

THE PROPER CARE AND FEEDING OF
ADJUNCT FACULTY
A QUALITATIVE MULTI-SITE
CASE STUDY: THE INTEGRATION OF PART-TIME
ADJUNCT FACULTY WITHIN THE HIERARCHICAL
ORGANIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

By

DEENA K. FISHER

Bachelor of Arts
Southwestern Oklahoma State University
Weatherford, Oklahoma
1979

Master of Education
Social Science Specialization and School Counselor
Southwestern Oklahoma State University
Weatherford, Oklahoma
1983 and 1999

Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate College of
Oklahoma State University
In partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
DOCTORATE OF EDUCATION
December, 2004

THE PROPER CARE AND FEEDING OF
ADJUNCT FACULTY
A QUALITATIVE MULTI-SITE
CASE STUDY: THE INTEGRATION OF PART-TIME
ADJUNCT FACULTY WITHIN THE HIERARCHICAL
ORGANIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

BY DEENA K. FISHER

Dissertation Approved:

Adrienne Hyle
Dissertation Adviser

Robin Hughes

Timothy Pettibone

John Steinbrink

A. Gordon Emslie
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to thank the gatekeepers for their help in making the arrangements for me to visit the two universities chosen for this case study.

A very special thank you goes to all the anonymous participants for sharing their insights and perspectives for this study on adjunct faculty integration in higher education.

Finally, I want to thank my dissertation chair at Oklahoma State University, Dr. Adrienne Hyle, for contributing her time, thoughts, expertise, and advice with me. I am truly grateful to Dr. Hyle and feel blessed to have such a caring educator to guide me through the dissertation process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. DESIGN OF THE STUDY.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Purpose of the Study/Research Objectives	7
Orienting Theoretical/Conceptual Framework	7
Procedures.....	8
Researcher.....	9
Data Needs.....	11
Data Sources	11
Data Collection	12
Data Analysis.....	14
Research Criteria.....	15
Significance of the Study	17
Research.....	18
Practice.....	18
Theory	19
Summary	19
Reporting.....	19
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	20
The Adjunct	20
The Power of Privilege	23
The Indifference of Full-Time Faculty	27
The Hierarchical Power of a Bureaucracy	30
The Impact on Students	36
Toward an Integrated Approach	37
Socialization Opportunities.....	40
Learning Organization Theory.....	42
Chapter Summary	46
III. PRESENTATION OF THE DATA.....	47
Procedures.....	47
Data Collection	48
Research Sites.....	49
Case Study A.....	49

Case Study B.....	53
Participants.....	57
Interviews.....	60
Reporting.....	62
Presentation of the Data.....	62
The Meaning of Adjunct Integration.....	63
The “Meaning” of Adjunct Faculty Integration.....	70
Viewpoints Over More Integration.....	76
Ways Adjuncts are Integrated in Day-to-Day Practice.....	84
Opportunities for Integration at the.....	
University/Administrative Level.....	85
University Governance.....	85
Orientation.....	87
Adjunct Faculty Handbooks.....	89
Office Space.....	91
Temporary Full-Time Positions.....	93
University Parking Privilege.....	99
Opportunities for Integration at the Department Level....	102
Department Orientation Sessions.....	102
Department Meetings.....	104
Mentoring Adjuncts.....	119
Professional Development.....	127
Networking Opportunities.....	133
Satisfaction of the Adjunct Faculty.....	136
Roadblocks to Integration.....	142
Organizational Structure’s Effect on Adjunct Integration.....	151
Summary.....	157
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.....	163
Systems Thinking.....	164
Shared Vision.....	168
Mental Models.....	171
Team Learning.....	175
Personal Mastery.....	177
Summary.....	182
Explanations for Adjunct/Part-time Integration.....	182
No Explanation for Adjunct/Part-Time Integration.....	184
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND COMMENTARY ...	186
Summary.....	186
Findings.....	188
Systems Thinking.....	188
Shared Vision.....	190

	Mental Models	191
	Team Learning	193
	Personal Mastery.....	194
	Conclusion	195
	Implications and Recommendations	199
	Implication for Research.....	200
	Implication for Theory	202
	Implication for Practice.....	204
	Concluding Remarks.....	208
VI.	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	211
VII.	APPENDIXES	219
	APPENDIX A – EXAMPLE OF COVER LETTER	219
	RESEARCH CONSENT FORM.....	220
	APPENDIX B- INTERVIEW PROTOCOL	221
	APPENDIX C- CASE STUDY A/FOLLOW-UP LETTER	225
	CASE STUDY B/FOLLOW-UP LETTER	226
	APPENDIX D- ADJUNCT FACULTY HANDBOOK ARLINGTON .	
	UNIVERSITY.....	227
	APPENDIX E- FACULTY HANDBOOK BEDFORD UNIVERSITY	
	TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	228

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Demographic Table.....	59

CHAPTER ONE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

In the first administrator's meeting of the fiscal year 2003, at a university located in a Midwestern state, the new vice-president of academic affairs handed out the agenda. Item four on the agenda stood out on the page with three simple words: Adjunct Faculty Orientation. When the discussion of the group turned to the fourth item, the vice-president of academic affairs explained that with the increasing reliance of the university on adjunct faculty services, it is time to better inform adjunct faculty, the non-permanent faculty hired semester to semester, about the academic happenings on the campus.

He emphasized that the orientation session is a first step toward getting to know the adjunct faculty member better and for the adjunct faculty member to know "us" better. He lamented that the pay for adjunct faculty is low and, in the current economic climate, that is not going to change this budget year. However, he hoped the orientation session will prove to be beneficial in helping the adjunct faculty feel appreciated and more a part of the university. He concluded by asking the academic deans how the adjunct faculty are being included in their various departments. The request was followed by silence as the academic deans looked at each other quietly searching their minds for examples of adjunct inclusion within their departments.

Non-permanent faculty, part-time or adjunct faculty play an important role in higher education. Lack of adequate state funding plus growing enrollment can put a strain on university purse strings. Therefore, part-time/adjuncts are needed to keep costs down, to add flexibility to the scheduled course offerings, to keep faculty-to-student ratio reasonable, to help during enrollment surges, and to teach classes that regular faculty do

not want to teach (Bach, 1999; Fulton, 2000; Moser, 2000; Rhoades, 1996; Shumar, 1999).

As for the part-time/adjunct faculty members, they cite the need for extra income, the prestige of teaching in higher education, the need to stay current in their particular field, and the hope of a more permanent position with the institution as motivation factors for accepting a part-time, non-permanent faculty position (Church, 1999; Fulton, 2000; Leslie & Gappa, 1993). “These faculty members are not short-term casual labor. The average part-time faculty member has been employed at the same institution for 5.4 years. More than one-fourth of the total number of part-time faculty members have taught eight or more years at the same institution” (Bach, 1999, p. 1). The U. S. Department of Education (2002) study reports that six years is the average time at the same institution.

Higher education institutions are becoming increasingly dependent on part-time/adjunct employees. These “contingent professionals now make up approximately 60% of all faculty in the United States; their proportion relative to tenured faculty has grown by about 1% a year since early 1970’s” (Moser, 2000, p.2). In addition, the increasing use of part-time/adjunct faculty gives these part-time/adjuncts a more visible presence in academe. The higher visibility is slowly and increasingly raising the consciousness of administrators and full-time faculty in understanding the experiences part-time/adjunct (temporary) faculty face within the university environment (American Association of University Professors, 2001; American Federation of Teachers, 2002; Bach, 1999; Rhoades, 1996).

The American Association of University Professors (2001) has called for more of a group effort and coalition building between full and part-time faculty. In fact, AAUP representative, Richard Moser (2000) states in *ACADEME*, “By acting in unison (for all university workers) and advancing the conditions under which academic freedom, due process, and shared governance can flourish, we set the example of community and citizenship” (p. 5).

The American Association of University Professors (2001) and the American Federation of Teachers (2002) have issued reports containing standards for the fairer treatment of adjuncts and have called for increased collaboration between full and part-time faculty. Both research reports recommend the following concerning adjuncts:

- Opportunity for professional advancement
- Regular evaluation based on established criteria consistent with responsibilities
- Opportunity for appeal or grievance in the event of allegedly substantial violations of procedure, discrimination, or denial of academic freedom
- Access to all regular departmental communication
- Integration in collegial processes related to contractual responsibilities for teaching and curricular planning

Concerning adjunct faculty working conditions, several recent studies uncover that adjunct faculty members lack status, recognition, social and professional development opportunities, professional courtesy, sick leave, insurance, and due process rights, and networking opportunities (American Association of University Professors, 2001; American Federation of Teachers, 2002; Bach, 1999; Hodkinson, 2003; Leslie &

Gappa, 1993; U. S. Department of Education, 2001). The American Federation of Teachers (2002) report purports that “the surest way to address institutional isolation among part-time/adjunct faculty is not by excluding them from faculty decision-making, but by including them in every way possible” (p. 15).

Roadblocks exist that hinder collaboration among administrators, faculty, and adjuncts. In higher education across the United States, the institutional bureaucracy houses a hierarchical pecking order with adjuncts at the lower end of the hierarchy. The bureaucracy protects the hierarchical power structure of top-down management and perpetuates fears that empowering adjuncts will make others in the organization less powerful (Banachowski, 1997; Church, 1999; Shumar, 1999).

To some full-time faculty members, the adjunct represents both an economic and security threat (Church, 1999; Dubson, 2001; Fulton, 2000; Leslie & Gappa, 1993). Faculty do not understand from the administrator’s viewpoint that the economic reliance on adjunct faculty “are not budgetary priorities, they are bottom-of-the barrel realities. Most state-supported colleges are not fully funded” (Fulton, 2000, p. 4). Therefore, adjuncts “alarm full-time faculty by taking away full-time positions and extra pay for course overloads” (Banachowski, 1997, p. 2). Furthermore, faculty may view the growing use of part-time/adjunct faculty as a threat to the tenure system and believe that their use depresses salaries (Banachowski, 1997; Church, 1999; Fulton, 2000; Leslie & Gappa, 1993). Moreover, adjuncts lack status and credentials in a system where faculty promotions are based on moving from junior status to senior in order to gain tenure and acceptance into a “community of scholars” (Church, 1999; Fulton, 2000; Shumar, 1999).

Therefore, adjuncts may become marginalized, and their needs unrecognized or ignored within the higher education institutional status system and bureaucratic (based on chain of command and hierarchical power) organizational structure. Cox (2000) calls the present system a “structural catastrophe” that is centered in a tenure system working within a bureaucracy that takes little notice of part-time employees while at the same time is highly dependent upon their services. As Dubson’s (2001) research findings conclude, “The adjunct system is not simply a problem in one place, it is a systemic problem across higher education” (p. v.). Rice (1996) emphasizes, “The complex problems we are going to face in the future require not only collaboration between faculty and administration, but walls separating faculty, administration, and staff become increasingly permeable” (p. 28).

Research well documents the poor working conditions and discrimination many adjunct faculty face. Emerging research is calling for more collaboration and integration of the adjunct faculty member and fairer working conditions. However, there is little research on how the call for integration is actually taking place. Further research is needed to understand what integration means to the adjunct instructor and the university that employs them. In addition, little research exists that explores in what ways the hierarchical organizational structure embedded in the higher education systems can foster integration.

Statement of the Problem

Research indicates that in colleges and universities across the nation, it is not uncommon for 40% to 60% of a university’s faculty to be comprised of part-time/adjunct faculty (American Association of University Professors, 2001; American Federation of

Teachers, 2002; U. S. Department of Education, 2002). Justification for the growing use of adjunct faculty is that adjuncts are needed during enrollment surges and economic downturns to keep costs down and allow more classes to be offered (Bach, 1999; Fulton, 2000; Moser, 2000).

However, despite the increased dependence on part-time/adjunct faculty, research indicates that they “are not integrated into the life of the programs in which they are teaching (by invitation to department meetings) or to the academic community (by support for their research and professional development)” (American Historical Association, 2001, pp. 4-5). Adjunct faculty lack status and recognition, value and respect, social and professional development opportunities, collegiality and professional courtesy, information and networking opportunities, adequate compensation and empowerment (American Association of University Professors, 2001; American Federation of Teachers, 2002; Bach, 1999; Dubson, 2001; Leslie & Gappa, 1993).

While the lack of power, status, recognition, and networking opportunities are well established by existing research, there is not a coherent theoretical framework that explains the nature and level of adjunct faculty integration into the complex hierarchical structure of higher education. The hierarchical organizational structure of higher education takes little notice of part-time/adjunct faculty while, at the same time, is highly dependent upon this service (Cox, 2000; Dubson, 2001; Hodkinson, 2003; Moser, 2000; Rhoades, 1996; Shumar, 1999). Senge’s (1994) learning organization model provides a framework by which to examine the underlying structures needed for integration to take place. Senge’s (1994) conceptual framework may help illuminate the causes of the problem and may offer lessons on how the adjuncts’ situation might be more supported.

Purpose of the Study/Research Objectives

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore and gain insight into part-time/adjunct faculty integration within the hierarchical organizational structure of higher education. The following questions served to drive this study:

1. How is adjunct/part-time faculty integration described by higher education administrators, department heads, and part-time faculty?
2. In what ways does Senge's learning organization model (1994) explain these descriptions of adjunct/part-time faculty integration?
3. In what ways does it not?

Orienting Theoretical/Conceptual Framework

According to Senge (1994), bureaucracies are based on the chain of command, hierarchical power, and specialized experts who do not always see their connection to the rest of the organization. These bureaucratic organizations hoard information and power at the top levels of management. Under this system, participants fail to see their interrelationships and interdependence on each other and to the effective operation of the system as a whole. This can lead to competition and isolation within the organizational structure. The system often fails to become a cooperative learning organization.

To determine to what extent cooperation and inclusion is happening in an organization, Senge (1994) examined five areas (systems thinking, shared vision, mental models, team learning, and personal mastery) he calls disciplines. The five disciplines are used to view power relationships, circle of causality, and patterns by examining in what ways employees (regardless of their hierarchical rank) see their interconnection with each other. Senge's (1994) model views human capital in the organization by

exploring how employees view their interdependence in making the organization function effectively (called systems thinking), in having common goals not directly imposed on them (called shared vision), in dropping any false assumptions surrounding each other and opening a dialogue with each other (called mental models), in fostering group empowerment for effective team building (called team learning), and in empowering the individual members to reach their full potential (called personal mastery).

Dever (1997) believes the five disciplines outlined by Senge (1994) have great appeal for educational institutions. “Systems thinking, personal mastery, mental models, building shared vision, and team learning are compatible enough with traditional values in higher education to appeal to both the academic and administrative sides of the house” (Dever, 1997, p. 1). Furthermore,

The learning organizational model and associated disciplines hold great promise for helping to reconceptualize and invigorate collegial practices characteristic of higher education. Building on a foundation that prizes the mastery of self-directed professionals and honors the practice of participative decision-making, colleges and universities are well suited to use mental modeling and systems thinking to critique their own organizational structures and processes. (Dever, 1997, p. 4)

The five-discipline model for developing supportive learning organizations was the lens used to view an adjunct’s integration within the hierarchical organizational structure.

