fewer than 2 years	8 (22)
2-5 years	17 (47)
6 or more years	11 (31)
Education	
Bachelor's	15 (42)
Master's	14 (39)
Ph.D. or Ed.D.	4 (11)
Other	3 (8)
Department/Discipline (College)	
ETM	24 (69)
HAS	11 (31)

Specific results for research questions are discussed following each question.

1) What perceived teaching support services do adjunct faculty at OIT report having been offered to them? Participants were asked, in question 11 of the survey, which of the following services OIT provided them.

Table 5: Adjuncts Report of Services Provided by OIT

	Regularly or Frequently	Has Never Been Offered	Would not Use if Offered
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
An office-your own or shared?	8 (22%)	17 (47%)	11 (31%)
Money for travel to conferences?	1 (3%)	33 (92%)	2 (5%)
Professional development and training?	5 (14%)	28 (80%)	2 (6%)
Support services like secretarial help?	26 (72%)	8 (22%)	2 (6%)

The greatest number of respondents answered in the “has never been offered” category (except for secretarial help), indicating OIT did not offer these services to many adjunct faculty or these faculty were not aware of these services.

2) What perceived teaching support services do adjunct faculty at OIT report using? Participants were asked, in question 12 of the survey, to indicate their activity level for the following activities.

Table 6: Adjuncts Report of Services Used

	Regularly or Frequently	Has Never Been Offered	Would not Use if Offered
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Attend Departmental Meetings?	8 (22%)	14 (39%)	14 (38%)
Serve on Committees?	3 (9%)	15 (43%)	17 (48%)

Table 6: Adjuncts Report of Services used, continued

	Regularly or Frequently	Has Never Been Offered	Would not Use if Offered
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Attend Convocation?	6 (17%)	20 (57%)	9 (26%)
Attend September Institute?	2 (6%)	20 (55%)	14 (39%)
Attend Specific Adjunct Training?	11 (30%)	10 (28%)	15 (42%)
Meet with an Assigned Mentor?	8 (23%)	11 (30%)	17 (47%)
Attend Training by Student Services?	7 (21%)	16 (47%)	11 (32%)
Help Develop Courses in your Department?	25 (70%)	4 (11%)	7 (19%)
Receive Feedback about your Teaching?	32 (89%)	3 (8%)	1 (3%)

While the greatest number of adjuncts never participated in most of the activities, on the average, one-third indicated they were never invited to participate in the activities surveyed. The two activities where adjunct faculty regularly or frequently participated were 1) helping develop courses in their departments (70%) and, 2) receiving feedback about their teaching (89%). For some, these services were not important to them to enhance their teaching, so they did not participate even if they were aware of the service.

Further, participants were asked, in question 13 of the survey, how often (per term) they met with the provost, their dean, their department chair, faculty in their department, or their office manager for support.

Table 7: Adjuncts Report of Meeting with Key Personnel

	Regularly or Frequently	Seldom	Never	Person(s) was Not Available
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Provost	0	3 (8%)	32 (89%)	1 (3%)
Dean	0	4 (11%)	31 (86%)	1 (3%)
Department Chair	16 (44%)	15 (42%)	5 (14%)	0
Faculty in your Department	16 (46%)	10 (28%)	9 (26%)	0
Office Manager	15 (43%)	9 (26%)	9 (26%)	2 (5%)

The majority in each category are listed here. Ninety-two percent (92%) of the participants responded they had never met with the provost or he was unavailable, (89%) responded they had never met with their dean or he was unavailable, (42%) responded they seldom met with their department chair, over half (54%) responded they had seldom or never met with faculty in their department, and over half (57%) responded they had seldom, never met, or the person was not available regarding their office manager.

3) In addition to the support services that are currently offered to adjunct faculty at OIT, what additional support would they like to have offered to them to assist in improving teaching?

Respondents were asked, in question 17 of the survey, to describe the type of additional support services they would like from OIT. The majority of participants

thought training on how to teach, teaching strategies, learning styles, curriculum, student assessments, teaching aids, and teaching methods would be helpful. In addition, some felt additional technical support and professional librarian services to assist in locating teaching and resource materials would assist them to become better teachers.

Two participants thought office space would be helpful. Three participants thought knowing about resources such as who to go to with questions regarding grades, students struggling in class, how to order instructor copies of textbooks, and finding lab assistants would assist them in becoming better teachers. See appendix C for full list of additional services adjuncts would like from OIT.

4) Do adjunct faculty differ in their use of support services provided by OIT on the basis of:

- a. Age?
- b. Gender?
- c. How long employed at OIT as an adjunct faculty member?
- d. Education?
- e. Department/discipline?

To answer research question four, each demographic variable was analyzed in relation to the adjuncts' responses to question 12 using a chi square statistical analysis. With an overall sample size of 36, initial cross-tabulations indicated that many of the cells in the tables would be smaller than 5. Therefore, responses to question 12 were recoded into a two category variable with the possible values of: 1) used the service frequently or regularly or 2) did not use the service or were not offered the service. Responses to three support services, "serving on committees," "attending Convocation," and "attending September Institute" had very few participants who reported using the

service, so they were dropped from the analysis. In contrast, almost all respondents reported using “feedback on teaching” resulting in small cell sizes for the negative categories. This service was also dropped from the analysis.

The final five services were analyzed by demographic category and the results are reported in tables 8. Even with recoding, several analyses still had 2 or more categories that had cell sizes less than 5. For these analyses, a chi-square value is not reported. The null hypothesis was no association between the variables, and the alternate was there is an association between the variables, using an Alpha of less than .05.

