

LOVE, HONOR, AND “LIGHT BULBS”: INVESTIGATING ADJUNCT FACULTY
IDENTITY AND PREPARATION FOR ONLINE TEACHING
AT A SOUTHEASTERN RESEARCH UNIVERSITY

by

STEVEN D. YATES

VIVIAN H. WRIGHT, COMMITTEE CHAIR

ANGELA D. BENSON

PHILO HUTCHESON

MARK D. NELSON

MARGARET L. RICE

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the
Department of Educational Leadership,
Policy, and Technology Studies
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2017

Copyright Steven D. Yates 2017
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

The increasing number of adjunct, part-time instructors in higher education continues to be discussed in the literature and trade publications. The increased adoption of online degree programs in higher education institutions across the United States has contributed to the enhanced need for flexible faculty employment options. This study provided a campus-wide look at adjunct employment and training at a research university framed by Gappa and Leslie's (1993) study of the status of adjunct faculty in higher education and their recommendations for institutions to improve the status of these important academic workers.

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore adjunct faculty employment and training, primarily for online teaching, at a research university in the southeastern United States. The researcher was also interested in how adjunct faculty members prepared themselves to teach and how they defined what it means to be an adjunct. Data were collected through interviews of site administrators and adjuncts along with the analysis of documents shared by study participants. The study found that the site provided multiple training options for online teaching. Some participants reported that their graduate programs provided training for teaching, while others reported learning to teach online in ways outside of those provided by the site or through the participants' graduate programs. Participants often described their experiences as adjunct faculty members in terms of the connection to practice they were able to provide for students in the online learning environment. This study provided qualitative data to the discussion of adjuncts in the literature and provided a campus-wide portrait of adjunct employment and training practices at a research university.

DEDICATION

This document is dedicated to my parents, Betty Jean Montz Yates and the late Alsie Waymon Yates, for their steadfast support and sincere belief in the power of education.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As a first generation college student completing my doctorate while continuing to work full time, there are a number of people whose wisdom and influence empowered me to accomplish this lifelong goal. What appears here is not sufficient gratitude for their contributions to this milestone.

- Dr. Vivian Wright, a thoughtful, kind, and supportive chair;
- Drs. Margaret Rice, Angela Benson, Philo Hutcheson, and Mark Nelson, a committee who challenged me to a higher standard;
- 26 participants willing to share their time and experiences with me to make this study possible,
- Dr. Kelly Guyotte, whose class allowed me to regain my confidence in conducting a qualitative study;
- John Walker, for believing in my doctoral success before, during, and after I believed it myself;
- Dr. Ann Bourne, whose exacting eye strengthened this document time and again;
- Dr. Ann Prentice, for supporting the double life of career and doctoral studies;
- Anna, Miriam, Bob, Beth, Tonia, Jeff, Jamie, and John, whose cheerleading and commiserating kept me afloat;
- My family and friends, for understanding the missed celebrations and gatherings that seem to be a side effect of doctoral work.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	x
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Statement of Purpose	3
Significance of the Problem.....	3
Conceptual Framework.....	3
Research Questions.....	5
Methods.....	5
Assumptions of the Study	6
Limitations of the Study.....	6
Operational Definition of Term	7
Summary.....	7
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	8
Introduction.....	8
Online Education	8
Contingent Faculty.....	10
Adjunct Faculty.....	11

<i>The Invisible Faculty</i>	12
Job Satisfaction	14
Models for Professional Development of Adjuncts.....	16
Discipline-level Focus	23
State-level Focus	28
Summary	29
CHAPTER III: METHODS	30
Introduction.....	30
Setting	30
Researcher Positionality.....	31
Participants.....	32
Instrumentation	34
Research Questions.....	35
Data Collection for Administrators.....	35
Data Collection for Adjuncts	36
Data Analysis	36
First cycle coding.....	37
Second cycle coding	37
Third cycle coding	38
Validity	38
Summary	40
CHAPTER IV: ANALYSIS OF DATA	41
Introduction.....	41

Administrators' Views	41
Using Part-timers to Achieve Educational Objectives.....	42
“Fill in the gaps”	43
Staffing is scheduling.....	44
Developing Fair Employment Practices and Policies	45
“What rights?”	45
Evaluation	46
Investing in Human Resources	48
“The academy is run by professors”	48
Adjunct inclusion	50
Adjuncts' Stories.....	52
Gappa and Leslie's Recommendations	53
Publish a faculty manual.....	54
Early notification of teaching appointments.....	54
Salary and benefits.....	55
Evaluation of teaching	55
Stress of student course evaluations	56
“They keep inviting me back”	57
Desire for performance reviews.....	57
Research Questions One and Two	58
By site	58
Distance Learning Unit (DLU).....	58
Impact of DLU	61

Instructor Training Unit (ITU).....	63
Impact of ITU	64
Department/college-level training	65
Impact of department/college-level training.....	66
By degree program.....	67
By self.....	69
“Learning on my own”	69
Mentoring.....	70
Professional associations	72
Third Research Question.....	73
Delivering practice to classroom	73
Teaching helps practice.....	75
Connections.....	75
Online students.....	75
Email response time	78
Invisibility/isolation	78
“You’re kind of on your own”	79
Love, Honor, and “Light Bulbs”	80
Love	80
Honor and prestige.....	80
“Light bulb”	81
Summary.....	82
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	84

Introduction.....	84
Conclusions and Discussion	84
First Research Question	85
Second Research Question.....	86
Third Research Question.....	87
Discussion of the Implications.....	89
Administrators.....	89
Adjuncts	92
Full-time Faculty.....	93
Students.....	93
Instructional Designers	94
Recommendations for Further Research.....	94
Summary.....	96
REFERENCES	97
APPENDIX A: GAPP AND LESLIE’S RECOMMENDATIONS	102
APPENDIX B: ADJUNCTS: INTERVIEW GUIDE.....	105
APPENDIX C: ADMINISTRATORS: INTERVIEW GUIDE.....	108
APPENDIX D: ALIGNMENT OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS TO GAPP AND LESLIE’S (1993) RECOMMENDATIONS	111
APPENDIX E: FOCUSED CODES.....	114
APPENDIX F: PARTICIPANT INVITATION EMAIL	115
APPENDIX G: STUDY CONSENT FORM.....	116
APPENDIX H: IRB APPROVAL.....	119

LIST OF TABLES

1. Distribution of Study Participants.....34

2. Cycles of Coding Used in Study.....38

3. Data Collection Plan Overview39

4. Overview of Administrator Participants42

5. Overview of Adjunct Participants.....53

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The employment of adjunct, part-time, non-tenure-track faculty in colleges and universities across the United States is a recurring theme in the literature and popular trade publications (Cross & Goldenberg, 2009; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Jenkins, 2016). Students appreciate adjuncts for the practical field knowledge they share in the classroom (Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, & August, 2012). Higher education administrators appreciate adjuncts for the cost savings realized by minimal contractual obligations (Cross & Goldenberg, 2009). The employment of adjuncts in higher education has increased in the past 20 years (Hoyt, 2012; Klein & Weisman, 2001). The recruitment and retention of adjuncts is most often the responsibility of department chairs (Jenkins, 2016). The increase in the employment of adjuncts has been met with a variety of responses from departments, ranging from last-minute hiring practices and isolation from department life to considerate inclusion and training (Dolan, 2011; Sheeks & Hutcherson, 1998).

The literature provides a range of definitions of adjunct faculty in academic institutions along with a showcase of the ways that training programs for adjuncts have worked on single campuses or for single states. For the purpose of this study, “adjunct faculty” will be defined in the way the American Federation of Teachers’ (n.d.) Higher Education Data Center classifies this group of employees using Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) categories. Adjunct faculty members are part-time faculty who are not full-time tenure-track/non-tenure-track faculty or graduate assistants (American Federation of Teachers, n.d.). These part-time, non-tenure-track faculty members are often more heavily involved in online

course development and delivery than their tenured and tenure-track faculty counterparts (Ortagus & Stedrak, 2013).

Statement of the Problem

Academic departments rely on adjunct faculty for reasons ranging from bringing practical expertise to the classroom to providing financial flexibility while temporarily increasing the number of course sections offered (Cross & Goldenberg, 2009). The American Federation of Teachers' (n.d.) Higher Education Data Center reported in the national Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data that part-time/adjunct faculty numbers in the United States have ballooned from 548,729 in fall 2005 to 623,564 in fall 2009 and finally to 775,618 in fall 2013, an increase of 41% from 2005 to 2013. Data from one southeastern research university report 380 employed temporary part-time/adjunct faculty members in fall 2009, increasing to 535 in fall 2013, a change of 41% (Study Site, 2016b). This university experienced dramatic undergraduate enrollment growth in this same time period. In fall 2005, student enrollment at this university was 21,500 (Study Site News, 2006). By fall 2013, student enrollment reached ~34,500 (Study Site News, 2013).

Such a significant growth in student population made this southeastern research university an intriguing location to explore adjunct faculty employment as academic departments work to meet the instructional needs of a growing student population. The training and development of adjunct faculty at this research university appear to be limited to one website that serves as a clearinghouse of resources (Study Site, 2016a). The literature notes varied levels of attention focused on the needs of adjunct faculty in universities throughout the United States (Elliott, Rhoads, Jackson, & Mandernach, 2015; Hoyt, 2012; Shattuck & Anderson, 2013a). The work of online education, both course development and deployment, often falls on adjunct

faculty members (Curtis & Jacobe, 2006; Ortagus & Stedrak, 2013; Potvin, 2015). This arrangement allows for tenure-track and tenured faculty to conduct research and seek external funding.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this case study was to explore adjunct faculty employment and training, primarily for online teaching, at a research university in the southeastern United States. The researcher was interested in how adjunct faculty members prepare themselves to teach and how they defined what it means to be an adjunct.

Significance of the Problem

The small number of qualitative studies investigating the training of adjunct faculty members for online teaching offered a gap in the literature that this case study sought to inform. The choice of a southeastern research university that has experienced recent dramatic growth allowed the researcher to examine current practices of departments in a variety of colleges to better understand current practice. This case study was designed to be replicable in public and private institutions of varying sizes to contribute to the body of research on preparing adjuncts to teach online.

Conceptual Framework

The strategy for framing this study comes from Gappa and Leslie's (1993) foundational work on improving the status of part-time faculty in higher education (Fagan-Wilen, Springer, Ambrosino, & White, 2006; Gappa, 2000; Shattuck & Anderson, 2013). In a seven-month period during 1990-1991, Gappa and Leslie visited eighteen colleges and universities chosen to represent a cross-section of higher education institutions. The visits yielded a total of 467 interviews with "part-time faculty members, deans, department chairs, central administrators,

and senior faculty leaders” (Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. xiii). Gappa and Leslie analyzed policies, procedures, and handbooks at each site to corroborate findings from interview data. Each of the participants in this current study was identified in one of Gappa and Leslie’s four classifications of adjuncts: career enders; specialists, experts, and professionals; aspiring academics; and freelancers. *Career enders* are described as those adjuncts who are moving into retirement or are already retired yet are still striving to maintain contact with their discipline or with students. *Specialists, experts, and professionals* are employed full time elsewhere and are intrinsically motivated to give back to what is often their field of full-time employment. *Aspiring academics* are those adjuncts hoping for full-time faculty employment in tenure-track positions and who see their adjunct work as needed experience to enhance employability. *Freelancers* choose adjunct work as one of many forms of simultaneous employment (Gappa, 2000; Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Another valuable aspect of Gappa and Leslie’s (1993) work was the set of 43 recommendations (see Appendix A) they put forward for higher education institutions to consider as ways to improve the status of adjuncts. These recommendations were centered on three ideas: using adjuncts to achieve educational objectives, developing fair employment policies and practices, and investing in human resources. Gappa and Leslie’s adjunct classifications and recommendations for improving the status of adjuncts provided a framework for determining how adjunct needs are being met in a southeastern research university. Online teaching and any preparation provided to adjuncts for online teaching was not a part of the Gappa and Leslie study, which provides further motivation for the current study.

Research Questions

The research questions for this study were the following:

1. How are adjunct faculty members at a southeastern research university prepared to teach online?
2. How do adjunct faculty members believe the training provided by their employing institution impacts their teaching practices?
3. How do adjunct faculty members describe their experiences and perceptions of what it means to be an adjunct?

Methods

The researcher approached this qualitative case study research from a constructivist perspective. Based in Piaget's work, constructivism describes the process of acquiring knowledge to be one of self-construction (Driscoll, 2005). While Piaget's work focused on child development, the last stage of his constructivist approach to learning extends into adulthood and allowed the researcher the opportunity to examine how the study's adjunct participants are making sense of teaching online.

The case study consisted of 25 interviews and document analysis from eight of the study site's 11 colleges with undergraduate and graduate student populations. Participants included at least one administrator with adjunct hiring responsibilities and two adjunct faculty members per college. The adjunct faculty members interviewed in this study taught for the study site in academic years 2014-2015 and/or 2015-2016. The interview guides for administrators and adjunct faculty members were informed by Gappa and Leslie's (1993) recommendations. The researcher asked for access to any relevant course spaces in the study site's learning management

system, copies of official communication, and any training materials the adjuncts received from the study site for document analysis.

The researcher analyzed the interview data for insight on the experiences of adjunct faculty members employed by the study site. The documents shared by participants during data collection were analyzed to compare the site's written communication with the lived experiences of the study's participants. The researcher employed member checking to ensure the participants' experiences were accurately captured through the study.

Assumptions of the Study

The researcher assumed that all study participants provided honest responses to interview questions, remaining willing and available for any follow-up questions that arose during the analysis phase of the study. It was also assumed that each participant's experience was unique. The role of the researcher was to listen thoughtfully, engage the data critically, and communicate the study findings respectfully. Through this exacting process, the researcher hoped to capture a vivid snapshot of current employment and training practices at one southeastern research university while honoring each participant's voice.

Limitations of the Study

Sample size and researcher bias may present limitations to this study. The researcher chose to include only the study site's colleges that have both graduate and undergraduate student populations. While this decision excludes three colleges, it allowed for a focus on the eight colleges within the study site that share a majority of common characteristics related to faculty and student populations. The inclusion of administrators for each of the colleges in the study and the request for their assistance in identifying adjunct participants was designed to mitigate, and hopefully eliminate, the possibility of negative consequences of participation by adjunct faculty

members in this study; however, this could potentially allow the administrators to silence possible participants. This unfortunate limitation is difficult to erase in a qualitative project of this size and type but could allow areas for future study at the same site.

The researcher is a past adjunct faculty member and a current full-time contract faculty member of the study site and has online teaching experience as both an adjunct and full-time faculty member. While these experiences informed the desire to conduct the study, the researcher made every effort to limit the impact of bias from clouding the participants' voices in this study.

Operational Definition of Term

For this study, "adjunct" is defined as a temporary, part-time employee contracted for less than full-time work in a non-tenure-track capacity, often one academic term at a time (American Federation of Teachers, n.d.; Fagan-Wilen et al., 2006). This term does not include graduate teaching assistants or part-time employees who receive benefits (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Summary

This study consists of five chapters. Chapter I provides an overview of the study's purpose, significance, framework, methods, assumptions, and limitations. Chapter II offers a review of relevant literature on online education, adjunct faculty, and faculty training for online teaching. Chapter III details the methodological plan for the study, including considerations of interview guide creation and the guiding principles of document analysis. Chapter IV presents the findings of the study while noting any methodological inconsistency. Finally, Chapter V concludes the study with implications and applications of the findings to areas for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The increasing popularity of online higher education course offerings continues to transform the learning landscape (Caruth & Caruth, 2013; Kentnor, 2015). Colleges and universities across the United States continue to employ increasing numbers of adjunct faculty members to provide instructional solutions with low budgetary impact (Gappa, 2000). Higher education administrators work to balance these two trends while endeavoring to ensure quality (Tipple, 2010). In most higher education institutions, the recruitment of adjunct faculty falls on the shoulders of department heads (Jenkins, 2016), so leadership finesse continues to be important for the success of adjunct faculty members and online education (Tipple, 2010).

Online Education

The market for distance education began long before the internet. Kentnor (2015) noted the commencement of correspondence courses in the United States in a 1728 Boston newspaper advertisement while Caruth and Caruth (2013) marked Ticknor's 1873 establishment of the Society to Encourage Studies at Home as the beginning of distance education in the United States. Similarly, radio and television provided advancements for distance education prior to the first distance education class delivered through the internet in 1989 (Kentnor, 2015). The 1990s saw increased competition in the online education market without significant emphasis on the quality of instruction (Kentnor, 2015).

By the 2000s, higher education administrators and the education marketplace desired data on the state of online education in the United States. Allen and Seaman's (2016) popular annual report on the state of online education, initiated in 2003 and funded in part by the Online Learning Consortium, attempted to fill the gap in providing reputable statistics describing online higher education activity. Allen and Seaman found that 5.8 million students were enrolled in at least one online course in fall 2014, with 2.85 million of those completing all of their courses online for degree completion. Public institution enrollment of distance education students soared in fall 2014, with 72.7% of undergraduate distance education students and 38.7% of graduate distance education students being enrolled in public institutions. The 2016 report marked the last of the Allen and Seaman reports due to the inclusion and integration of online higher education data by IPEDS and other national data sources. The site of this current study reported for fall 2015 that 7% of its undergraduate population and 24% of its graduate population were enrolled in only distance education while 18% of its undergraduate population and 11% of its graduate population were enrolled in some distance education (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016).

Ortagus and Stedrak (2013) posited that contingent (all non-tenure-track) faculty members were more heavily involved in online course development and delivery than tenured and tenure-track faculty because contingent faculty did not have the burden of publishing and securing grant funding for research. Contingent faculty includes both adjunct faculty and full-time, non-tenure-track employees, a grouping that represented 65% of the faculty workforce in 2003 (Curtis & Jacobe, 2006). With the majority of online education being offered at public institutions by contingent faculty, more studies are needed to determine how adjunct faculty

members, a subset of contingent faculty, are being prepared to teach online at a public southeastern research university.

Contingent Faculty

As mentioned above, the term “contingent faculty” includes both adjunct faculty and full-time, non-tenure-track employees (Curtis & Jacobs, 2006). Kezar and Maxey (2014), co-principal investigators of the Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success, have worked to uncover what drives higher education administrators to make troubling ethical decisions with contingent faculty employment practices. They noted “the values that typically drive campus leaders are prestige (e.g., improving the institution’s position in various ranking systems), revenue generation, market competitiveness, and managerial efficiency” (Kezar & Maxey, 2014, p. 35). Utilizing studies of ethics in decision making to inform their study design, Kezar and Maxey developed the Delphi Project to determine best practices in higher education institutions for providing avenues for increased stakeholder input, to encourage institutions to collect and share contingent faculty employment data, and to promote avenues for feedback from formal and anonymous sources. Kezar and Maxey noted a move in higher education institutions for more centralized decision making which has prompted an increased need for stakeholder input from a variety of sources. Shinn relayed that one international accrediting body, the Association for the Advancement of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), entered the arena of defining faculty classifications and setting best practices for the mix of faculty types. Shinn (2016) also shared resistance from some higher education administrators that such best practices are not realistic for all accredited schools in an international organization. The study site has a college accredited by the AACSB, but the accreditation requirements were not mentioned by administrator or adjunct participants in this study.

Adjunct Faculty

Fagan-Wilen et al. (2006) chose to group the term “adjunct” with other often-used terms in the literature such as “part-time” and “contract”; further, they define “adjunct” as a temporary employee contracted for less than full-time work in a non-tenure-track capacity, often one academic term at a time. Meixner, Kruck, and Madden (2010) elaborated to claim that these faculty members “are seldom offered benefits such as health insurance or access to retirement plans, even if they teach as many or more courses than a full-time faculty member” (p. 141). Such definitions demonstrate how scholars often frame adjunct faculty.

Discussion of adjuncts in literature and trade publications has increased in recent years (Daniel, 2016; Dolan, 2011; Forbes, Hickey, & White, 2010). Dolan examined the issue of adjunct faculty members’ isolation while teaching in online education programs. Dolan found that increased communication from administrators was perceived to reduce the adjuncts’ feelings of isolation. The role of the administrator and/or department chair as the main communication channel was reiterated by Gappa and Leslie (1993), Jenkins (2016), and Daniel (2016).

Diegel (2013) provided a rare qualitative look at adjunct and department chair experiences in a phenomenological study of three community college departments. The study found that administrators wanted to spend more time working with adjuncts but other obligations tended to take precedence and that adjuncts found their own mentors in an effort to avoid bothering their busy department chairs (Diegel, 2013). Diegel did not delineate if the adjuncts in the study were teaching online. DeLottell and Cates (2016) explored the importance of a department chair’s leadership style as a predictor of the affective commitment of online adjuncts. The administrator participants in Diegel seemed to employ the transformational leadership style that DeLottell and Cates described as best for having committed and productive adjuncts. These

studies highlight the critical need for administrators to be cognizant of adjunct needs in each departmental and college-level decision.

Rossing and Lavitt (2016) included the learning needs of adjunct faculty members as part of their larger discussion on developing integrative learning for all types of faculty. Their description of “this neglected group of part-time faculty learners, already on the margins of the institution, misses the benefits of learning through scholarship through pedagogical development, and through institutional support for more innovative approaches to learning and scholarly work” casts a negative outlook for the possibility of adjuncts having the opportunities to enjoy improved faculty development if they are already shut out of the existing professional development (p. 37).