Procedures

To gain multiple perspectives and an in-depth insight into the integration of adjunct faculty within the hierarchical organizational structure of higher education, a

multi-site and multiple source explanatory case study was conducted (Creswell, 1998; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2003). In this procedures section, the researcher, data needs, data sources, data collection, data analysis and research criteria are discussed.

Researcher

I have had experience as an adjunct instructor with two universities—one a community college and the other a regional university. Therefore, I have first-hand knowledge of what it is like to be an adjunct instructor. I believe this prior experience as an adjunct gives me added insight into the “need for” and “problems associated” with the adjunct experience in higher education.

Presently, I am the dean of a branch campus located 75 miles from the main regional university campus. Even though I am an administrator, I am still somewhat perceived as an outsider due to my location. I teach one or two courses a semester (in addition to my administrative responsibilities), but here again, I am not perceived as full-time faculty. I work with full-time faculty and adjuncts, but I do not directly hire them. Their respective academic deans and department chairs do the actual hiring. However, I am asked for recommendations and input.

My own experience as a former adjunct faculty member has been shaped by the perception that part-time faculty should be treated as professionals and integrated into the university environment. Once, the department chair did not tell me until 4:30 p.m. that I was hired to teach a class that night beginning at 6:30 p.m. In addition, I never attended a department meeting even though I had been an adjunct instructor for six years. When communication occurred with the department chair, I had to initiate it. He was always

courteous but distant. The lack of information and contact with the department was frustrating.

An adjunct (nearing completion of his doctoral studies) was not notified by his department chair of the final exam schedule for his night class. He had to call me to confirm that the date the students were telling him was indeed the correct one. The department chair had not returned his phone calls on the matter. In addition, another part-time instructor, who teaches master's level psychology classes, was given the wrong day to report for his first class meeting. The department chair had simply gotten so busy that he neglected to tell the instructor the day had been changed. However, he had contacted the students.

I suspect that there may be a better way to treat and include the adjunct faculty in academe. Thus, my research journey began with my own desire to gain insight on how adjuncts might be better integrated into the university environment. I recognize and accept the position that I am in while conducting research for this study. I believe I bring a unique perspective having once served as an adjunct (off and on for ten years) and now as an administrator for the past five years.

I worked to control bias by ensuring that my research met the standards of academic rigor for a qualitative case study. I used multiple interviews, multiple data collection strategies, member checks, and peer debriefing. This multi-site case study allowed for rich, thick, detailed description (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) to “build an in-depth picture of the case” (Creswell, 1998, p. 123) by rigorous data collection and analysis.

Data Needs

The data needed for this case study centered on rich, thick, detailed descriptions of what adjunct integration meant as described by higher education part-time adjunct faculty, department heads, and administrators. In addition, based on the description of integration provided by the participant, I needed to know to what extent adjunct integration was taking place at their respective university campuses.

Data Sources

Two universities, which were different sizes and at different locations, served as settings for this multi-site case study. Information was gathered from multiple sources by examining documents, records, and interviews of administrators, department heads, and part-time faculty at each site location. This use of multiple sources of information helped provide the thick description and depth that case studies are noted for in research (Creswell, 1998; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2003).

Boundaries exist such as time, location, and interrelated parts in case study research (Creswell, 1998; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2003). In this research project, the case study was bounded by a multi-site location in two separate regional universities located at two different geographical sites 200 miles apart in a Midwestern state. The two regional universities selected for this multi-site case study had in common that they are part of the six state-supported regional university system operating under the same governing board of regents. In addition, all of the regional universities offer bachelor's and master's degrees to their constituents. The two universities were selected based on their size and location. The university's size was determined by student and faculty populations. Therefore, one mid-sized university (Case Study A), and one large-

sized university (Case Study B) from the six regional university system were selected. In addition, one university location was in a rural area and the other in an urban area. Since this study examined the hierarchical organizational system, the question of size and the location of the organization may be factors. Multiple sources of evidence were gathered and patterns analyzed from the multi-site (and multiple source) case study of these two universities.

In addition, part-time/adjunct faculty were employed by the university system for at least three years. Research reports that most adjunct faculty report working at an educational institution on an average of six years (American Association of University Professors, 2001; Bach, 1999; U.S. Department of Education, 2002). Leslie and Gappa (1993) place adjunct faculty into four categories: career-ended, freelancer, aspiring academics, and expert/specialist. For this case study, the adjuncts coined “aspiring academics” or “expert/specialist” were interviewed for their insight into the meaning of integration because they were typically employed longer at the same university and tended to feel more connected with the university environment where they worked (Bach, 1999; Dubson, 2001; Leslie & Gappa, 1993).

Data Collection

The information collected for this (multi-site, multiple source) case study was gathered from site visitations, observations, open-ended interviews with administrators, department heads, and adjunct faculty. In addition, relevant documents and university records were examined at each site of the case study.

I visited each site for five days to observe, make field notes, conduct interviews, and analyze documents and public university records. I worked at building a rapport at

each research site (Creswell, 1998). The data collected occurred during the winter and spring of the 2003-2004 academic year in the months of March and April, 2004

Open-ended interviews were conducted at each university location. Six adjunct faculty members, three department chairs, and three administrators (academic deans and/or the vice president of academic affairs) were interviewed one-on-one. Seven open-ended questions were asked of each participant (Appendix A) based on Senge's learning organization model. The seven open-ended questions were similar for each group of participants, however, they were constructed in such a way to reflect the differences in the participants' positions, power, and responsibilities within the university hierarchical structure. The participants were carefully and purposefully selected for this study (Merriam, 1998). The common link that bound the participants was their direct connection to the adjunct experience in higher education. A vice president and an academic dean were the gatekeepers for the research and helped select the participants. Permission was obtained before the site visit and interviews took place. A quiet location was selected with the help of the gatekeeper, and the sessions were audio taped. The participants were told in advance that they were being taped. In addition, they signed a Consent Form for the research (see Appendix A).

I took my own notes while each of the interviews were being taped (Creswell, 1998; Mertens, 1998). I wrote up my field notes and observations within 24 hours of each interview. Every effort to meet standards of credibility and trustworthiness was taken. All interviews and documentation were accurately presented. At each site of the case study, documents and university records were examined. The universities' mission

statement, strategic plan, North Central Accreditation reports, fact books, budget reports, and Web sites were collected and examined.

Data Analysis

After collecting the data, I made sense of the information by carefully sorting, forming categories, clustering topics, and accurately transcribing notes used for portraying the stories of the participants. From the multi-site cases and multiple sources, gathered data were examined for emerging themes, patterns, comparisons, and emotions by looking through the lens of Senge's (1994) learning organization for evidence of systems thinking, shared vision, mental models, team learning, and personal mastery in their policies and practices concerning the inclusion of adjunct faculty.

Senge's (1994) learning organization presented a promising framework to analyze power relationships in organizations, circles of causality, and patterns that either support or prevent collaboration and integration. By using the five-discipline model for developing supportive learning organizations, the adjunct's interaction with administration and department heads in higher education was analyzed. For example, interview questions and documents were analyzed concerning the adjunct's participation in the strategic planning process of the university (systems thinking), setting of department goals (shared vision), social networking and dialogue opportunities with colleagues (mental models), attendance at professional meetings (team learning), and professional development (personal mastery).

From the observations and transcripts of the interviews, a thick, detailed description emerged from the data collected (Creswell, 1998; Merriam, 1998; Mertens, 1998; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2003) and gave a clearer picture of integration (through the lens

of the learning organization model) at these two regional universities. In addition, analysis focused on how useful Senge's (1994) learning organization model was in examining patterns, themes, comparisons, and categories that lead to understanding factors that help or hinder integration of the adjunct. The data analysis took place in the winter/spring of 2003-2004.

Research Criteria

In the constructionist framework, the researcher and the participant are interactively linked. "All interpretive inquirers watch, listen, ask, record, and examine" (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, p. 119). The researcher and the participants are in a cooperative agreement. The researcher must develop trust. Constructivists interpret their results with the help of the participants. Mertens (1998) further explains, "Interpersonal validity refers to the soundness or trustworthiness of understanding emanating from personal interactions" (p. 240). The researcher must promote trustworthiness, credibility, and authenticity in order for the findings to be considered sound and "confirm that the data and the interpretations are not figments of the researcher's imagination" (p. 299). The researcher should keep a journal that is self-reflective of emotions, bias, and personal history. The researcher should acknowledge any bias. As Lincoln and Guba (1985) point out, "Trustworthiness will be judged by readers who personally ascertain the fit between what they read and what they know and have experienced" (LeCompte, Millroy & Preissle, 1992, p. 717).

The following safeguards, based on criteria set forth by Lincoln and Guba (1985), were taken to ensure credibility (that the researcher portrays the participants' viewpoints truthfully and accurately), transferability (that the descriptions are detailed enough that

generalizations and comparisons can relate to other situations), dependability (that the researcher reports in detail the methods and protocol used), confirmability (that the researcher's interpretations and conclusions can be supported by the data), and authenticity (that the research presents a balanced view of the perspectives of the participants):

- A multi-site, multiple source case study was conducted for multiple perspectives reporting.
- Triangulation of data included multiple source interviews, site visitation, observations, and document analysis.
- A confidentiality statement was presented to the participants, both orally and in written form, and a consent form was used.
- The researcher was knowledgeable in the protocol for open-ended interviewing techniques and explained the protocol to the participants and gatekeeper.
- Participants were involved in member checks for accuracy in reporting their perspectives.
- An accurate portrayal of the interview was reported with detailed field notes taken and interviews audio taped. A follow-up interview was conducted to check the meanings and truthfulness of the data analysis.
- On-site observations and interviews took place for five days at each site of the case study.
- The researcher's bias was explained in the dissertation proposal.

- A rich, thick, detailed description was written in this case study to add to the previous knowledge and in any future study of the adjunct experience in higher education.

(Creswell, 1998; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998; Mertens, 1998; Yin, 2003)

In addition, peer debriefing (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994) was used. Dr. Adrienne Hyle, my dissertation chair, served in this role.

Significance of the Study

Despite today's increased dependence on adjunct faculty, research indicated that adjunct faculty were not receiving adequate support to do their job in the best possible way. It was in the best interest of all the stakeholders in education in the 21st century to examine the relationship that existed among administrators, department heads, and part-time faculty that prevented their collaboration. The research helped gain insight with the challenge for education in the 21st century to find specific ways that part-time and full-time faculty can work together within a spirit of respect that enriches the educational community. This research was significant in extending our knowledge and understanding of the part-time/adjunct inclusion and/or exclusion within the university environment. Research was collected and analyzed from the words, feelings, emotions, and stories shared by administrators, full-time faculty, part-time/adjunct faculty, and from public documents and records.

In addition, patterns and themes were examined that connected to the learning organization model developed by Senge for added analysis and insight. According to Senge (1994), "Systems thinking is a conceptual framework . . . to make full patterns clearer, and to help us see how to change them effectively" (p. 7). This case study

research not only used the data collected to examine and document findings, but also for analyzing lessons learned from the study. Therefore, this study proved valuable to current research, practice, and theory.

Research

Prior research on part-time/adjunct faculty had focused mainly on the exploitation of adjunct faculty. Research needed to go further than the documentation of discrimination against adjunct faculty. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the ways that higher education institutions integrate adjunct faculty into their institutional culture. This research study added to the emerging research literature in this important area. Furthermore, this research proved timely, especially with the increasing use of part-time/adjunct faculty at all levels of higher education institutions. More research was needed to understand how hierarchical power structures of tenure, promotion, and bureaucratic power affected the integration and collaboration between full-time and part-time/adjunct faculty.

Practice

Faculty, administrators, and students need excellent adjuncts. An integrated faculty would aid in retaining highly qualified faculty. Research indicated that part-time/adjunct faculty members were not receiving adequate support to do their jobs in the best possible way. The students would gain the most by allowing part-time/adjuncts to better participate in the academic environment. In their classes, they would be taught with well trained, well respected, well informed, and well prepared instructors, regardless of full-time or part-time faculty status. In addition, insight was explored on what it meant to treat each other as colleagues in higher education.

Theory

Senge (1994) presented a model for developing a learning organization that was more inclusive in its approach to organizational change. Senge's learning organization presented a theoretical model based on interrelationships and interdependence on each other, not on chain of command and hierarchical power. This study examined Senge's learning organization as a theory in understanding the changes needed within the organizational structure of higher education to allow for more collaboration and integration of part-time/adjunct faculty in the institutional organization.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to use Senge's (1994) learning organization model as a lens for examining the integration of adjunct/part-time faculty in the university environment. Qualitative methods through a multi-site case study were used to gain more insight, multiple perspectives, and meanings about the adjunct experience in higher education. This study used the interpretive/constructivist paradigm to understand attitudes, emotions, beliefs, and feelings rather than measuring them (Mertens, 1998).

Reporting

Chapter Two reviewed the literature on adjunct faculty and Senge's (1994) community learning model. Chapter Three presented the data collected for the study. Chapter Four provided the analysis and interpretation of the data. The summary, implications, conclusions, and recommendations were presented in Chapter Five, the final chapter.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter presents an extensive review of research centering on the adjunct experience as well as Senge's (1994) learning organization model. From this review of the literature, the problem statement, purpose, and significance of my study concerning the integration of adjunct faculty within higher education emerged. A profile of the adjunct faculty member is presented as well as the attitude and experiences adjuncts face while interacting with staff, faculty, and administrators in academe. In addition, the call for a more integrated approach when working with adjunct faculty is reported.

I found, through the literature review, there was little research on how the integration of adjunct faculty is taking place. Furthermore, I found there was little research on what integration means to the adjunct instructors and the university that employs them. Senge's (1994) learning organization model provides a useful lens to view the organizational system on the inclusion of employees and offers relevant insight on how to overcome any obstacles to integration. My research builds on previous studies as presented in this literature review and added new insight in understanding the adjunct faculty experiences inside academe.

The Adjunct

The 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF: 93) included 377,000 part-time instructional faculty and staff. The report released through the United States Department of Education (2002) presents a profile of the adjunct. The quantitative data collected suggest the average age of an adjunct (temporary part-time, non-tenured faculty) at two and four-year institutions was 46 years old. Adjunct part-time faculty

members were more likely to be female (45%). Most adjunct part-time faculty and staff are white (87%) and married (75%). The majority of adjuncts hold the academic rank of instructor (69%). Most adjuncts (60%) work on a term-by-term contract. Adjuncts generally worked at the same college or university for an average of six years. At least 12% of the adjunct part-time faculty reported union membership. Adjunct part-time faculty reported spending 34 hours per week at their job assignment and reported teaching an average of two undergraduate classes a semester and 0.2 graduate classes. In addition, about one-half (49%) of part-time faculty held one other job. According to the data collected in the report, 42% of all faculty in four-year institutions are part-time and 62% of all faculty in two-year institutions are part time (Note: Graduate assistants were not included in the data).