Table 8: Chi-Square Tests of Services Used by Demographics

Attend Department Meetings			
	Used n (%)	Did Not Use n (%)	Chi Square <i>df</i> p
Age			*
30-39	3 (37)	5 (63)	
40-49	1 (11)	8 (89)	
50-59	3 (43)	4 (57)	
60 and above	1 (9)	10 (91)	
Gender			*
Female	4 (31)	9 (69)	
Male	4 (18)	19 (82)	
Yrs Employed			*
Fewer than 2	1 (12)	7 (88)	
2-5	5 (30)	12 (70)	
6 or more	2 (18)	9 (82)	
College			0.033
ETM	5 (21)	19 (79)	1
HAS	2 (18)	9 (82)	1.000

Table 8: Chi-Square Tests of Services Used by Demographics, continued

Specific Adjunct Training			
	Used n (%)	Did Not Use n (%)	Chi Square <i>df</i> p
Age			10.752
30-39	5 (63)	3 (37)	3
40-49	0	9 (100)	0.013
50-59	4 (57)	3 (43)	
60 and above	2 (18)	9 (82)	
Gender			0.536
Female	3 (23)	10 (77)	1
Male	8 (35)	15 (65)	0.464
Yrs Employed			*
Fewer than 2	1 (12)	7 (88)	
2-5	7 (41)	10 (59)	
6 or more	3 (27)	8 (73)	
College			1.129
ETM	8 (33)	16 (66)	1
HAS	3 (27)	8 (73)	0.189
Mentor			
Age			*
30-39	3 (37)	5 (63)	
40-49	1 (11)	8 (89)	
50-59	2 (28)	5 (72)	
60 and above	1 (9)	10 (91)	
Gender			0.550
Female	2 (15)	11 (85)	1
Male	6 (26)	17 (74)	0.458
Yrs Employed			*
Fewer than 2	3 (37)	5 (63)	
2-5	3 (18)	14 (82)	
6 or more	2 (18)	9 (82)	
College			1.724
ETM	7 (29)	17 (71)	1
HAS	1 (9)	10 (91)	0.189

Table 8: Chi-Square Tests of Services Used by Demographics, continued

Training by Student Services			
	Used n (%)	Did Not Use n (%)	Chi Square <i>df</i> p
Age			*
30-39	1 (12)	7 (88)	
40-49	0	8 (100)	
50-59	2 (34)	4 (66)	
60 and above	4 (36)	7 (64)	
Gender			0.080
Female	3 (23)	10 (77)	1
Male	4 (19)	17 (81)	0.778
Yrs Employed			*
Fewer than 2	0	7 (100)	
2-5	3 (18)	14 (82)	
6 or more	4 (40)	6 (60)	
College			*
ETM	3 (14)	14 (86)	
HAS	3 (27)	8 (73)	
Develop Courses			
Age			*
30-39	6 (75)	2 (25)	
40-49	4 (44)	5 (56)	
50-59	4 (57)	3 (43)	
60 and above	10 (91)	1 (9)	
Gender			0.599
Female	8 (61)	5 (39)	1
Male	17 (74)	6 (26)	0.439
Yrs Employed			
Fewer than 2	6 (75)	2 (25)	
2-5	10 (59)	7 (41)	
6 or more	9 (82)	2 (18)	
College			2.567
ETM	19 (80)	5 (20)	1
HAS	5 (46)	6 (54)	.109

* Unable to calculate due to small cell sizes

Only one chi square test had a probability level (alpha) less than .05, the test of the relationship of age to use of specific adjunct training. However, several cell sizes for this analysis were below 5 so the results should be interpreted with caution. Adjunct faculty in the 30-39 and 50-59 categories were more likely to report attending specific adjunct training more than other ages. All adjunct faculty in the 40-49 age category reported that they did NOT attend adjunct specific training.

5) How do adjunct faculty perceive additional support would improve their teaching performance? Adjunct faculty were asked to what degree they think the following resources would improve their teaching.

Table 9: Degree that Resources Improve Teaching

	A Great Deal	Some-what	Very Little	Not at All	Don't Know
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Receiving feedback about your teaching?	19 (53)	14 (39)	2 (5)	0	1 (3)
Help develop courses in your department?	12 (36)	14 (42)	2 (6)	2 (6)	3 (9)
Professional Development and training?	11 (31)	15 (43)	3 (8)	5 (14)	2 (6)
Basic training on teaching strategies?	10 (28)	14 (39)	4 (11)	7 (19)	1 (3)
Your own office or shared with another faculty member?	9 (25)	4 (11)	4 (11)	16 (45)	3 (8)
Meeting with your Department Chair?	9 (25)	18 (50)	6 (16)	1 (3)	2 (6)
Money for travel to conferences?	9 (25)	6 (17)	4 (11)	10 (28)	7 (19)

Table 9: Degree that Resources Improve Teaching, continued

	A Great Deal	Some-what	Very Little	Not at All	Don't Know
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Meet with faculty in your department?	9 (25)	14 (39)	7 (20)	3 (8)	3 (8)
An assigned mentor?	6 (17)	13 (36)	6 (17)	8 (22)	3 (8)
Attend specific adjunct training?	5 (14)	15 (42)	7 (19)	7 (19)	2 (6)
Attending departmental meetings?	5 (14)	14 (39)	8 (22)	7 (19)	2 (6)
Secretarial assistance?	3 (8)	6 (17)	16 (45)	7 (19)	4 (11)
Meet with your office manager?	3 (8)	10 (28)	9 (25)	8 (22)	6 (17)
Training by student services? (e.g. registrar's office, financial aid, student health, etc.)?	2 (6)	7 (19)	14 (39)	11 (30)	2 (6)
Attending September Institute?	2 (6)	3 (8)	6 (17)	6 (17)	19(52)
Serving on committees?	1 (3)	10 (27)	8 (22)	15 (42)	2 (6)
Attending Convocation?	1 (3)	7 (19)	6 (16)	11 (31)	11 (31)
Meeting with your Dean?	0	10 (28)	10 (28)	12 (33)	4 (11)
Meeting with the Provost?	0	6 (17)	8 (22)	16 (44)	6 (17)

The resources adjunct faculty felt would most improve their teaching a great deal or somewhat were receiving feedback about their teaching (92%), helping develop courses in their department (78%), professional development and training (74% or twenty six

respondents), basic training on teaching strategies (67%), meeting with their department chair (75%), meeting with faculty in their department (64%), having an assigned mentor (53%), attending specific adjunct training (56%), and attending departmental meetings (53%). The resources adjunct faculty felt would not improve their teaching at all included having their own or a shared office (45%) and meeting with the provost (44%).

In addition, participants were asked how the additional support services they requested would improve their teaching as an adjunct faculty.