As Datray, Saxon, and Martirosyan (2014) note, it is common in the literature to find unflattering language surrounding any discussion of adjuncts. Datray et al. reported that 85% of the sources used in their work included unfavorable language when describing adjuncts, regardless of whether the findings reflected positively or negatively on adjunct faculty. While this trend of uncomplimentary language may be indicative of more nuanced discussions in the field, it reveals a bias that must be controlled for in research experiments and reports. Again, for the purpose of this study, an adjunct is defined as a part-time faculty member who is not full-time tenure-track/non-tenure-track faculty or a graduate assistant (American Federation of Teachers, n.d.).

The Invisible Faculty

Gappa and Leslie’s ambitious study of the status of adjunct faculty in higher education, published in 1993 as *The Invisible Faculty: Improving the Status of Part-Timers in Higher Education*, captured a pivotal moment in the development of the higher education literature on

adjunct faculty. In a seven-month period during 1990-91, Gappa and Leslie (1993) conducted 467 interviews including 240 adjunct faculty members along with a variety of full-time faculty and layers of university, college, and community college administrators to complement the content analysis of documents, handbooks, and other print information shared by study participants. The Gappa and Leslie study provided the classification of adjunct faculty “into four loose categories: career enders; specialists, experts, and professionals; aspiring academics; and freelancers” (p. 47). *Career enders* were described as pre-retired or fully retired people who were transitioning out of careers that were mostly outside of higher education (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). *Specialists, experts, and professionals*, the largest of the groups interviewed and described by Gappa and Leslie, included adjunct faculty who often had full-time careers elsewhere and came to be an adjunct “for the love of it rather than because of a need for income” (p. 48). For the adjuncts who desired a tenure-leading faculty position or were limited by other obligations to a part-time position, Gappa and Leslie termed the group *aspiring academics*. The fourth group, *freelancers*, was composed of those adjuncts who were part-time by choice in higher education, not aspiring academics, although they cobbled together a career from a number of part-time jobs or roles.

The findings and recommendations of Gappa and Leslie (1993) provided fertile ground to build a case study of a state flagship university’s work with adjunct faculty. Gappa and Leslie’s collection of 43 recommendations for fully integrating adjunct faculty into a higher education institution were situated around three overarching areas: using part-timers to achieve educational objectives, developing fair employment practices and policies, and investing in human resources. The full list of recommendations can be found in Appendix A.

Job Satisfaction

Measures of job satisfaction are used to explore the motivation of adjunct faculty to accept what most researchers have assumed to be unfavorable work conditions. Johnson and Stevens (2008) began their article with an extended quotation from a veteran adjunct expressing displeasure over the lack of attention she receives from full-time faculty. The researchers went on to note that adjunct faculty often describe themselves as invisible due to the lack of inclusion in departmental decisions. While the literature finds this assertion has some support, adjunct faculty members also find fulfillment in various areas of their job responsibilities (Dolan, 2011; Gappa, 2000; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Hoyt, 2012).

Maynard and Joseph (2008) explored job satisfaction at a mid-sized public university in the northeast United States with a survey distributed to all employed full-time and adjunct faculty that produced a 29% response rate. The study showed that involuntary adjuncts were more unhappy with opportunities for advancement, compensation, and job security than voluntary adjuncts and full-time faculty (Maynard & Joseph, 2008). Maynard and Joseph were surprised to find that full-time faculty members reported less emotional attachment to the university in the study than both voluntary and involuntary adjunct faculty members. Eagan, Jaeger, and Grantham (2015), informed by Maynard and Joseph's study, examined existing datasets from the Higher Education Research Institute's faculty survey and IPEDS found that adjunct faculty members are not satisfied with their relationships with administrators and colleagues, leading them to report more negative feelings toward employment-related concerns such as office space, compensation, and overall satisfaction. The authors also noted that underemployed, or involuntary adjuncts had significantly lower levels of job satisfaction than voluntary adjuncts, but conjectured that part of the dissatisfaction could have been rooted in not

having other workplace employment from which to derive job and workplace satisfaction (Eagan, Jaeger, & Grantham, 2015).

Herzberg's theory of job satisfaction is used by scholars to explore questions related to satisfaction of adjunct faculty (Hoyt, 2012; Waltman et al., 2012). Herzberg's theory grouped *the work itself* and *recognition* as factors contributing to job satisfaction and factors in *personal life* and *company policy and administration* as factors contributing to job dissatisfaction. Waltman et al. (2012) found that non-tenure-track faculty mirrored Herzberg's findings in relation to the *work itself* and *company policy and administration*. Waltman et al.'s study found the opposite of Herzberg's theory to be true for non-tenure-track faculty when it comes to *recognition* and *factors in personal life*. In the adjunct job satisfaction research, *recognition* is described as any act of appreciation from the employing department or institution, including thank you notes, appreciation dinners, and invitations to faculty meetings (Hoyt, 2012; Waltman et al., 2012). Non-tenure-track faculty in Waltman et al.'s study reported that their level of recognition contributed to job dissatisfaction, a finding also reported by Johnson and Stevens (2008).

Hoyt's (2012) study applied Herzberg's theory and found that adjunct faculty job satisfaction came from the motivating factors of the work itself as well as opportunities for personal and professional growth. Hoyt, like Waltman et al. (2012), identified recognition as a strong element in dissatisfaction among the motivating factors. Hoyt's finding that remuneration was the largest point of dissatisfaction for adjunct faculty is mirrored in Waltman et al.'s discussion of employment terms as a point of dissatisfaction. While pay is outside the scope of this study, the conclusion remains that remuneration is not recognized as an aspect of motivation for adjunct faculty.

In their study of adjunct job satisfaction, Meixner et al. (2010) explored the creation of an inclusive atmosphere that provided a sense of belonging along with recognition. Meixner et al. also noted that satisfaction percentages reported in the literature are generally the same for full-time faculty and part-time faculty, but some studies indicate that part-time faculty members have stronger emotional connections to their employing institutions than full-time faculty (Hoyt, 2012; Waltman et al., 2012). Hoyt also found a link between satisfaction and adjunct faculty loyalty. Studies by Meixner et al. and Klein and Weisman (2001) highlighted the concept of an atmosphere of professionalism and recommended that inclusiveness could be fostered by integrating the strengths of adjunct faculty members into academic work environments. Suggestions in the literature (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Johnson & Stevens, 2008; Klein & Weisman, 2001; Waltman et al., 2012) include a professional work environment that extends invitations to meetings and committee work for full-time and adjunct faculty regardless of contract or tenure status, contracts that reach beyond a single academic term, research collaborations between full-time faculty and part-time faculty, and, finally, the opportunity to take part in orientation and training for continued professional development.

Models for Professional Development of Adjuncts

Faculty development and teaching preparation of adjuncts have been points of discussion in higher education since the 1970s, especially for community colleges (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Richardson, 1992). Most of the existing literature has addressed overarching professional development of adjuncts (Datray et al., 2014; Maldonado & Riman, 2009; Richardson, 1992). Some adjunct professional development discussions begin by detailing the complaints administrators receive about limited availability for adjuncts to hold traditional office hours (Klein & Weisman, 2001; Rutz, Condon, Iverson, Manduca, & Willett, 2012). While these

studies note that students appreciate the exposure to practical knowledge of the field received in classrooms led by adjunct faculty members, Rutz et al. (2012) noted that classes taught by adjunct faculty reflected the lowest scores on achievement tests when compared to full-time faculty, both tenure-track and non-tenure-track. The Institute for Research and Study of Accreditation and Quality Assurance, in cooperation with the Council for Higher Education Accreditation, produced a paper examining the link between changing higher education faculty types and student achievement in the United States that echo Rutz et al.'s findings (Kezar, Maxey, & Eaton, 2014). Results of other studies are mixed on achievement test scores being linked in this way (Datray et al., 2014; Fagan-Wilen et al., 2006). Studies that identified the needs of adjunct faculty in professional development included instruction on pedagogy and student evaluation, mentoring by full-time faculty, and opportunities for continuing education as major areas of emphasis (Datray et al., 2014; Dolan, 2011; Fagan-Wilen et al., 2006; Johnson & Stevens, 2008).

A range of approaches for developing successful models to satisfy adjunct faculty needs is present in the literature. Some focus on single programs (Maldonado & Riman, 2009; Mujtaba & Gibson, 2007; Richardson, 1992), some on particular disciplines (Brannagan & Oriol, 2014; Klein & Weisman, 2001), and others on a state level (Dolan, Hall, Karlsson, & Martinak, 2013; Shattuck & Anderson, 2013b; Shattuck, Dubins, & Zilberman, 2011). Delivery methods for adjunct professional development range from traditional classroom meetings to full online instruction and various points in between (Datray et al., 2014; Johnson & Stevens, 2008; Santisteban & Egues, 2014). A number of adjunct orientation and training programs are present in the literature, but there does not seem to be any single programs replicated on multiple campuses. In an effort to advocate for faculty development initiatives to be shared across

institutional types, an ambitious survey of 859 part-time online instructors found that adjunct employment by non-profit and for-profit institutions were comparable (Starcher & Mandernach, 2016). The following examples provide a sample of existing adjunct training models in the literature.

Mujtaba and Gibson (2007) detailed a five-stage adjunct orientation and training program in the H. Wayne Huizenga School of Business and Entrepreneurship at Nova Southeastern University, a school that employed 45 full-time faculty members and over 400 part-time faculty members in three countries at the time of publication. Mujtaba and Gibson provided an outline of a general, not discipline-specific immersion model for adjunct orientation covering aspects of hiring, orienting, modeling, mentoring, and teaching. The authors provided an ambitious list of suggestions to assist administrators hoping to replicate the program at other campuses, noting that both mentors and mentees should be compensated for their time. Mujtaba and Gibson's suggestions for compensation included financial support for adjuncts investing the minimum of eight hours to complete the orientation and training or course releases for full-time faculty members who agree to mentor two or more adjuncts in a single semester. The authors did not clearly indicate if all of their suggestions for implementation were a part of the tested model at Nova Southeastern University that yielded 120 faculty participants in one of six pilot sessions.

Creating Links, a program established at a private university in the Midwest, served learners at multiple sites and was designed to provide training for a growing community of adjunct faculty employed to meet the needs of an expanding student body (Johnson & Stevens, 2008). The focus of the program grew from a survey of adjuncts who wanted skills training similar to that received by their full-time counterparts at the same university. The survey results led to an inclusive faculty development initiative on adult learning principles that focused on

strategies for teaching adult learners online. The developers provided the training in both face-to-face and online formats, allowing for real-time and self-paced options for learning. The best practice of allowing adjunct faculty members a choice in delivery method is echoed in Shattuck et al. (2011) and Dolan et al. (2013).

Lewis and Wang (2015) studied the implementation of an online orientation module for adjunct faculty members from design to deployment for a newly established online degree completion program. The driving force in curriculum design was to create a learning environment for adjuncts that would mimic what their students would experience in the compressed course format of the new online degree completion program. Among Lewis and Wang's findings were that adjuncts had problems navigating the learning management system and were surprised by the level of instructor-student and student-student interactions. They suggest orientation programs and continuing professional development opportunities as strategies to combat the adjuncts' struggles with the online teaching environment (Lewis & Wang, 2015).

Rutz et al. (2012) used statistical evidence to put forth a bold indictment of the inferiority of adjunct teaching at a private liberal arts college and a large public university, both located in the Pacific Northwest. The inferiority of adjunct teaching as a national point of concern is an overarching theme of the Kezar, Maxey, and Eaton (2014) paper. The Rutz et al. research team sought to develop a model that would be applicable for all institutions, regardless of size and educational focus. The Rutz et al. approach to faculty development centered on how to impact both teaching and learning and to offer opportunities for non-participants throughout both campuses in the study. While these duplicate ideas raised by Dolan et al. (2013) and Datray et al. (2014), Rutz et al. failed to acknowledge that most of the strategies highlighted in their research

are broadly recognized models—namely, writing across the curriculum. The study’s participation rate, however, provides strong evidence for disbursing professional development training. The study also highlights the idea of adjuncts participating in professional development to facilitate continuing employment by the institution offering the development (Rutz et al., 2012).

Meixner et al. (2010) conducted a qualitative study and focused on a mid-Atlantic, primarily undergraduate, mid-sized public university to determine strategies for creating a culture of inclusion for adjuncts. This study had a 31% response rate (85 of 277 part-time teaching employees of the university). The themes that emerged were receiving outreach communications, navigating challenges, and developing skills. These are themes shared by Fagan-Wilen et al. (2006) and Dolan et al. (2013). While Meixner et al. were quick to note that their study was not intended to represent universal application, the research team used the study to detail powerful aspects of a fully realized adjunct support environment. Their recommendations included the university president or provost sending personalized thank you notes to all part-time faculty, monitoring all campus listservs to enforce mandatory inclusion of part-time faculty on distribution lists, and a university vice president-level representative being the voice of part-time faculty needs from employment terms to classroom features. These recommendations are not mentioned in other studies although Fagan-Wilen et al. noted the growing popularity of having a designated adjunct liaison who is a faculty member, not a staff member. Meixner et al. contributed to the adjunct training conversation by highlighting the skills noted by survey respondents for inclusion in any developed training: general and specific technology assistance, peer review and sharing of teaching strategies with other part-time faculty, course planning strategies, and approaches for motivating students. Student motivation is a theme for training also found in Rutz et al. (2012) and Datray et al. (2014).

In community colleges, possibly the most heavily documented type of institution in adjunct research, Datray et al. (2014) provided recommendations designed to ensure that the quality of instruction for developmental courses remained as high as possible. The article included the following recommendations:

- maintaining an appropriate balance of full-time and adjunct faculty,
- choosing adjunct instructors judiciously,
- providing training to new adjunct faculty,
- providing professional development opportunities,
- assigning adjunct faculty to mentors,
- providing institutional resources and including adjunct faculty in resourcing and strategic initiatives,
- encouraging and supporting the use of diverse instructional techniques,
- integrating adjunct faculty into the institutional mainstream,
- considering the needs and contributions of adjunct faculty when engaging in course redesign initiatives,
- retaining qualified adjunct faculty,
- hiring in advance of need, and
- including adjunct faculty in policy and grant initiatives.

Datray et al. (2014) included research that supported a direct relationship between training and retention of adjunct faculty, a point also made in Dolan's (2011) earlier work. These comments framed a discussion of the specific importance of training those adjuncts hired to teach developmental courses. Datray et al. (2014) suggested that training adjuncts reduces the amount

of other special services students will need in the future due to learning from a trained, skilled, and prepared adjunct faculty member in their developmental coursework. Johnson and Stevens (2008) and Klein and Weisman (2001) also link training to both student and adjunct faculty retention.

Maldonado and Riman (2009) focused on the strategy behind the development of the Adjunct Advocate @ FIT, the faculty development program offered to adjuncts teaching for the Fashion Institute of Technology, a part of the State University of New York. The Adjunct Advocate program was designed to meet all of an adjunct instructor's teaching needs through a robust online site maintained by the school's Center for Excellence in Teaching. Although the stated aim of the program was to improve student learning by fostering professional connectivity, a strategy noted by Klein and Weisman (2001) and Meixner et al. (2010), an outcome was the broader adoption of the learning management system, a stated goal of the project outlined in Shattuck et al. (2011). Maldonado and Riman lamented the dearth of training options available, stating that "there are few truly innovative teaching models for post-secondary education despite the growing challenges faced in today's classrooms and even fewer that address the well-known challenges faced by part-time faculty" (p. 329). This motivation mirrored that of the developers of the study described in Mujtaba and Gibson (2007).

The models previously discussed provided professional development and orientation for adjunct faculty at a variety of higher education institutions. While there was attention to modes of delivery for the training and preparation of adjuncts, there remains a lack of literature dedicated to how colleges and universities are preparing adjunct faculty members to teach online.

Discipline-level Focus

A number of disciplines have encouraged discipline-specific inquiry into the deployment of adjunct faculty. While preparation and use of adjunct faculty for online teaching is not exclusively examined in these studies, a number of important details were highlighted. While the fields of social work (Fagan-Wilen et al., 2006; Klein & Weisman, 2001) and nursing (Brannagan & Oriol, 2014; Forbes, Hickey, & White, 2010; Gazza & Shellenbarger, 2010; Santisteban & Egues, 2014) have maintained a perennial interest in adjunct faculty employment, library and information science (Lester, 2011) and public relations (Pompper, 2011) have also contributed adjunct faculty studies in discipline-specific journals.

The disciplines of social work and nursing have a documented interest in research and discussion of adjunct faculty in their respective disciplines. Social work has two journals dedicated to exploring research questions concerning teaching in the field, *Journal of Teaching in Social Work* and *Social Work Education*. Klein and Weisman (2001) open their study with a discussion of liabilities and assets of employing adjuncts for instruction. The plan Klein and Weisman set forth in their conceptual model for actualizing the potential of adjunct instruction begins with a program self-assessment and continues with recruitment based on candidate screening, relation to the course content to be taught, and level of practice experience. The plan's second step, development, is critical to this discussion of adjunct training. Adjuncts must be continually developed as educators in the same ways that full-time faculty are developed (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Klein & Weisman, 2001). Klein and Weisman focused their development phase on five areas: anticipated tenure of the adjunct relationship, orientation, evaluation, mentoring, and adjunct peer support. Klein and Weisman's adjunct plan is a thorough list of what most of

the studies in this review cite as missing aspects of current programs, regardless of discipline. Klein and Weisman, however, do not offer current examples of success, only recommendations.

Fagan-Wilen et al. (2006), on the other hand, provided many of the same focus areas covered in Klein and Weisman (2001), yet they examined adjunct faculty development in a school of social work located in a Carnegie Research I university. Fagan-Wilen et al. noted the following changes in the school as a result of implementing a development plan for adjuncts:

- creation of an adjunct liaison staff position,
- recognition of adjuncts in department life (e.g., an adjunct office refurbishment, current placards of each semester's adjuncts, and concerted professional development efforts for all faculty that publicized adjuncts as equal partners on the list of invitees),
- improved information-sharing and strengthened communication lines,
- collaboration between tenure-track and adjunct faculty on research projects and course development and revision, and, last,
- professional development training designed specifically for and targeted to adjunct faculty exclusively.

Feedback from the school's entire faculty highlighted the ways this initiative had positively transformed the entire teaching community by providing opportunities for adjuncts to gain a more holistic view of the curriculum and current and future course offerings. Clearly, Fagan-Wilen et al. extended the work of Klein and Weisman by capturing what can happen when recommendations move into practice.

Clark, Moore, Johnston, and Openshaw (2011) conducted a national survey on the use of adjuncts through a social work educator professional association listserv that focuses on undergraduate education in the field. Clark et al. (2011) found that adjuncts are valued to meet

curriculum requirements and allow for scheduling flexibility for administrators who build course schedules. They also found a consensus that orientation and continued training offerings could lead to greater retention, an idea echoed by Lewis and Wang (2015). Clark et al. closed with a short review of social work literature that suggests best practices for utilizing adjunct faculty in social work education programs.

Shobe, Murphy-Erby, and Sparks (2014) shared details of their adjunct mentoring program at the University of Arkansas School of Social Work as a preface to their study of adjunct support in social work education programs across the United States. Through a survey distributed through a social work education administrators' listserv, Shobe, Murphy-Erby, and Sparks learned that the size of the educational unit impacted the usage of adjunct faculty. Schools of social work tended to have more resources to utilize adjunct faculty members as well as to develop support programs for their success while departments of social work relied more on their full-time faculty to meet teaching demands (Shobe, Murphy-Erby, & Sparks, 2014).

Social work is not the only discipline that remains keenly interested in cultivating adjunct faculty. Forbes, Hickey, and White (2010) in a survey study in one school of nursing found that adjuncts needed assistance from administrators in "four major areas: role expectations, inconsistencies leading to role ambiguity, the need for materials, technology help and people resources, and a more adequate orientation stressing written guidelines and materials" (p. 122). Santisteban and Egues (2014) provided a comprehensive literature review of nursing scholarship to highlight the struggle for nurses to transition between roles as nurse and instructor. Strategies for program administrators to employ for development of training resources for new and veteran adjunct faculty members who provide continuing education to full-time faculty members were also included (Santisteban & Egues, 2014). Forbes, Hickey, and White along with Santisteban

and Egues and Brannagan and Oriol (2014) celebrated mentorship as a powerful tool able to raise nursing adjunct effectiveness to a higher level. Mentorship of adjuncts is one of Gappa and Leslie's (1993) 43 recommendations for improving the status of adjuncts. Gazza and Shellenbarger (2010) did not find that the lived experiences of nine Caucasian female adjunct baccalaureate nursing faculty across the United States reflected a commitment to mentoring in practice. The participants in Gazza and Shellenbarger's study identified students as the most reliable means of communication from the employing department, an intriguing point the researcher did not find in other studies. Brannagan and Oriol described an untested model for online adjunct faculty orientation and mentoring for the nursing field that was based on Bandura's social cognitive theory. Important pieces of this model included full-time faculty mentors being paired with adjunct faculty mentees teaching like courses in an orientation and mentoring program facilitated by an online adjunct faculty coordinator (Brannagan & Oriol, 2014). This model would need to be tested and studied to determine the possibility for success.