The motivation for working part-time ranged from wanting to be a part of the academic environment (70%), to preferring working part-time for family reasons (50%), and to working part-time because full-time employment was unavailable (U. S. Department of Education, 2002). In addition, adjunct faculty cite the need for extra income, the prestige of teaching in higher education, the need to stay current in their particular field, and the hope of a more permanent position with the institution as motivation factors for accepting a part-time position (Church, 1999; Dubson, 2001; Fulton, 2000; Valadez & Anthony, 2001).

Moreover, when attempting to document any average profile of part-time faculty, the language used to identify adjunct faculty is confusing, and, therefore, becomes important to understand and analyze. In a review of literature over the adjunct experience, the word “part-timers” is sometimes used to denote almost a nomadic faculty

(Church, 1999; Dubson, 2001; Shumar, 1999), while authors/researchers who use the words “part-time faculty” (Fulton, 2000; Rhoades, 1996) seem to refer to a more semi-permanent (working more than a year as an adjunct) instructor. In addition, the words “adjunct” and “graduate student” were used to denote a more permanent, established (teaching for several years) temporary instructor (Cox, 2000; Leslie & Gappa, 1993). The term adjunct seems to refer to a non-permanent faculty with more educational expertise. In the literature articles, the American Association of University Professors preferred the term or language “contingent professionals” or “paraprofessionals” (Bach, 1999; Moser, 2000; Townsend, 2000). In the areas where adjuncts have tried to organize nationally, they refer to their group as the Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor (COCAL) (Leatherman, 2001; Saltzman, 2000). Virtually all of the research articles, reports, studies, and oral histories surrounding the adjunct experience show a seesawing back and forth within articles on the terms part-timers, part-time, and adjunct.

In addition, the research language of the constructivist seeks more understanding and awareness of the adjuncts’ plight. The language used by postmodern and critical theorists (through the lens of class theory) describes the adjuncts’ condition as disturbing and promoting a class-divided society. They speak of “faculty apartheid,” “the ghettolization [*sic*] of labor,” or the “university caste system” (Church, 1999; Di Giacomo, 1999; Dubson, 2001; Shumar, 1999). Whatever the term used, part-timers, part-time faculty, adjunct, graduate students, paraprofessionals, or contingent academic labor, the research literature indicates evidence of unequal treatment. The literature review seems to bear out the need for more understanding and awareness of the adjunct experience in higher education to improve relationships among colleagues.

The Power of Privilege

To some full-time faculty members, adjuncts represent both an economic and security threat. Church (1999) writes about his seven-year experience as an adjunct faculty member (before reaching full-time faculty member status). He states that the sting and the pain of his non-acceptance from his colleagues still haunt him. As Church (1999) relates, “I was somehow an asset because I was skilled, cheap, and desperate” (p. 2). Church (1999) calls himself a “ghost . . . made invisible within the university caste system” (p. 1). In the seven years he served as an adjunct, he was never asked to attend a department meeting nor given a desk of his own. “For the students, I was a full-time presence credited with expertise, authority, and a certain sympathy for the struggles of their life’s situation, but this could only be maintained if I always appeared absent to the faculty. So I met with students invisibly” (Church, 1999, p. 4). Church goes on to explain he had an invisible job, an invisible office, and an invisible desk. Furthermore, he felt that even if the offer of some shared space were made, “to take up the offer and not decline it at the same time, would mean encroaching on professional entitlement and status” (Church, 1999, p. 4).

Dubson (2001) recounts the stories of many in his collection of 27 essays. A 12-year veteran adjunct states, “I shared a dingy office with twenty other instructors, and some semesters I was lucky to find a chair to perch on during my office hours. I often met with students in the hallway because it was quieter than the office” (Dubson, 2001, p. 147). Another eight-year veteran adjunct (at a different college) explained, “We have no health insurance, retirement benefits, or preference in hiring when a full-time position opened. Adjuncts had no office space where they could meet with students, no phone to

use, and no room to sit down in for coffee breaks or lunch. I held many of my student conferences in the front seat of my vehicle” (p. 63).

Emerging research indicates the adjuncts’ lack of professional treatment on issues of class size, textbook selection, curriculum concerns, compensation, and office accommodations (Dubson, 2001; Fulton, 2000; Hodkinson, 2003; Lane, 2002; Leslie & Gappa, 1993; Moser, 2000). In a recently released government study conducted by the United States Department of Education (2002) on part-time instructional faculty and staff, quantitative data collected (from 377,000 part-time employees) found that “part-time faculty were ten times as likely (33%) to report office space was ‘not available’ or ‘not applicable’ to them” (p. 21). Moreover, Shumar (1999) points out that “to raise the voice challenge is to threaten their very strategy of survival, because without tenure, temporary faculty can be fired. In fact, they are so marginal they don’t even need to be fired to be silenced. They can just not be rehired.” (p. 9).

Dubson (2001) recounts that many of the writers telling their experiences as adjuncts for publication “are afraid, and their manuscripts were delivered with enormous amounts of trepidation, fear of the retribution and terrorism found only in academic departments” (Dubson, 2001, p. v). Therefore, fabricated names were used. As one of the writers laments after working at a college for eight years as an adjunct, “when the school system ordered that cuts be made for budgetary reasons, I was axed, even though I had been with the college longer than more than half of its full-timers, had better student evaluations than almost all of them, and taught in areas of high student demand” (p. 59).

Another essay found in the Dubson (2001) book has yet another eight-year adjunct, this time at a community college located in the Southwest, recalling the time she

got involved in the Adjunct Faculty Association and represented part-time faculty concerns (for three years) in the faculty senate.

I was let go. Without a ‘thank you.’ Without an explanation. All the most-involved adjuncts on our campus suffered a similar fate. All the committed and dedicated adjuncts who cared enough about teaching and the college to want to do more than ‘teach their one class and go home’ are now *personae non grata* at the local community college. (Dubson, 2001, p. 68)

Part-time faculty are becoming increasingly more vocal and are trying to unionize for better pay, benefits, and working conditions (Leatherman, 2001; Saltzman, 2000; U. S. Department of Education, 2002). However, only 12% of the adjunct work force belongs to a union (U. S. Department of Education, 2002). However, for many of the adjuncts, the pain of non-acceptance that is inflicted by their own colleagues seems to do the most damage (Church, 1999; Dubson, 2001; Gappa & Leslie, 1997; Leslie & Gappa, 1993; Moser, 2000).

Many adjuncts “resent the uncollegial treatment they receive and are frustrated by the impediments to good teaching performance they must put up with” (Gappa, 1984, p. 1). Furthermore, Gappa (1984) emphasized, “part-timers are painfully aware that administrators and full-time faculty see them as second-class citizens” (p. 2). As Townsend (2000) reports from a comprehensive American Association of University Professors’ survey of part-time faculty members, “a number complained that they felt slighted by full-time faculty members when they did attend meetings. In the words of one respondent, ‘full-time faculty hold us at arm’s length and treat us with disdain’” (p. 3). As one adjunct relates her story, “Oh, yes, I am ‘welcome’ to come to meetings, but

usually they are scheduled during times I cannot come. If I do come, it must be on my own time and dime” (Dubson, 2001, p. 3).

Di Giacomo (1999) lashes out at the condescending attitude she faced at a reception for faculty while employed as an adjunct instructor. She recalls the humiliating experience of not being invited to the reception, then deciding to go with a colleague at his insistence only to face a situation of shunning that produced, in her view, “professional marginalization . . . and an academic underclass” (p. 4). A catty remark by a tenured professor on her presence at the reception was aimed at putting her in her academic place according to Di Giacomo (1999). In another example, an adjunct relates, “I can’t count the number of times I have accidentally walked in on a party or meeting to which I was not invited when I’ve gone to check my mailbox in the teachers’ lounge. My presence is simply ignored” (Dubson, 2001, p. 37). The adjunct had been working at this college for four years. Again, she relates,

Once, in a heated discussion with a full-time colleague, she blurted out, ‘Who the hell do you think you are? You’re only an adjunct here.’ Initially, this comment stunned and hurt me. But soon, anger and indignation took over. During the semester this was said to me, I was teaching nearly twice the load that this person was for half the salary. (Dubson, 2001, p. 37)

The adjunct further states that she could not complain for fear of losing her position.

Church (1999), in relating his seven years as an adjunct instructor, scoffs at the idea of a “community of scholars” and academic freedom purported by academic elite when faculty ignore the plight of part-timers. Tierney and Bensimon (1996), in *Promotions and Tenure: Community and Socialization in Academe*, encourage critical

dialogue over the subject of promotion and tenure and argue that the current system does not protect academic freedom until tenure is obtained, thus leaving out junior faculty, staff, part-time and adjunct faculty, nor does the tenure system protect new faculty, part-time, adjunct faculty, or staff from political interference, either internally or externally.

However, a growing number of full-time faculty are recognizing that with tenure comes responsibility that academic freedom, “that is, freedom of expression and inquiry . . . would be assumed to be the right of all faculty, including newly appointed and adjunct” (Rice, 1996, p. 33). Rice (1996) points out that “the complex problems we are going to face in the future require not only collaboration between faculty and administration, but that the walls separating faculty, administration, and staff become increasingly permeable” (p. 28).

The Indifference of Full-Time Faculty

At last, for the adjuncts, “an increasing number of their tenured colleagues, too, criticize colleges and universities for turning a blind eye to what is to many a regressive, unethical practice that strikes at the heart of academic quality” (Fulton, 2000, p. 1). The blind eye and indifference have resulted in a kind of faculty apartheid and a resulting caste system (Church, 1999; Di Giacomo, 1999; Shumar, 1999). Shumar (1999) declares higher education has decided “what is democratic is the educational opportunity to rise above one’s contemporaries . . . the intellectual life is the product of a class-divided society . . . and that elites abandon the quest for democracy and help build a new aristocratic order” (p. 7). Di Giacomo (1999) relates that the problem of elite faculty is they “much like privileged people everywhere, avoid scrutinizing too closely a system from which they benefit” (p. 3).

For Fulton (2000), his qualitative study suggests one of the past reasons for the sedimentation of the discrimination “is the fact people are building complex arguments on sets of assumption that are, to put it kindly, not commonly understood, or, if so, not commonly accepted” (p. 2). In fact, study after study has produced no conclusive evidence that adjunct/part-time teachers are not excellent instructors (Banachowski, 1997; Fulton, 2000; U. S. Department of Education, 2002).

Contradictory to the claim that part and full-time faculty use different teaching methods, data drawn from national studies of professional development programs for two-year college faculty revealed that part-timers who engage in professional development activities use the same methods of teaching as full timers.

(Banachowski, 1997, p. 3)

A recent U. S. Department of Education (2002) study on part-time instruction supports Banachowski’s (1997) and Fulton’s (2000) findings, “analyses of the effect of hiring part-time faculty on the quality of instruction often produce conflicting results; however, part of the reason for this is that there is no agreed upon way of measuring quality” (p. 13).

Currently, concerning adjuncts, there is a conscience raising among faculty and administrators along the lines of the “civil rights, women’s, and peace movements” (Moser, 2000, November-December, p. 2) to open the eyes of their colleagues and shake them out of their passive indifference. Church (1999) explains his experience as an adjunct as “homologous to the ideologies of race precisely to the degree that a distinction is drawn that allows for the most exploited tenure-track academic to know he/she is at least higher up than the adjunct” (p. 5). For faculty who have written or commented on

the exploitation of part-time faculty, “it should come as no surprise that historically exploited groups such as women and minorities are disproportionately represented among secondary workers” (Pederson, 2001, p. 1).

In a recently released report from the American Historical Association (2000) entitled *Summary of Data from Surveys by the Coalition on the Academic Workforce*, “women who gained academic positions were significantly more likely to be employed part-time than their male counterparts” (Townsend, 2000, p. 4). The Department of Education (2002) survey of adjuncts verifies that “a higher proportion of part-time faculty members than full-time faculty members were female” (p. iv).

Di Giacomo (1999), in her personal account, explains, “The adjuncts are the reserve army of academic labor . . . and is heavily feminized” (p. 2). What shocked her was the higher education institutions where she worked as an adjunct were highly sensitive to women’s issues of sexual harassment, sexual orientation, and child care issues, but silent on hiring practices that promote “a class of invisible, marginal, underemployed, and semi-affiliated professionals” (p. 2).

Lundy (1990), in *Gender and Career Trajectory: The Case of Part-Time Faculty*, concludes that “once in the part-time cadre, membership (discrimination) does not differ significantly for men and women” (p. 12). However, Lundy (1990) did uncover that “females are more likely than males to be steered into part-time positions” (p. 1).

Pederson (2001) states, it’s time for a commitment to promote social justice, “No moral or ethical rationalization justifies the exploitation of one group—in the case, part-time faculty—so that another group—their own students—can receive an education leading to employment within the primary labor force” (p. 2).

One veteran part-timer writes,

I am an adjunct; I know hypocrisy. I am often surrounded by liberal men and women who cluck and coo about the plights of ‘women, people of color, gays and lesbians, the old, the poor, the ill, the third world, and the working classes’ with all the politically correct/plastic emotionalism academe has given its stamp of approval to. In the process, they either ignore, endorse, or propagate the injustices done to the underclass of faculty that surrounds and outnumbers them. (Dubson, 2001, p. 6)

One four-year adjunct explains her plight after being fired for speaking up at the Faculty Senate on behalf of the Adjunct Faculty Association,

Not invited to eat. Not invited to ride. Not invited to teach. Adjuncts, separate and unequal. South Africa has abandoned its policy of apartheid, but an academic apartheid still exists in the United States. At least it still exists on the small community campus in the Southwest where I was once foolish enough to believe I was a contributing and respected member of the academic community. (Dubson, 2001, p. 69)

She states she will not return to teaching. Di Giacomo (1999) states, “The profession needs to recognize that ethics is also a matter of how we treat our colleagues” (p. 3).

The Hierarchical Power of a Bureaucracy

The recent report issued by the American Historical Association (2001) presents “solid evidence of the second-class status of part-time and adjunct employees in the academy” (p.1). The report not only documents discrimination but also the increasing use of part-timers across all institutions of higher learning.

Ph.D. granting programs relied heavily on graduate students to fill the staffing role of part-time and adjunct faculty at liberal arts and community colleges. Graduate students taught anywhere from 25% to 60% of the undergraduate classes at Ph.D. programs in all of the reporting disciplines. (p. 2)

With the increased dependence on part-time employees, “these contingent professionals now make up approximately 60% of all faculty in the United States; their proportion relative to tenured faculty has grown by about 1% a year since the early 1970’s (Moser, 2000, p. 2). A recent report states that part-time faculty has held steady at 42% from 1992 to 1998 (U.S. Department of Education, 2001; Wilson, 2001).

Cox, in the December 1, 2000, issue of *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, quotes William Pannacker, “I don’t think anyone is going to be able to claim anymore that the crisis is merely the whining of people who couldn’t cut it in the profession. This is a major structural catastrophe” (p. 14).