Table 10: How Having Additional Support Would Improve Teaching

	n (%)
I would be able to answer student questions better	10 (67)
I would be further educated on pedagogies and how to use them in my classes	8 (53)
I would be more organized in my teaching	7 (47)
I would be more effective at assessment	6 (40)
I would feel more confident in my teaching	9 (60)
I would be more a part of the campus community	7 (47)
Other (Please describe)	5 (33)

In addition to the responses in the chart above, adjunct faculty also added the following ‘other’ responses as ways the additional support services could improve their teaching.

- Lab classes could be more focused on the principles to be taught instead of dealing with details of the lab equipment.
- Need to be up to date with latest technologies.
- I would be less stressed whether the technology is going to work and I would have more visual material available.
- I would manage my time better.

Adjunct faculty were also asked to rank these additional support services on a scale of 1 (most important) to 6 (not important). Below is the chart depicting the responses.

Table 11: Ranking of Additional Support Requested by Importance

	1 n(%)	2 n(%)	3 n(%)	4 n(%)	5 n(%)	6 n(%)
I would be able to answer student questions better	2 (17)	2 (17)	3 (25)	4 (33)	0	1 (8)
I would be further educated on pedagogies and how to use them in my classes	4 (36)	0	1 (9)	1 (9)	2 (18)	3 (27)
I would be more organized in my teaching	1 (9)	1 (9)	6 (55)	0	2 (18)	1 (9)
I would be more effective at assessment	1 (9)	2 (18)	2 (18)	3 (27)	3 (27)	0
I would feel more confident in my teaching	1 (8)	7 (54)	1 (8)	2 (15)	2 (15)	0
I would be more a part of the campus community	2 (15)	0	1 (8)	2 (15)	2 (15)	6 (46)

Analyzing both tables above, two-thirds (67%) of adjunct faculty said with having additional support, they would be able to answer student questions better and 34% ranked this as being important; and almost two-thirds (60%) said with additional support, they would feel more confident in their teaching, with 62% ranking this as important. Over half (53%) indicated with additional support, they would be further educated on

pedagogies and how to use them in their classes, and 36% ranked this as being important. The ranking percentages are a combination of 1 and 2 (on the scale mentioned above of 1 to 6).

Chapter Summary

At Oregon Institute of Technology, 102 adjunct faculty were surveyed to determine what support services were provided to and utilized by adjunct faculty and how they perceived these support services could affect their teaching. After statistical analysis of the sample data, it was determined that support services offered are not lacking, but that communication to adjunct faculty about what is available is lacking. While gender, age, number of years employed at OIT, education, and college did not have a significant effect on the use of support services, the affect of support services on teaching improvement did make a difference.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

Nationally, adjunct faculty are essential to the operation of academic programs and comprise about half the professoriate. The rise in adjunct faculty paralleled increasing financial stress in many colleges and universities, and they have had to hedge on their commitments to long-term employment of full-time, tenure-track faculty (Leslie, 1998). Exploitive use of adjunct faculty is short-sighted and avoids the need for faculty to develop good lines of communication, a sense of shared purpose, and a high level of professional trust. This only reinforces the illusion that adjunct faculty are hired as a temporary bridge during hard times (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Adjunct faculty are expected to assume responsibility to teach while at the same time are often encumbered by inadequacies in the areas of orientation, service and support systems (Leslie, et al., 1982). Relatively small investments in adjunct faculty now will pay off in the future. These faculty represent a source of energy, commitment, and creativity that colleges and universities can use to make academic programs stronger (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Summary of Problem and Research Questions

Adjunct faculty are expected to be fully prepared to teach their courses. Many receive a short orientation from their department chair, while others receive no orientation. OIT utilizes adjunct faculty to teach approximately 41% of courses throughout the year, and lack of support services could translate into difficulty creating and maintaining a highly qualified adjunct workforce as well as diminished educational experiences for students.

OIT is lacking research studying the support and services provided to adjunct faculty, so a survey was sent, via Zoomerang.com, to adjunct faculty at OIT who taught in the 2010-2011 academic year. Participants were required to 'opt in' or agree to take the survey. There was an informed consent document, and by completing the survey, participants agreed to the informed consent. Data gained was used for the following five research questions:

- 1) What perceived teaching support services do adjunct faculty at OIT report having been offered to them?
- 2) What perceived teaching support services do adjunct faculty at OIT report using?
- 3) In addition to the support services that are currently offered to adjunct faculty at OIT, what additional support would they like to have offered to them to assist in improving teaching?
- 4) Do adjunct faculty differ in their use of support services provided by OIT on the basis of: age, gender, how long employed at OIT as an adjunct faculty member, education, and department/discipline, and
- 5) How do adjunct faculty perceive additional support would improve their teaching?

Methods

A quantitative descriptive research study was used to examine the relationship among adjunct faculty demographic characteristics, their utilization of and desire for support services and their self perception of teaching improvement. The methodology used was an on-line survey administered to 102 adjunct faculty who taught on the OIT Klamath Falls or Portland campus during fall, spring, or winter terms of the academic year 2010-11. The survey measured how the data compared across the groups, i.e. availability of support services, use of support services, perceptions of support services they wish they had available and compared those across gender, age, education, number of years teaching as an adjunct at OIT, department, and college in which they taught.

The survey was administered via Zoomerang.com using OIT's adjunct faculty email addresses. Survey participants were required to 'opt in' or agree to take the survey. There was an informed consent document, and by completing the survey, participants agreed to the informed consent.

The dependent variables in this research were the types of services adjunct faculty reported having available as well as the types of services adjunct faculty reported using. These variables were measured comparatively across the groups, and the results were descriptive. For the final research question, the dependent variable was the self-perception of teaching improvement.

Independent variables were gender, education level, age, longevity of teaching, and College in which they taught.

Descriptive statistics using proportions were used for each question on the survey. Questions were cross-referenced to other questions to determine associations between/among variables. Chi-square tests were run for each sub category in research question 4. These were used to determine how many faculty fell into a particular category, relative to a different category. The data (frequencies) were measured at the categorical level, and the design was between groups so that each participant was in only one group. These tests of association gave the researcher comparison data on how adjunct faculty might differ in their use of support services on the basis of demographics listed. Results were shown as percentages and proportions as well as in written data reporting.