Lester (2011) examined adjunct employment trends in the field of library and information science (LIS) in a study involving a survey of 42 American Library Association-accredited master's programs in the United States and Canada. The survey was followed up by interviews of 21 program administrators. The study, published in the *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, the field's journal dedicated to education issues, focused on two semesters in 2007 and attempted to gain a profile of adjunct faculty usage, adjunct training, and geographic dispersion of adjunct faculty. All programs that responded to the survey used adjuncts, and the geographic dispersion of adjuncts depended on the offering of online education. Of the survey respondents, 14 required training for adjuncts, 20 provided optional training for adjuncts, and eight did not provide training for adjuncts (Lester, 2011). Lester issued a call to action for the

discipline's association for LIS education to collect statistics on adjunct faculty for further study. Pompper (2011), in an interview study of 32 adjuncts from across the United States, extended the discussion of adjuncts into the public relations literature. The field of public relations relies on adjunct faculty to provide the practitioner point of view for students, a point also found in Cross and Goldenberg (2009) and Waltman et al. (2012). The tension between academics and practitioners was revealed through many respondents elevating the importance of the "real world" experiences offered by adjuncts over the academic focus of full-time faculty (Pompper, 2011). Pompper framed the article on a respondent's term for adjuncts as "cheap labor," and the frame remained omnipresent in the article.

Betts, Kramer, and Gaines (2013) examined the use of the Online Human Touch (OHT) framework for training and support in an effort to effectively recruit, train, and retain "online faculty and adjunct faculty" to meet growing online student enrollment numbers in Drexel University's Master of Science in Higher Education master's program (p. 95). The faculty participants reported a desire for professional development throughout the academic year, with a majority of faculty participants preferring those offerings to be online. Betts, Kramer, and Gaines offered ten strategies for integrating the OHT framework into other online programs. These strategies centered on recruitment (first impressions, pre-hiring selection process, and teaching philosophy), training (faculty orientation, professional development and virtual faculty lounge, and shadowing), and retention (mentoring, ongoing faculty development and annual faculty development workshop, faculty effectiveness program, collaboratively bring the campus to faculty worldwide). Betts, Kramer, and Gaines credited the OHT framework for increasing student and faculty engagement and retention rates in the Drexel program.

State-level Focus

While disciplines have worked to answer questions around the employment of adjuncts for teaching and, in some cases, teaching online, there is only one example in the literature of a statewide commitment to adjunct preparation for all teaching. The state of Maryland is well represented in the literature for having a sustained commitment to research on matters of importance to adjunct faculty (Dolan et al., 2013; Shattuck & Anderson, 2013a; Shattuck & Anderson, 2013b; Shattuck, Dubins, & Zilberman, 2011). The state's code of regulations requires that at least 50 percent of the credit hours offered by Maryland's public colleges and universities be taught by full-time faculty members at those institutions, a factor impacting the size of the adjunct population in the state (Dolan et al., 2013). Dolan et al. explored a statewide survey of adjuncts administered in 2010 and found that adjuncts noted location and flexibility as main factors impacting adjuncts' decisions to teach. The need for appreciation noted in other studies (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Hoyt, 2012) was not an important factor in the Dolan et al. study. The statewide survey, while not yet longitudinal in scope, was administered in 2005 and 2010 to professionals employed in a part-time capacity in community colleges and some universities across the state through the Maryland Consortium for Adjunct Professional Development (MCAPD). The MCAPD was formed to meet the professional development needs of Maryland's adjuncts and now conducts an annual conference dedicated to topics noted in survey results.

In another Maryland-based study, instructional designers across the state noticed they were all being tasked with developing instruction to help adjunct faculty learn how to teach online. Working together as the Instructional Design Affinity Group of the Maryland Distance Learning Association, these designers worked with administrators and developed the Certificate for Online Adjunct Teaching course outlined in Shattuck et al. (2011) as a high-quality training

module. Offered through the MarylandOnline [*sic*] consortium, the certificate program was developed from years of research that identified the training needs of adjuncts who were required to teach online. Those needs were grouped into the categories of teaching online, pedagogy, assessment, managing online discussions, Americans with Disabilities Act, copyright, course design, and technology (Shattuck et al., 2011). Participants in the nine-week pilot course completed a mixed-method evaluation, the results of which informed final design decisions before a full launch. The Shattuck et al. article serves as a paragon of project management but also as a template for how to approach adjunct training in a consortium-based, multi-institutional way.

Summary

The development of and interest in online education continues to expand in the United States (Caruth & Caruth, 2013; Lester, 2011). Growth in online education continues to be seen in public institutions, and the deployment of online teaching is often placed on contingent faculty. Adjunct faculty members, a subset of contingent faculty, often carry the instructional burden of online classes. There are numerous models for adjunct faculty professional development, but there is a need for qualitative studies of adjunct preparation to teach online.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

Introduction

The purpose of this case study was to explore adjunct faculty employment and training at a research university in the southeastern United States. The researcher was interested in how adjunct faculty members prepare themselves to teach and how they defined what it means to be an adjunct. Data collection methods employed for this case study included interviews and document analysis.

Setting

The study site was a research university in the southeastern United States that has experienced dramatic growth in its undergraduate student population in the past ten years. Enrollment in fall 2015 was ~37,000 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016), a ~71% increase over fall 2005 enrollment of ~21,500 (Study Site News, 2006). Of the ~32,000 undergraduate students enrolled in fall 2015, approximately 8,000 of them were enrolled in some or only distance education courses. The institution was divided into 11 academic colleges, with eight of the colleges having undergraduate and graduate populations. This study focused on adjunct preparation for teaching online in the eight colleges with undergraduate and graduate populations.

The site provided a webpage that serves as a clearinghouse for adjunct faculty, including mandatory compliance training, parking information, emergency preparedness, and a link to the Instructor Training Unit (Study Site, 2016a). The Instructor Training Unit provided instructional

technology and learning management system support online tutorials as well as a selection of face-to-face and live online workshops open to faculty of all types.

The university's Distance Learning Unit offered the Online Educator Development Program (Study Site Distance Learning Unit, 2016). Initially offered face-to-face but now available face-to-face and online through Blackboard (the learning management system adopted by the university), the program offered seven core sessions. The topics of the session were orientation to online teaching, choosing teaching materials, promoting student engagement, universal design, communications, assessment in online courses, and managing expectations. There were also seven elective sessions on the following topics: test security, designing interactive course content, Blackboard IM fundamentals, advanced Blackboard IM, Blackboard Collaborate fundamentals, advanced Blackboard Collaborate, and creating accessible documents. Faculty wishing to achieve an Online Educator Development Program certificate must complete all seven core workshops and three elective workshops (Study Site Distance Learning Unit, 2016). The Distance Learning Unit also offered travel grants for faculty teaching online courses to attend conferences related to online education, but the website does not clearly state if the grant opportunities extend to adjunct faculty. The Distance Learning Unit also provided a technical support call center, staffed by a mix of professional staff and highly trained students, which is available 62 hours a week during all instructional terms (Study Site Distance Learning Unit, 2016).

Researcher Positionality

As a former adjunct faculty member at two community colleges and a state flagship university, the researcher has taught in traditional and online modes and has experienced training practices for both delivery modes. These experiences produced a pro-adjunct bias that influenced

the researcher to begin doctoral studies. While the researcher remained vigilant to mitigate the impact of bias on this study, past experiences provided a broad, rich base from which to draw questions in order to better understand how training practices impact adjunct teaching. The researcher was currently a full-time contract faculty member at the study site and taught in a program from which he matriculated a decade ago. The researcher's experience and past performance as an adjunct faculty member for the study site paved the way for his successful candidacy in his current position. When he started as an adjunct faculty member, the researcher did not have the goal of becoming a full-time faculty member for a university. Since this university was the only site for this case study, it became extremely important that the researcher took time at the beginning of each interview to explain his background and interest in the subject, especially for any adjunct faculty members who knew him only as a full-time faculty member. In addition to the work-related concerns above, the researcher had to remember at all times that he was a white male alumnus of the site of the case study. The researcher's past, present, and future experiences were privileged in a way that impacted all stages of this study. The researcher had to develop strategies for reducing the influence of his race, gender, power, and status when conducting research.

Participants

The researcher planned to interview adjunct faculty members from eight of the university's 11 colleges with undergraduate and graduate student populations who have been employed by the site of the study in the academic years 2014-2015 and/or 2015-2016. The researcher also planned to interview one administrator in each college of the university with hiring responsibilities for adjuncts. The administrator interviews informed participant recruitment and selection for the adjunct faculty members who participated in the study. The

researcher was interested in adjunct faculty who teach online due to 25% of the study site's undergraduates and 35% of the study site's graduates being enrolled in some, if not all, online education courses in fall 2015 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016). While effort was made to find adjuncts who have taught online for the study site, depending on scheduling and access granted from college to college, some participants have not been instructors of record for online courses for the study site. The researcher relied on administrator referrals combined with those adjunct faculty members willing to be interviewed after being identified by their employing administrators. The researcher did not want to silence the voice of those adjuncts who have not taught online because those adjuncts have meaningful data to share on how they prepare to teach and other aspects of what it means to be an adjunct for the study site.

The researcher made multiple efforts to include participants from each of the academic colleges and schools at the study site that offered both undergraduate and graduate programs. Two of the colleges had two administrator participants each while six colleges had one administrator participant each for a total of 10 administrator participants. Nine administrator interviews were conducted with 10 participants as one administrator asked a fellow administrator colleague to join in the interview. Administrators were asked to recommend two to four adjuncts who might be willing to speak with the researcher, and the administrators chose a variety of ways to share that information with the researcher. Methods of adjunct identification included choosing from a list sent by administrators and placing a news item in a college newsletter asking for participants to contact the researcher. One administrator only supplied one adjunct's name and another administrator never supplied any adjuncts' names. Table 1 shows the distribution of study participants. Due to multiple requests from study participants, no college names were used in this written report.

Table 1

Distribution of Study Participants

College	Number of Administrator Participants	Number of Adjunct Participants	Number of Interviews Conducted
A	2	2	3
B	1	0	1
C	2	2	4
D	1	2	3
E	1	4	5
F	1	3	4
G	1	2	3
H	1	1	2
Total	10	16	25

Instrumentation

The researcher drafted the interview questions (Appendix B and Appendix C) based on Roulston’s (2010) guide to reflective interviewing. The study’s interview guides were designed to facilitate semi-structured interviews with open questions that encouraged participants to “formulate answers in their own words concerning topics specified by the interviewer” (Roulston, 2010, p. 12). The questions were designed to allow the participants to share their experiences with the study site and the phenomenon of being an adjunct. The questions covered experience with training offered by the study site as well as personal preparation outside of the participants’ adjunct employment at the site.

Gappa and Leslie’s (1993) recommendations (Appendix A), specifically the three general areas of focus, were used as guides for the creation of open-ended questions for both the administrator and adjunct faculty interview guides. The first area of focus, *using part-timers to achieve educational objectives*, included eight recommendations (e.g., include the use of part-time faculty in the overall faculty staffing plan; review and evaluate the faculty staffing plan on a

regular basis). The second area of focus, *developing fair employment practices and policies*, included 18 recommendations (e.g., make department chairs responsible for implementing part-time faculty employment policies consistently; provide support services to part-time faculty). The third area of focus, *investing in human resources*, included 17 recommendations (e.g., orient department chairs to good supervisory practice; appoint part-time faculty to committees). See Appendix D for the alignment of interview questions to Gappa and Leslie's (1993) recommendations.

Research Questions

The research questions for this study were the following:

1. How are adjunct faculty members at a southeastern research university prepared to teach online?
2. How do adjunct faculty members believe the training provided by their employing institution impacts their teaching practices?
3. How do adjunct faculty members describe their experiences and perceptions of what it means to be an adjunct?

Data Collection for Administrators

The researcher conducted a case study, examining many cases at the same study site, with interviews and document review as described in Stake (1995). The interview guide for administrators is included as Appendix C of this document. The researcher conducted nine total interviews with ten administrator participants; this number includes one interview in which the administrator being interviewed asked a fellow administrator colleague to participate. The administrator interviews, ranging in length from 20 to 75 minutes, were recorded and transcribed verbatim. The interview participants were administrators in each college who have hiring

responsibilities for adjunct faculty. The administrators for each college directed the researcher to possible adjunct participants for that college. When the researcher met with each administrator participant, he asked for access to any relevant course spaces in the site's learning management system, copies of official communication, and any training materials the adjuncts have received from representatives of the study site. This request was met with concern for confidentiality by many administrator participants and only one document was collected from an administrator.

Data Collection for Adjuncts

The researcher conducted 16 interviews with adjunct faculty members representing seven of the eight colleges examined in this case study (see Appendix B for adjunct interview guide). The adjunct interviews, ranging in length from 30 to 95 minutes, were recorded and transcribed verbatim. The administrator interviews described above informed the adjunct participants for each college, though one administrator did not supply any names of adjuncts for the researcher to contact. When the researcher met with each adjunct participant, he asked for access to any relevant course spaces in the site's learning management system, copies of official communication, and any training materials the adjuncts received from representatives of the study site. This request to adjunct participants was also met with concern for confidentiality, but adjuncts did share a number of documents for the study. Out of respect to those sharing, the researcher did not identify which participants shared documents.

Data Analysis

The analysis began by creating an informative profile of each adjunct participant, using Gappa and Leslie's (1993) four categories for structure. The categories were career enders; specialists, experts, and professionals; aspiring academics; and freelancers (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Some of the adjunct participants in this study shifted from one category to another over

time. It was not the researcher's intention to limit the identity of any study participant; therefore, the category assignments for this study were the best fit for the timeframe in the study, 2014-2016, and could have shifted to other categories before and since data collection. The researcher employed grounded theory coding methods to analyze the interviews and code for themes and trends within and among colleges within the study site. While not a grounded theory study, the coding conventions associated with grounded theory provided a strong foundation for data analysis in this case study.

First cycle coding. The first round of coding consisted of initial coding to break the interview data into manageable pieces, concepts, and in vivo codes where appropriate (Saldana, 2013). The researcher employed line-by-line initial coding as recommended by Charmaz (2014) utilizing process coding and in vivo coding to retain as much of the spirit of the participants' experiences as possible (Marshall & Rossman, 2016; Saldana, 2013). All interview data were analyzed using this method of analysis by typing line-by-line codes into a column next to the interview transcript in separate word processor documents.

Second cycle coding. The second round of coding consisted of focused coding to allow the most frequently occurring initial codes to be organized into categories (Saldana, 2013). The researcher utilized memo writing to build understanding of the emerging categories while attempting to allow in vivo codes to stand wherever possible. The gerunds used in the style of process coding during the first cycle were retained where possible to best capture participants' experiences (Saldana, 2013). The interview transcripts were printed with a blank column to the right of the initial codes allowing the researcher to handwrite focused codes onto the transcript documents. The focused codes generated in this study appear in Appendix E. The focused codes

and emerging categories from the interview data were then applied to the documents shared by study participants.

Third cycle coding. The third round of coding consisted of axial coding to allow the codes developed through the first two rounds of data analysis. Axial coding is well-suited for data analysis of multiple formats of data (Saldana, 2013). The researcher assembled and examined the axial codes from a number of viewpoints to find the most salient expressions of the data to answer the research questions while respecting the multiple requests for confidentiality at levels beyond the original study design. The researcher chose to employ axial coding as a means of allowing himself to make the most of the opportunity to explore the data provided by participants in this case study. As the researcher explored how the axial codes fit together, he revisited Gappa and Leslie’s (1993) 43 recommendations for higher education administrators for better integration of adjunct faculty members into institutional life. The recommendations inspired the organization of Chapter IV of this document.

Table 2

Cycles of Coding Used in Study

Coding Cycle	Description
First	Initial (line-by-line, process, in vivo)
Second	Focused
Third	Axial [with Gappa and Leslie’s (1993) recommendations]

Validity

Throughout the coding process, the researcher utilized memo writing to maintain a firm idea of what specific codes mean, unique outliers that may need future attention, and how categories were defined, all while staying attuned to researcher positionality. The researcher

coded the data for themes and significant quotations that give insight into how the participants experience being an adjunct for the study site. These statements and quotations were used to describe the experience of teaching as an adjunct faculty member for the study site. The researcher remained attuned to his positionality during this process as he continued analysis to describe the codes and themes.

All print and digital materials collected from interview participants were examined using techniques of coding applicable for multiple types and sources of data. The thoughtful coding of the documents provided by interview participants enriches the overall dataset created during the analysis of the interview data. Additionally, the researcher employed member checking and peer debriefing during the data analysis and report preparation stages of the study (Marshall & Rossman, 2016). These methods are employed to triangulate any findings across the colleges of the study site. Table 3 provides an overview of how data were collected to answer the research questions for this case study.

Table 3

Data Collection Plan Overview

Research Question	Data Collection Method
1. How do adjunct, part-time faculty members at a southeastern university prepared to teach online?	Interviews -Adjuncts -Administrators Document Analysis
2. How do adjunct faculty members believe their training impacts their teaching practices?	Interviews -Adjuncts Document Analysis
3. How do adjunct faculty members describe their experiences and perceptions of what it means to be an adjunct?	Interviews -Adjuncts

Summary

After outlining the methodological plan for this case study, the following chapter presents the analysis of the data collected by the researcher to answer the research questions. The final chapter presents the researcher's conclusions, implications, and recommendations for future research based on this study's findings.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this case study was to explore adjunct faculty employment and training primarily for online teaching at a research university in the southeastern United States. The researcher was interested in how adjunct faculty members prepare themselves to teach and how they define what it means to be an adjunct. Data were collected through interviews of site administrators and adjunct faculty members, as well as documents shared by interview participants. Data were analyzed through three rounds of coding: initial (line-by-line), focused, and axial. Gappa and Leslie's (1993) recommendations, used to develop the interview protocols, were revisited during axial coding to orient study data within the study's framework. These recommendations focused on three areas of higher education administration: using part-timers to achieve educational objectives, developing fair employment practices and policies, and investing in human resources. While evidence did not emerge to support all 43 Gappa and Leslie recommendations, a number were addressed in the study data. The recommendations' areas of concentration served to guide the analysis discussion and allowed the researcher to present the data analysis in a known, organized format.

Administrators' Views

Ten site administrators participated in this study from the eight colleges with undergraduate and graduate programs. At the time of this study, administrator participants held titles ranging from department chair to college dean. Due to repeated concerns from participants

around confidentiality, college identities and administrator identities were described in the most general terms possible. In order to further protect the identity of participants, the researcher made an effort to avoid gender-based pronouns. The study’s administrator participants are randomly identified as Administrator A, Administrator B, Administrator C, Administrator D, Administrator E, Administrator F, Administrator G, Administrator H, Administrator I, and Administrator J. The administrator participants are described in Table 4.

Table 4

Overview of Administrator Participants

Administrator Participant	Access to Adjunct Hiring	Promoted to Administration at site
A	Yes	Yes
B	No	Yes
C	Yes	No
D	Yes	Yes
E	Yes	No
F	No	No
G	No	Yes
H	Yes	No
I	Yes	No
J	Yes	Yes

Using Part-timers to Achieve Educational Objectives

The first of Gappa and Leslie’s (1993) three areas for improvement for integrating adjunct faculty members into higher education institutions included eight recommendations for that area: using part-timers to achieve educational objectives (see Appendix A for the full list). Most of the eight recommendations surrounded the development and maintenance of a faculty staffing plan that includes adjunct faculty members. The themes below emerged from this current study through the administrator interview transcripts and document analysis.

“Fill in the gaps.” Gappa and Leslie’s (1993) recommendation, *include the use of part-time faculty in the overall faculty staffing plan*, emerged in interview data through plans voiced by the study site’s administrators. A theme that developed in the study data that began as an initial, in vivo code was the role of adjuncts to “fill in the gaps” in a department’s staffing plan.

As Administrator A related:

I’d say adjuncts tend to help fill the gaps where we have gaps. Occasionally we will identify someone who has a unique expertise that we don’t have elsewhere in the department. For the most part they’re fulfilling the gaps in our teaching assignments where we don’t have the ability to cover some of the courses with our full-time faculty.

This sentiment is echoed by Administrator C when describing the role of adjuncts in their college:

We couldn’t make it without them. Our adjuncts...come in and they fill in the gaps with their tremendous practice experience. Our adjuncts have as a total something like 250 years of practice experience coming in...the adjuncts give [students] a fuller educational experience.

Administrator I provided a more nuanced description of the role of adjuncts in their department, sharing that:

Ideally the way [the adjuncts’] role is supposed to work is that they absorb unforeseeable fluctuations in our enrollment management needs. We like to staff our classes with graduate students and full-time faculty, but because there can be last minute needs and you can’t hire a full-time person or get a new graduate student at the last moment, we have a group of [adjuncts] who we rely upon to be able to fill in for courses that get added at the last or nearly the last moment.

In the same vein, Administrator J admitted their department “couldn’t sustain credit hour production that we have at the undergraduate level without [adjuncts].” They described their face-to-face adjunct pool as a mix of instructors “who have jobs or responsibilities elsewhere but want to teach” and their online adjunct pool as “academics” currently located away from campus, making online instruction “the only way they could stay connected with the department

and the [site].” Adjunct O, who teaches for a different college from Administrator J, reported their understanding that their college “has maybe three times as many adjuncts as they do professors.” Statistics like these demonstrate the need for a closer look at the employment of adjuncts at the study site.