The “structural catastrophe” is centered in a tenure system working within a bureaucracy that takes little notice of part-time employees while at the same time is highly dependent upon their services. Adjuncts are needed to keep costs down, to add flexibility to the scheduled course offerings, to keep faculty-to-student ratio reasonable, to help during enrollment surges, and to teach classes that regular faculty do not want to teach. In higher education across the United States, the institutional bureaucracy houses a hierarchical pecking order with adjuncts at the lower end of the hierarchy. The bureaucracy protects the hierarchical power structure of top-down management and perpetuates fears that empowering adjuncts will make others in the organization less powerful. The bureaucratic model is based on the tenant of modernity that is as follows:

Progress is best guided by an intellectual elite who have developed expertise in the physical, social, and human sciences, and hence are best equipped to manage society's public affairs through their rational administration of state and corporate institutions. (Starratt, 1996, p. 40)

The problem with the concept that developed alongside the industrial revolution is that for institutions of higher learning, the administrators now “think of themselves primarily as managers rather than educators” (Starratt, 1996, p. 5). The bureaucratic model is structured more like a corporation than an academic learning environment. “As business models increasingly shape higher education, corporate principles replace academic values, and making a profit elbows out the public good as the primary goal of colleges and universities” (Moser, 2000, p. 2).

The corporate bureaucratic model does not foster a community of scholars but a status of conscious administration within the university hierarchy (Krier & Staples, 1993). The point needs to be re-emphasized that higher education historically has been built around the noble idea of a community of scholars, a learning community, not a corporate company town (Shumar, 1999).

Bennis (1989) explains, “Within any organization, an entrenched bureaucracy with a commitment to the status quo undermined . . . certain social forces between individual rights and the common good. . . . Bureaucracy produces managers that do things right, not leaders who do the right thing” (pp. 14-24).

In addition, the hierarchical power structure inherent in a bureaucracy hurts academic freedom and forces social control

within any bureaucratic organization, be it office, school, or prison, it is exemplary performance in conformity with established rules that leads to promotion and tenure . . . individuals fear being cast out of the organization . . . (their) prison bars are composed not of iron and steel, but of the fear induced by real economic need. (Krier & Staples, 1993, p. 3)

Therefore, tenured faculty and junior faculty are socialized to ignore the economic needs of part-time faculty, and part-time faculty do not speak up for fear of losing their chance at promotion to full-time status.

Krier and Staples (1993) continue to describe the corporate analogy calling part-time instructors “the fast food clerks at McUniversity” (p. 5). As Dubson (2001) explains,

No one else but the fast food industry allows so much of its principle work to be done by underpaid, expendable help. How many other professionals are hired on the spot and then expected to do an outstanding job without training or support? How many other professionals are expected to give selflessly of their time and mind for less than minimum wage, even expected to take on extra responsibilities for free? (p. vi)

Higher education funding is tied to state and federal appropriations based on a capitalistic economy. Furthermore, under this complex financial system, higher education is inadequately funded to fulfill its mission of educating the citizenry and to promote good citizenship. One of the problems surrounding the lack of proper funding is “education then becomes a commodity, a set of skills to get, instead of a culture where students and teachers learn to think together” (Shumar, 1999, p. 7). Education gets mixed

up in the ideology of a market economy. “Non-profits must use temporary and part-time workers in addition to increasing their efforts to raise revenue in order to offset the loss of state funding” (Shumar, 1999, p. 6). Lack of adequate state funding coupled with growing enrollment can put a strain on university purse strings. Adjuncts are needed to keep costs down, to add flexibility to the scheduled course offerings, to keep faculty-to-student ratio reasonable, to help during enrollment surges, and to teach classes that regular faculty do not want to teach. However, the economic reliance on adjuncts “are not budgetary priorities, they are bottom-of-the barrel realities . . . most state-supported colleges are not fully funded” (Fulton, 2000, p. 4). In addition, state legislatures and career politicians may starve colleges due to pressure “to reduce deficits, lower taxes, and decrease social spending” (Shumar, 1999, p. 6). In reality, “managers in higher education have hired more part-time workers to minimize costs and maximize managerial control in providing educational services” (Rhoades, 1996, p. 1).

As one veteran adjunct writes,

My work has allowed the schools I have worked for to stay open and functional. They have filled their classes with more people than their full-time teachers could ever teach. They have expanded their night schools, their summer programs, their intersession programs, their life-long learning outreaches because of me. They can fill my classes with high numbers of students and reap tremendous profits. They can threaten me with unemployment or prorate my salary when my classes don't meet their (not all that) minimum figures. (Dubson, 2001, p. 2)

Furthermore, what bothers Rhoades (1996) is faculty not taking active roles in matters of part-time employees but allow “managers to exercise their discretion in the use

of part-time faculty, especially in times of financial stress” (p. 21). Rhoades (1996) sees this as a problem for intra-professional faculty. “These non-faculty professionals are less likely than faculty to be unionized and more likely than faculty to identify and align themselves with management. Their hiring, evaluations, firing, and conditions of work are directly controlled by management” (p. 22). The American Association of University Professors has called for more of a group effort and coalition building between full and part-time faculty. In fact, Moser (2000) states, “By acting in unison (for all university workers) and advancing the conditions under which academic freedom, due process, and shared governance can flourish, we set the example of community and citizenship so strikingly absent from the corporate agenda for higher education” (p. 5). However, only 12% of the adjunct population belongs to a union (U. S. Department of Education, 2002). The Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor is a “loose group of part-timers, graduate students, and full-timers who are off the tenure track . . . despite the activity on both coasts, the movement to organize part-timers hasn’t made its way south, where unions don’t have much clout” (Leatherman, 2001, pp. 2-3).

Shumar (1999) warns that a global economy has upset the American dream, “the new world view rationalizes fewer full-time jobs, lower wages, and more part-time jobs as part of the healthy, lean, productive economy” (p. 4). He has coined the term “lean and mean” economy production. He sees the part-time adjunct as part of this new flexible workforce and that it is unfair and unjust to discriminate against the poor, especially in tough economic times.

The Impact on Students

The continued mistreatment of part-time faculty ultimately hurts everyone involved, including the students. Faculty, administrators, and students need excellent adjuncts. In universities across the nation, the use of adjunct faculty is increasing (Bach, 1999; Cox, 2000; Moser, 2000). Moreover, universities recruit students with the promise of giving them the opportunity for a quality education with highly qualified faculty. As the research tells us, adjunct faculty are not receiving adequate support to do their job in the best possible way. The students stand to gain the most by ending the current discrimination and allowing adjuncts to better participate in the academic environment. They will be taught with well trained, well respected, well informed, and well prepared instructors, regardless if they are full-time or part-time faculty. As Church (1999) describes, “For the students, I was a full-time presence credited with expertise, authority, and a certain sympathy for the struggles of their life’s situation, but this could only be maintained if I always appeared absent to the faculty. So I met with students invisibly” (p. 4). For many adjuncts, academic life often goes unseen by their peers (Church, 1999). Church (1999) goes on to explain he had an invisible job, an invisible office, and an invisible desk. Shumar (1999) points out the irony that the part-time faculty is selling the idea of a college education to their students as a foundation to partake of the American dream with “rewarding permanent full-time careers while they must choke back their own disappointment and disillusionment” (p. 2).

Bach (1999), in her qualitative report, finds, “These faculty members are not short-term casual labor . . . the average part-time faculty member has been employed at the same institution for 5.4 years . . . more than one-fourth of the total number of part-

time faculty have taught eight or more years at the same institution” (p. 1), thus, making the part-timers more suited to be called part-time lifers or veteran adjuncts. The U. S. Department of Education (2002) study reports that six years is the average time an adjunct serves at the same institution. Moreover, their condition of employment denies sick leave, insurance, and due process rights (Bach, 1999; Cox, 2000; Rhoades, 1996). Furthermore, the research literature uncovers that adjunct faculty members lack status, recognition, social and professional development opportunities, networking opportunities, and professional courtesy (Bach, 1999; Cox & Leatherman, 2000; Fulton, 2000; Gappa & Leslie, 1997; Leslie & Gappa, 1993; Rhoades, 1996; Townsend, 2000).

Cox (2000) reports that the American Historical Association’s findings on part-time instructors “that institutions make it difficult for part-timers to do their jobs, which in turn diminishes the quality of their students’ education” (p. 1). With the lack of even basic accommodations for the adjuncts, the report reminds full-time faculty and administrators that “the importance of the teaching personnel is of the utmost because those are also the learning conditions of the students” (p. 6). Furthermore, when excellent adjuncts are silenced until they quit and/or are dismissed for voicing their concerns too passionately, less qualified adjuncts who will put up with the lack of professional respect often replace them. Adjuncts who are integrated in the educational community have the knowledge, prestige, respect, information, and professional opportunities that enhance the educational experience of the students they serve.

Toward an Integrated Approach

In universities across the nation, the use of adjunct faculty is increasing. According to recent research, it is not uncommon for 40% to 60% of a university’s

faculty to be comprised of adjunct faculty (American Historical Association, 2000; Bach, 1999, Cox, 2000; Moser, 2000; U.S. Department of Education, 2002). Previous research has centered around the reasons for the discrimination of part-time faculty. The American Historical Association Survey (2000) states that “the data clearly establish that part-time faculty members are not integrated into the life of the programs in which they are teaching by invitation to department meetings or to the academic community by support for their research and professional development” (pp. 4, 5).

Rice (1996), in his research study entitled *Making a Place for the New American Scholar*, calls for a “transformative approach to the way we think about faculty work and the structure of the academies” (p. 10). He discusses the new American scholar as being part of a more collaborative organization with the “rewarding of collaborative endeavors built into department incentive systems, including the budgetary process” (p. 26). He proposes leadership seminars for department chairs and faculty to create a more flexible career path for faculty and more collaboration with part-time faculty. In addition, he calls for more flexibility centered around tenure.

Moreover, research provides insight into how some of the problems inherited in a bureaucracy might be overcome to the advantage of the adjuncts and the students they serve. The literature research produces discussions about the need for higher education organization structure itself to change in order to truly support all faculty. As Dubson (2001) explains, “The adjunct system is not simply a problem in one place; it is a systemic problem across higher education” (p. v). Senge (1994) presents a model for developing a learning organization that is more inclusive in its approach to organizational change. Everyone in the organization, at all levels and regardless of hierarchical power,

is empowered to accomplish goals. In addition, everyone in the organization works as an ensemble. Senge's theory is based on interrelationships and interdependence on each other, not on chain of command and hierarchical power (Senge, 1994).

Furthermore, recognizing the growing dependence of colleges and universities for excellent adjunct faculty, and the need for a more integrative approach, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has developed a series of recommendations on professional standards for part-time faculty.

Example of Standards:

- All appointments must have a description of specific duties required.
- Compensation for part-time employees should correspond fractionally to full-time compensation, including essential fringe benefits such as health and pension contributions.
- Timely notice of non-reappointment should be extended to all faculty, regardless of length of service.
- Institutions should provide resources necessary to perform assigned duties in a professional manner.
- Part-time faculty should be given fair consideration when positions are converted to full-time.

Examples of Guidelines for Standards:

- Opportunity for professional advancement, including merit increases and promotion
- Regular evaluation based on established criteria consistent with responsibilities

- An opportunity for appeal or grievance in the event of allegedly substantial violations of procedure, discrimination, or denial of academic freedom
- Integration in collegial processes (including governance) related to contractual responsibilities for teaching and curricular planning
- Access to all regular departmental communication

(American Association of University Professors, 2001)

The standards presented by the AAUP have merit. These standards are based on treating the adjunct instructor as a respected professional and valued colleague. The standards reflect justice, fairness, equity, and respect. However, as previously presented, the discrepancy between the standards outlined by the AAUP and the practice at higher education institutions is wide.

Socialization Opportunities

Community colleges lead the way in providing more socialization opportunities for part-time faculty. Community colleges focus in this direction more than any other sector of higher education (Roueche, 1999; Valadez & Anthony, 2001). In a recent study centering on community colleges reports success in integrating and utilizing part-time faculty, the following suggestions were useful: high-quality orientation sessions mandatory for all faculty, mentoring programs involving all faculty, staff development activities for all faculty, professional development opportunities for all faculty, teacher recognition programs for all faculty, and inclusion in college rituals for all faculty. These strategies build common bonds between full and part-time faculty (Roueche, 1999). However, the study concludes that even though community colleges place more emphasis on integrating part-time faculty, it is “not yet happening on a grand scale” (p. 2).

In yet another comprehensive study focusing on the socialization of part-time faculty within community colleges, information was collected to study the job satisfaction and commitment of two-year college part-time faculty. The findings of this research study found that part-time faculty were satisfied with their decision to teach and their academic careers. However, they “would leave their current position for better paying jobs, benefits, and job security” (Valadez & Anthony, 2001, p. 6). Further research is needed in the area of job satisfaction of adjunct faculty. Research studies are hard to find on the topic. “Few scholars and policymakers have made systematic studies to identify whether these individuals are satisfied with their roles, responsibilities, and rewards” (p. 1).

The U. S. Department of Education (2002) study on part-time instructional faculty found that “part-time instructional faculty and staff reported being satisfied with their job overall . . . but were unhappy with certain aspects of their job including security, opportunity for advancement, and benefits” (p. 25). In other words, the adjuncts found teaching itself satisfying but working conditions were not. Murphy (2002) states he was one of the lucky few adjuncts treated fairly at his institution. “Both departments in which I taught as an instructor offered part-timers all the same benefits afforded to full-timers: health insurance, vision and dental plans, retirement benefits, remitted tuition, and, in one case, even adoption assistance as a tuition-exchange program” (p. 2). The same university later hired Murphy for a full-time professional job. While an adjunct, Murphy was fully integrated into the university environment. Murphy (2002) states, “Just before I left my part-time position, one of my departments proposed to evaluate veteran part-timers on a seven-year cycle” (p. 2). Murphy (2002) continues to suggest,

We should establish career paths for the instructorate that runs parallel to those of the professoriate, provide protection for their academic freedom, and encourage their professional development, and we should find ways to integrate them into departmental and university governance that balances their different backgrounds and roles with those of the professoriate . (p. 4)

In addition, the “AAUP advocates every effort to reward the good work of part-time professors by moving them onto full time and tenure-track lines . . . it’s a matter of fairness and equity for them to give priority to those faculty already on the payroll who have proved themselves by excellent teaching” (*The Role of Faculty*, 2000, p. 2). The U. S. Department of Education (2002) study on part-time faculty concludes with these thoughts that if adjuncts are needed to deliver quality education,

then policies may be implemented which would result in improvements in the working conditions for part-time faculty. Examples of these types of policies may include changing salary structures, promoting collegiality between full and part-time faculty members, and reviewing institutional policies as they affect professional development activities. (p. 27)

Learning Organization Theory

Senge’s learning organization theory outlines how change can occur in large complex systems. In the introduction to the 1994 paperback edition of *The Fifth Discipline*, Senge explains the central message of this theory,

Our organizations work the way they work, ultimately, because of *how we think and how we interact*. Only by changing how we think can we change deeply embedded policies and practices. Only by changing how we interact can shared

visions, shared understanding, and new capacities for coordinated action be established. (p.xiv)

Everyone in the organization, at all levels and regardless of hierarchical power, is empowered to accomplish goals. In addition, everyone in the organization works as an ensemble.