Limitations of the Study

This research sampled adjunct faculty at Oregon Institute of Technology, which is a technology focused institution. Survey responses did not represent those who did not complete the survey, only those 36 individuals who responded to the survey were represented. Due to the small number of adjunct faculty members at OIT, further research is needed on a larger population base that would reflect the perceptions of adjunct faculty at liberal arts, community colleges or research universities. A study comparing adjunct faculty with full-time faculty on these metrics would also provide more information.

Summary of Results

This research found that the majority of adjunct faculty at Oregon Institute of Technology never engaged in most support services. This research demonstrated a relationship between adjunct faculty demographics and support services of adjunct faculty at OIT. Summary results for each research question follows.

For research question one, what perceived teaching support services do adjunct faculty at OIT report having been offered to them, providing support services to adjunct faculty delivered mixed results. Current support services met the needs of twenty two (61%) of adjuncts, while sixteen (44%) wanted more support services. These results could be caused by a lack of communication; adjuncts did not know what resources and trainings were available to them. Or, it could be they could not attend the professional development trainings and orientations when offered because they were employed full time. In addition, some adjunct faculty came to teach their class, and did not want to get involved in other ways.

Surprisingly, one-third of the respondents reported they would not use an office if one was offered, and of that one-third, nine out of ten of those adjunct faculty who are employed full-time somewhere besides OIT, reported they would not use an office if offered. In addition, almost two-thirds of adjunct faculty who had been employed at OIT for two-five years reported they would not use an office if offered. There are some ramifications to adjunct faculty not having an office on campus. Office visits are critical for student and faculty interaction, and if these faculty do not hold office hours, this interaction may not occur. Faculty reported in this survey that with additional support,

they would be better able to answer student questions. If they had an office, many of those questions could be discussed there. They also reported additional support would help them be more organized in their teaching. Using an office, they could organize their materials in a filing cabinet rather than carrying everything around in their backpack.

For research question two, what perceived teaching support services do adjunct faculty at OIT report using, an important finding from the research data is the majority of adjunct faculty never engaged in most support services that were available. For some, the support was not important to them, so they never participated even if they had been invited. For example, this research shows a high percentage of adjunct faculty did not serve or were not invited to serve on committees, but most did not perceive serving on committees would improve their teaching, so they did not engage in this activity. The same is true of attending Convocation and September Institute as well as attending trainings and meetings. From this research, it is true that adjunct faculty at OIT who responded 'never' or 'was not invited' to participate in support activities also perceived those same activities would not improve their teaching.

We would expect these faculty to want the professionalization described in the previous paragraph; yet, this finding suggests there are reasons why these faculty do not engage in these activities. Many part-time faculty teach at either uncommon hours or days or at off-campus locations (Baron-Nixon 2007), and thus, cannot attend meetings and trainings. Perhaps funding for adjunct faculty to develop a new course, supervise an independent study course, serve on committees and be part of governance would give

them more reason to engage in these activities. Include adjunct faculty in the information pipeline (Bradley 2007).

As expected, adjuncts were most engaged in receiving feedback about their teaching and helping develop courses in their department. Adjunct faculty reported that both these could improve their teaching, indicating support services that help them become better teachers and improve their teaching were the ones where they valued spending their time.

For research question three, in addition to the support services that are currently offered to adjunct faculty at OIT, what additional support would they like to have offered to them to assist in improving teaching, an important finding was adjunct faculty asked for additional support in the area of training on how to teach and what would help them become better teachers. Adjunct faculty often come with highly specialized knowledge and excellent technical credentials, but they have little or no teacher training or knowledge of learning principles and cognitive psychology. The majority of comments asking for additional support were in the teaching category on topics like ‘how to teach,’ ‘learning styles,’ ‘teaching methods,’ ‘teaching techniques,’ ‘teaching strategies.’ This finding asking for additional support in teaching strategies indicates adjunct faculty at OIT have not been offered this support and feel they could benefit from this type of training. This correlates with research question two, what perceived teaching support services do adjunct faculty at OIT report using, where data showed adjunct faculty were overwhelmingly engaged in activities that could improve their teaching.

For research question four, do adjunct faculty differ in their use of support services provided by OIT on the basis of age, gender, how long employed at OIT as an adjunct

faculty member, education, and department/discipline, the overall important finding was the majority of adjunct faculty at OIT never engaged in most of the support services available to them, regardless of demographics. Either they were not aware of the activities available, or they were aware and chose not to engage. Perhaps they did not participate in services offered because they did not perceive them as important vs. not being invited. By specific age groups, those in the 30-39 and 50-59 group reported they attended specific adjunct training more than any other age group. This is the only variable that was dependent on another. Some possible reasons for this might include those in age group 30-39 aspire to do more than just teach, so they want to learn everything they can, or they may have more time (less family obligations). Those in the 50-59 age group may be starting over in a new career and teaching as a means to gain full-time employment.

For research question five, how do adjunct faculty perceive additional support would improve their teaching, adjunct faculty indicated the top four areas of support that would most improve their teaching performance were 1)receiving feedback about their teaching, 2)helping develop courses in their department, 3)professional development and training, and 4)basic training on teaching. Adjuncts also reported that with the additional support asked for, they would be able to answer student questions better; they would feel more confident in their teaching; and they would be further educated on pedagogies and how to use them in their classes. These are all areas where having additional support would improve their teaching.

One surprising finding was that adjunct faculty did not rank having an office as something that would improve their teaching. The majority of adjunct faculty at OIT have full-time jobs in addition to their teaching, so they just come teach and leave; thus, they may not need an office. However, without an office, how do these faculty meet with students or even use the support services offered to them?

Adjunct faculty reported they did not perceive money for travel to conferences would improve their teaching. However, they did report professional development and training as being important to improving their teaching. Is this because they cannot travel due to other obligations or due to the cost? Perhaps they would travel if given the money to attend conferences. There are many conferences on the basics of teaching, which is what adjunct faculty perceived as very important to improve their teaching.