Staffing is scheduling. Gappa and Leslie’s (1993) recommendation, review and evaluate the faculty staffing plan on a regular basis, is directly related to scheduling at the study site. Administrators B and J described their work on staffing plans as “constant.” Administrator I noted their staffing plan “is continuously under review” to “manage the fluctuations in the numbers of the various groups who teach for us.” Administrator F described the staffing plan in their college as vital to moving degree programs forward. They also strive to protect the research time for tenured and tenure-track faculty by using adjuncts instead of granting teaching overloads for full-time faculty. Administrator A described their staffing plan as “*ad hoc* or as needed,” while Administrator B described their college’s plan this way:

There’s a comprehensive plan. We know what courses are going to be taught each year so we started an Excel spreadsheet of all the courses that are going to be taught. We know how many students we desire per section of each course, so the spreadsheet gets set up with all of fall courses and the spring courses and the expected number of enrollees, followed by how many per section.

They later related:

There’s a lot of last minute tweaking. So we set that up in May because the teaching assignments have to go out. We tweak it as much as we can in June because by then we have some better idea of what our numbers of sections will be. Then we start to fill in who’s taught it before; generally, who’s going to teach it again, and sometimes that changes...so around the end of June or the beginning of July we’re ready to really look to make sure the assignments are equal, they’re fair, the sections are covered, and that’s when we discover who we might need, you know, to adjunct for this course or that course. Most of the adjuncts we have are adjuncts that we’ve used for three or more years, with the exception of one person who’s new to us this year. Otherwise, we don’t have a lot of new adjuncts. Once the semester starts, we will go back to see what’s the actual enrollment. Do course sections need to be closed or more opened?

This description highlights the amount of lead time an adjunct has between being given a teaching offer and the start of the academic term, a portion of site planning that is further explored later in this chapter.

Developing Fair Employment Practices and Policies

Gappa and Leslie (1993) provided 18 recommendations for developing fair employment practices and policies, the second of their three areas (see Appendix A for a full list). A number of the recommendations in this area surround the idea of adjunct tenure, with possible rights after tenure for adjuncts ranging from long-term job security and due-process rights based on seniority and a positive performance record to longer contract periods. The themes that emerged from this study did not support all 18 recommendations for this area, but the themes below shed light on some of Gappa and Leslie's recommendations.

“What rights?” When asked what rights do continuing adjuncts earn after continued employment at the study site, Administrator I responded:

What rights? The [adjunct] contract is strictly delimited. They are contract workers in the strictest sense of the term. They get hired to do one specific thing and to get compensated a specific amount to do it. And at the conclusion of that work and that contract, there's no obligation on their part to us or on our part to them.

While this sounds strict and unyielding, this quote was immediately preceded by their admission that Administrator I's department “has to maintain a certain number of adjuncts,” and they recognized that a number of the adjuncts “have been very loyal to the department.” This recognition means that the department tries to “make sure we have some work to give them, too.”

Administrators' views of adjuncts' relationship to their units seems to be well understood. Administrator A admitted, “I do not know that we have any sort of rights or

privileges that the adjuncts have or that they earn over time, really.” Administrator D provided insight on legal reasons behind some of these policies when they shared:

[Adjuncts] don’t really gain any rights, no voting rights, and their contract is either semester to semester or year to year. Yeah, so what we do is, if things are going well, their [student evaluation] scores are good...we almost always re-employ them. Sometimes there’s not a need for them and sometimes they just don’t work out and so, as you know, at the [site] and in [the state] itself, there is no promise of employment until you’re tenured.

There is no possibility to earn tenure as an adjunct at the site. However, Administrator F conceded that “once we have somebody who we like and who was working out well, I think we try to hang on to them because it’s frankly not easy for us to be chasing after new [adjuncts] all the time, you know.”

Documents shared by study participants included contracts for adjunct employment from two different colleges. Both documents include this specific language:

It must be understood that this is a temporary appointment that, by definition, is not tenure-earning and does not convey any right or expectation of continued employment after the time specified above. Continuation of this appointment to its scheduled termination date is dependent upon meeting department and college performance standards and compliance with all policies in the Faculty Handbook and general [site] employment policies. The [site] reserves the right to terminate teaching appointments immediately if, in the judgment of the department chair and dean, such action is warranted.

While a number of administrator participants mentioned having veteran adjuncts, the strict language of the employment contract outlines strict and temporary employment expectations. Administrator D’s unit was the only one in the current study that mentioned adjunct employment terms for longer than one semester.

Evaluation. Another Gappa and Leslie (1993) recommendation under developing fair employment practices and policies is to develop objective performance criteria and procedures for evaluating part-time faculty and use the results as the basis for decisions about

reappointment. All study participants, administrator and adjunct, related that the online, site-administered student course evaluations were the primary, and often sole, means of adjunct teaching evaluation. Administrator B described their “open door policy” that allows students to communicate student issues with any faculty member or course outside of the formal student course evaluations. Administrator C felt that their students “are very vocal” and noted evaluation data and student reports have been used as discussion points between the administrator and instructors to plan corrective action. If that corrective action was not completed, Administrator C has “told adjuncts that we longer will need their service.”

Administrator D provided more detail about the student course evaluations:

The evaluation tool really is their [student course evaluation] scores. We don’t do anything other than that. We don’t have them complete an annual report. We don’t necessarily sit with them and say “Hey, you did really good this time or you didn’t do good.” It’s just a matter of looking at our [student course evaluations]. And I look at the qualitative data really closely. Quantitative is ok but it’s really the qualitative part that tells us that that person is engaging with the student.

Administrator E described their college’s reliance on student course evaluations while admitting that college administrators, full-time faculty members, and adjunct faculty members are all interested in “something more additional that’s not as subjective or volatile as you made me mad and gave me a bad grade and, therefore, now I’m going to take your [student course evaluations].” They noted other data points in their college’s adjunct evaluation process include participation in trainings offered at the college level, turning grades in on time, and student feedback received outside of the formal evaluation process.

Administrator F was keenly interested in a combination of student course evaluations and grade distributions to evaluate all types of faculty in their unit. They described this arrangement in this way:

What I would like to do is to have a [student course evaluation] score next to a grade distribution score. Using the [student course evaluation] score as a popularity index and using a grade distribution score as a rigor score. So, in other words, if you're a tough grader and you're really popular, to me, that means something pretty special. If you are a really easy grader and you're really unpopular—that says something as well. And then you have the ones who are in between, right?

All of the administrator participants in the study mentioned policies outlining peer observations of teaching as a required part of tenure-track faculty evaluation, but none of the colleges represented in the study employ peer observations of teaching for adjuncts.

Investing in Human Resources

The third area of Gappa and Leslie's (1993) recommendations, *investing in human resources*, included 17 points for higher education institutions to consider (see Appendix A for a full list). All of Gappa and Leslie's recommendations for this area did not emerge in the analysis of this study's data, though the themes that emerged from the data elucidate the specific recommendations as demonstrated below.

“The academy is run by professors.” None of the administrator participants in this study received formal training to be an academic administrator in higher education prior to starting their first administrative appointments. Six of the 10 administrator participants were promoted to their first administrative positions after earning tenure at the study site. The other four administrators were hired by the site into academic administration roles. Administrator I, when providing detail of training they received for administration, painted a rich picture of the landscape of academic administration:

When you are a professor in an academic department, it often happens that you get assigned administrative goals despite not ever having had any desire to be an administrator or training to be an administrator. This is a vestigial quality of the academy, that, ostensibly, the academy is run by professors. With the rise of professional PhD programs, there's now increasingly professionally trained administrative classes within the university. But, for centuries, it was professors in academic areas that ran the university as administrators. So, I think usually the way it works is that a professor in an

academic department...displays some aptitude for administration and is pounced upon by his or her colleagues and forced into an administrative role.

Administrator I went on to describe the training they were offered after being named to an administrative role:

I have attended one conference that was geared toward training people how to be an administrator once I started doing the department chair job. The college encouraged me to attend. And I've been to various workshops and retreats sponsored by the [site] which are designed to keep me abreast of policies and procedures and let me know how it is I am supposed to do my job.

Administrator E shared their own extremely positive administrative training experience. They came to the site in an administrative role, yet happily recalled the site's investment in their training as an administrator:

Here we have [site-based leadership program] which is, you know, administrator college, and it's amazing. So, in addition to [site-based leadership program] there is SECU, there are lots of leadership development opportunities through the HR department and then there are leadership and administrative tracks in our discipline that you can take at major conferences. So, here is kind of like the jackpot in terms of looking at my colleagues across the country. You know they don't have as much at their universities—they're thrown into it and they kind of learn along the way. But I feel really fortunate to have those two very specific experiences along with opportunities in our discipline and conferences too to be able to get additional training.

Administrators D and G both mentioned the leadership programs that Administrator E described as positive and helpful learning experiences once they were hired into their leadership roles at the site. Administrator F, who was hired into an upper level administrative role, related "I don't think you just train [upper level administrators] administratively, although, I suppose there might be some things that all of us could catch up on."

All participants describe the site environment as eager to assist when administrators have questions, but the rich training experiences were not experienced across the board. Administrator A described their transition from faculty to administrator as "sink or swim." Administrator J recalled arriving to the site in a tenure-track role and immediately being called upon for "heavy

service assignments from day one.” Administrators B and J are the site veterans among the participants in this study, but only Administrator J mentioned being hired into “more of a teaching service institution and it became more of a research institution about halfway through my probationary period.” This transition, combined with Administrator I’s recollection that “the academy is run by professors,” sheds light on the additional demands that a research university has on its academic administrators.

Adjunct inclusion. The majority of recommendations in Gappa and Leslie’s (1993) third area, *investing in human resources*, provide strategies for adjunct inclusion. Due in part to the restrictive contract language mentioned earlier, there is no service requirement for adjuncts at the site. Administrators A, B, C, D, and J mention geographical limitations to physical meeting attendance, a result of a national adjunct faculty body for online education. The growth of Administrator B’s faculty has been so large that they have trouble finding a room large enough for those on campus to gather in, but they do facilitate virtual meeting attendance whenever possible. Administrators E and I mentioned ongoing full faculty conversations in their units on how to ensure that adjunct faculty member interests are represented in all faculty meetings.

Administrator J, who worried that adjuncts are invisible to the full-time faculty and known only to them, invites all types of faculty to one meeting per year. They also encourage their full-time faculty serving as course coordinators to work with adjunct faculty members in course planning, syllabus updates, and other course concerns. Administrator E instituted adjunct faculty meetings multiple times each academic year, with online attendance options through the site’s learning management system. They have also convened an adjunct leadership group to make sure adjunct concerns are being heard and addressed by administrators and full-time faculty members. Administrators B and C, who work in the same college, include all of their

college's adjuncts on the invitation lists for college-wide events. They also instituted an annual adjunct appreciation dinner two years ago that Administrator B described:

It's always well attended. It's a very nice meal. We do it right. We order linens, have centerpieces, and everyone introduces themselves to the whole group. We talk a little bit about each one, give them the opportunity to add to their introduction, then provide college-wide updates.

A number of administrators mentioned informal mentoring that occurs between full-time faculty and adjuncts. Administrator A mentioned the adjuncts who live close to the site will have multiple face-to-face meetings with full-time faculty for course planning and updates, while adjuncts living at a distance will meet with full-time faculty via phone or the live online meeting component of the site's learning management system. Administrators D and G credited informal mentoring as a powerful learning tool in their administrative work as well as an active part of the collaboration process between full-time faculty and adjunct faculty on course-related issues. Administrator H provided a less nuanced experience in their department with their thought that "adjuncts sort of by definition have another job, so unless they're compelled, they're not inclined to be there." A number of other administrator participants mentioned that the majority of site adjuncts have full-time work outside of their part-time teaching, but no one summed it up as succinctly as Administrator H.

The administrator participants in this study provided a vital piece of this study—a connection to adjunct faculty members in the colleges of the study site. Along with access to adjunct faculty, the administrators provided insight to the institutional views of adjuncts and how they are deployed across the site to meet instructional needs. The analysis continues with the data collected from the study's adjunct participants.

Adjuncts' Stories

Sixteen of the study participants taught at least one course for the study site in 2014-2015 and/or 2015-2016 academic years. Thirteen of the 16 adjunct participants were single instructors of record for online courses in one or both of the aforementioned academic years. The management of adjuncts varies from department to department within the eight colleges included in this study. After multiple attempts to recruit adjunct participants through administrator referrals from all eight colleges, the researcher received no response from Administrator H's college and only one participant from Administrator F's college, and that one participant had no online teaching experience for the site. Since the researcher relied on administrators to make connections to adjuncts, he interviewed any adjunct who reached out to him willing to participate in this study. This yielded three respondents from Administrator D's college and four respondents from Administrator E's college. Confidentiality was a concern raised by seven of the study's sixteen adjunct participants, so every effort has been made to protect identities throughout the analysis and discussion. Table 4 provides an overview of this study's adjunct participants.

Table 5

Overview of Adjunct Participants

Adjunct Participant	Gappa and Leslie Classification	Taught Online for site 2014-2016	Alumnus of Study Site
A	Career Ender	Yes	Yes
B	Career Ender	Yes	No
C	Specialist, Expert, Professional	Yes	Yes
D	Specialist, Expert, Professional	No	No
E	Specialist, Expert, Professional	Yes	Yes
F	Specialist, Expert, Professional	Yes	Yes
G	Specialist, Expert, Professional	Yes	Yes
H	Aspiring Academic	Yes	Yes
I	Freelancer	No	Yes
J	Specialist, Expert, Professional	Yes	Yes
K	Aspiring Academic	Yes	Yes
L	Aspiring Academic / Freelancer	Yes	No
M	Freelancer	Yes	No
N	Specialist, Expert, Professional	Yes	Yes
O	Specialist, Expert, Professional	Yes	Yes
P	Specialist, Expert, Professional	No	Yes

Gappa and Leslie's Recommendations

Gappa and Leslie's (1993) provided 43 recommendations for how higher education administrators can improve the status of adjunct faculty members in colleges and universities.

The data collected from adjuncts speak to a number of these recommendations, but not to all of

them. The researcher realized these connections while working through the third round of coding and chose to present the themes from this study's data as they relate to Gappa and Leslie's recommendations.

Publish a faculty manual. The site's website for adjunct policies and resources was mentioned by one of this study's adjunct participants (Study Site, 2016a). Adjunct G-Specialist, Expert, Professional commented:

A webpage that is designated toward adjuncts is on the [site's] page. I don't think I found [who to contact for help] through that, I think I just looked on their [learning management system] help for teachers, you know. But I kind of navigated through that, through my own kind of way.

This webpage did contain links to human resources, the site registrar, the Instructor Training Unit, teaching resources, and links for student success. There was a link to a faculty handbook appendix at the bottom of the teaching resources page to help adjuncts find more information on how to handle academic misconduct. The documents shared with the researcher by one administrator participant and one adjunct participant both mention the faculty handbook as one of the main policy guidelines for adjunct faculty employment, but a web address was not provided on either document.

Early notification of teaching appointments. Five adjuncts representing three colleges specifically mentioned short notification times before academic terms began. Adjunct L-Aspiring Academic / Freelancer was informed just days before the term began that a face-to-face class would be moved to online. Adjunct G-Specialist, Expert, Professional described a time when two online sections they were assigned to teach were combined without any consultation from their administrator. Adjunct P-Specialist, Expert, Professional described their first online teaching offer from a former site administrator this way:

Actually, he called me not very long before the class started. I technically did not get enrolled and signed up in the system until about 10 days actually after the class had already started. So, I kind of came into it unfortunately a little late. I don't know if something happened and someone chose not to teach the class. I don't know what occurred for them to call me so late, but they did and after I got in there and figured out [the learning management system] it wasn't that hard.

This case may be a rare extreme at the study site. Most of the adjunct study participants have taught for multiple semesters and have future teaching expectations as long as enrollments remain steady or increase.

Salary and benefits. While adjunct salary and benefits are outside of the scope of this study, five adjunct participants mentioned salary and benefits as points of concern, including Adjunct H-Aspiring Academic's admission that "we all know we don't make money as an adjunct." Four of the adjunct participants who mentioned salary and benefits hold doctorates in their fields. This may be related to their classification as aspiring academics and freelancers in Gappa and Leslie's (1993) adjunct groups described earlier.

Evaluation of teaching. All of this study's adjunct participants reported that student course evaluations are all or at least a significant portion of the evaluation of teaching they receive from the study site. Adjuncts from two colleges described additional attention to evaluation from college administrators. Adjunct J-Specialist, Expert, Professional admitted their "department evaluation is based on my student evaluations" and shared an evaluation document that compared their evaluation scores from one course to a desired average score. The document also provided feedback on their publicly posted syllabus for the same single course followed by three sentences of summary comments from a department administrator that were based on the student course evaluations' qualitative comments and the posted syllabus contents. Adjunct L-Aspiring Academic / Freelancer described a voluntary annual evaluation based on student course evaluations and any publications the adjunct had completed over the same time period.

Stress of student course evaluations. Eight of the adjunct participants shared negative experiences with the student course evaluations. The reactions from adjunct participants range in intensity. On one end of the spectrum is Adjunct O-Specialist, Expert, Professional's approach of never looking at the evaluations. They reported:

There is supposed to be a way to do that [looking at evaluations] and I've never done that since the start. If there's a problem somebody would let me know, but yes, there is technically a way that I'm supposed to be able to see those evaluations...sometimes it feels better not to look for trouble [laughs].

On the other end of the spectrum of this study's adjunct participants is Adjunct G-Specialist, Expert, Professional. They stated how much they value the student course evaluation process and try to implement changes after each set of evaluation comments they receive. They described a recent semester in this way:

They weren't just complaining they were basically saying, "Hey, this would be a constructive idea" and they have good ideas, for sure. I've tried to listen to things that they provide to me. I usually take about two weeks after the semester and spend a pretty good amount of time reading those. They hurt your ego sometimes but it is good.

They later provided:

But it's worth it to kind of beat yourself up over those couple of things because you know in the end you're paying attention to what the class feels and you can make changes and it bothers me if people don't look at that. I think if there's a problem we should always be improving ourselves.

Later in the conversation, Adjunct G-Specialist, Expert, Professional admitted they sometimes check an independent instructor rating website where students leave anonymous feedback about instructors from all types of higher education institutions. Adjuncts J-Specialist, Expert, Professional and K-Aspiring Academic, from the same college, both reported that their employing college does look at student course evaluations, but the student response rate in online courses is often too low to provide rich data. Adjunct K-Aspiring Academic described that the

responses seem to align to “if they make a bad grade, they slam the professor.” Similar sentiments were shared by Adjuncts I-Freelancer and N-Specialist, Expert, Professional.

“They keep inviting me back.” Three adjunct participants from the same college provided a unique insight when asked about evaluation. Adjunct A-Career Ender noted their experience with the evaluation of their adjunct work as “you know we don’t get graded on anything other than the student evaluation, and the fact that they keep inviting me back, so I guess they’re happy with me.” Adjunct O-Specialist, Expert, Professional shared that “they keep asking me to do what I’m doing now.” Adjunct P-Specialist, Expert, Professional added, “I’ve never been evaluated except from the student evaluations. I kind of assume that if I was not doing a decent job that I wouldn’t be continued to be asked to teach.”

Desire for performance reviews. Adjuncts G-Specialist, Expert, Professional and N-Specialist, Expert, Professional, from different colleges, both expressed a desire for performance reviews. While Adjunct G-Specialist, Expert, Professional recalled performance reviews in a former business position they held before seeking higher education, Adjunct N-Specialist, Expert, Professional provided a more concrete example inspired by a negative student course evaluation. They shared:

In my work world you either have a supervisor or your board of directors—it just depends on your chain of command. You don’t have 99 people writing comments about you. I was taken aback after my first semester thinking, “What is going on here?” There was that one [negative evaluation]. I went and actually ended up talking to [an administrator] because my feelings were hurt. In the practice world if you have something bad on your evaluation it can go with you forever and could mean your raise or that you’re not getting a promotion—your board could have a vote of no confidence. I was interpreting it totally different than [administrators] were.

After speaking with multiple administrators, Adjunct N-Specialist, Expert, Professional better understood the role of student course evaluations in their college’s adjunct evaluation, yet they

still desired a review process that more closely aligns with what they expected in the practice world.

While a number of themes emerged in the data analysis process, the ones covered in this section provided a transition from administrators' voices, those in the roles that Gappa and Leslie (1993) were speaking to with their recommendations, to adjuncts' voices, the focus of the current study. The analysis now transitions from themes supporting Gappa and Leslie's recommendations to the themes that further enlighten and more specifically address this study's research questions.

Research Questions One and Two

The researcher's first research question sought to determine how the site's adjunct instructors were prepared to teach online while the researcher's second research question sought to understand adjunct faculty members' impressions of how their training to teach online has impacted their online teaching practices. Through three phases of coding of interview data and documents shared by study participants, themes emerged that shed light on three distinct ways that training occurred for online teaching: by site, by graduate program, by self.

By site. The study site's support of online education at the institutional level comes through two entities: the Distance Learning Unit and Instructor Training Unit. Adjuncts from two colleges reported specific college-level resources provided by college employees that impact online teaching and learning.