This model incorporates elements of motivational theory into a complex organizational model aimed at changing the organization from one that hoards power to one that shares power. Senge (1994) believes, “The organizations that will truly excel in the future will be the organizations that discover how to tap peoples’ commitment and capacity to learn at all levels in an organization” (p. 2). Senge (1994) speaks of learning organizations that function as a team “together in an extraordinary way, who trusted one another, who complemented each other’s strengths and compensated for each other’s limitations, who had common goals that were larger than individual goals, and who produced extraordinary results” (p. 2).

According to Senge (1994), “Small changes can produce big results in an organization” (p. 63). Senge’s theory is based on interrelationships and interdependence on each other, not on chain of command and hierarchical power. He believes members of an organization must challenge deeply ingrained images and assumptions that form “mental models” in their minds and affect how they treat each other. Through an open dialogue, each member of the organization will “see each other as colleagues” (p. 245).

In *The Fifth Discipline*, systems thinking (focusing on the people within the organization) integrates the concepts of “shared vision (common goals), mental models (openness), team learning (group empowerment), and personal mastery (responsibility)”

(Senge, 1994, p. 3) for building a learning organization, a learning organization where people want to work and where people can excel, learn, create, and collaborate in harmony.

Systems thinking helps people in the organization break complex problems apart by seeing patterns of behavior, circles of causality, power relationships, and participants' interconnectedness. System thinking is a "discipline for seeing wholes. It is a framework for seeing interrelationships rather than things, for seeing patterns of change rather than static snapshots" (Senge, 1994, p. 68). It is a discipline for seeing the "structures that underline complex situations" (p. 69) that helps people within the organization turn from passive indifference to active participants in shaping change.

Shared vision becomes a shared picture of the organization that promotes team learning and team togetherness with core values, principles, and guiding practices (Senge, 1994, pp. 9-12). As Senge (1994) views the organization, "When people in an organization focus only on their position, they have little sense of responsibility for the results produced when all positions interact" (p. 19). Shared vision brings forth a sense of connection to the larger whole . . . a sense of working together as a great learning organization team.

In addition, Senge's (1994) organization model presents the term "mental models" consisting of what people carry around in their head, such as images, assumptions, and beliefs that "shape how we act" (p. 175). Senge (1994) believes deeply ingrained assumptions and generalizations should be exposed by opening up a dialogue among participants to rid themselves of outdated and erroneous thoughts. Participants within the organization need to discover hidden assumptions and inconsistencies that

keep them from working as a team and “seeing each other as colleagues” (Senge, 1994, p. 245).

Team learning produces group empowerment, group compassion, and group commitment to organization. Participants learn to think together by encouraging a dialogue that allows a “free-flowing of meaning through a group, allowing the group to discover insight . . . and to recognize the patterns of interaction in teams that undermine learning” (Senge, 1994, p. 10).

Personal mastery consists of ideas of personal responsibility, personal sense of mission, and personal growth within a supportive work environment. Senge (1994) sees personal mastery as linking the “connection between personal learning and organizational learning, in the reciprocal commitment between individuals and organizations, and in the spirit of an enterprise made up of learners” (p. 8). According to Senge (1994), “The sense of connectedness and compassion characteristic of individuals with high levels of personal mastery naturally leads to a broader vision . . . to a vision beyond their self-interest” (p. 171). Senge (1994) believes all five of the learning disciplines work in concert with each other for the good of the organization. His framework helps as a lens to see patterns in complex, hierarchical organization “to help us see how to change them effectively” (p. 7).

Dever (1997) believes the five disciplines outlined by Senge (1994) have great appeal for educational institutions. “Systems thinking, personal mastery, mental models, building shared vision, and team learning are compatible enough with traditional values in higher education to appeal to both the academic and administrative sides of the house” (Dever, 1997, p. 1). Furthermore,

The learning organizational model and associated disciplines hold great promise for helping to reconceptualize and reinvigorate collegial practices characteristic of higher education. Building on a foundation that prizes the mastery of self-directed professionals and honors the practice of participative decision-making, colleges and universities are well suited to use mental modeling and systems thinking to critique their own organizational structures and processes. Doing so will help to build new visions of what college leaders can and should accomplish in a world where cultural and technological changes are rendering many current practices obsolete. (Dever, 1997, p. 4)

Senge's learning model organization provides insight into the adjunct faculty members' situation and helps identify strategies for integrating adjunct faculty members into higher education.

Chapter Summary

The literature review bears out two important issues centering around the adjunct experience. First, mistreatment of adjunct faculty, and, secondly, the need for research that explores issues centering on changing the organizational structure of higher education from autonomy and competition to more cooperation and collaboration to learn if this is a better avenue for the integration of part-time faculty. Research is now emerging around the theme that it is in the best interest of all the stakeholders in education to tear down any roadblocks that exist between full-time and part-time faculty that prevent their collaboration. My research further explores what integration means to the adjunct instructors and the university that employs them through the lens of Senge's (1994) learning organization model.

CHAPTER THREE

PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

Through the theoretical lens of Senge's (1994) learning organization model, this study explored what the term "integration" meant to the adjunct instructor and the university that employs them at two state regional universities (one rural and the other urban). Specifically, the study examined how faculty integration was described by higher education part-time faculty, department heads, and administrators at the two universities.

To collect the data, a series of open-ended interview questions was asked of the participants in an effort to gather evidence of systems thinking, shared vision, mental models, team learning, and personal mastery (Senge 1994). The information for this case study was gathered from site visitation, observations, open-ended interviews, and by examining relevant documents and university records at each location of this multi-site and multiple source explanatory (Yin, 2003) case study.

Procedures

Boundaries exist such as time, location, and interrelated parts in case study research (Creswell, 1998; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2003), and this case study was bounded by a multi-site location with two universities located approximately 200 miles apart. One university was solely situated in a rural area of the state, and the other university was situated in an urban area of the state. The two regional universities have in common that they are part of the six state-supported regional university system operated under the same governing board of regents, both universities offered bachelor's and master's degrees, and both universities have been in existence since the early 1900's. However, the urban university housed a new campus built within the last five years and

was approximately an hour's drive from the main university campus. (The majority of my research was conducted at the new urban campus even though I did visit the main campus during my site observation.) Moreover, the regional universities selected for this study were based not just on location, but also on the size of their student and faculty population (considered possible factors when examining the hierarchical structure). The names of the universities were changed for the purpose of confidentiality.

Data Collection

The data needed for this explanatory case study were obtained primarily through 23 interviews that provided rich detailed descriptions and insight into the meaning of adjunct faculty integration through their shared experiences, unique perceptions, and multiple perspectives. The open-ended interviews were conducted (based on Senge's (1994) learning organization model) with five to six part-time adjunct faculty, three department heads, and three administrators at each university selected for this case study. In addition, the part-time adjunct faculty participants selected were employed by their university for at least three years. The adjuncts coined "aspiring academics" or "expert/specialist" (Leslie & Gappa, 1993) were purposely selected for this study since these adjunct faculty members were more connected with the university.

In addition, the data collected from the case studies were examined through documents and university papers that contained the universities' mission statements, strategic plans, North Central Accreditation reports, enrollment and budget reports, and by perusing the universities' Web sites. These documents presented further insight into the realities of adjunct faculty integration at the campus sites.

Research Sites

The gatekeepers at both sites played an important role in gaining access to the participants of the study and in gaining the permission needed from the university to conduct the study. Trust was a mutual reciprocal agreement in that they would help me in getting the materials and sources needed to collect the data for the study, and I would truthfully present the data and protect the confidentiality of the universities and participants in this study. At both universities, the human research committee wanted assurances that their universities and their employees would not be recognized in my research report. I have honored their request while still providing the accurate and rich detailed descriptive data required of rigorous qualitative research (Creswell, 1998; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2003).

Case Study A. Case Study A took place at Arlington University located in a rural Midwestern state. The university has been in existence since around statehood. The campus has beautiful, well-manicured lawns with rich historical buildings sprawled out on the grounds. The inside of the buildings reflected remodeling efforts in various decades from statehood to the present time. A few new buildings built within the last ten years stood in contrast with the historic ones. The campus has just over 4,000 students (head count) enrolled according to the Spring, 2003 Enrollment and Statistics and Demographics Report published by the university (Arlington University, Spring, 2003). I located this report in the university library and read it completely on the third day of my visit.

I spent five days wandering through the campus buildings soaking up the atmosphere of the university. Students of all ages (traditional and non-traditional)

walked the well-worn and well-marked paths to class and passed by the large trees that marked the longevity of the campus. I observed students visiting with a harried professor as he tried to make his way perhaps to a class or a meeting.

I visited the university's library and the student union which were housed in buildings reflecting the rich architectural style reminiscent of the federalist era. When I went inside these historic buildings, I found they had been remodeled into modern state-of-the-art facilities and were alive with student activity. Both of the buildings were filled with students and university personnel; however, the noisy environment of the student union stood in contrast to the quieter, more studious library atmosphere. While at the library, I found the North Central and Strategic Plan for the university. I read these reports during the five days I was at the campus.

The student union had food courts, study cubicles, exercise area, comfortable furniture, and upstairs meeting rooms. I watched the human activity and wondered how many of the faculty members I was observing were adjuncts. In addition, I made a note to ask if adjuncts were allowed to use the exercise area upstairs. (I later learned that adjuncts could use the library and the exercise area if they had requested and received a faculty identification card.) I picked up several school newspapers and class schedules. I wanted to search each one to see if adjuncts were mentioned. To my delight, I found evidence of their names mentioned in the publications. (The gatekeeper helped me know what names were long-term adjuncts at Arlington.)

I walked to the building where I was scheduled to conduct the majority of my interviews and asked to see the office space provided for adjunct faculty. What I saw was a small office equipped with a desk, chair, computer, telephone, and small bookcase.

I thought it was functional space but noted it was void of any personal items. I was told that several adjuncts often share the same office space. I got out my camera and took pictures. I visited other classroom buildings at Arlington University and found the same functional, shared office space for adjuncts. I noted that the literature review for this study found that many adjuncts lacked access to office space, telephones, or computers (Dubson, 2001; Fulton, 2002; Leslie & Gappa, 1993), but that was not the case at this university. The office space provided was adequate and functional. However, the lack of pictures and personal items in the offices made it seem rather bare and gave the impression that the occupants lacked a feeling of permanency.

My overall impression of Arlington University was that it was a thriving campus that had stood the test of time. On the outside, it had retained the traditional look and feel of the campus of old with its beautiful historical buildings while modernizing the inside to meet the changing needs of its present day students. This blending of the old and the new was in keeping with the perceptions of the people I interviewed here.

An academic dean at the college was selected as the gatekeeper. We had been in contact for months planning the details of my site visit. He arranged for me to have an office complete with a telephone and a computer. In fact, he deliberately chose a room designed for adjunct faculty use. I brought my camera and snapped photos to help document and aid my memory. He arranged for me to have a small conference room down the hall from my new office space and around the corner from his office. The small conference room had eight chairs situated around a small rectangular table. I had the room to myself for the five days that I was there. I was able to keep my materials and audio taping equipment in the conference room. I worried about the security of my taped

interviews and signed consent forms, so he agreed that each night they would be securely placed in a locked filing cabinet in his office. He smiled knowingly about how important it was to keep the taped interviews and observation notes secure.

I named the gatekeeper Dean Adkins. He has been an administrator in higher education at the regional university level for around 12 years. He explained that all my interviews would be held in this small conference room with the exception of two administrators and two department chairs. I needed to go to their offices to conduct my interviews. He gave me a sheet with the names, times, and locations of all the interviews. Prior to the visit, we had discussed the criteria for selecting participants.

He presented me with a statement that I had been cleared to conduct human subject research at Arlington University. This turned out to be quite an ordeal. I sent to Dean Adkins the consent form for the participants to sign guaranteeing confidentiality and explaining the research procedures weeks in advance of my arrival (see Appendix A). This consent form was approved by the Oklahoma State University Internal Review Board. However, before my arrival, Dean Adkins e-mailed me that I had to gain additional approval by filling out the required forms (downloaded from the university's Web site) and also obtain approval from Arlington's Research and Professional Development Committee before I could conduct human research. Just before my first interview, Arlington's Vice President of Academic Affairs called Dean Adkins and asked if I had been approved by the university's research committee to conduct research. The gatekeeper explained that I had been approved by the committee, and further explained that the university and the participants would not be named in the study. However, according to the Vice President, the chair of the human research committee had not sent

the report to the Vice President for his signature. For one brief moment, I thought I might be denied access for my research due to this glitch. However, the Vice President called back, and the report had been submitted but was buried on his desk under other paperwork. I was allowed to continue with my research. I was now ready to interview the participants.

According to the 2001 North Central Self-Study Report, Arlington University reported that the university employed 74 part-time faculty and 163 full-time faculty with 11 (all males) of the part-time possessing doctorate degrees. Fifty-five percent of the part-timers were male, and 45% were female (Arlington University, 2001).

Case Study B. Case Study B took place at Bedford University located in an urban setting on the edge of one of the major cities in a Midwestern state. The campus was housed in a u-shaped, state-of-the-art, three-story building complex only five years old. Everything about the building looked modern and smelled new. It was breathtakingly beautiful. As I wandered through the complex, I was greeted warmly by staff and students. From comments made to me during my first walk through and throughout my five-day stay, the pride in the new branch campus was very apparent and often expressed. The campus seemed to attract the non-traditional professional student (later confirmed by statements obtained during the interview process). The students I observed going to their classes reflected the 25 to 45 age range. The university's main campus was located approximately 60 miles away. The total enrollment of the university was around 7,000 students (head count) according to the spring, 2004 Enrollment Report published by the university. The branch campus had just under 2,000 students (Bedford University, Spring, 2004).

I spent five days at the urban branch campus. I walked around the urban campus and visited the library located on the second floor of the administrative section of the u-shaped building. The administrative portion of the complex was located in the center of the u-shaped campus. I introduced myself to the library coordinator and gave her a list of documents (NCA reports, budget reports, enrollment documents, and strategic plan) I would need to read while I was researching the subject of adjunct faculty. The gatekeeper for my project had already informed her I would be coming by to see her. We made an appointment for me to come back later in the week to peruse the documents. Three days later, I went back to the library and read the documents for insight into the adjunct experience at Bedford University.

There was not a student union. Instead, there was a large room that served as a study area. There were comfortable chairs and sofa arranged for students' convenience, conversations, or solitude. I found copies of the student newspaper and class schedules lying on the tables. I put them in my tote bag to read later. I wanted to search for articles featuring adjuncts' names or names of adjuncts listed in the schedule. From a list of adjuncts furnished to me by the administration, I was able to find the names of some adjuncts in the publications. There was a small café with limited hours that served sandwiches, salads, and beverages. There were vending machines hidden in various corners.

I walked through to the two buildings that connected directly to the administrative complex. These connected buildings housed the faculty offices and student classrooms. I stopped when I found a sign that said "Adjunct Faculty Offices." I looked inside at the clearly marked adjunct faculty space. I found a large rectangular room that contained

three large desks with a chair on the side of each desk for the adjunct and a visiting student or colleague to sit at the side of each desk. There were new computers at each desk and one telephone for the adjuncts to share. There was one large picture window in the room. Both of the classroom buildings had this arrangement for the adjunct faculty. I took pictures with my camera to aid in my memory. I also took pictures of the sign that showed the names of faculty members and their office location. The adjunct office space was clearly listed on the board attached to the wall which would greatly aid students in trying to locate them. In addition, I noticed two of the adjuncts I would be interviewing were mentioned by name on the sign and had their own individual office space. I later learned they had just been placed on one year contracts.