Comparison of Results to Literature

Nationally, adjunct faculty were about evenly split between two groups, those who prefer part-time teaching (50%) and those who would like to have full-time teaching jobs (47%). About 38% have full-time non teaching-related jobs (Lyons 2007). At OIT, adjunct faculty primarily work as an adjunct because they already have full-time jobs (31%) whether teaching or not, and because they prefer part-time work (11%).

Females make up about one-third of adjunct faculty at OIT, and males make up about two-thirds. Nationally, gender proportions are an even mix, 49% female and 51% male (American Academic, 2010).

Adjunct faculty at four-year universities are more likely to have a Ph.D. (33 percent)(American Academic, 2010); OIT adjuncts are more likely to have a Bachelor's (42%) or a Master's (39%).

Nationally, more than half (57%) of adjunct faculty members have been teaching at their institution for 10 years or less (American Academic, 2010), while at OIT, 47% of adjunct faculty have been employed for two to five years.

The mean age of adjunct faculty at OIT is 50, and it is 46 nationally (Leslie, 1998).

One of the reasons OIT adjunct faculty teach was to fill a void where no one else in the department had a background for the course. This same reason was given nationally—that adjunct faculty provide expertise in critical courses that perhaps no full-time member on staff possesses (Lyons, 2007).

Suggestions for Further Research

Teaching performance or improvement is not just knowledge of the content areas. This study has shown that different types of support and services may help or hinder the teaching improvement of adjunct faculty. Further research may consider a number of other variables, such as investigating why adjunct faculty do not use services if they are offered. Because the majority of adjunct faculty surveyed were already employed full-time, maybe the time that orientations were offered conflicted with their work schedules.

Further research investigating adjunct faculty with previous teaching experience versus very little prior teaching could be done. This could provide data in areas of confidence, teaching styles, ordering textbooks, grading, etc.

Follow up surveys to measure teaching improvement when adjunct faculty engaged in support activities versus those who did not participate could also provide further data.

This research did not investigate salary of adjunct faculty. Further research in this area to compare salary to teaching performance could be beneficial. Adjunct faculty with higher salaries may be more likely to engage in support services that could improve their teaching.

This research did not investigate the content and presentation of those services that could benefit adjunct faculty in their teaching. Further research investigating the specific services that were offered could show what changes or additions need to be made to improve the existing support services. If adjunct faculty feel these services are worthwhile and important to improving their teaching, they may be more likely to participate.

Further research from the adjunct faculty who did not respond would give data on what they are thinking and what they perceive would improve their teaching.

Expanding this research to include adjunct faculty from other universities would provide more data for comparison. Isolating the survey to adjunct faculty only from one university narrows the responses.

Recommendations and Discussion

The data from this survey suggests there is a real opportunity to reach out to adjunct faculty in ways that engage them in activities that can improve their teaching experience at OIT. Teaching performance affects the overall quality of academic programs, and if services are available, they need to be offered to adjunct faculty to assist them in making

a positive difference in their teaching performance. Lyons (2007) adds that a key to the future success of higher education institutions lies in their ability to change part-time teaching into a rewarding, collegial experience.

Communication with adjunct faculty to invite them to activities and meetings would be a good place to begin. Even if they cannot attend, the invitation would enhance their sense of belonging to the institution.

Assigning a mentor to each adjunct faculty member would give them someone to whom they could go with their questions. A mentor would keep them up-to-date with changes in the department as well as answering their specific questions. More knowledge of even small details would improve their teaching.

Oregon Institute of Technology has a committee, the Commission on College Teaching, which provides seminars on everything from the basics of teaching to more advanced topics. These seminars are already offered to regular faculty, and this would be a good opportunity for adjunct faculty to be invited. Adjunct faculty said they wanted training on basics of teaching, pedagogies, curriculum, and teaching methods, so attending these seminars would provide training on these topics. Possibly, they could be offered in the evenings or times when adjunct faculty who work full-time could attend. These seminars offer content specifically to help faculty improve their teaching.

The literature also indicates training on basics are needed. A study of adjunct faculty at a Florida college (Lyons 1996) found that part-time instructors require, among other things, adequate training in fundamental teaching and classroom management skills and both initial and ongoing professional development.

According to Inside Higher Ed, 8/7/08, a new business announced plans to offer certification to adjuncts. The idea is to provide training on teaching and then to test adjuncts on that training before providing a certificate that could be used to impress would-be employers. However, the program costs \$395, and renewals cost \$75 per year. The curriculum for certification is focused on 10 “core competencies,” on which participants would be tested. These include staying current in one’s discipline, the ability to construct and deliver course content aligning objectives, methodology and evaluation that supports the learning objectives, using appropriate teaching strategies that actively engage students, the ability to work with diverse student populations, the ability to use technology to support classroom objectives, etc.

While some adjunct faculty would welcome this opportunity, will they pay \$395? Perhaps the university could pick up the tab as they see the value of this certification.

Organizing and offering training specifically for adjunct faculty would be of great assistance. This training should include presentations from the Dean of Students, registrar, financial aid, admissions, disability services, counseling services, and student health services. In addition, it should include the deans and department chairs who could answer any questions regarding academics. Equipping adjunct faculty with necessary information on logistics as well as academics would improve their teaching.

As discussed in chapter two, the conceptual model includes several areas that OIT adjunct faculty reported they would like to have. Some of these areas are being included in faculty retreats and other department events, opportunities to attend workshops, mentoring relationships, and conferences. Implementing some of the suggestions from

this model may help to create a more inclusive and equitable work environment for the entire college/university community (Bergom & Waltman 2010).

Just the sheer number of classes assigned to adjunct professors makes a powerful argument that responsible colleges and universities should invest in their teaching lives. Instructional policies must deliberately support the development of all instructors, not just those who teach full-time. A key to the future success of higher education institutions lies in their ability to change part-time teaching into a rewarding, collegial experience (Lyons 2007).

Chapter Summary

Part-time faculty are a resource that postsecondary organizations need to nurture rather than ignore. There is every reason to believe that improved working conditions will enhance the overall productivity of the institution (Charfauros and Tierney, 1999). These faculty are here to stay and in many cases serve as the lifeline of the school. Because of this, they should be integrated into the institutional fiber in a manner that will provide opportunities for improved academic performance.