Distance Learning Unit (DLU). The site's Distance Learning Unit (DLU) provides support for degree programs that can be completed online or through the site's satellite campus. This support comes in a variety of forms. The most comprehensive service provided is instructional design for online classes to be delivered through the site's learning management

system. Four of this study's adjunct participants have created online classes from scratch, and all were required to use the instructional designers in the DLU. Most adjunct participants in this study provided positive views of the instructional design team in DLU. Adjunct M-Freelancer related their experience being a part of a department that decided to develop an online iteration of an existing graduate degree program at the site. They described their experience as:

I wanted them to really learn the skills and so I was committed to somehow making it so that they'd still be doing those things even though they were maybe five hundred miles apart from each other as partners, and it was really DLU and specifically [DLU employee] over there, that was kind of my mentor and also just a person assigned to help me develop the course. They're called instructional designers. The people in her role work with the faculty to help the faculty member realize their goals for the course and if you have a dream or an idea of what you want the students to get out of the course they are there to help you make that happen. They are there to help you with the logistics and so she had all these ideas about how we could make that work.

They go on to describe their online classes as “under contract with DLU; in other words, if I were to leave, you know, or not teach one semester, they can use my material, all my materials, and let someone else teach the class.”

While Adjunct M-Freelancer found a mentor in the DLU staff, Adjunct B-Career Ender held a doctorate and was moving into retirement yet strives to maintain contact with their discipline and students, held a different view. They described the instructional design staff as “very up-to-date in terms of technology, but they don't necessarily know that much about adult learning.” Adjunct B-Career Ender went on to describe the instructional design staff as “kind of like puppy dogs coming and ‘oh, it's time to review your course, why don't we have this?’ And, well, they'll give you the reason why you don't want to have this other part of your course.”

These views of frustration were not shared by other participants, yet provide a contrasting view of a popular online teaching resource at the site.

Adjunct L-Aspiring Academic / Freelancer designed a popular online class with DLU and noticed other adjunct faculty members being assigned to teach the class and seeing them struggle with some of the course's structure and pedagogical design. This inspired them to work with DLU to create an instructor's informational module that explains the pedagogical decisions made in the course in hopes of raising the quality of teaching and learning in the course. This module will have content created by both Adjunct L-Aspiring Academic / Freelancer and DLU. The DLU content for this instructor module comes from the DLU Online Educator Development program described earlier. The sessions in the program may be completed in any combination and in face-to-face meetings or through the site's learning management system. Instructors are able to earn a certificate for completing seven required sessions along with three elective sessions. Four of this study's adjunct participants have participated in the program. One college requires any online instructor, full-time or adjunct, to complete the Online Educator Development certificate to be allowed to teach online. Adjunct K-Aspiring Academic holds a doctorate and has taught online for the site for a decade. They described their experience:

A couple of years ago the [site] started a new program where we had to have a certificate of online completion. So, I had to go through that. It was 10 different one-hour sessions that were sort of beneficial but not directly beneficial. To me it seemed like I was just "checking a box," and most of the sessions were offered during the day so I ended up having to take half days from my job in order to go and do that [on site]. I did do some over the summer which was really good but some of them, as I had, I had to end up taking some days off to complete 10. Now when you sign up to teach the next semester that's one of the questions they ask you. Do you have your online certification completed? SO I guess they don't hire anybody that doesn't.

Adjunct J-Specialist, Expert, or Professional teaches in the same college as Adjunct K-Aspiring Academic and completed their DLU online certification during their first semester of online teaching for the site. They noted:

The online educators course was suggested when I started, but now it's required. The first semester I taught, fall 2015, it was a suggested thing and then the next semester it was required. So I was kind of doing that as I was teaching my first ever online class.

Adjunct J-Specialist, Expert, Professional noted the DLU certification as the only training for online teaching they have completed. They praised the DLU Online Educator program for helping them establish student communication best practices with their students. They also lauded the broad exposure to the learning management system components throughout the program, but they admitted that they had forgotten how to use the components that were not already built into the online course they teach.

Impact of DLU. Most of the study's adjunct participants rely on DLU for technical support, and some wished for more live technical support during non-traditional work hours. Adjunct C-Specialist, Expert, Professional noted their experience with DLU as "wonderful. They're wonderful. They have been very helpful. I have never had issues with the help even when I was a student and now as faculty there. They are very good at answering and taking care of problems and so forth." Adjunct C-Specialist, Expert, Professional was one of the twelve adjunct participants in this study who hold degrees from the study site. Adjunct E-Specialist, Expert, Professional described an instance of working with DLU to copy online course shells from one semester to the next in the site's learning management system. Adjunct J described DLU as the designer of the online class they teach, noting that DLU developed the class in partnership with their employing department. Adjuncts L and M credited DLU with foundational roles in the courses they developed for their program, with Adjunct M-Freelancer sharing, "I think that's just a really amazing resource on campus for online teaching."

The online course shells designed by DLU are designed to be updated every three years according to multiple study participants. This schedule is impacted by the availability of the

faculty member serving as content expert for each particular course. Some participants reported experiences like Adjunct H-Aspiring Academic, who described the course shell update process for one of the courses they taught for the site as “we [full-time faculty and other instructors of record for the course] all sat down collectively to work on it.” Adjunct M-Freelancer, who created an online course with DLU while working at the site in a different capacity before becoming an adjunct, shared:

The way these courses are set up with DLU is they’re intended to last for three whole years and I mean I was setting up the class with the materials that I used the year before I developed it. So here we are in 2017 and the newest articles the students in the class are reading this semester are from 2013. They need to be reading some classics but they definitely need to be reading the latest state-of-the-art research as well. And so, that’s one drawback that looks like a bad one but it’s a big ordeal to change this stuff because you have to follow the DLU process.

Adjunct M-Freelancer is speaking here from the standpoint of a context expert. Adjunct A-Career Ender described their experience with an online course that needed updating after a new edition of a national standards publication was released. The content expert was not available to update the course with DLU immediately, so Adjunct A-Career Ender ended up posting supplemental material in the course shell’s discussion board to provide more up-to-date instruction than the unchangeable DLU online course shell components.

Adjunct G-Specialist, Expert, Professional expressed the following concern to their employing department:

We’re teaching from a book that’s eight years old which is not great in terms of statistics in [the field]. So I’m actively teaching things that I know have changed because you know the way books are made....it stresses me out because I know there are students who identify [with a statistic not covered in an online course] and they’re being presented with material that doesn’t include them which is a problem in many areas.

Adjunct G-Specialist, Expert, Professional’s response from her employing department cited the course in question was scheduled to be updated the semester after they brought the concern to the

department and that no other accommodations were planned in the meantime. These descriptions of adjunct study participants who have concerns about the lack of control they have over the DLU-created online course shells are not experiences that concern all of this study's adjunct participants. Adjuncts O and P, both Gamma and Leslie SEPs, noted the convenience of receiving complete online course shells, too. Adjunct O-Specialist, Expert, Professional showed relief that "the [site] has designed all of the courses and has all of that set. So, I did not have to design course content." Adjunct P-Specialist, Expert, Professional noted more specifics around their DLU-designed course shell experience:

The way I understand it was that the faculty designed all of the online courses and all of the laboratory classes that went with them. Those were all designed upfront. So, that's the one thing I really liked about it is because when [a site administrator] called me and said "Hey, would you mind teaching this [course name]?" Of course, he wanted me to teach it within two weeks. I'm like "I can't prepare for a class in two weeks." He's like, "It's prepared for you." So, that is the one thing that I think is great, that the material is already out there. It's a matter of reading it and knowing how to teach from it.

While Adjunct P-Specialist, Expert, Professional celebrated this aspect of the site's online courses developed in consultation with DLU, Adjunct K-Aspiring Academic felt like the strict course shell parameters turned them into "more of a facilitator than an instructor." The contributions of DLU to the state of online teaching at the site are many and the issues surrounding that support vary from college to college.

Instructor Training Unit (ITU). The site's Instructor Training Unit (ITU) is described as "a godsend" by Adjunct H-Aspiring Academic. Adjuncts K and M noted the ITU as the clearinghouse for learning management system tutorials, with Adjunct K-Aspiring Academic adding that the ITU also offered instructional design assistance early in the site's development of online courses through the learning management system. They went on to note DLU as the site's sole provider of online instructional design assistance. Adjunct L-Aspiring Academic /

Freelancer mentioned reaching out to the ITU as the site's resource center for integrating academic technology into the face-to-face classroom. Adjunct B-Career Ender recalled working with the ITU during the first learning management system adoption many years ago. A number of study participants, both adjuncts and administrators, mentioned receiving notices about training sessions offered by the ITU, but admitted time and geographical limitations as reasons for having not made it to any of the sessions.

Impact of ITU. Adjuncts H and K credited the ITU for the success of the class components they built in the learning management system with the assistance of ITU personnel. Adjunct H-Aspiring Academic recalled having to retain an overwhelming amount of paper records for their face-to-face classes, which prompted them to visit the ITU where they said "this all has to be online." The ITU staff was able to help them time and again to fully utilize the available features of the site's learning management system. Adjunct H-Aspiring Academic used the knowledge gained from their ITU interactions to provide thoughtful input to the course designers for an online course they have taught for their department.

Adjunct K-Aspiring Academic described the ITU as a vital part of their early course development work that predated the work of DLU. Utilizing their own knowledge of the curriculum, the stated course objectives, and the assigned texts, they developed modules with the help of the ITU that they used to teach their first semester online. They noted the course writing process as "very overwhelming, and I was thinking, 'I don't think I can do this again.'" Whenever they ran into issues or had questions, telephone calls and emails to the ITU were always helpful and allowed them to successfully develop their first online class throughout their first term of online teaching. Adjunct K-Aspiring Academic recalled "the very next semester after" they had developed their own course "the [site] hired someone full-time that actually wrote

the shells for those classes.” The full-time course developers significantly decreased the time commitment that Adjunct K-Aspiring Academic had to invest for online teaching as an adjunct for the site.

Department/college-level training. Adjuncts from two colleges reported specific administrators assigned to provide support to online instructors. Some guiding documents that full-time and adjunct instructors received from one college’s administrators concerning lower-level undergraduate courses were shared by study participants. These documents provided information on grading expectations and other common practices for one administrative unit. The documents contained the following disclaimer at the end (emphasis in original):

Final Note: All online courses at [study site] go through a rigorous development and review process every three years. [College] must ensure that these courses comply with our accreditation standards and DLU must renew copyrights for all materials each semester, which is why we strive to maintain consistency across all sections of all courses. Because of this, the following things **should remain the same:** Course policies and syllabus content, including assignment point values and percentages; Number, depth, and order of writing assignments, discussion posts, and homework assignments; and Module content: readings, assignments, instructions, and prompts.

Adjuncts J and K shared the periodic trainings and meetings offered by unit-level personnel to enhance teaching and learning for all instructors. Adjunct J-Specialist, Expert, Professional described an email list where site administrators would share helpful information on topics ranging from calendar reminders to full-time and adjunct employment opportunities at other institutions.

Adjuncts A, N, O, and P, who all taught for the same college, describe two different administrators who were available when they had questions about their online course shells or college policies. One of the administrators was specifically assigned to facilitating the technical success of the college’s online programs. The other administrator was described by Adjunct N-Specialist, Expert, Professional in the following story:

[College administrator] came in and she decided, I think, that it was her role to take on adjuncts and I think adjuncts had been housed pretty much [at a lower administrative level]. I think she saw or was hearing comments like “We’re not sure what to do,” and “Where do we go? We have problems with students.” We know what to send a student but we were kind of left out of the loop of things and then a lot of big things going on like workshops and training that no one was telling us about. So now, she is the point person in my mind. And so, now we have adjunct faculty meetings and she’s trying to do those once a quarter. People are Skyping in and they’re providing training.

All four of the adjunct participants from this college credited the same administrator that Adjunct N-Specialist, Expert, Professional described above with ensuring they knew about trainings and received meeting announcements. Adjunct P-Specialist, Expert, Professional shared an email that provided a link for the online meeting room for one of the adjunct faculty meetings as well as a copy of a digital invitation reminding those adjuncts who cannot make the meeting to contact the college for a digital archive of the meeting.

Impact of department/college-level training. Adjuncts J and K noted positive and frequent communication with the department-level administrators over their specific courses. Adjunct J-Specialist, Expert, Professional’s adjunct experience at the site began less than two years ago, but Adjunct K-Aspiring Academic’s decade of experience allowed them to notice a marked difference a few years ago when a department-level administrator was hired specifically to coordinate all sections of lower-level courses in the department. Adjunct K-Aspiring Academic recalled:

I remember emailing her the middle of that first semester going, “I am so glad you’re here!” With that, I have someone I can actually email and ask a question to. It was just such a wonderful thing because before then we were kinda like under the umbrella of [the college]. And so, when I would email, they would respond, “What are you talking about?” because they weren’t in the online world. So now that we have her it has just been tremendous and she offers mini-courses.

The marked change in site administrator and staff accessibility over time made a difference to Adjunct K-Aspiring Academic.

The same meaningful impact was noted by Adjuncts A, N, O, and P in their college once an administrator made a college-level, concerted effort to provide attention to adjunct faculty and their needs. Adjunct A-Career Ender described an experience earlier in their 20-year career working as an adjunct for the same college at the site where a student in one of their online classes experienced a sudden medical issue. Adjunct A-Career Ender's willingness to ask questions alerted the college-level administrators of a communication process-related issue that was impacting all of that student's course instructors, both full-time and adjunct. Adjunct O-Specialist, Expert, Professional described using the open discussion time during a recent adjunct faculty meeting for their college to ask for specific refreshers for the learning management system components of the courses they now teach. This frequent opportunity for open discussion allowed Adjunct O-Specialist, Expert, Professional the opportunity to communicate in a friendly environment and to receive the assistance they needed to enhance the quality of their online teaching.

By degree program. Five of the study's adjunct participants credited their higher education degree programs as a significant provider of training for teaching in higher education. While none of this training in past degree programs was specifically for online teaching, these study participants noted the impact on their online adjunct teaching work with the study site. Adjunct F-Specialist, Expert, Professional, who has three graduate degrees and has taught both full-time and adjunct in a variety of higher education settings, recalled:

A few courses and I can't even remember the names of them. I've probably always known that I wanted to teach but I've remember taking in my master's course, I took, probably as my electives, I took a few classes on teaching. I can't even remember the names of the classes, but anytime I had elective courses, I would pick up any course that I could on teaching whether it was teaching adult learners or learning about the different styles and I was lucky to have so many classes focused on teaching theories, basically.

Adjunct G-Specialist, Expert, Professional, who has one graduate degree, noted feeling as though all of their graduate courses were preparing them and their classmates to teach:

Because of how graduate-level courses are set up and a lot of that is you have the learning material like they don't have time to prepare you on so you teach it to the rest of the class. That is how they educate in my graduate program—you can't learn about everything there...so I had some really practical experience in terms of presenting, public speaking, things like that.

Adjunct J-Specialist, Expert, Professional, who has two graduate degrees, chose their first graduate program to earn enough hours to teach at a community college and was inspired to take courses on teaching methods to better prepare for what they hoped would be their future work.

Adjuncts L and M each have two graduate degrees and full-time higher education teaching experience in the past. Adjunct L-Aspiring Academic / Freelancer noted multiple years as a graduate teaching assistant in a variety of class settings as a fertile training ground for their work as a full-time and adjunct instructor. However, they shared, “one of my lamentations has been I feel as though higher education does just a terrible job in general of preparing future professors and I feel as though all graduate students should take a course in pedagogy about their particular field.” Adjunct M-Freelancer also credited their time as a graduate teaching assistant in a department that required a formal, extensive graduate teaching training program as well as constant communication with the faculty course coordinators as being foundational to their growth as an instructor. They described a particular resource at their graduate institution that impacted their teaching immensely:

Early on I saw at [graduate institution] they have this place called the center for teaching excellence and you as a faculty member or a graduate teaching assistant could use the services of that office to help you improve your teaching. So, for example, you could get someone to come in and observe your teaching, tape record, you, you could watch the video of yourself, and they could give you feedback and coach you in terms of your teaching. At [the study site], I sought that out and I found that no such program or office existed.

Of the 16 adjunct participants in this study, only five recalled their graduate programs as impacting their current adjunct teaching. Of the five adjuncts who mentioned their degree programs as significant contributors to their training to teach, three of them have the terminal degree in their fields and the other two have plans to seek a terminal degree in the near future.

By self. A number of the study's adjunct participants reported that they sought out most of their training for their adjunct work for the study site through their own personal networks. The main codes that emerged in this area were "learning on my own," informal mentoring, and professional associations.

"Learning on my own." Many of this study's adjunct participants describe themselves as lifelong learners. Adjunct I-Freelancer described their approach to their adjunct work as attempting to keep as low a profile as possible. Being a former higher education administrator, they strive to do their job without having to bother site administrators if at all possible. They describe their main objective as follows:

Learning on my own. If I have a question or some type of issue, I try to solve it myself. I usually try to find someone that is not a head of department or dean or something like that--maybe another professor, maybe a graduate student, maybe a secretary.

While Adjunct I-Freelancer's motivations are to keep a low profile, Adjunct H-Aspiring Academic described their motivation as "making sure I'm on top of whatever is going on currently," whether that topic is public speaking or online learning. Both Adjuncts L and M reported seeking out journal articles on best practices in online education as they prepared content for online classes. In Adjunct M-Freelancer's consulting work, they found it necessary to seek additional professional, non-degree certifications. In the course of completing the certificate, they learned skills that they have been able to integrate into the course content for one of the online courses they developed and continue to maintain for the study site. Adjuncts O and

P, employed by the same college at the study site, both reported seeking answers to learning management system questions through the internet before their employing college within the study site began providing online learning updates within regularly scheduled adjunct faculty meetings.

Mentoring. This study revealed no formal mentoring programs for adjunct faculty at the study site. However, Adjunct E-Specialist, Expert, Professional described their beginning of adjunct teaching at the site as being a teacher assistant for a full-time faculty member in an online course for a semester before teaching the course alone the next semester. From that point on, whenever either Adjunct E-Specialist, Expert, Professional or the full-time faculty member taught the course, the other was added to the online course shell as an additional collaborator to troubleshoot issues if needed, in addition to the aforementioned DLU resources. Adjunct K-Aspiring Academic also noted the course coordinator they praised in their remarks was always enrolled in Adjunct K-Aspiring Academic's online course shells. Adjunct K-Aspiring Academic viewed this as peer observation, but this arrangement is mentioned here in relation to Adjunct E-Specialist, Expert, Professional's admission that their situation was a mentor-mentee relationship.

Adjunct D-Specialist, Expert, Professional noted their mentor, who was one of their instructors in their graduate degree program at another higher education institution, was the only person they knew at the study site. They left their alma mater to lead a program at the study site and invited them to teach for the study site. Adjunct D-Specialist, Expert, Professional noted that since their mentor had left to move on to another program, they did not feel they had any connections to the study site other than with their students. Adjunct I-Freelancer, alumni of the study site, recalled the names of professors who inspired them. They even recalled specific

teaching methods or times they asked for advice from two of their most venerable mentors.

Adjunct P-Specialist, Expert, Professional, site alumni, recalled their experience in much the same way as Adjunct I-Freelancer. They treated some of their former professors as both mentors and role models for how they approached their face-to-face and online teaching.

Adjuncts G and L both described the process of the development of their own networks of mentors that happened to include other adjunct faculty members. Adjunct G-Specialist, Expert, Professional described a conversation they had with their mentor in the following way:

We don't have a lot of mixed interaction with full-time faculty—we're not invited to faculty meetings...that was a concern of one of the ladies that was kind of a mentor to me. She was an adjunct teacher and she always complained about that, she was always saying I think we'd be better informed if we were treated better or included more like the full faculty.

Adjunct G-Specialist, Expert, Professional relied on their mentor's understanding of the higher education landscape as they navigated their own time as an adjunct faculty member for the site.

Adjunct L-Aspiring Academic / Freelancer recalled an adjunct that shared an office space with their graduate student cohort during Adjunct L-Aspiring Academic / Freelancer's graduate program at another higher education institution. This adjunct faculty member took it upon themselves to provide "lunch and learn" presentations on topics surrounding teaching and learning. This willingness to go out of their way to help graduate students had a lasting impact on Adjunct L-Aspiring Academic / Freelancer and inspired a lasting mentoring relationship between that adjunct and Adjunct L-Aspiring Academic / Freelancer long after Adjunct L left the institution. As mentioned earlier, Adjunct M-Freelancer arrived at the study site and looked for resources to improve the quality of their teaching. When they found that:

No such office existed, the rest of my training became more just this informal mentoring that I got from my colleagues in the department and then I sought out some mentors outside the department but within the college that had a very strong teaching reputation.

The networks of mentors developed by the participants in this study served as fertile ground for information, and in some cases, collaboration.