I did travel one day to the main campus location. I spent five hours at the main campus when I drove over to interview one of the administrators for this study. The main campus was beautiful in its own realm with its rich historical buildings and sprawled-out campus. The office of the President was located primarily at the main campus; however, he did have a beautiful office on the third floor of the new campus with a breathtaking view of the front grounds. The main campus was more traditional than the urban campus. The urban campus had a more informal feel, and it seemed most employees knew each other well. Of course, with the way the new campus was designed, students, faculty, and staff were in closer contact with each other.

The Vice President of the branch campus was selected as the gatekeeper. We had been in contact for months planning the details of my site visit. He arranged for me to have a large office complete with a telephone and a computer. The room had a small round conference table with four chairs. He explained that this room was used for

department chairs who travel over from the main campus. The room was assigned to me exclusively throughout my stay, and I kept all my materials and audio taping equipment in the room with no issues of security. All my interviews were conducted in this room with the exception of the interviews with the administrators. Those interviews were conducted in their respective office (two at the urban site and one at the main campus).

I named the gatekeeper Vice President Barby. He had been an administrator at the regional level in higher education for 15 years. He had e-mailed me earlier that I had been cleared to conduct research at Bedford University. Again, similar to my experience at Arlington, this turned out to be quite an ordeal. I sent to Vice President Barby the consent form for the participants to sign guaranteeing confidentiality and explaining the procedures weeks in advance of my arrival (see Appendix A). This form was approved by Oklahoma State University Internal Review Board. Vice President Barby e-mailed me that I had to gain approval by filling out the required research consent form by Bedford's Human Research Committee. I downloaded the form off the university's Web site, filled it out, and e-mailed it to the research chair. Vice President Barby stated I was approved. However, while I was at Arlington conducting research, I received a call from Vice President Barby at Bedford University stating that the research chair at Bedford wanted to visit with me before final approval of my conducting research at Bedford University. I called him and answered all the questions he had about the study. I was finally granted the right to conduct research at Bedford University. Vice President Barby, in consultation with me, selected the participants to be interviewed.

In the 2002 North Central Self-Study Report by Bedford University, they report that 104 people served the university as part-time instructors and that full-time faculty

numbered 267 (Bedford University, 2002). According to the adjunct faculty list provided to me by the Vice President at Bedford, in the spring of 2004, 58 part-time adjuncts were utilized by the urban branch campus. (That represented around 25% to 30% of the faculty.)

At both universities, the human research committee wanted assurances that their universities and their employees would not be recognized in my research report. I have honored their request while still providing the accurate and rich detailed descriptive data required of rigorous qualitative research (Creswell, 1998; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2003). I was now eager to interview the participants for my study.

Participants

Case Study A participants from Arlington University consisted of three male administrators ranging in age from early forties to late fifties with their length of service as administrators ranged from 12 to 20 years. One administrator had a professional studies academic background, while the other two administrators were from the arts and science field.

The department chairs were male, and their ages ranged from 30 to 50 years. The time they served as department chairs ranged from 2 to 24 years. Two were from the professional studies area and one from the arts and science field.

I interviewed five adjuncts at Arlington University. Six interviews were scheduled, but the last interview on the last day before I was scheduled to leave Arlington did not show up for the interview. I left the interview questions, my telephone number, and e-mail address, but I did not hear from him. The adjuncts were three females and two males, all from the academic area of arts and science. Their ages ranged from late

twenties to middle fifties. All had obtained master degree academic status. Their years of service at the university ranged from 6 to 17 years. (See Table 1)

Case Study B participants from Bedford University were three male administrators in their forties and fifties. Two were located at the branch campus with one administrator located at the main campus. Two were from the area of professional studies and one from the field of arts and science. Their service in administration ranged from 3 to 15 years.

Bedford University's department chairs were two males and one female. Their ages ranged from 30 to 50 years old. Two were from the field of professional studies and one from arts and science. Their experience as department chairs ranged from 3 to 11 years.

I interviewed six part-time/adjunct faculty members—four females and two males from Bedford University. Four adjuncts were from the area of professional studies and two were from the arts and science academic field. Their ages were mainly in the thirty to fifty-year-old range. Their years of service at Bedford University ranged from 6 to 20 years. All had master's degrees, and two part-time adjuncts had their doctorate.

Table 1 introduces the participants. For clarity, all participants from Case Study A, Arlington University, shared the last name beginning with the letter "A." The participants from Case Study B, Bedford University, shared the last name beginning with the letter "B."

Table 1			
Demographic Table			
Case Study A			
Arlington University			
	Name	Years of Service	Area of Study
Administrators	Ian Armstrong	20	Professional Studies
	Theodore Adkins	12*	Arts and Science
	Stephen Adams	14	Arts and Science
Department Chairs	Daryl Andrews	2	Professional Studies
	Andy Arnett	6	Professional Studies
	Richard Alley	24	Arts and Science
Adjuncts	Patricia Ames	6***	Arts and Science
	Kirk Allison	17	Arts and Science
	Theresa Appel	6	Arts and Science
	Curt Austin	7	Arts and Science
	Janie Albright	9	Arts and Science
Case Study B			
Bedford University			
	Name	Years of Service	Area of Study
Administrators	Wilson Baird	9	Professional Studies
	Martin Barby	15*	Arts and Science
	Jason Barton	3	Professional Studies
Department Chairs	Timothy Beckett	11	Professional Studies
	Julie Bender	3	Professional Studies
	Earnest Bell	7	Arts and Science
Adjuncts	Nicole Black	6	Professional Studies
	Samantha Bowers	8***	Professional Studies
	David O. Baxter	15**	Arts and Science
	Phyllis Brooks	8***	Professional Studies
	Don Brown	8***	Professional Studies
	Jane Burk	20**	Arts and Science
<p>* included service at other regional universities</p> <p>** Adjuncts with doctoral degrees.</p> <p>(Note: All Adjuncts interviewed have Masters' degrees)</p> <p>*** Adjuncts on temporary one year contracts 2003-2004</p>			

From Table 1 (found on page 59), one asterisk indicated service included working at another regional university. Even though all adjuncts interviewed had a degree at the master's level, two asterisks indicated two adjuncts from Bedford University had doctoral degrees (adjunct number 3 and adjunct number 6). Three asterisks indicated after serving as adjunct, four participants were now on a temporary one-year full-time faculty (non-tenured track) contract. Their duties included advisement, service on committees, and full-time faculty class load.

Interviews

I conducted a mini-pilot study of the interview protocol as a forerunner to the more extensive interview protocol produced in Appendix B of this study. The mini-pilot study consisted of open-ended questions asked to four part-time adjuncts as part of a culminating course project in my Critical Issues in Higher Education class held at Oklahoma State University in 2002. With the assistance of my dissertation chair, the interview protocol was made more comprehensive to better address the purpose of this study and the research objectives (see Appendix B).

After the first two interviews conducted at Arlington University, I modified the order but did not change the wording of the questions located within question number three. Question number three asks, "In what ways are adjunct faculty members being integrated into the academic life of this university?" I asked a series of related questions under the umbrella of question number three in order to gain a clearer picture of the ways in which adjunct faculty members were being integrated. I asked if adjuncts were asked to participate in developing the university's plan; in developing the department goals, mission, or vision; in serving on committees; or in attending department meetings. I soon

discovered that the interviewees were more comfortable when I rearranged the order of this series of questions by asking first about the adjuncts' attendance at department meetings, then asking about what committees adjuncts served on, followed by asking if adjuncts helped in developing department goals, mission, or vision, and then if adjuncts participated in the strategic plan of the university.

I observed participants were more comfortable with questions starting with the department level and then the university-wide questions about integration. At the department level, there were more positive responses to the questions than the university-wide questions, and I believe that made the adjuncts more comfortable. In addition, I added questions under this category to include questions related to social opportunities, perks, stipends, office space, parking, evaluations, and the likelihood of adjuncts being hired full time. These subjects were addressed in the literature review and naturally evolved from the interviews. The interviews lasted around 55 minutes.

The interview protocol is found in Appendix B. The rest of the interview protocol was followed as written. I wrote short observation notes after each interview and tested my tape recorder often. In addition, I wrote detailed field notes within 24 hours of each site visit and/or interview. Once back at my office, I kept all materials in a locked safe in my office with only my administrative assistant and myself having access to the combination.

I hired a former paralegal secretary to transcribe my interviews from the tape recording. The interview length ranged from 10 to 15 typed pages. I bought a transcription machine to help with this process. It took around six weeks to transcribe all 23 interviews. I checked the transcribed interviews for accuracy, and I have stored all the

files on several diskettes that are kept locked in my safe. In addition, every transcribed interview was sent to the appropriate participant for peer review. Thirty-five percent of the participants returned their interviews with comments. I either e-mailed or telephoned several participants with follow-up questions. (See Appendix C) After completion of the dissertation, all data collected were destroyed.

Reporting

In the following section, I report the data collected from the case study sites. The data collected provide insight to the first research question asked in this study, “How is faculty integration described by higher education part-time faculty, department heads, and administrators?” Therefore, based on the purpose of this study, the problem statement, and the theoretical lens, 23 participants were asked open-ended questions regarding what the word or concept of integration meant as it related to adjunct faculty.

In addition, at the end of this chapter, I summarized the data collected from this multi-site and multi-source explanatory (Yin, 2003) case study.

Presentation of the Data

The following descriptive narrative represents the data collected from the administrators, department chairs, and adjunct instructors from the two universities. In addition, I used the perspectives and knowledge I gained from site observations and document analysis during my five days at each university for added insight. I followed the interview protocol (see Appendix B) and used the first question to gather demographic information (see Table 1) and to build a rapport with the participants. The remaining questions were asked in such a way as to collect data needed to answer the first

research question and to fulfill the purpose of this study in gaining understanding of adjunct faculty integration.

I have presented the data collected from the two sites together because there were no major differences found between the two sites. The variances in perceptions were more from among the groups than across the universities. The multiple perspectives used for comparison, relationships, and meaning emerged more from the interview data collected from the administrators, department chairs, and adjuncts.

Four categories emerged from the data and provided the following sections: The meaning of adjunct integration, the ways adjuncts were integrated in day-to-day practice, roadblocks to adjunct integration, and the organizational structure's effect on adjunct integration. In the chapter that follows, I analyzed the patterns that emerged from this data through the lens of Senge's learning community model for evidence of systems thinking, shared vision, mental models, team learning, and personal mastery.

The Meaning of Adjunct Integration

To understand what the concept or word "integration" meant, I first wanted to know what being an adjunct instructor meant to the administration, the department chairs, and the adjuncts at the two universities. It was important to the study for the participant to define what was meant by the term "adjunct instructor."

The data revealed that the administration and the department chairs had similar views about what being adjunct faculty meant to their universities. Their perception focused on how the adjunct benefited the university and the department in which they served. Their responses reflected their shared view of the meaning of being adjunct.

Administrators' responses centered on the prestige of working in higher education, and that "adjunct faculty" meant the adjunct had the experience, professionalism, and credentials to do the job. As Dean Armstrong from Arlington University explained:

I think it would mean that you hold a level of prestige within the community, a reaffirmation of expertise in some form or fashion, in either preparation of experience, depending on the situation in which you work--an affirmation of professionalism and value to the profession. It's sort of a recognition by others in the field that you hold those credentials and have the right preparation and background to be successful or to help others be successful.

Vice President Barby from Bedford University spoke directly about the typical role of the adjunct and what that means to the university. He stated:

Typically, the typical adjunct, I think, can be considered part-time. The typical adjunct would come in and do minimal office hours. We actually have an adjunct office space, or several locations that are designated as adjunct office spaces. They come and do preparation, do a little student advisement relative to the class that they are teaching. They teach their class and, typically, that's the extent of serving as an adjunct. Preparation for the class and counseling with the students who are in their class and teaching the class—that's the typical role of an adjunct.

One administrator, Dean Baird, stated adjunct faculty allowed the students to become more exposed to the profession in which they had shown an interest. He elaborated:

Our hope is that we are using adjunct instructors in order to allow our students to become more exposed to the flavor of the day-to-day activity in the profession in which the student wishes to become involved. Whether that be teaching, or whether that be biology, or whether that be whatever it is in the area of your field. Hopefully, we're learning from what we have done. But, the adjunct instructor is to add flavor and, hopefully, not just a cheap source of labor.

The administrators spoke in terms of the adjunct's benefit to the university as a whole, while the department chairs spoke specifically about the expertise the adjunct brought to the department. Professor Andrews from Arlington University explained:

An adjunct instructor is one who comes in with expertise to fulfill the course objectives, the syllabi that we have to teach the students the knowledge, skill, disposition required in that course.

Professor Arnett stated, "These are the folks who are here to assist, help, teach, prevent overload, and to meet enrollment needs, and that's it."

Professor Beckett, from Bedford University, saw the use of adjuncts in a slightly different light. He explained:

We try to use them strategically. I think that that's the key word—use them strategically. We don't use them as our workforce. We use them strategically, and strategically means the areas where we are growing, areas we are changing in, to bridge things when we've had people die, we've had people quit, we've had all these kinds of things, and we try to refit the puzzle then to make it work, and so they allow us to be strategic. Otherwise, we couldn't do this. We don't tell anybody we can't do it—we get it done.

Professor Bender echoed the views of Dean Baird when she mentioned the “real life” experience that adjuncts bring to the students. “You have the education and credentials to teach a wide range of classes, and adjuncts bring into play the actual practice—the practical, not just theory, but real life practical experience—to the students they teach.”

However, Professor Bell from Bedford University seemed to understand what motivated the adjunct faculty and his comments mirrored more the adjuncts point of view about their service. He explained:

I think the reason they teach—it’s an intrinsic reward. First, they want the prestige of being an adjunct. Once that door is open, and they’ve taught for two or three weeks, they find it extremely rewarding. The reward is not the pay, but the reward is the interaction with the students, the learning process, the teaching process. Every adjunct that has ever taught with us just thoroughly loves the student interaction. Being called, say three or four years later, by students saying they received a job because of something you said in class, that type of thing. So, the teaching process, the interaction with the students, I would say is the biggest benefit, the biggest reason they do it. Initially, though, it’s probably just wanting a line on the vita. Our adjuncts are all extremely successful.

The adjunct faculty viewed their service to the university in terms of the intrinsic rewards they receive from the part-time job. These adjuncts had served in this role for at least three years. As adjunct Appel from Arlington University explained:

Well, I’m not in the prestige thing. It doesn’t matter what ranking you are. To the students, you’re their teacher, you’re their professor, and you’re their mentor.