For various reasons, adjunct faculty at OIT did not engage in the majority of support services offered to them. Better communication with adjunct faculty will certainly improve their knowledge of support services as well as allow them to become more engaged. Being more engaged will improve their teaching performance.

REFERENCES CITED

American Federation of Teachers (2010). *American Academic. A national survey of part-time/adjunct faculty.* Washington, DC.

American Federation of Teachers (2009). *American Academic. The state of the higher education workforce 1997-2007.* Washington, DC.

American Federation of Teachers (2008). *JBL Associates, Inc. Reversing course: the troubled state of academic staffing and a path forward.* Washington, DC.

Ames, I. (1997). Part-time faculty: Part-time department: An inquiry into the reciprocal relationships among adjunct faculty, department power, and faculty service. Paper presented at the National Communication Association Conference, Chicago, Illinois.

Ancona, C. (1989). A faculty senate president's view of the plight of adjunct instructors. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 311 993).

Banachowski, G. (2007). Perspectives and perceptions: A review of the literature on the use of part-time faculty in community colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 398 943).

Baron-Nixon (2007). *Connecting non full-time faculty to institutional mission.* Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Beck, E. & Grieve, D. (2005). Going the distance: a handbook for part-time & adjunct faculty who teach online. Michigan: The Adjunct Advocate.

Bender, L. & Hammons, J. (1972). *Adjunct Faculty: Forgotten and neglected.* Community and Junior College Journal, (43) 2. Pp. 20-22.

Boileau, D. (1997). *Employing adjuncts and associate faculty: The good, the bad, and the ugly.* Paper presented at the National Communication Association Conference, Chicago, Illinois.

Bradley, G. (2007). *How to help adjuncts.* Inside Higher Ed. (March 13, 2007).

Burk, N. (2000). The invisible professor at-risk: How departmental disconfirmation disempower adjunct faculty. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 447 530).

Carducci, R. (2002). Understanding faculty: A step toward improving professional development programs. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 477 910).

Charfauros, K. & Tierney, W. (1999). Part-time faculty in colleges and universities: trends and challenges in a turbulent environment. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education.

Clough, M. (1999). Improving engineering education: A research-based framework for teaching. Journal of Engineering Education.

Covey, S.R. (1989). *The 7 habits of highly effective people: Powerful lessons in personal change*. New York, NY: Fireside.

Disbrow, L. (2009). Defining “adjunct” aren’t we all just “faculty?” Spectra (May).

Edmonson, S. & Fishere, A. (2003). Effective use of adjunct professions in educational leadership. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 475 420).

Finder, A. (2007). Decline of the tenure track raises concerns. The New York Times (November 20, 2007).

Finley, A. (2010). Women as contingent faculty: The glass wall. AACU, Volume 37.

Fountain, W. (2005). Academic sharecroppers: exploitation of adjunct faculty and the higher education system. Bloomington: AuthorHouse.

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

Gappa, J.M. & Leslie, D.W. (1997). Two faculties or one? The conundrum of part-timers in a bifurcated work force. Washington, D.C.: American Association for higher Education.

Gappa, J. (1984). Part-time faculty: Higher education at a crossroads. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 284 513).

Gerda, J., et. al. (1992). The associate program for adjunct instructors. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 326 275).

Ghaffari-Samai, Parvine, et.al. (1994). The relationship fo student ratings, faculty status and student writing performance. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 373 345).

Gladwell, M. (2002). *The tipping point: How little things an make a big differencel*. New York, NY: Back to Bay Books.

Gosink, J. (2000). Bringing adjunct engineering faculty into the learning community. Journal of Engineering Education.

Graber, J., Kinser, P. (1999). The college level teaching core: An orientation and training system for new faculty. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 427 805).

Greive, D. (2006). Teaching strategies & techniques for adjunct faculty. Michigan: Part- Time Press.

Grieve, D. (2003). Handbook II, advanced teaching strategies for adjunct and part-time faculty. Michigan: The Adjunct Advocate.

Grieve, D. (2003). A handbook for adjunct/part-time faculty and teachers of adults. Michigan: The Adjunct Advocate.

Grieve, D. & France, R. (1992). Orientation to teaching for adjunct faculty. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 346 917).

Grieve, D. & Worden, C. (2000). Managing adjunct & part-time faculty for the new millennium. Ohio: Info-Tec.

Haeger, J. (1998). Part-time faculty, quality programs, and economic realities. New Directions for Higher Education, no. 104, 81-88.

Heywood, J. Smith, K. & McGrann, R. (2007). Can philosophy of engineering education improve the practice of engineering education? 37th ASEE/IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference.

Hickman, J. (1998). Adjunct U. The New Republic v. 219, no. 23, p. 14-16.

Inside Higher Ed. (2007, March 5). A new campaign on adjuncts.

Inside Higher Ed. (2007, June 27). Where the adjuncts are.

Inside Higher Ed. (2009, September 11). New form of adjunct abuse.

Inside Higher Ed (2008, October 14). Call to arms for adjuncts...from an administrator.

Inside Higher Ed (2008, August 7). Will adjuncts pay to be certified?

June, A. (2009). Love of teaching draws adjuncts to the classroom despite low pay. The Chronicle of Higher Education (October 18).

Kezare, A. (1999). Higher education trends (1997-1999) Graduate and professional education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 435 346).

Leslie, D. (1998). A report of the Sloan conference on part-time and adjunct faculty. American Council on Education. Department chair online resource center. Part-time, adjunct, and temporary faculty: the new majority?

Lyons, R. (1996). *A study of the effects of a mentoring initiative on the performance of new, adjunct community college faculty*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida.

Lyons, R. (2004). Success strategie for adjunct faculty. California: Pearson Education, Inc.

Lyons, R., Kysilka, M., & Pawlas, G. (1999). The adjunct professor's guide to success. Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.

Mangan, K. (2009). Adjunct inspiration. The Chronicle of Higher Education (March 27)

Nelson, C. (1999). Our campuses are in crisis. National Forum, v. 79 il, p. 30.