Professional associations. Some of the study's adjunct participants reported that professional association membership and conference attendance provided vital learning opportunities to support their adjunct work for the study site. Adjunct E-Specialist, Expert, Professional described their active membership in an international professional association, and especially their attendance at their annual conferences, as fertile ground on teaching-related topics. They related that "there are many different discussion topics around [the particular field] that provide background on changing aspects of the industry and up and coming things to be aware of." Adjunct B-Career Ender also described content area conferences as a source of input for their online teaching. Adjunct F-Specialist, Expert, Professional credited their active involvement in professional association meetings and attendance at continuing education sessions as the reason they were recruited to teach as an adjunct for the study site. Adjunct D-Specialist, Expert, Professional, in a field related to Adjunct F-Specialist, Expert, Professional's field, also felt their professional association had a positive impact on their work as an adjunct for the study site. During the data collection phase of this study, Adjunct J-Specialist, Expert, Professional was actually looking forward to their first professional association meeting on topics related to their adjunct teaching. Adjunct O-Specialist, Expert, Professional admitted that their continued involvement with professional associations made them a better professional, which in turn makes them a better adjunct instructor for the study site. These rich experiences have provided great benefits to the study site, but no study participants reported that the study site supplemented any of the costs related to association membership or conference attendance.

Third Research Question

While the first two research questions focused on the training that one southeastern research university's adjunct faculty members received and how that training impacted their teaching practices, the third research question sought to uncover how the study's adjunct participants described their experiences and perceptions of what it means to be an adjunct.

Delivering practice to classroom. The opportunity to teach in an adjunct capacity for a southeastern research university has provided the opportunity for a number of study participants to bring their practice experience into the study site's classrooms. Adjunct E-Specialist, Expert, Professional explained:

One of the things I've tried to do each semester as I'm lecturing or conducting help sessions is trying to get real-world examples of things that I've actually had first-hand experience with to help students see how to apply material that we are covering. In every job I've had I've been fortunate enough to derive great examples.

Adjunct E-Specialist, Expert, Professional's teaching experiences for the site has occurred in a course developed by their mentor mentioned earlier. Adjunct H-Aspiring Academic, when they described a class they were able to develop, related:

I've designed the class intentionally because in today's world, it's not so important to take and regurgitate information because everyone has Google to access today so it's not quite as important as when I was a kid—they're able to regurgitate it. So, I don't think it's as important to test someone on their knowledge of what does this mean as it's used today. You know, moving forward, they'll need to know the meaning eventually, but with time, I consider it like being in the field.

Adjunct H-Aspiring Academic's recreation of a fast-paced practice environment has tested traditional notions of classroom environments in their department and college. They described their new class as follows:

[Like] nothing that's ever been taught before, not at [the site] and it's a class that I hold dear to my heart that I think everyone in the class will graduate a step ahead of anyone else at any other program. So I want it to be valued by the students.

Adjuncts N, O, and P all noted the power of sharing practice experiences during their adjunct teaching for the study site. Adjunct P-Specialist, Expert, Professional vividly recalled how practice-based examples inspired them as a student and how they tried to recreate that experience for their students in their adjunct work:

I think my daily work life and the continuing education that I do in general for my job benefits me in being able to teach these courses. I try to provide a lot of real-life experiences, situations, and scenarios to my students. You know, a vignette is one thing, but if I can actually give them an actual story of “This is what happened, what would you do? And then I’ll tell you what I did.” To actually use real-life examples of things I think is very helpful. [A former site instructor] did that with us, and I took every course that woman could teach when I was in school, and I feel like from her courses that I learned more about every day real-life world of [the field] than I really did from any other classes. And so I think I kind of use her as kind my guide for these students because they need to know real life. They need to know the good, the bad, and the ugly of everything that we see every day, and using those examples are very helpful. So I try to incorporate that into what I do teach them, based on the information that I have to present—how can I, you know, utilize real-life examples for them, versus, you know, reading a piece of paper with a made-up vignette on it?

Adjunct P-Specialist, Expert, Professional desired to recreate the memorable learning environment of their own time as a graduate student at the study site, but Adjunct O-Specialist, Expert, Professional explained that the content of some courses is simply more memorable when presented in non-traditional ways:

We can all read it in the textbooks so it helps to put a different spin on it with some real-life examples. So, you know, my work experience definitely enhances the face-to-face class, but also with the online class being able to relate to an issue that a student might bring up.

Adjunct N-Specialist, Expert, Professional found that their students would ask for updates on their practice experiences until they realized that the way they were sharing their practice experience was resonating more strongly than textbook explanations. They affectionately referred to their real-world examples as “what’s going on in [Adjunct N]’s world.” All of the study participants who described how their practice experiences impact their classroom teaching

also mentioned that their inclusion of “real-world” examples were provided in positive qualitative feedback for student course evaluations.

Teaching helps practice. Adjuncts N and E also shared how their adjunct teaching has impacted their work in the field. When thinking about what her work as an adjunct for the study site means to them, Adjunct N-Specialist, Expert, Professional quickly responded:

Now when you adjunct and you’re teaching different classes, you have to read. You have to stay on top of the literature. I have to stay current where otherwise I may want to be lazy. This evening I’m not doing anything because I have to stay on top of my classes. It keeps you energized. The pace is changing and the students constantly change. The conversation changes constantly. I think I enjoy that aspect.

They later added, “It’s probably given me some energy to keep going a couple of more years [in practice]. The exposure I have in my adjunct work has helped me to meet more people and tell people about my [practice area].” Adjunct E-Specialist, Expert, Professional shared:

I think the teaching helps my full-time job and my full-time job helps my teaching...being well-versed in the course material as we update books and make course changes keeps me abreast on the difference aspects of [the field] that I don’t use every day, but possibly could use in my full-time job to make it better or make improvements to the organization.

These common experiences shed light on a possible area of impact that some study participants may have been afraid to discuss with the researcher due to confidentiality concerns.

Connections. A major concern for adjunct study participants was the level of connection they felt to their online students. Participants shared a variety of perceptions of how online interaction with students is impacted by course design, the learning management system, and other personal reflections on aspects of online teaching for the study site.

Online students. Adjuncts B and E appreciated the ways that online education provide for the chance to interact with students in a variety of circumstances. Adjunct B-Career Ender shared:

The strength of what we've been doing is that the classes I teach are completely asynchronous and every time they come along and say "why don't we add some kind of chat feature this or that," because they're not thinking about the student who is in the military dealing with the midst of moving from one base to another. I would just say that one of the most fascinating things about teaching online has been the interaction with the students and the types of issues that adults have during the course of the semester. That can knock them out of their graduate program if faculty are not willing to work with them. They change jobs, move across the country, they're giving birth to babies, they're getting married, they're getting divorced—anything you can imagine.

Adjunct B-Career Ender went on to describe the generous amount of flexibility they allows for their students to succeed even when their assignment schedule is not followed exactly. Adjunct E-Specialist, Expert, Professional provided their reasons for enjoying online student interaction centered on their own past online student experience and their interest in managing a global classroom. They admitted:

We have found through numerous semesters of teaching the course that it's a different mentality, taking online classes. I did all of my master's online through [the site program in his field] so I kind of understood that it's self-motivated and you have to stay on top of your work yourself since there's no class to go to so you're watching your lectures and submitting your work. It's always really interesting I find that the range of locations that students are from—like this semester I have students in California, Kuwait, south Alabama, Connecticut, Texas, pretty much all of the United States, so it's interesting demographics.

These positive connections with online students were shared by Adjunct L-Aspiring Academic / Freelancer who cited consistent communication with online classes beginning on day one of the term and providing email reminders of due dates for face-to-face and online classes as the foundation for positive interaction throughout the course. They noted:

I do get more messages from my online students, and I love that because I'm so grateful that they reach out to me. And they're so appreciative for my communication with them. And I'm thinking, "I'm just being a decent human being," you know, I'm not doing anything special. But I have so many students who tell me, "Thank you so much for taking the time to respond to my questions!" I'm thinking these are just basic things that I'm doing.

Adjuncts A, O, and P did not share the same enthusiasm for the connections they were able to make with their online students. Adjuncts A and P noted they requested to move away from teaching online classes to only face-to-face classes, explaining their reasons for preferring face-to-face. Adjunct A-Career Ender stated simply, “You don’t get that connection with online students.” Adjunct P-Specialist, Expert, Professional shared that they enjoyed the live interaction with students in face-to-face classes because they were able to share their real-life experiences and “I think that helped the students tremendously and my only concern about the actual online courses is that the students do miss out on the interaction with the teachers face-to-face. That’s the one thing that has concerned me about the online program from the beginning.” Adjunct A-Career Ender described experiences when online students misunderstood what they felt were straightforward assignment instructions as a main point of frustration for the lack of connection they felt with their online students. They went on to explain their preference for face-to-face teaching centered on the rapport they build with their face-to-face classes that is not possible with asynchronous online classes. Adjunct O-Specialist, Expert, Professional recently moved outside of commuting distance to teach face-to-face classes, which led them to begin teaching online for the study site. They noted the inability to communicate in real time and to see students’ nonverbal feedback as their main point of frustration with online teaching for the site.

Adjuncts J and K both described their leniency to accommodate late student work as related to the strictness of deadlines in their practice fields combined with their past experience as students who were also working full-time jobs. Adjunct J-Specialist, Expert, Professional worried they might be “a little bit too nice as far as understanding circumstances and especially from my own experience as a student because I was working full-time the last two times that I’ve gone back to school.” Adjunct K-Aspiring Academic described their willingness to schedule

phone meetings with students as a productive means of connecting with online students when students encountered trouble with assignment directions or needed further feedback from Adjunct K-Aspiring Academic to understand their comments on graded assignments.

Email response time. Seven of the study's adjunct participants reported that they checked and responded to email within 24-48 hours. The document shared by one adjunct participant instructed one department's instructors to check email daily and respond promptly. This aligned with the guidance included as part of the DLU Online Educator Development program. Many of the study participants who reported their email response times were also ones who expressed strong feelings concerning connection to online students discussed previously.

Invisibility/isolation. Along with Administrator J's worries about adjunct invisibility mentioned earlier, a number of study participants expressed worries about feelings of isolation and invisibility for adjunct instructors in general. Adjunct G-Specialist, Expert, Professional admitted, "It's kind of isolating I think in a sense that when you're a teacher there's nobody that's checking up on you, there's nobody that can really share with you what they're doing unless you purposefully seek them out, so that's not helpful." This experience was reported by adjuncts L and M as well. Adjunct L-Aspiring Academic / Freelancer shared:

There is this sense of isolation. This feeling that, "I've been handed this, I need to figure this out, I'm kind of alone in this. I'm at the bottom of the totem pole and I need to be thankful for what I have, and if I ask questions or raise a fuss I might experience these negative consequences. I might be punished for it." So there is this feeling like, "I'm just not going to make waves, I'm going to make the best of this, I'm going to do my best."

Adjunct M-Freelancer, who had recently moved away from the region where the site is located, expressed a similar sentiment:

I think generally speaking from an adjunct standpoint—I think it's very isolating, not really part of a community, that's been my impression, that's definitely how I feel right now. I'm very independent—maybe a little too independent. I'd like to work more with

colleagues; I miss working with colleagues. My only professional interaction that I have at this point is with the students.

Another related comment that Adjunct O-Specialist, Expert, Professional shared can be considered here as well. After hearing a statistic that the number of adjuncts may greatly outnumber the full-time faculty in one area of campus, she “wondered about how the [site] does quality control with having so many adjuncts.” They did not report any observation over their teaching, but they did report multiple site resources that they contacted when they had questions concerning their online course.

“You’re kind of on your own.” Adjuncts A and G reported a perception related to isolation that provides insight into the state of training adjunct instructors for teaching online at the study site. Adjunct A-Career Ender, a veteran adjunct with over 20 years of experience for the study site, reported:

I don’t know what other colleges and programs have been doing but here it was very much, you’re kind of on your own. And it can be intimidating. When people don’t know how to get in to find out what their student surveys say. How do you know how you’re doing? You know, what are you doing?

They went on to relate that turnover in college administration rectified most of the instructors’ training needs for their particular area, but the sentiment was also expressed by Adjunct G-Specialist, Expert, Professional, who works in another part of campus. They shared:

When I sat down for the first time to teach, I met with a lot of people just on my own so I could get feedback on “What do you do in this scenario?” And then any time I have a scenario or situation where it’s something that I don’t really know how to handle it or I’d like to know someone else’s opinion on that. I try to seek out those people as well.

Adjunct G-Specialist, Expert, Professional’s willingness to seek answers when they started teaching for the study site and their willingness to speak about those experiences were fairly unique in this study. This could be due to their first adjunct teaching being one year before the time of their study interview.

Love, Honor, and “Light Bulbs.” When prompted by the question of “what does it mean to you to be an adjunct of the study site,” a number of adjuncts provided strong, emotional responses. The most commonly occurring responses are included here for discussion.

Love. Four of the study’s adjunct participants were eager to share their feelings of love about their adjunct employment at the study site. Adjunct F-Specialist, Expert, Professional noted:

I enjoy—it’s just, I mean—I’m sure you can tell I love doing it. I don’t know what else to say. I enjoy it! I can’t think of anywhere that I’d rather teach that the people are very helpful, you know, I think they’re very supportive—the dean, everybody—everybody is supportive.

Even Adjunct G-Specialist, Expert, Professional, in the middle of her explanation of how the perceived lack of communication in between administration and adjuncts in their department, exclaimed “I love my job, I really do, I just wish we were communicating more.” The exuberant responses continued with Adjunct H-Aspiring Academic. When answering the question above, they responded, “I know you see that I love doing this absolutely. It’s been, and I will tell anyone who asks, it has been years and years and years since I love what I do. I love this. Absolutely love this.” Adjunct I-Freelancer, after contemplating the meaning of the question and asking for clarification, responded thusly: “It is an opportunity to teach, to do what I enjoy doing, what I love doing, and what I feel like I’m good at doing.” These four study participants also happened to be alumni of the study site.

Honor and prestige. The concepts of honor and prestige emerged as another common theme in participants’ comments on what their adjunct work at the study site means to them.

Adjunct K-Aspiring Academic related:

I mentioned earlier they are probably not going to hire me full time. So, it’s kind of a way for me to say that I work for the [site]. I mean, it’s just a status thing. The [site] has a

wonderful, wonderful reputation and they were part of that. I love that and I have [degrees] from here. So it means a lot to me to work there.

As related earlier, Adjunct K-Aspiring Academic was a Gappa and Leslie (1993) aspiring academic, yet they still place a strong positive sense of attachment to their employment status at the site. Adjunct M-Freelancer also appreciated the status of being “able to say to people, ‘You know, I’m on faculty at [the study site] and I teach online courses.’ I’m proud of that. Also, another thing it means to me is there is some prestige with having that name and also feeling like I’m making a difference in people’s lives.” This prestige factor extends past the adjuncts themselves according to Adjunct J-Specialist, Expert, Professional’s experience:

There is a prestige factor to say you work for—well, my parents like to tell people even though it’s not my full-time job and I only teach one class a semester, “Oh, [Adjunct J] is teaching at the [site] now,” so there is a little bit of a prestige factor with that I guess, but I do it because I really like to teach. I have found that I enjoy doing it part time.

Finally, Adjunct P-Specialist, Expert, Professional provided a particularly poignant, thoughtful reply to the question of what being an adjunct at the site means to them:

I guess, professionally, it means that I’ve gotten to a milestone in my life and career where I have done enough and witnessed enough and experienced enough that I can give back to the students, and that someone at the [site] feels that the work I do on a daily basis and the work that I’ve done in the past and all of my studies that I can provide a quality education for students. I’m obviously very honored and humbled that the school feels like the information that I provide and the skills that I bring to the table through my teaching is apparently decent enough for them to maintain me for a number of years now. And I hope that I get to continue to teach.

All of the study participants whose remarks mention honor and prestige are all alumni of the study site.

“*Light bulbs.*” Study participants also enjoyed witnessing students as they experience “light bulb” moments. Adjunct B-Career Ender was the only study participant who described this type of moment in online classes. They related:

So what happens in this particular program is that almost every student comes to the program with some knowledge of the discipline but very little theoretical background and so, what I find from students is a constant set of ‘ah-ha’ moments, where they’ll be saying ‘oh, we didn’t know!’

Adjunct N-Specialist, Expert, Professional described the moment as “that startling look” that occurs when facts take hold in students’ minds during face-to-face classes. Adjunct I-Freelancer also described their face-to-face classes and a sense of “satisfaction of seeing the light bulbs come from the dots being connected in their minds to their practice.” Adjunct A-Career Ender also described a favorite occurrence in their face-to-face classes: “I like when you see the light bulb go off, you know, to me that’s the most rewarding—when all of a sudden it’s like bing-bing-bing-bing and you see it happen!” The joys of capturing the moments when students learn new concepts and make connections to existing knowledge remained fulfilling for adjuncts employed by the study site.

Summary

The study site had a rich history of employing adjuncts to meet the instructional demands of a growing student body of a southeastern research university. As the number of online courses increased, the site has developed resources to train instructors for teaching online, but the resources were not universally adopted in the eight colleges of the site included in this study. Some participants reported that their graduate programs provided instruction on teaching methods. A significant number of participants sought their own answers through informal mentoring and networking in professional organizations.

The adjuncts who participated in this study represent all four of Gappa and Leslie’s (1993) classifications of adjuncts. They reported that they enjoy their adjunct work for the study site and helping students gain exposure to the world of practice in their respective disciplines.

Feelings of isolation were present, but a commitment to doing what was best for students drove many of the participants to continue working for the site.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Higher education institutions rely on adjunct faculty to meet temporary instructional needs with minimal contractual commitment (Cross & Goldenberg, 2009). The fall of 2014 saw 2.85 million college students in the United States completing all of their degree requirements online. The increased adoption of online degree programs in colleges and universities in the United States has led to an increase in the use of adjunct faculty members to meet enrollment demands. The researcher chose a southeastern research university that had experienced dramatic growth in undergraduate enrollment as the setting for a case study of the preparation of adjunct faculty to teach online. Utilizing semi-structured interviews of administrators and adjuncts in combination with document analysis, the researcher examined the adjunct training practices for online teaching at eight of the site's 11 colleges that enrolled both undergraduate and graduate students.

Conclusions and Discussion

This study was comprised of three research questions:

1. How are adjunct faculty members at a southeastern research university prepared to teach online?
2. How do adjunct faculty members believe the training provided by their employing institution impacts their teaching practices?

3. How do adjunct faculty members describe their experiences and perceptions of what it means to be an adjunct?

Data were collected through interviews of study site administrators and adjuncts along with documents shared by study participants. The interview guides were developed using Gappa and Leslie's (1993) 43 recommendations for improving the status of adjunct faculty members in higher education institutions. Data analysis of transcripts and documents shared by study participants provided insight into the preparation of adjunct faculty members for online teaching at the study site.

First Research Question

To answer the question of how adjunct faculty members at the study site were prepared to teach online, the researcher analyzed administrator and adjunct interview transcripts along with documents shared by study participants. Site-specific resources for all faculty members, including adjuncts, emerged during data collection. These resources could be accessed and utilized on adjuncts' personal time. These resources included an online educator training program through the study site's learning management system, an instructor training unit with a robust schedule of workshops and offers of individual help for all instructors at the site, and some college-level resources. The college-level resources were not consistent from college to college. Five adjunct participants reported that they were prepared for teaching through their graduate programs. A number of adjunct participants described ways they sought training on their own, including five who identified informal mentors and four who reported attending professional conferences and meetings.

The site addresses the employment and preparation of adjuncts for teaching in much the same way as the literature: one discipline at a time. This study contributes a university-level

snapshot of practices for adjunct employment and training for online teaching. Some of the site's colleges mimic the orienting stage of the program described in Mujtaba and Gibson (2007), but not the stages of the program around hiring, modeling, mentoring, or teaching. Adjunct O-Specialist, Expert, Professional's report that their college "has maybe three times as many adjuncts as they do [full-time] professors" highlights the need for increased attention to the preparation of adjuncts for all aspects of teaching. The site's online educator professional development provides synchronous and asynchronous learning opportunities, which provides more scheduling options than the state of Maryland's Certificate of Online Adjunct Teaching program outlined in Shattuck and Anderson (2013a, 2013b).

Second Research Question

To determine how the study's adjunct participants believe their site-provided teaching preparation impacted their teaching, the researcher examined interview transcripts and documents for evidence of training impact. The four study participants who have experience with the site's online educator training program recalled it positively. The two participants who were required to complete the program by their college were less enthusiastic for the program than those who chose to enroll without being required to participate in the program. The difference in enthusiasm could be due to the two adjuncts required to complete the program being employed in full-time positions outside of their adjunct work for the site while the two who chose to enroll did not have full-time work obligations outside of their work for the site.

As far as technical support, this study's adjunct participants were pleased with the support they received on technical issues related to the learning management system and online teaching available through the Distance Learning Unit (DLU) and the Instructor Training Unit. Adjunct C-Specialist, Expert, Professional described DLU as "wonderful" and "very helpful." A

few participants noted a desire for more hours of operation for the site-based online technical support hotline offered through DLU, seeing the current 62 hours a week as not quite enough for some adjunct faculty members and their students who are working on coursework outside of typical working hours. This study extends Lewis and Wang's (2015) findings that learning management systems may provide more issues for adjuncts than they report themselves.