I have that bond with my students, and they know that, so I feel my job is to teach, and that's what I do, and, you know, if you make contact with someone and turn their life around, which that's what the fun of teaching is—to see someone who didn't think they could do it make it, and so I love doing that. It gives you a high to do that. I like being an adjunct teacher. That's all I can say is I like my job. I would like to be a full-time teacher, professor—someday I will. I'll work on my doctorate. This year and next year my babies are gone, and I can focus on that part.

Adjunct Ames has been an adjunct for six years and recently received a full-time temporary one-year contract. She explained her reasons for her long-term adjunct faculty status this way:

It means that I get to do what I love, which is teaching, without much other responsibility, such as committees. I really didn't understand how much work there was involved in a full-time position until this year, really, even though they don't assign me a lot. I see it more in other faculty members, and so, essentially, just teaching and just enjoying the interaction with the students is more of what I have enjoyed as an adjunct. Also, I loved the flexibility—I had a small child at home, and it worked well with his schedule. My husband also works for the university.

Adjunct Ames went on to say how she planned to pursue her doctorate when her child entered school.

In addition to his love of teaching, Adjunct Austin explained his reasons for accepting the job of adjunct faculty. He explained:

I am a member of the faculty that comes in to assist. Because full-time faculty members will need help from time to time with their workload as well, and, as an adjunct, I come in to assist them. I don't believe that I'm coming in to relieve them of teaching responsibilities, but I come along side of them to assist them within my department. That is exactly how my colleagues that are full-time instructors and professors have made me feel. That I'm actually a part of the entire teaching faculty here—not just an adjunct faculty member.

Adjunct Brooks viewed the experience in personal terms of how it benefited her.

She explained:

It's probably mentally stimulating to me. It keeps me current and interesting. I like students. I like working with college-aged students. It's a part-time job that allows me to do other things with my life as well. While I don't need to work full time financially, should that occasion arise, I have kept myself current in my field of study.

The adjunct faculty members (every one of them) stated that being an adjunct meant they can share their love of teaching, gift for teaching, or passion for teaching with others. In addition, all the adjuncts mentioned the same enjoyment or desire to interact with students. Adjunct Allison, a 17-year veteran adjunct, felt that he was “sharing my talent for teaching with my students. I know that they value me, and I have worth to my students because of my excellent student evaluations—the highest evaluation in my department.”

The adjuncts all stated at some point in the interview that they believed they made a contribution to the university. They believed they contributed by lending their expertise

when the university budget did not allow for hiring of a full-time professor, and by their willingness to teach at times (during weekends and evenings) that full-time faculty did not want to teach. Adjunct Burk, who has her Ph.D., explained:

Personally, I am in a position financially where I don't have to teach, and I tell my students this. Sometimes I tell the whole class, there are two major reasons I teach, well maybe three. The first is that I feel having had a Ph.D., I needed to make some type of professional contribution, and I think teaching as an adjunct helps do that, and, also, I can give my students a different perspective based upon my experiences, being a medical spouse, and it's a little different in that regard, which we have already discussed. I also make sure my students understand that my personal goal in teaching is not only to make a contribution, but it is to help prepare them for whatever they experience in the future.

Adjunct Burk was asked to accept a full-time tenured-track position but refused for now because of her young children. Her marriage to a local medical doctor made her financially secure. She wanted to come back full time when her children were older. She had worked as an "on and off" adjunct the last 20 years. She informed me that she had worked at Bedford University and some surrounding universities. Adjunct Burk explained to me why she worked as an adjunct in very personal terms. "I make a contribution. I work in the evening. I can watch my family grow and still use my expertise to make a contribution to academia."

Adjunct Baxter, who has a juris doctorate, explained that he saw himself as "sort of an independent contractor. I participate relatively little in the daily affairs of the

university. I teach because that is what I enjoy most about the job.” Adjunct Baxter had worked as an adjunct for 17 years at Bedford and two other nearby universities.

All the adjuncts stated they were satisfied working as adjuncts at their respective universities. All expressed the hope to one day work either full time for their universities or as full-time temporaries on one-year contracts. Adjuncts Ames, Bowers, Brooks, and Brown were all working this year as full-time temporary after serving for years as adjuncts. Adjuncts Burk and Baxter (the two adjuncts with doctorates) expressed the desire to work full time after either raising their children or retiring from a higher paying job.

On the concept of what it meant to be an adjunct at these two universities, the administrators and the department chairs viewed the adjunct in terms of how they benefited the institution, while the adjunct focused on the internal rewards they received from the experience.

The “Meaning” of Adjunct Faculty Integration. To better understand the concept of adjunct faculty integration, I needed to know just what the word or concept of “adjunct faculty integration” meant to the administrators, department chairs, and adjuncts at the two universities. It was surprising to me that the responses among the individuals and within the groups were in agreement on three basic concepts. The three concepts were more opportunities for communication, involvement, and recognition. The administrators expressed that integration meant opportunities would be provided to interact with full-time faculty for interfaculty discussions on teaching and content, and for recognition of adjunct contribution. Dean Armstrong explained:

That means that we find a way to bring them into the fold of our own faculty members, provide opportunities for them to interact with their own faculty, provide opportunities to explain to them why we are having them do what we want them to do, what we're asking them to do, find ways to provide feedback on how well they do the job.

Dean Adkins mentioned that this meant they are involved in an exchange of scholars and training. He elaborated:

I think it involves an opportunity for exchange, two-way street, in which the adjunct gets the opportunity to participate in the institutional questions and is involved in some interfaculty discussions on teaching and on content areas, but, also, some collegiality opportunity there. Talk about what research they're doing in history or in their particular field or how their teaching experience at some other place related or does not relate to what they're doing—just an exchange of scholars and/or teachers. I think of those as being separate activities. It should also include, in the best of all possible worlds, some sense of some things that would show that institution would recognize their contribution, and that the institution provided them some of the kinds of opportunities that they provide the full-time faculty—specifically training.

Dean Adams, even though he liked the idea of more integration, felt that too much integration might cause the “good ones” to leave. He warned:

We try to pick the best ones. We need to find an adjunct faculty that can cover a course that needs to be taught. So, when we hire adjunct faculties, we do so knowing we'd like them to be the best classroom teacher they can, but then on the

same token, we don't want to insist that they take additional training, attend additional meetings, particularly at the pay we give them because we have some concern that we would drive them out the door.

Vice President Barby viewed adjunct faculty in terms of better communication.

He stated:

Well, first, the concept of integration of faculty, to me, would include orientation. We try to do an orientation of adjunct faculty so they have information that they need to become familiar with the institution and the communication—that's the second level. It's communication. Orientation and communication about what's going on at the university, and how the functioning elements of the university, how we operate and what's going on during the semester, and then the third element is involvement. Trying to make sure they're invited to functions, invited to social events, if you will, invited to be a part of the university community. Sometimes we are better at those elements than other times, depending on the involvement of the faculty member and depending on what's happening at any given time. We sometimes do a better job, typically, I'd say we do a better job of orientation in the fall than we do in the spring. We provide a faculty handbook for the adjuncts to help.

Dean Baird expressed his hope that through better integration of the adjuncts, they will become an integral part of the Bedford University community. He explained:

We'd like to have the opportunity to bring the adjunct instructor in and have them become as much a part of the institution and specifically the department and/or college that they're working in as is possible and that the adjunct instructor is

willing to do, because, obviously, we are not paying the adjunct instructor to make our decisions for us, participate in the NCAA studies, or participate in those kinds of things. We're asking the adjunct instructor to come in and fulfill a responsibility of imparting an environment in which the student can learn. We're not really asking the adjunct instructor to become an integral part, if you will, of the university. Now, I have a problem with that. I think by accepting and working them that way, we look down on the adjunct instructor. We say you're not really qualified—we're just really hiring you as cheap labor.

Dean Barton viewed the integration of adjuncts in more practical terms from the viewpoint of the department's role in the process. He stated:

I think there's the ideal and there's what really happens. I think, ideally, adjunct faculty are mentored by members of the full-time faculty beginning with syllabus preparation through methodology through evaluation. I don't know that that always happens. I think sometimes adjunct faculty are hired, given the textbook and put in the classroom.

The department heads spoke of letting adjuncts know that they were an important part of the department that hired them and giving adjuncts more opportunities to know the department better. The department heads shared the perception that adjunct integration meant being familiar with department goals, curriculum, content, information, scope, and sequence.

Professor Andrews explained,

Basically, I suppose it means that people who are working as part-time faculty, the adjunct faculty, are integrated, fit into, brought into some part of the academic

setting, particularly in the department where they're teaching. For example, I know in a lot of departments, they use part time—like English has a lot of part time and those people do classroom lectures. So, they need to be integrated into the department so they know the goals of the department and the mission of the department and are able to fulfill that.

Professor Alley seemed concerned with the term “integration,” and the changes he observed taking place at Arlington University. He voiced:

Integration just means to me that they are talked to about the content of the course, or they are asked what they think ought to be offered in a course, but in terms of integration into faculty decisions, they are not. That's what I've observed. I can't prove that. I'm not saying that, but it is my observation that part-time faculty do not have the same luxuries, privileges, things that are written in a faculty handbook that full time does. Now, that is in the process of being changed. I know that there is work here on an adjunct faculty handbook, where information on what adjunct faculty can do and can't do, use of facilities, etc. is being worked on, and that is just recently—that has not been the case until just recently.

Professor Alley went on to talk about the use of the adjunct faculty handbook as a communication tool. I had an opportunity to examine both universities' handbooks. They contained good, helpful information for the adjunct. I provided a copy of the table of contents in Appendix D. Professor Alley wanted to make one other point concerning adjunct integration as he emphatically stated:

I'm not trying to sound negative. I have not seen any integration if the meaning of the word is incorporation, involvement. They are just sort of folks who are here to assist, help to prevent overload, and to meet the needs of enrollment.

However, Professor Bender, Bedford University, expressed that adjunct integration meant “they are considered part of the department and part of the college—colleagues—that they have worth to the department and college that hired them.”

Professor Bell stated, “Integration would be when you integrate the adjuncts with the faculty, with the mission statement, with the direction of the university, somewhat coordination, maybe team playing in a sense, everybody’s marching to the same band.”

The adjunct faculty members were unanimous in stating that integration meant that the university recognized they “needed” their services and “appreciated” their help. In addition, the adjuncts agreed the concept of integration meant more opportunities for participation in information sharing. Adjunct Allison stated integration meant “working together as a single unit,” and Adjunct Albright emphasized that “adjuncts would actually be a part of the university and the department that they serve.” Adjunct Brooks stated it quite simply:

The adjunct is consulted, adjunct’s opinion is sought out on matters pertaining to the department they work in, and they’re informed as to, let’s say the book is changing. They even seek your input on that, but at the very least would tell you why and you would be informed when somebody important is leaving, like the department chairman or things like that.

Adjunct Brown expressed the concept of integration this way. “I think that would mean blending that person and the skills you feel that person can bring

into the program, melting their experience into the university's mission and what the course goals are.

Instructor Bowers expressed that integration meant, "I am not out of the loop, that this is a conscious effort by the university to include me."

All the participants believed integration of adjunct faculty meant more opportunities for open communication, involvement, and recognition within the university community. They expressed a range of thoughts on what integration meant to them individually, but three main concepts emerged that centered on more communication, involvement, and recognition.

Viewpoints over More Integration. I hoped to delve a little deeper into the concept of adjunct faculty integration by asking the participants to describe the effect on the university if adjuncts were more integrated into the educational organization. From the descriptions provided, a clearer understanding of the concept emerged. The participants spoke in germs of greater respect, professional exposure, communication, involvement, and opportunities for adjunct faculty. They emphasized the benefits to the university with the increased integration of adjuncts.

Dean Adkins stated that adjuncts "would be treated as more important and not treated as assembly line workers. With the increased integration of adjuncts, I believe the university gains maximum benefits, and our students benefit from exposure to the diversity of thought and practical experience that the adjuncts bring into their coursework."

Dean Baird emphasized the need for an adjunct coordinator. He pointed out that with non-traditional students who mainly attended classes on weekends and evenings, the

adjuncts were probably the only representatives of the university the students were exposed to on a regular basis. Dean Baird felt that “we don’t want to have a bunch of adjuncts around that don’t know what’s going on.” Dean Baird believed the financial commitment to hire the adjunct coordinator was warranted for the increased importance of the adjuncts at Bedford University. The 2002 North Central Self-Study Report that I read on enrollment placed the number around 25%. Dean Baird placed it at 30%, and Vice President Barby said around 22%. Dean Baird further explained:

I think that on the particular campus, we could have an adjunct coordinator who would be an assistant dean locally here—maybe some other duties and responsibilities, but their primary responsibility would be the care and feeding of adjuncts of all colleges.

That’s something that I think we need to have. If 30% of your FTE is going to be taught by adjuncts locally here, that’s bigger than any single dean on the main campus, and it would have a lot more people. We probably have as many adjuncts as we have resident minimally, even though they’re only teaching 30%. Those members greet them at the door, make them feel as though they’re important, at least not disdained. Give them some opportunity to have some input. Have a couple of meetings. Make them feel as though they’re an integral part of the institution to the extent you can.

I’m not going to have them wag the dog, but I think we need to have some organization for the adjuncts if they’re going to be 30% of the academic future at our institution. That needs to be taken care of, and we probably ought to have on this campus a director of adjunct activities. But, that means, once again, we’ve

got to come to some sort of agreement budget wise. I'm not even going to worry about budget because, believe it or not, in our institution, budget does follow strategy. Now, it's difficult to get strategy to change, but it's not as difficult to get budget to change. And, I think if we can strategize—and the problems is, we have always been so functionally oriented that it's difficult for us to think outside of that box.

I talk about all the problems. We're probably doing as good a job as anybody, but I think we know where we want to get to, but I think there are a lot of hurdles that are there, and some of them would relate to budget, and also the idea of, on the one hand, full-time academics are saying that we don't want to have a bunch of adjuncts around because they don't really know what they're doing. On the other hand, we need to have some adjuncts because they work cheap, but because they work cheap, they must not know what they're doing. So, it's kind of a catch 22 situation.

Vice President Barby felt the organizational structure would need to change to accommodate the increased role of the adjunct. He said it presented a challenge but realized the need for more adjunct participation within the academic community. He stated:

I can't see that there would be any harm done there. I think that would be wonderful, but, in order to do that, there would have to be some structural changes, particularly in the financial structure. I see a clear place for adjuncts as an academic community, but, achieving that could be a challenge. Achieving that would be easier in some locations than others. For us, it's not a difficult issue.

We could probably, as a matter of fact, I personally have encouraged the academic deans to use more adjuncts at this location than they use.

They are very reluctant to use adjuncts here because of the “academic standards of accreditation” issues. But, the past several semesters, we ran statistics, and we have seen the percentage of adjuncts here much lower than it could be and still have very effective instruction. I want to say that we were almost 80%, between 75% and 80% full-time regular faculty teaching, resident faculty, and traveling faculty teaching classes at this campus when the typical standard is 60% at a branch campus particularly. We don’t come close to having 40% of the classes taught by adjuncts.