Norris, N. (1986). Adjunct faculty handbook: Title III curriculum enrichment activity. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 270172).

Ovando, M. (1999). Meeting adjunct faculty teaching needs through a faculty development program: It is possible! (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 323 850).

Pendergrass, N., Kowalczyk, R, Dowd, J., Laoulache, R., Nelles, W. Gaolen, J. & Fowler, E. (1999). Improving first-year engineering education. 29th ASEE/IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference.

Price, C. (1994). Building a community discourse for a writing program: Creating a handbook and a common experience teaching program for adjunct faculty. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 402 580).

Puzziferro-Schnitzer, M. [on-line] (2005). Managing virtual adjunct faculty: Applying the seven principles of good practice. Available: <http://www.westga.edu/distance/ojdl/summer82/schnitzer82.htm>

Rodgers, C. (1993). Mentoring each other: teacher educators as learners of teaching. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 362 509).

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

Santis, J. (1980). Support for training vocational-technical adjunct faculty. New Directions for Community Colleges, 30.

Schmidt, P. (2009). When adjuncts push for better status, better pay follows, study suggests. The Chronicle of Higher Education (November 1, 2009).

Silvers, P. (1990). Utilization of associate faculty at pima community college: A report on surveys of college associate faculty and department heads. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 329 320).

Stolhanske, L. (1997). Ain't I a scholar?: Reflection and scholarship in the land of part-time faculty. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 414 582).

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (1996). The use of part-time faculty in California community colleges: Issues and impact. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 395 634).

Walker, P. (1998, May 29). The economic imperatives for using more full-time and fewer adjunct professors. The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. B6.

Walter, P. (1990). Adjunct faculty staffing and development program. Rio Salado Community College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 322 952).

Waltman, J, Hollenshead, C., August, L., Miller, J., Bergom, I. (2010). Contingent faculty in a tenure track world. Center for the education of women, University of Michigan.

Westbrook, F., Kandell, J. Kirkland, S. Phillips, P, Regan, A, Medvene, A & Oslin, Y. (1993, July/August). University campus consultation: Opportunities and limitations. Journal of Counseling & Development, volume 71.

Wickun, W. & Stanley, R. (2000). The role of adjunct faculty in higher education. Retrieved August 12, 2007 from <http://mtprof.msun.edu/Win2000/Wickun.html>

Williamson, L. & Mulholland, K. (1993). Adjuncts disjunct? Your institution's defunct. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 382 262).

Wilson, R. (2009). 'Chronicle' survey yields a rare look into adjuncts' work lives. The Chronicle of Higher Education (October 18).

Wilson, R. (2009). At one 2-year college, adjuncts feel left out. The Chronicle of higher Education (October 18).

Winter, G. (1980). Individualized inservice education for adjunct occupational faculty. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 198868)

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

CONSENT FORM

March 2011

Hello,

My name is Donna Bergmann, and I am a graduate student at Montana State University-Bozeman pursuing a doctoral degree in Higher Education. Throughout my studies, I have become interested in work that has been done in the area of adjunct faculty support. The focus of my schooling is higher education academics, and I am conducting a study this summer investigating adjunct faculty support at Oregon Institute of Technology. I want to find out what support is offered, what support is requested, and the effectiveness of adjunct faculty support as well as some possible solutions for improving adjunct faculty support at OIT.

As a department chair of adjunct faculty, I encourage your support of my study. I will administer the survey via Zoomerang.com. Once I have completed my analysis, I will provide you with a copy.

Thank you,

Donna Bergmann, M.Ed., MS
MSU-Bozeman Graduate Student
donnambergmann@yahoo.com

CONSENT FORM

Donna Bergmann
Doctoral Candidate
donnambergmann@yahoo.com

The study in which you will be participating is designed to analyze the support adjunct faculty receive at Oregon Institute of Technology. I am asking you to participate by completing this survey. **Your participation is voluntary, and you can choose to not answer any question that you do not want to answer, and you can stop at anytime.**

Your participation in this research study is confidential. Results from the study will only be presented in aggregate form. If I believe that any information you disclose will be uniquely identifiable, I will decline to disclose this information. There are minimal risks and benefits to participating in this study.

If you have any questions regarding this research project, you can contact me at the email address above. Any additional questions about the rights of human subjects can be answered by the Chair of the MSU Human subjects committee, Mark Quinn, 406/994-4707

By completing this survey, you agree to this informed consent document. You understand the information given to you and have received answers to any questions you may have about the research procedures. You understand and agree to the conditions of this study as described.

You are eligible to participate in a drawing for a thumb drive, an OIT hooded sweatshirt, or an OIT water bottle. You will be given this opportunity at the end of the survey.

APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

1. How many years total have you been working as a part-time adjunct?
 - a. 16 or more n=2 (6%)
 - b. 11 to 15 n=5(14%)
 - c. 6 to 10 n=4(11%)
 - d. 2 to 5 n=17(47%)
 - e. Fewer than 2 n=8(22%)

2. What is the highest degree you have attained?
 - a. Bachelor's
 - b. Master's
 - c. Ph.D. or Ed.D.
 - d. Other terminal degree (e.g. M.B.A., J.D.)
 - e. Other (Please describe)_____

3. What is your age?
 - a. 20-29
 - b. 30-39
 - c. 40-49
 - d. 50-59
 - e. 60 or more
 - f. Prefer not to say

4. What is your gender?
 - a. Female
 - b. Male

5. How many classes did you teach at OIT as a part-time adjunct during the 2010-11 academic year?
 - a. 2 or fewer
 - b. 3 to 5
 - c. 6 to 10
 - d. 11 to 15
 - e. 16 or more

6. How many online classes did you teach at OIT during the 2010-11 academic year?
 - a. 0
 - b. 1
 - c. 2
 - d. 3
 - e. 4
 - f. 5 or more

7. Which type of classes did you teach most often (please check only one)?
 - a. Introductory classes
 - b. Courses in the major
 - c. Advanced courses
 - d. Remedial courses
 - e. Other (please describe) _____

8. At OIT, which college did you primarily teach in?
 - a. Engineering, Technology, and Management (ETM)
 - b. Health, Arts, and Sciences (HAS)

9. Did you have a full-time job separate from your part-time adjunct teaching during the 2010-11 academic year?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

10. What is the primary reason you work as a part-time adjunct?
 - a. Prefer part-time work
 - b. Cannot find full-time teaching job
 - c. Already have full-time job
 - d. Need part-time work to fit with demands of family life
 - e. Other (Please describe) _____

11. As an adjunct faculty member, which of the following does OIT provide to you?
(Please check all that apply)

	Regularly	Frequently	Has never offered	Would not use if offered
An office-your own or shared?				
Money for travel to conferences?				
Professional development and training?				
Support services like secretarial help?				