The restrictive nature of the online classes developed in the learning management system in partnership with DLU received mixed reviews from study participants. Adjuncts O and P noted the convenience of having full-time faculty design courses that do not require updating. Adjunct P-Specialist, Expert, Professional described the fixed content in the online course shells as "the one thing that I think is great, that the material is already out there." Five adjunct participants noted frustration with the static nature of the courses that left Adjunct K-Aspiring Academic, among others, "feeling like a facilitator, not an instructor." Adjunct H-Aspiring Academic expressed appreciation for being asked to "collectively work" on the update of a course they teach that was designed by a full-time faculty member. The four adjunct participants in this study who have developed online classes for the study site have doctorates, which may explain why they were asked to develop courses. The site's preference for full-time faculty members as course developers seems to go against the larger trend noted in Curtis and Jacobe (2006) and Ortagus and Stedrak (2013) of institutions relying on adjuncts for course development as well as implementation.

Third Research Question

The study's third question centered on what teaching for the study site meant to the study's adjunct participants. Adjunct participant data were analyzed to answer this question. The adjunct participants expressed gratitude for the opportunity to teach at a southeastern research

university. Many of the participants who can be described using Gappa and Leslie's (1993) classification of specialists, experts, and professionals viewed their adjunct teaching as a reciprocal relationship that positively impacts their full-time work in their respective fields. Opinions on the strength of connections between adjunct faculty and students varied in this study. Some adjunct participants reported strong, ongoing communication with students. Adjunct L-Aspiring Academic / Freelancer recalled receiving more communication from online students, "and I love that because I'm so grateful that they reach out to me. And they're so appreciative for my communication with them." Other study participants, like Adjunct A-Career Ender, lamented the lack of student interaction in online teaching for the study site, summing up their thoughts with "you don't get that connection with students."

The theme of isolation that emerged in this study echoed the concerns raised in Dolan's (2011) study. Six adjunct study participants mentioned seeking out their own informal mentors, which speaks to resourcefulness among the study participants to build their own networks if some form of mentoring is not provided by the site. The more formalized mentoring programs described in Mujtaba and Gibson (2007), Diegel (2013), and Shobe, Murphy-Erby, and Sparks (2014) were not immediately evident in the data collected for this study, yet that does not mean that formal mentoring for adjunct faculty is not available in some departments of the study site. The institution-level focus on adjunct faculty with university- and college-wide programs like the ones described in Gappa and Leslie (1993) was not found at the study site.

Job satisfaction for the adjunct participants in this study extends the work of Waltman et al. (2012) which pointed to the opportunity to work with students and career flexibility as rich sources of non-tenure-track employee satisfaction. With the exception of some study participants classified as aspiring academics, or what Maynard and Joseph (2008) call involuntary adjuncts,

the study's adjunct participants are proud to teach part-time for the study site where they can facilitate what Adjunct A-Career Ender described as "light-bulb" moments for their students. The theme of pride in teaching for one's alma mater is new to the conversation of adjunct job satisfaction points. Adjunct J-Specialist, Expert, Professional's mention of "a prestige factor to say you work for—well, my parents like to tell people even though it's not my full-time job and I only teach one class a semester, 'Oh, [Adjunct J] is teaching at the [site]'" typifies a strong theme in this study's interview data.

Discussion of the Implications

This study yielded a dataset that contributes to the literature of adjunct employment and training for online teaching. Using the framework of Gappa and Leslie's (1993) recommendations for higher education institutions to better meet the needs of adjunct faculty members, the researcher presents study implications for administrators and adjuncts.

Administrators

Gappa and Leslie (1993) provided three areas in which institutions should consider their specific recommendations. The first area, using adjuncts to achieve educational objectives, was evident in the data collected and analyzed for this study. Policies and guidelines are mentioned by name but not included in documents regarding employment terms shared by study participants. While Gappa and Leslie (1993) advocated for the delegation of authority, the delegation to the department level for most adjunct employment decisions and regulations misses the opportunity for college-level and site-level initiatives for the training and development of adjunct faculty members. While employment terms were seen as consistent across the colleges in the study, the training requirements for adjuncts for online teaching were not. The lack of consistency across colleges could be a contributing factor to the discipline-specific studies in the

literature (Brannagan & Oriol, 2014; Fagan-Wilen et al., 2006; Forbes, Hickey, & White, 2010; Gazza & Schellenbarger, 2010; Klein & Weisman, 2001; Lester, 2011; Pompper, 2011; Santisteban & Egues, 2014). For example, the training programs developed and available through the site's DLU and the Instructor Training Unit were not required across the site. The experiences described by the two adjuncts whose college mandated the online educator course offered by DLU could have been mitigated by an initial offering of asynchronous and synchronous classes. This would have prevented Adjunct K-Aspiring Academic's experience of "having to take half days from my job in order to" complete sessions they felt were "beneficial but not directly beneficial." Using online education to provide training for online teaching could help to meet the needs of a geographically diverse pool of adjunct faculty members.

Data related to Gappa and Leslie's (1993) second area of recommendations, developing fair employment practices and policies, were evident through publicly available websites mentioned by participants and in the interviews. Employment contracts shared with the researcher mentioned available online resources, but no evidence was found that any formalized tenure was available although both administrator and adjunct study participants noted years of continuous employment, one term at a time, for some adjuncts. The common experience shared by Adjunct O-Specialist, Expert, Professional of "they keep asking me to do what I'm doing now" was positive for them, but codifying and having explicit policies for adjunct employment and tenure could benefit site administrators and adjuncts alike. This would help to facilitate one of Hoyt's (2012) key factors for adjunct job satisfaction, predictable teaching schedule.

Data addressing Gappa and Leslie's (1993) third area of recommendations, investing in human resources, were present in administrator-provided study data on a college-by-college basis through department-wide and college-wide adjunct faculty meetings described by

Administrators B, C, and E, adjunct appreciation dinners described by Administrators B and C, and empowering adjuncts to develop online courses in their areas of expertise, as described by one administrator participant and four adjunct participants. Administrator study participants did not see department-level committee involvement as appropriate due to the strict temporary teaching appointment contract terms not including any forms of service to the site. This sentiment was succinctly expressed by Administrator I in their point that “the [adjunct] contract is strictly delimited. They are contract workers in the strictest sense of the term. They get hired to do one specific thing and to get compensated a specific amount to do it.” Fagan-Wilen et al. (2006), Mujtaba and Gibson (2007), and Klein and Weisman (2001) all provide alternatives to the teaching-only compensation model the study site has in place for adjuncts. These models include compensation for adjuncts for attending meetings, completing training, and serving on department committees including thesis and dissertation committees. Administrators also reported no formal evaluation of their adjunct faculty members outside of the student course evaluations. Waltman et al. (2012) described performance reviews as a practice many adjuncts appreciated. In this study, Adjuncts G and N both expressed a desire for performance reviews like ones they receive in their full-time employment away from the study site. Site administrators could explore more robust evaluation options outside of student course evaluations.

As this current study indicates, the areas of concern that Gappa and Leslie identified for administrators in 1993 still remain decades later. These concerns have been compounded by the online learning environment, which was an area not included in the Gappa and Leslie study. These concerns are compounded at the current study site by a rapidly growing student population that has led to an increased need for instructors. The literature continues to recognize a need for administrative attention at department, college, and central administration levels for best meeting

the training and employment needs of adjunct faculty members (Fagan-Wilen et al., 2006). Administrators should continue to look for ways to foster community and inclusion among all types of faculty members. The adjunct participants in this study strongly desired more communication and showed an earnest interest in performance evaluation. While study participants noted the many responsibilities that administrators juggle, providing adjuncts with a more responsive work environment can pay dividends in the future for any higher education institution. Fagan-Wilen et al. (2006) set forth the idea of an adjunct advocate being an institutional position that is a direct report to the provost. Having an institutional, rather than departmental, focus on adjunct employment and preparation for teaching would provide a foundation on which to meet Gappa and Leslie's (1993) 43 recommendations.

Adjuncts

This study demonstrates the continued reliance on adjunct faculty at the study site and throughout higher education in the United States. There are resources available to adjunct faculty teaching online and this study's findings highlight the need for consistent communication across the colleges of a southeastern research university. Increased communication would help to combat the invisibility and isolation expressed by Administrator J and Adjuncts G, L, M, and N. Adjunct faculty members provide a vital skill and presence for higher education administrators. While the participants in this study described their resourceful habits of informal mentoring along with utilizing site-based resources, participants such as Adjunct H-Aspiring Academic noted that they were often consulted by full-time faculty for input during course redesign. Teaching part-time for a research university is enjoyable, challenging work, and appreciation for that work is shown in different ways. This study's findings in this area support Hoyt's (2012) and Eagan, Jaeger, and Grantham's (2015) discussion of job satisfaction and could also

contribute to Maynard and Joseph's (2008) exploration of the connection between underemployment to job satisfaction. While the responsibility for supplying resources for adjunct faculty should not fall to the adjuncts having to advocate for themselves before needs are met, study participants saw some success in advocating for themselves. Adjunct L-Aspiring Academic / Freelancer's negotiations to develop an instructor help module for an online course they designed is an example of the resourcefulness. As online education grew, so did the resources provided for adjuncts by the study site with the emergence of DLU resources for technical support and course development in the learning management system. Adjunct faculty can use this trend to their advantage.

Full-time Faculty

Along with administrators, full-time faculty members have the power and status to positively impact adjunct faculty status by making connections with adjuncts who may be teaching courses the full-time faculty have designed and inviting them to collaborate on course design and updates much like Adjunct H-Aspiring Academic described in this study. Full-time faculty members can reach out to adjunct faculty to answer questions or possibly demonstrate openness to a mentoring relationship like the one described by Adjunct E-Specialist, Expert, Professional. Full-time faculty members may also choose to advocate for a formal orientation and mentoring program like the one described in Mujtaba and Gibson (2007). This mentoring can be reported as service for those in tenure-leading positions to further demonstrate the important role of adjuncts in the higher education landscape.

Students

Student course evaluations are the only means of performance evaluation for many non-tenure-track faculty members, including adjunct faculty, employed by the study site during the

2014-2015 and/or 2015-2016 academic years. At least three participants reported low student participation in the course evaluation process. Students can advocate for adjunct faculty, and all faculty, by completing all course evaluations at the end of each academic term. Adjunct faculty members are contracted for teaching only, making their role in college or university settings to be completely student-focused (Diegel, 2013). The participants in this study demonstrated a commitment to students, and completing course evaluations provided adjuncts with the feedback to learn and grow in the work they love.

Instructional Designers

The employment of instructional designers to help online course designers, often full-time faculty members, at the study site provided a level of structure that ensures a consistent presentation through the site's learning management system no matter the instructor of an online course. Instructional designers should look for ways to empower adjunct faculty members teaching online courses they did not design themselves. Providing support for adjuncts as they make sense of course design will lessen the learning curve described in Lewis and Wang (2015) related to learning management system familiarity.

Recommendations for Further Research

The opportunities to study the role of adjunct faculty in higher education are immense. More university-wide and statewide studies are needed to better understand the employment of adjuncts at the institutional and state levels. If the current study is replicated, the researcher suggests adding the demographics of race and ethnicity to better understand differences in the employment and preparation of adjunct faculty among colleges within the same university. The current study could also be replicated with a quantitative element, such as a survey, that could possibly allow for a broader quantitative coverage of a variety of factors. These factors could

include course enrollments, grade distributions, and levels of adoption of learning management system features by adjuncts. Researchers could then build upon the quantitative to inform a representative selection of participants to provide qualitative data, providing increased validity for claims found in multiple data sources.

The popularity of online education continues to rise, so more qualitative and quantitative research is needed to understand how adjunct faculty are served and represented in this teaching format. There is a distinct need for more research studies of online adjunct faculty orientation and teaching preparation programs to move past the “best practices” bent of much of the literature. With the common practice of adjunct faculty members deploying a course designed by someone else, as indicated in this study, there are a number of research directions that could prove fruitful with studies to examine student reactions to the course designer as instructor versus another type of instructor, whether the other instructor be an adjunct, a graduate student, or another full-time faculty member.

One point of particular interest from this study’s findings that could prove interesting to investigate is the possibility of a connection between adjunct employment and alumni status for universities. Investigating questions related to alumni adjunct employment at universities with a broad range of graduate programs would help to determine if the large number of alumni participants in this study is unique or typical for research universities. Another point for consideration would be the investigation of the visibility of adjunct faculty on research university websites, teaching college websites, and community college websites. Any study that could shed light on the experience of being an adjunct faculty member for a college or university stands to increase levels of understanding of the needs, benefits, and how to best meet the needs of this valuable higher education resource.

Summary

This study sought to examine the current ways that a southeastern research university prepared adjunct faculty members to teach online and how adjuncts believed that preparation impacted their teaching. Also, the researcher wanted to explore what it meant to study participants to teach in an adjunct capacity. The study's adjunct participants were identified through initial interviews with site administrators since a site-wide list of adjunct faculty was not available. Data were collected through interviews and documents shared by study participants. Data analysis occurred through three stages of coding and thoughtful engagement with Gappa and Leslie's (1993) recommendations for improving the status of adjuncts in higher education as a conceptual framework.

The data showed site-wide training available to all faculty members and an institution-sponsored webpage specifically created for adjuncts. Participants utilized technical support provided by the site but also noted their own graduate education and informal mentoring as important sources of training and support. Adjuncts defined their work as delivering the practical side of their respective disciplines into the classroom. Participants struggle with finding the right balance of connections with students and administrators, yet they reported loving their jobs and feeling honored to teach for the site. This study sheds light on the need for site-wide coordination of adjunct preparation for teaching.

REFERENCES

- Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2016). *Online report card: Tracking online education in the United States*. Retrieved from <http://onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/onlinereportcard.pdf>
- American Federation of Teachers (n.d.). Higher Education Data Center. Retrieved from <http://www.aft.org/higher-education-data-center>
- Betts, K., Kramer, R., & Gaines, L. L. (2013). Online faculty and adjuncts: Strategies for meeting current and future demands of online education through online human touch training and support. In M. S. Raisinghani (Ed.), *Curriculum, learning, and teaching advancements in online education* (pp. 94-112). Hershey, PA: Information Science Reference.
- Brannagan, K. B., & Oriol, M. (2014). A model for orientation and mentoring of online adjunct faculty in nursing. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 34(6), 128-130.
- Caruth, G. D., & Caruth, D. L. (2013). Distance education in the United States: From correspondence courses to the internet. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 14(2), 141-149.
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Clark, H. G., Moore, B. A., Johnston, L. B., & Openshaw, L. (2011, December). *Social Work Education*, 30(8), 1012-1021.
- Cross, J. G., & Goldenberg, E. N. (2009). *Off-Track profs: Nontenured teachers in higher education*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- Curtis, J. W., & Jacobe, M. F. (2006). AAUP Contingent Faculty Index 2006. Retrieved from <https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/files/AAUPContingentFacultyIndex2006.pdf>
- Daniel, M. C. (2016). Contingent faculty of the world unite! Organizing to resist the corporatization of higher education. *New Labor Forum*, 25(1), 44-51. doi: 10.1177/1095796015620408
- Datray, J. L., Saxon, D. P., & Martirosyan, N. M. (2014). Adjunct faculty in developmental education: Best practices, challenges, and recommendations. *Community College Enterprise*, 20(1), 36-49.

- DeLottell, P., & Cates, S. (2016). The department chair influence on institutional affective commitment of online adjuncts. *International Journal of Business and Public Administration*, 13(1), 61-75.
- Diegel, B. L. (2013). Perceptions of community college adjunct faculty and division chairpersons: Support, mentoring, and professional development to sustain academic quality. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 37(8), 596-607.
- Dolan, D. M., Hall, M. S., Karlsson, C. R., & Martinak, M. L. (2013). Five years later: Maryland adjuncts tell us (again) who they are and what they want. *Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 61(1), 35-45. doi:10.1080/07377363.2013.758552
- Dolan, V. (2011). The isolation of online adjunct faculty and its impact on their performance. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 12(2), 62-77.
- Driscoll, M. P. (2005). *Psychology of learning for instruction* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Eagan, M. K., Jaeger, A. J., & Grantham, A. (2015). Supporting the academic majority: Policies and practices related to part-time faculty's job satisfaction. *Journal of Higher Education*, 86(3), 448-483.
- Elliott, M., Rhoades, N., Jackson, C. M., & Mandernach, B. J. (2015). Professional development: Designing initiatives to meet the needs of online faculty. *Journal of Educators Online*, 12(1), 160-188.
- Fagan-Wilen, R., Springer, D., Ambrosino, B., & White, B. (2006). The support of adjunct faculty: An academic imperative. *Social Work Education*, 25(1), 39-51. doi:10.1080/02615470500477870
- Forbes, M. O., Hickey, M. T., & White, J. (2010). Adjunct faculty development: Reported needs and innovative solutions. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 26(2), 116-124. doi: 10.1016/j.profnurs.2009.08.001
- Gappa, J. M. (2000). The new faculty majority: Somewhat satisfied but not eligible for tenure. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 105(1), 77-86.
- Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1993). *The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Gazza, E. A., & Shellenbarger, T. (2010). The lived experience of part-time baccalaureate nursing faculty. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 26(6), 353-359. doi: 10.1016/j.profnurs.2010.08.002
- Hoyt, J. E. (2012). Predicting the satisfaction and loyalty of adjunct faculty. *Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 60(3), 132-142.

- Jenkins, R. (2016, July 10). Your to-do list as chair. *Chronicle of Higher Education, Advice*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com.libdata.lib.ua.edu/article/Your-To-Do-List-as-Chair/237052>
- Johnson, C., & Stevens, C. (2008). Creating links: An inclusive faculty development initiative. *Adult Learning, 19*(1/2), 26-29.
- Kentnor, H. E. (2015). Chapter 2: Distance education and the evolution of online learning in the United States. *Curriculum & Teaching Dialogue, 17*(1/2), 21-34.
- Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (2014). Troubling ethical lapses: The treatment of contingent faculty. *Change, 46*(4), 34-37.
- Kezar, A., Maxey, D., & Eaton, J. (2014). *An examination of the changing faculty: Ensuring institutional quality and achieving desired student learning outcomes*. Council for Higher Education Accreditation Occasional Paper. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Research and Study of Accreditation and Quality Assurance.
- Klein, W. C., & Weisman, D. (2001). Adjunct instruction: A conceptual model for actualizing the potential. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 21*(1/2), 77-93.
- Lester, J. (2011). Use of adjunct faculty in delivery of distance education in ALA-accredited LIS master's programs in the U.S. and Canada. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science, 52*(3), 212-237.
- Lewis, E., & Wang, C. (2015). Using an online curriculum design and a cooperative instructional approach to orientate adjunct faculty to the online learning environment. *Journal of Continuing Higher Education, 63*(2), 109-118.
- Maldonado, E., & Riman, J. (2009). The Adjunct Advocate @ FIT: Bringing part time faculty into the mainstream. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 37*(3), 327-333.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2016). *Designing qualitative research* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Maynard, D. C., & Joseph, T. A. (2008). Are all part-time faculty underemployed? The influence of faculty status preference on satisfaction and commitment. *Higher Education, 55*(2), 139-154.
- Meixner, C., Kruck, S. E., & Madden, L. T. (2010). Inclusion of part-time faculty for the benefit of faculty and students. *College Teaching, 58*(4), 141-147.
doi:10.1080/87567555.2010.484032
- Mujtaba, B. G., & Gibson, J. (2007). The creation and implementation of a formal faculty orientation and training program in higher education. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning, 4*(8), 17-24.

- National Center for Education Statistics (2016). Study Site. *College Navigator*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/?q=university+of+alabama&s=all&id=100751>
- Ortagus, J. C., & Stedrak, L. J. (2013). Online education and contingent faculty: An exploratory analysis of issues and challenges for higher education administrators. *Educational Considerations, 40*(3), 30-33.
- Pompper, D. (2011). "Cheap labor" speaks: PR adjuncts on pedagogy and preparing Millennials for careers. *Public Relations Review, 37*, 456-465. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.09.015
- Potvin, C. (2015). From telecourses to online courses: A story of redesign. *Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology, 41*(3.1), 1-25.
- Richardson, R. C. (1992). The Associate Program: Teaching improvement for adjunct faculty. *Community College Review, 20*(1), 29-34.
- Rossing, J. P., & Lavitt, M. R. (2016). The neglected learner: A call to support integrative learning for faculty. *Liberal Education, 102*(2), 34-41.
- Roulston, K. (2010). *Reflective interviewing: A guide to theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rutz, C., Condon, W., Iverson, E. R., Manduca, C. A., & Willett, G. (2012). Faculty professional development and student learning: What is the relationship? *Change, 44*(3), 40-47. doi:10.1080/00091383.2012.672915
- Saldana, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Santisteban, L., & Egues, A. L. (2014). Cultivating adjunct faculty: Strategies beyond orientation. *Nursing Forum, 49*(3), 152-158. doi:10.1111/nuf.12106
- Shattuck, J., & Anderson, T. (2013a). Making a match: Aligning audience, goals, and content in online adjunct training. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 16*(3), 1-14.
- Shattuck, J., & Anderson, T. (2013b). Using a design-based research study to identify principles for training instructors to teach online. *The International Review of Research on Open and Distance Learning, 14*(5), 187-210.
- Shattuck, J., Dubins, B., & Zilberman, D. (2011). MarylandOnline's inter-institutional project to train higher education adjunct faculty to teach online. *International Review of Research in Open & Distance Learning, 12*(2), 40-61.
- Sheeks, G. L., & Hutcheson, P. A. (1998, Fall). How departments support part-time faculty. *Thought & Action, 14*, 85-90.

- Shinn, S. (2016). Adjusting for adjuncts. *BizEd*, 24-30.
- Shobe, M. A., Murphy-Erby, Y., & Sparks, J. (2014). Mentorship efforts to support part-time social work faculty members. *Mentorship & Tutoring: Partnerships in Learning*, 22(5), 446-460.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Starcher, K., & Mandernach, B. J. (2016). An examination of adjunct faculty characteristics: Comparison between non-profit and for-profit institutions. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 19(1), 1-16.
- Study Site (2016a). Adjunct information. Retrieved from <http://adjunct.ua.edu>
- Study Site (2016b). Faculty by rank, tenure status, and job status. *Factbook*. Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. Retrieved from <http://oira.ua.edu/factbook/reports/faculty-and-staff/faculty-by-rank-tenure-status-and-job-status/>
- Study Site Distance Learning Unit (2016). Instructional Technology and Academic Services. Retrieved from <http://itas.ua.edu/index.shtml>
- Study Site News (2006). News, September 21, 2006. Retrieved from <http://ourstudentsourfuture.ua.edu/enrollment.html>
- Study Site News (2013). [Study Site] enrollment reaches record high; Freshmen bring high scores, GPAs. Retrieved from <http://uanews.ua.edu/2013/09/ua-enrollment-reaches-record-high-freshmen-bring-high-scores-gpas/>
- Study Site News (2015). [Study Site] enrollment tops 37,000. Retrieved from <http://uanews.ua.edu/2015/09/ua-enrollment-tops-37000/>
- Tipple, R. (2010). Effective leadership of online adjunct faculty. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 13(1), 1-13.
- Waltman, J., Bergom, I., Hollenshead, C., Miller, J., & August, L. (2012). Factors contributing to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among non-tenure track faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, 83(3), 411-434.

APPENDIX A

GAPPA AND LESLIE'S RECOMMENDATIONS

Area	Recommended Practice
Using Part-Timers to Achieve Educational Objectives	1. Develop goals for the use of part-time faculty that are based on the educational mission of the college or university.
	2. Include the use of part-time faculty in the overall faculty staffing plan.
	3. Consult part-time faculty during the development of the faculty staffing plan.
	4. Assign responsibility, delegate authority, develop policies and guidelines, and review and monitor adherence to policy.
	5. Systematically and routinely gather and use accurate and timely data on part-time faculty for decision-making purposes.
	6. Periodically survey part-time faculty for additional information about their perceptions of the conditions under which they work, their satisfaction with their employment, and other concerns or interests.
	7. Assess the benefits and short- and long-term costs of employing part-time faculty.
	8. Review and evaluate the faculty staffing plan on a regular basis.
Developing Fair Employment Practices and Policies	9. Establish a campuswide representative body to give advice on part-time faculty employment policies.
	10. Publish part-time faculty employment policies in the faculty manual and distribute them to all department chairs and faculty, especially the part-time faculty.
	11. Make department chairs responsible for implementing part-time faculty employment policies consistently.
	12. Offer a range of employment options for part-time faculty.

	13. Provide for part-time tenure.
	14. Provide security and due-process rights for part-timers with seniority and records of effective performance.
	15. Appoint continuing part-time faculty for more than extended periods.
	16. Establish career tracks that provide rewards and incentives for long-term service and/or high achievement.
	17. Identify qualifications for part-time faculty that are legitimately related to the job requirements.
	18. Recruit, select, and hire part-time faculty proactively.
	19. Diversify the part-time faculty pool through affirmative action.
	20. Provide timely and early notification of appointments to part-time positions.
	21. Develop a salary scale for part-time faculty.
	22. Ensure consistency of compensation practices for part-timers within departments and institutions.
	23. Set standards for progression through the salary scale.
	24. Provide benefits to continuing part-time faculty.
	25. Develop objective performance criteria and procedures for evaluating part-time faculty and use the results as the basis for decisions about reappointment.
	26. Provide support services to part-time faculty.
Investing in Human Resources	27. Communicate the message that part-time faculty are important to the institution.
	28. Give department chairs responsibility and incentives to supervise part-time faculty.
	29. Orient department chairs to good supervisory practice.
	30. Invite part-time faculty to share their perceptions of effective supervisory practice at department chair training sessions.

	31. Use teams of experienced faculty (full- and part-time) to develop new faculty members' teaching skills.
	32. Provide faculty mentors to inexperienced part-time faculty.
	33. Engage full- and part-time faculty in course coordination.
	34. Involve part-time faculty in the assessment of student learning.
	35. Appoint part-time faculty to committees.
	36. Involve part-time faculty in informal talk.
	37. Invite part-time faculty to social events.
	38. Publicly recognize part-time faculty for their achievements and contributions.
	39. Orient part-time faculty to the institution and to the expectations the institution has for them.
	40. Conduct frequent workshops on good teaching practices.
	41. Provide in-service professional development opportunities for part-time faculty.
	42. Provide incentives for good performance.
	43. Use teaching evaluations to help part-time faculty improve.

APPENDIX B

ADJUNCTS: INTERVIEW GUIDE

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study is to explore current training for online teaching available to adjunct faculty members at a research university in the southeastern United States.

Research Questions

The research questions for my study are the following:

1. How are adjunct faculty members at a southeastern research university prepared to teach online?
2. How do adjunct faculty members believe the training provided by their employing institution impacts their teaching practices?
3. How do adjunct faculty members describe their experiences and perceptions of what it means to be an adjunct?

Introduction

Welcome _____! Thank you for taking the time to meet with me today.

My name is Steven Yates and I am a graduate student at the University of Alabama. In this interview, I am interested in understanding your experience as an adjunct faculty member at the study site. Over the next 45-60 minutes, I will ask you some questions about your experiences as an adjunct faculty member at a southeastern research university. If you feel uncomfortable answering a question, you are welcome to pass on the question. If you need a break at any point, please let me know. You may also end the interview whenever you wish. I am using an audio recorder app on my iPhone and my iPad to record this interview. I will also use a

pseudonym in my interview transcript to protect your identity and will keep the recording in password-protected, cloud-based storage.

Do you have any questions? If there are no questions, let's get started!

Interview Questions

Tell me, with as much detail as possible, about your educational and professional background.

What inspired you to want to teach in higher education?

Can you tell me more about what teaching experience you have?

What about any training or formal teaching preparation?

What about experience or training to teach online?

Walk me through the process of how you came to be an adjunct instructor at the site.

Do you have a set teaching schedule from semester to semester, or year to year? Help me understand how you see your current and future employment as an adjunct in your current department.

Would you mind giving me a detailed account of a typical week for you as an adjunct instructor during a recent semester-long face-to-face class you taught?

Now, you may have guessed it, please describe, in detail, a typical week as an adjunct instructor of a semester-long online class you have taught.

Please describe any print training materials, workshops, online course offerings, etc., that the site offered you before or during your adjunct teaching.

Do you have some specific examples of how your training and experience have impacted your teaching as an adjunct at the site?

Aside from what you just shared, how did your training impact your course design for the classes you taught?

How do you incorporate student or department evaluations into your course design, redesign, preparation, training plans, etc.?

Have you sought out training or professional development on your own that has impacted your adjunct teaching? If so, please tell me more about that.

Are there any teaching or training resources or strategies that you have asked for from your employing department chair or other site administrator? If so, please go into detail on how that happened from your question to the resolution.

What does it mean to you to be an adjunct faculty member here at the site?

What else would you like for me to know about your employment as an adjunct here at the site?

Are there any documents or communication from the site that you would be willing to share with me for the purposes of the study?

Do you have any other questions?

Thank you for your time! Have a great day!

APPENDIX C

ADMINISTRATORS: INTERVIEW GUIDE

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study is to explore current training for online teaching available to adjunct faculty members at a research university in the southeastern United States.

Research Questions

The research questions for my study are the following:

1. How are adjunct faculty members at a southeastern research university prepared to teach online?
2. How do adjunct faculty members believe the training provided by their employing institution impacts their teaching practices?
3. How do adjunct faculty members describe their experiences and perceptions of what it means to be an adjunct?

Introduction

Welcome _____! Thank you for taking the time to meet with me today.

My name is Steven Yates and I am a graduate student at the University of Alabama. In this interview, I am interested in understanding your experience as an administrator who hires and manages adjunct faculty members at the study site. Over the next 45-60 minutes, I will ask you some questions about your experiences as an administrator of adjunct faculty members at a southeastern research university. If you feel uncomfortable answering a question, you are welcome to pass on the question. If you need a break at any point, please let me know. You may also end the interview whenever you wish. I am using an audio recorder app on my iPhone and

my laptop to record this interview. I will also use a pseudonym in my interview transcript to protect your identity and will keep the recording in password-protected, cloud-based storage.

Do you have any questions? If there are no questions, let's get started!

Interview Questions

Tell me, with as much detail as possible, about your educational and professional background.

What inspired you to want to teach in higher education?

Describe any online teaching experience or training to teach online that you have had.

Can you tell me about what administrative experience you have?

What about any training or formal preparation to be an administrator?

Walk me through the process of how you came to be an administrator at the site.

Tell me about any training to be an administrator that you have received either at the site or in a previous position.

Describe in detail what you consider to be the culture of your department/college.

Please describe the role of adjuncts in your department/college.

Are adjuncts invited to faculty meetings and to serve on department/college committees? Why or why not?

You have the chance to hire a new adjunct. Tell me more about the steps, from the moment you realize a new adjunct is needed through the end of that adjunct's first term of teaching.

How do you evaluate adjuncts in your department/college?

Do you have an overall faculty staffing plan? If so, how did you develop it and how often do you revisit and/or revise it?

What "rights" are adjuncts in your department/college entitled to once they have completed their first term of teaching?

Tell me more about how your full-time faculty and your adjunct faculty interact throughout the academic year.

Walk me through how student evaluations are utilized in your department/college.

Does your department employ peer or administrator teaching observations or evaluations? Why or why not?

Are there any documents, emails, or other official communication to/from adjuncts that you are willing to share with me?

What else would you like for me to know about your role as an administrator of adjunct faculty here at the site?

Do you have any questions for me?

Thank you for your time! Have a great day!

APPENDIX D

ALIGNMENT OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS TO GAPPA AND LESLIE’S (1993)
RECOMMENDATIONS

Adjunct Interview Question*	Gappa & Leslie (1993) Recommendation
Can you tell me more about what teaching experience you have?	Investing in Human Resources
What about any training or formal teaching preparation?	Investing in Human Resources
What about experience or training to teach online?	Investing in Human Resources
Walk me through the process of how you came to be an adjunct instructor at the study site.	Developing Fair Employment Practices and Policies
Do you have a set teaching schedule from semester to semester, or year to year? Help me understand how you see your current and future employment as an adjunct in your current department.	Using Part-Timers to Achieve Educational Objectives; Developing Fair Employment Practices and Policies
Would you mind giving me a detailed account of a typical week for you as an adjunct instructor during a recent semester-long face-to-face class you taught?	Developing Fair Employment Practices and Policies; Investing in Human Resources
Now, you may have guessed it, please describe, in detail, a typical week as an adjunct instructor of a semester-long online class you have taught.	Developing Fair Employment Practices and Policies; Investing in Human Resources
Please describe any print training materials, workshops, online course offerings, etc., that the site offered you before or during your adjunct teaching.	Investing in Human Resources
Do you have some specific examples of how your training and experience have impacted your teaching as an adjunct at the site?	Investing in Human Resources
Aside from what you just shared, how did your training impact your course design for the classes you taught?	Investing in Human Resources
How do you incorporate student or department evaluations into your course design, redesign, preparation, training plans, etc.?	Investing in Human Resources
Have you sought out training or professional development on your own that has impacted your adjunct teaching? If so, please tell me more about that.	Investing in Human Resources
Are there any teaching or training resources or strategies that you have asked for from your employing department chair or other site administrator? If so, please go into detail on how that happened from your question to the resolution.	Investing in Human Resources
*Note: The full interview guide, with opening and closing questions, is found in Appendix B.	

Administrator Interview Question*	Gappa & Leslie (1993) Recommendation
Describe any online teaching experience or training to teach online that you have had.	Investing in Human Resources
Can you tell me about what administrative experience you have?	Developing Fair Employment Practices and Policies; Investing in Human Resources
What about any training or formal preparation to be an administrator?	Developing Fair Employment Practices and Policies; Investing in Human Resources
Walk me through the process of how you came to be an administrator at the site.	Developing Fair Employment Practices and Policies; Investing in Human Resources
Tell me about any training to be an administrator that you have received either here at the site or in a previous position.	Investing in Human Resources
Describe in detail what you consider to be the culture of your department/college.	Investing in Human Resources
Please describe the role of adjuncts in your department/college.	Using Part-Timers to Achieve Educational Objectives; Investing in Human Resources
Are adjuncts invited to faculty meetings and to serve on department/college committees? Why or why not?	Investing in Human Resources
You have the chance to hire a new adjunct. Tell me more about the steps, from the moment you realize a new adjunct is needed through the end of that adjunct's first term of teaching.	Using Part-Timers to Achieve Educational Objectives; Developing Fair Employment Practices and Policies; Investing in Human Resources
How do you evaluate adjuncts in your department/college?	Using Part-Timers to Achieve Educational Objectives; Developing Fair Employment Practices and Policies; Investing in Human Resources
Do you have an overall faculty staffing plan? If so, how did you develop it and how often do you revisit and/or revise it?	Using Part-Timers to Achieve Educational Objectives
What "rights" are adjuncts in your department/college entitled to once they have completed their first term of teaching?	Developing Fair Employment Practices and Policies; Investing in Human Resources
Tell me more about how your full-time faculty and your adjunct faculty interact throughout the academic year.	Using Part-Timers to Achieve Educational Objectives; Investing in Human Resources
Walk me through how student evaluations are utilized in your department/college.	Developing Fair Employment Practices and Policies; Investing in Human Resources
Does your department employ peer or administrator teaching observations or evaluations? Why or why not?	Using Part-Timers to Achieve Educational Objectives; Investing in Human Resources
Are there documents, emails, or other official communication to/from adjuncts that you are willing to share with me?	Using Part-Timers to Achieve Educational Objectives; Developing Fair Employment Practices and Policies; Investing in Human Resources
What else would you like for me to know about	Using Part-Timers to Achieve Educational

your role as an administrator of adjunct faculty here at the site?	Objectives; Developing Fair Employment Practices and Policies; Investing in Human Resources
*Note: The full interview guide, with opening and closing questions, is found in Appendix C.	

APPENDIX E
FOCUSED CODES

Focused Codes
“you’re kind of on your own”
New hires should be trained
“light bulb”
Out-of-date
Next contract as evaluation
Feeling invisible
Online perception as reality
DLU
Response time
HR training
Practice into classroom
Abuse
Alumna/us of site
Lack of control
Confidentiality
Geography
Mentors
Office space/office hours
Teaching helps practice
Professional associations
Connection with online students
“learning on my own”
Isolation
Honor
Local prestige
“love my job”
Adjunct webpage
Hire lead time
Created class
ITU
Student course evaluation emotions
Pay
Benefits
Educator parents
Online educator course
Growth in student body
Firing adjuncts
Performance review
Knowing what questions to ask

APPENDIX F

PARTICIPANT INVITATION EMAIL

Title: Investigating Adjunct Faculty Identity and Preparation at a Southeastern Research University

Phone/Email Solicitation Script

Hello, my name is Steven Yates. I am a doctoral student at the University of Alabama. I would like to invite you to participate in a study I am conducting on the experiences of adjunct faculty members who teach part-time at a state flagship university. I am particularly interested in exploring your experiences as an adjunct faculty member who teaches or has recently taught at least one online class. I would like to be able to schedule approximately one to two hours of your time during a prearranged appointment to converse about the experiences you have had as an adjunct faculty member. I plan to audio record the interviews and ensure your anonymity by not identifying you in any way. If you are willing to participate, I will send you an additional statement about this research project including an informed consent form. Do you have any questions regarding this project? Please contact me for further information. May I send you an informed consent form and suggested times and dates for interviews?

Sincerely,

Steven Yates

APPENDIX G

STUDY CONSENT FORM

**UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
HUMAN RESEARCH PROTECTION PROGRAM**

CONSENT FORM FOR NONMEDICAL INTERVIEW STUDY

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

Individual's Consent to be in a Research Study

You are being asked to be in a research study. This study is called “Investigating Adjunct Faculty Preparation at a Southeastern Research University.” This study is being done by Steven Yates. He is a doctoral student in the College of Education at the University of Alabama.

The study is not supported by any external funding.

What is this study about?

The employment of adjunct faculty is important to the success of colleges and universities in the United States. The development of online classes and degree programs is also important to the success of colleges and universities. This study examines how adjunct faculty members at one university are prepared to teach and, specifically, how to teach online. The study will also explore how adjuncts prepare themselves for their adjunct work as well as what it means to them to be an adjunct at a southeastern research university.

Why is this study important—What good will the results do?

The findings will help college and university administrators to better understand how to prepare adjunct faculty for online teaching assignments. It will also help adjuncts to more fully understand the support structures in place for their success.

Why have I been asked to take part in this study?

You may have been identified by an administrator as an adjunct faculty member employed by the study site in at least one term over the past two academic years. You may also have been identified by another study participant as an adjunct faculty member employed by the study site.

How many other people will be in this study?

The investigator hopes to interview between 25 and 35 people over a period of four months.

What will I be asked to do in this study?

If you agree to be in this study, the investigator will interview you in a place of your own choosing about your experiences in preparing to teach and working as an adjunct for the study site. The interviewer would like to record the interview to be sure that all your words are captured accurately. However, if you do not want to be recorded, simply tell the investigator, who will then take handwritten notes.

How much time will I spend being in this study?

The interview should last about 45-60 minutes, depending on how much information about your experiences you choose to share. The investigator may ask for permission for follow-up interviews that may take additional time, but you reserve the right to exit the study at any time.

Will being in this study cost me anything?

The only cost to you from this study is your time.

Will I be compensated for being in this study?

You will not receive any payment for your participation.

What are the risks (problems or dangers) from being in this study?

The chief risk to you is that you may find the discussion of your experiences to be difficult. You can control this possibility by not being in the study, by refusing to answer a particular question, or by not telling the investigator things you find to be difficult to share.

What are the benefits of being in this study?

There are no direct benefits to you unless you find it pleasant or helpful to describe your experiences of being an adjunct faculty member at the study site. You may also feel good about knowing that you have helped researchers and higher education administrators to best support adjunct faculty members.

How will my privacy be protected?

You are free to decide where we will visit you so we can talk without being overheard. We will visit you in a place that is convenient for you.

How will my confidentiality be protected?

The only place where your name appears in connection with this study is on this informed consent. The consent forms will be kept in a locked file drawer in the investigator's office, which is locked when he is not there. We are not using a name-number list so there is no way to link a consent form to an interview. When we record the interview, we will not use your name, so no one will know who you are on the tape. Once back in the office, the investigator will listen to the tape and type out the interview. When the interviews have been typed, the recording will be destroyed. This should occur within one month of the interview. You may also refuse to be recorded, in which case the interviewer will take handwritten notes.

The investigator will write his dissertation and research articles on this study, but participants will be identified only as "adjunct faculty members from a state flagship university in the southeastern United States." No one will be able to recognize you.

What are the alternatives to being in this study?

The only alternative is not to participate.

What are my rights as a participant?

Being in this study is totally voluntary. It is your free choice. You may choose not to be in it at all. If you start the study, you can stop at any time. Not participating or stopping participation will have no effect on your relationships with the study site.

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board is a committee that looks out for the ethical treatment of people in research studies. They may review the study records if they wish. This is to be sure that people in research studies are being treated fairly and that the study is being carried out as planned.

Who do I call if I have questions or problems?

If you have questions about this study right now, please ask them. If you have questions later on, please call Steven Yates at 205-826-3303. If you have questions or complaints about your rights as a research participant, call Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer of the University, at 205-348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877-820-3066.

You may also ask questions, make suggestions, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html or email the Research Compliance office at participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu.

After you participate, you are encouraged to complete the survey for research participants that is online at the outreach website or you may ask the investigator for a copy of it and mail it to the University Office for Research Compliance, Box 870127, 358 Rose Administration Building, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0127.

I have read this consent form. I have had a chance to ask questions. I agree to take part in the study.

Signature of Research Participant

Date

Signature of Investigator

Date

APPENDIX H

IRB APPROVAL



September 20, 2016

Steven Yates



Re: IRB # 16-OR-314, "Investigating Adjunct Faculty Preparation for Online Teaching and their Experiences at a Southeastern Research University"

Dear Mr. Yates:

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted approval for your proposed research.

Your application has been given expedited approval according to 45 CFR part 46. Approval has been given under expedited review category 7 as outlined below:

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

Your application will expire on September 19, 2017. If your research will continue beyond this date, please complete the relevant portions of the IRB Renewal Application. If you wish to modify the application, please complete the Modification of an Approved Protocol Form. Changes in this study cannot be initiated without IRB approval, except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants. When the study closes, please complete the Request for Study Closure Form.

Please use reproductions of the IRB approved stamped consent forms to obtain consent from your participants.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this proposal, please include the above application number.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,



T. Myles, MSM, CIM, CIP
Director & Research Compliance Officer
Office for Research Compliance