12. As an adjunct faculty member at OIT, please tell us your activity level for the following activities. (Please check on response only for each activity.)

	Regularly	Frequently	Never	Was not invited
Attend departmental meetings?				
Serve on committees?				
Attend Convocation?				
Attend September Institute?				
Attend specific adjunct training?				
Meet with an assigned mentor?				
Attend training by student services (e.g. registrar's office, financial aid, student health, etc.)				
Help develop				

courses in your department?				
Receive feedback about your teaching?				

13. How often (per term) do you meet with the following personnel for support?

	Regularly	Frequently	Seldom	Never	Person(s) was not available
Provost					
Dean					
Department Chair					
Faculty in your department					
Office Manager					

14. In your opinion, to what degree do you think the following resources would improve your teaching? Please check one response for each item.

	A Great Deal	Somewhat	Very Little	Not at All	Don't Know
Secretarial assistance?					
Attend specific adjunct training?					
Training by student services (e.g. registrar's office, financial aid, student health, etc.)?					
An assigned mentor?					
Attending departmental meetings?					
Your own office or shared with another					

faculty member?					
Serving on committees?					
Meeting with your Department Chair?					
Meeting with your Dean?					
Meeting with the Provost?					
Professional Development and training?					
Basic training on teaching strategies?					
Attending Convocation?					
Attending September Institute?					
Money for travel to conferences?					
Help develop courses in your department?					
Receiving feedback about your teaching?					
Meet with faculty in your department?					
Meet with your office manager?					

15. To what degree do you informally discuss classes or teaching issues with faculty in your department?
- a. Never
 - b. Seldom
 - c. Often
 - d. Whenever necessary

16. Would you like OIT to make additional support services available to you?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Don't Know

17. What additional support services would you like OIT to make available to you? Please list or describe.

18. For the additional support services you listed in the previous question, in your opinion, how would having this additional support improve your teaching as an adjunct faculty? (Please check all that apply.)
- a. I would be able to answer student questions better
 - b. I would be further educated on pedagogies and how to use them in my classes
 - c. I would be more organized in my teaching
 - d. I would be more effective at assessment
 - e. I would feel more confident in my teaching
 - f. I would be more a part of the campus community
 - g. Other (Please describe)

19. If I had the additional support items I described in Q17, I would be...(Please rank the importance of these statements as they relate to your additional support items listed in Q17.) (1=most important, 6=least important)
- I would be able to answer student questions better
 - I would be further educated on pedagogies and how to use them in my classes
 - I would be more organized in my teaching
 - I would be more effective at assessment
 - I would feel more confident in my teaching
 - I would be more a part of the campus community
20. What is your perception of the support you have received as an adjunct faculty member at OIT?
- Somewhat meets my needs
 - Meets my needs
 - Does not meet my needs
 - I have not received any support from OIT
21. Considering all aspects of working as a part-time adjunct at OIT, how satisfied would you say you are? (Please check only one)
- Very satisfied?
 - Somewhat Satisfied?
 - Neither Satisfied nor Unsatisfied?
 - Somewhat Unsatisfied?
 - Very unsatisfied?
22. Please tell us how you feel about the following statement: I was adequately compensated for my adjunct faculty teaching.
- Strongly agree
 - Somewhat agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Somewhat disagree
 - Strongly disagree
 - Other (Please describe)
-

APPENDIX C

ADDITIONAL SERVICES REQUESTED

ADDITIONAL SERVICES REQUESTED BY ADJUNCTS

(RESPONSES TO SURVEY QUESTION 17)

Comments about teachings strategies and support that would improve teaching:

- More training on just straight teaching.
- I would love to be trained on different learning styles and teaching methods.
- Basic information and guidance on curriculum and presentation.
- Technical training, streamlined procedures, and continuing training on teaching techniques and development.
- Several years ago we had a meeting of adjunct faculty at the Portland campus; for some reason that was not repeated. I thought it was useful to hear what others had to say as it included the department chair. In general, the difficulty of being an adjunct faculty member is knowing the technical material but not necessarily having much teaching experience and not having a reference frame of what constitutes good teaching methods. Bridging the gap would be helpful. I have attended several social/academic functions; there is no attempt to facilitate any networking between regular faculty and adjunct. At one, I sat next to the OIT president for 20 minutes before I found out he was the president.
- C-Flat overview, Web Tools, Teaching Strategies.
- Professional librarian services to help locate additional teaching and resource materials for myself and students. IT support to expand capabilities of the Blackboard application. More concrete statement of teaching goals and student assessments.
- Online course material and teaching aids, similar to what is provided by publishers of textbooks. Scheduled events usually conflict with other activities.
- Technical support - recording services, transfer of VHS materials to DVD, old slides to power point usable pictures - preparation of all technology for classes.
- Funding for training in area of teaching or future development.

Comments about offices:

- Office, even a shared adjunct office would be helpful.
- An office would be nice, even if shared with another adjunct. More lab space and opportunities to meet with students would help. Research projects and other involved activities outside of lecture would interest me greatly, and provide more hands-on engineering with students.

Comments about resources:

- I only teach one class a year. So having someone make sure all of the tools and accounts are ready to use when I show up would be useful. Would also like to know in general what has changed in the department over the last year.
- Defining grades - knowing who to go to with questions when they come up about dealing with students who struggle in a class - about looking at options for textbooks.
 - Provide capable lab assistants for lab classes.
- Help in ordering instructor copies of possible text books for use in my courses.