Dean Armstrong, at Arlington University, was less than optimistic. He felt little hope unless the university developed a campus-wide comprehensive plan that included adjuncts and that the current system, though it used adjuncts, was not conducive to their increased integration. Dean Armstrong lamented:

I’m not sure for the reasons that we hire adjuncts that it would be necessary, unless you were looking at developing a comprehensive plan that would say we’re going to have so many full-time people and so many part-time people, and we’re going to use the part-time people in this way. The current system that’s in place really is not conducive to doing that. I do know more and more universities across the nation are looking at utilizing part-time people, but I don’t think currently the systems we have in place support that.

We are still targeting the full-time people, and that’s our primary focus and for a lot of reasons. One of which is doing the reporting that has to be done—

accountability issues. We want to stay away from part-time as much as we can. You want to have people that can help do those things, and if you're having someone that you're not paying, they're not responsible, and you're just putting more of a workload on someone else. It's difficult for a part-time person to fill some of those roles.

However, Dean Barton, at Bedford University, felt that the increased communication and involvement of adjuncts benefited the university more than harmed it. He expressed:

Well, if they were better integrated, I'm sure we would communicate better, we would share ideas, and, if the model works as it should, adjuncts should not only gain ideas from the professors, but we should gain ideas from them because they are often working full time out there in the field of public education. We want them to bring new fresh ideas and problems that they encounter in the public schools to us to make us cognizant. If our communication were better, that would serve us, those that teach teachers full time. It would serve them, I think, by being able to share with professors and our getting the word out to new teachers and that folding back in eventually into their own institution as we graduate teachers that are better prepared to meet the demands and the problems in the public schools.

Vice President Barby stated that he has seen improvement in the way in which adjunct faculty were treated over the years. He shared that early in his career, he was an adjunct faculty member. In fact, all the administration at Bedford and one of the administrators, Dean Adkins, volunteered that they had once been adjunct faculty. Vice President Barby shared:

I think there's more effort to orient faculty. I think there's a recognition that adjunct faculty come in with good content knowledge, but limited knowledge about the operation of the institution. So, I think there's a recognition of that, and I think there is more effort being made to train adjuncts and to orient adjuncts in terms of the operations of the institution, getting their copier code, getting their phone (access to a phone), access to a computer, all those orientation issues that deal with the logistics involved. I think there is a more efficient effort, at least from what I might have seen 10, 15 years ago, in hiring adjuncts.

The department chairs spoke in terms of increased visibility for the adjunct and greater participation in the life of the department. Professors Andrews expressed:

Well, it would look more like the full-time faculty. They would participate in meetings, they would participate in committee activities, they would attend the campus functions, lectures series, things like that. They would have more input into the decision making processes that go on, both in the department and at the university level.

The department heads stated more integration meant adjuncts would participate more in department meetings, community activities, campus functions, and setting the department goals. Professor Alley stated, "If part-time is expected to do all the things full-time faculty do, then adjuncts need to get the same privileges." Dean Adams felt the increased integration of adjuncts was a worthy goal and benefited the department but worried that too many responsibilities for what they were paid might cause "us to lose the best ones." Professor Bender agreed:

It would help the students, and the adjuncts would be more aware of the vision, mission. This would be a ‘win-win’—more connectedness. Adjuncts would understand more how higher education works. But the budget—what we pay them—for the amount we pay them, how much should we, as administrators, expect from the adjuncts? That’s a question or concern, too.

The department chairs felt, without an increase in pay, the adjuncts needed to guide them on how much participation would be expected. They were unsure how much they would ask of the adjuncts with the low compensation adjuncts receive.

The adjuncts spoke in terms of respect and professional exposure. Adjunct Austin explained:

Well, if the word got out that the adjunct faculty were in the process of being integrated into the same mindset of full-time faculty, I think, probably, generically across the board, the morale of all adjuncts would probably rise quite a bit—that we are going to be treated very fairly, very equitably, from the salary packages to benefit packages to even respect by students.

Adjunct Albright felt, “If I am allowed to improve myself, I improve my students.” Adjunct Baxter explained what the concept meant to him. He stated, “What it conjures up in my mind would be probably more participation the day-to-day affairs of the university—things like committees, advising—things that I don’t do, at least in a formal way.” Adjunct Bowers stated that more guidelines from the department would allow her to answer questions from her students more confidently. She stated, “I am embarrassed when students asked me questions about procedures or policies, and I don’t know the answers.” Adjunct Baxter felt, “If you are going to be faculty, you should be

just that—faculty.” He wanted more input on textbook selection. Most of the adjuncts wanted information on any changes in university affairs. Adjunct Brooks lamented:

Sometimes, if you want in a loop, you have to make clear that you want in that loop. I’m not completely in the finance loop. There have been a few things that I think are important that I need to be informed on that I wasn’t, and I had people coming in my office with questions that I couldn’t answer and should have been able to answer.

Adjunct Brown felt the benefit of more integration centered on “higher education tied to theory—we are the bridge on what’s happening in today’s world by combining the theory with the practice.” Adjunct Burk added, “I’m assuming that that means being able to work well with the full-time staff and being able to be part of the team without having some of the obligations that the full-time faculty have.”

Adjunct Brooks stated her frustration at now knowing who her colleagues were at Bedford University. She explained:

The students would know that we know each other. I’ll have student tell me what they’re going to take and show me who’s teaching it, and a lot of times, I’m really like, gee, I really don’t know who that is. I would know who all these people were, even in the other disciplines. I would know who all the adjuncts are, and they would know who I was, and yes, we might be included in meetings and functions. A lot of adjuncts wouldn’t have the time for that. I’d like to know who I see when certain faces are coming through with media equipment. I know they teach here—I don’t know who they are.

The adjuncts spoke in terms of “more respect” by their increased participation. They expressed the improvement to their service at the university through more information sharing and exposure with their peers.

The administrators approached the concept through the lens of how integration would benefit the university. The department chairs viewed the subject through the lens of how best integration could serve the department. The adjuncts viewed the subject of integration through how it benefited them by increased exposure, respect, and involvement.

Ways Adjuncts are Integrated in Day-to-Day Practice

After establishing what it meant to be an adjunct faculty instructor at the two universities and what the concept of adjunct integration meant to the participants, I wanted to add to my understanding of the adjunct experience by determining exactly how adjunct integration was taking place at the two universities. Therefore, I sought information on specific ways adjunct integration was occurring in actual day-to-day practice.

The majority of the administrators, department heads, and adjunct faculty members responded that adjuncts were not expected to serve on university committees, develop the strategic plan for the university, attend department meetings, formulate department goals, or attend professional conferences. I was surprised to learn that two departments proved to be the exceptions.

The English Department at Arlington University and the Education Department at Bedford University welcomed and integrated their adjunct faculty into the department. The English Department and Education Department provided an unexpected opportunity

to compare situations in which integration was or was not taking place at the department level.

This section was divided into two conceptualized parts consisting of the data containing information on opportunities for integration at the administrative level and opportunities for integration at the department level.

Opportunities for Integration at the University/Administrative Level. I focused on collecting data from information gathered specifically on the university-wide integration of adjunct faculty in the areas of governance, orientation, faculty handbooks, office accommodations, full-time temporary positions, and university parking. What follows represented the dialogue that took place over these subjects, along with my observations.

University Governance. All the participants stated that adjuncts were rarely asked to serve on any university committees, including the strategic planning committee for the university.

All six administrators cited the fact that adjuncts were paid so low that they did not expect them to do much more than teach their classes. In fact, Dean Adkins empathized, “I actually feel guilty in asking an adjunct to do more for what we pay them.”

Dean Armstrong explained:

We do not have adjuncts serve on university committees, and, again, that’s purposely because of the commitments—financial commitments—we are making to them. We don’t feel like they need that extra load for what we pay them.

It’s not so much our budget, but their budget, because we’re only paying them a minimum amount, and it’s not very great, as you know. We can’t expect

them to give up a great deal extra beyond what it's going to take to teach that course and evaluate the students' efforts that go along with that and the other things that are all tied together. We don't want to stretch them.

Dean Adkins strongly discouraged adjuncts from taking part in university governance. He emphasized:

I think overall that in reality, adjuncts do not play a major role in governance. They are kind of like step-children of those processes. This is a side bar, but I think it's relevant. My age is such that I can remember when, as young adjunct faculty, we were all wanting to participate in governance and those kinds of things, and it's the stupidest movement that faculty ever got involved in.

If I were an adjunct now and an adjunct leader, I'd tell them, no, no, no. Don't do it. You don't want to do this—you don't want to be involved in these decisions and planning and so forth because really the teacher, in some respects, with obvious contradiction, but in some respects, the adjunct has the best job possible in the world. They've just got to teach their class. I mean, they don't get paid or anything like that, but they come in, and do their class, and relate to the kids, and have some fun with the content, and go home. They don't have to put up with all the governance. It's kind of like, wow, I wish I didn't have to do that anymore.

Vice President Barby from Bedford concurred that there was little opportunity for adjuncts concerning university governance:

I'm not aware of any adjuncts that participated in the strategic planning process. We've been doing ongoing strategic planning for about four years, and I'm not

aware of any adjunct involvement although there could have been. I am not aware of adjuncts' serving on any university-wide committees, but, again, there could have been some isolated cases when an adjunct was asked to serve.

The department chairs and adjuncts just answered a straightforward "no" on the subject. They did not elaborate. One strength (of qualitative research) was that it allowed me to observe how uncomfortable the department chairs and adjunct faculty participants were with the concept of adjuncts' involvement with university governance. It was obvious that adjunct faculty participation in university governance was not happening at the universities I visited. In addition, it wasn't an issue the adjuncts particularly wanted to address. I perceived it was from a lack of knowledge on how university governance operated since they were not involved in university committees. Adjuncts Brooks stated, "Those committees don't affect me."

During the time I spent in the library of each university, I read the strategic plans of the universities. I looked for evidence of adjunct faculty involvement, and I found no evidence in the documents they were involved. In fact, the only mention of adjunct faculty directly was in Bedford's Five-Year Strategic Technology Plan 2001-2005 where it was stated that the university recommended technology training for adjunct faculty and graduate assistants but went on to say this was optional. Both universities' strategic plan mentioned the importance of qualified faculty but did not single out adjunct faculty in any way.

Orientation. Bedford University did participate in a university-wide adjunct faculty orientation in the fall of each year. Since Bedford's urban university was a branch campus, the adjuncts' participation in the orientation session was via the

interactive television system that linked them together with the main campus 60 miles away. Vice President Barby stated:

Actually, in my five years here, we've had two different concepts at this campus. Just for clarification, we're concluding our third year at this campus. We also operated some minimal classes at other sites before the campus came online here. We actually operated out of a high school as well. But, we typically have an orientation session in the fall before the semester begins. We were conducting it the past couple of years as a university-wide orientation, and, very honestly, I don't think it's been as successful the past two years because the orientation has been on ITV, and we didn't get as good a response as we did face to face, because the orientation came from the main campus, and the faculty here observed the orientation, essentially. I don't think that was a much of an issue as the communications wasn't as good because it came out of the home campus to the adjuncts. I'm not sure what the breakdown was, but we didn't get as good a participation last year as we have in year's past. Anyway, there is a process—there is an orientation process.

Professor Beckett stated, "We have a university-wide orientation session that is one big meeting, and then they meet one-on-one with me." Professor Bell expressed that there was a formal orientation session and "one with me for the department that is optional for the adjunct. We are close knit. The adjunct just has to ask or just call me directly if they have questions. They know that."

Adjunct Black stated that she had not attended nor knew of an orientation for adjuncts. "No one showed me the ropes, but I asked, and I called the secretary—she

knows everything.” Adjunct Baxter stated he knew of the orientation session and that it “was worth going to once.” The other adjuncts knew of the orientation session and had attended, but felt the department chair was the one they would go to for information. Adjunct Burk stated, “I go to my department chair for information.” However, they agreed the faculty handbook was worth obtaining by going to the orientation session.

Arlington University did not have a university-wide orientation session and let the department chairs decide if an orientation session was necessary at the department level. However, they shared in common with Bedford a faculty handbook designed for adjuncts.

Adjunct Faculty Handbooks. The majority of participants from both universities concluded that the faculty handbook given to all adjuncts was a great resource containing useful information for adjuncts. The handbook was the primary way that the university communicated the policies and procedures with their adjunct faculty members.

Vice President Barby explained, “We have a handbook for all faculty that does include the adjuncts, and there is specific information provided for adjuncts.” Dean Baird further explained that “the faculty handbook is geared toward the adjunct, but it also contains information for our traveling faculty from the main campus.” Dean Armstrong explained how Arlington University used their adjunct faculty handbook:

We have a faculty handbook that we give them and then, normally, it is an adjunct faculty handbook made specifically for them. And then normally, we’ll have the department chair and another person that teaches that course meet with them so that they understand exactly what it is we’re asking of them and be sure that they’re in fairly safe waters, if you will.

Professor Arnett stated that all adjunct faculty members had to have a copy of the adjunct faculty handbook to familiarize themselves with the university. “They obtain one through the vice president’s office. They can call me if they have any questions.”

Professor Alley was not sure how the adjunct faculty handbook was being distributed:

It’s not really that well, to my knowledge, that well disseminated. My understanding is that when they are hired, they are visited by the dean and told what they can or cannot do, but, until recently, there has not been a written document. I know there is work on an adjunct handbook with information of what an adjunct can and cannot do. They are entitled to some privileges.

When I interviewed Adjunct Albright from Professor Alley’s department, she stated, “I was never given an adjunct faculty handbook.” However, all the other adjuncts at Arlington were familiar with the handbook and found it helpful. In fact, Adjunct Ames produced one for me. Adjunct Burk said of the handbook, “It is a supplement, but it has all the information I need in it.”

A copy of Arlington’s Table of Contents can be found in Appendix D, and a copy of the Table of Contents from Bedford’s faculty handbook (given to me by an administrator and geared toward adjuncts) can be found in Appendix E. I read both documents and concurred with the participants that it contained helpful, useful information on the policies and procedures for the adjuncts. However, I concluded after reading the handbooks that the handbooks should not be used as a substitute for face-to-face interchange. Adjunct Baxter expressed his frustration:

The handbook has useful information that I use, but it did not help me when I showed up once for my Saturday class and found the doors locked. I used my cell phone and went down the list provided in the handbook trying to find someone who could open the doors on a Saturday. I finally had to call Dean Baird to come and help me out. It was embarrassing, especially in front of the students.

Dean Baird expressed his frustration that the university needed to go beyond providing an orientation session or handbook. He stated,

“I really believe with the proper care and feeding of the adjunct, the university would add a flavor and a background to our educational process that would add quality overall and would be less expensive and more effective than just a once-a-year orientation session. What we need is an adjunct coordinator.

Office Space. The adjuncts were provided with office space equipped with a telephone and a computer by the universities. In most cases, the office space was shared with other adjuncts. The adjuncts were provided with e-mail, mailboxes, and copier privileges. I visited the sites of the adjunct offices at both universities during the five days I was at each campus. In fact, while at Arlington, my office space was one of the offices set aside for the adjuncts. The offices were adequately equipped but lacked any personal items on the walls or in the bookcase. At Arlington, the office space was one room with a telephone, computer, bookcase, desk, and chair. Several adjunct office spaces were located in different buildings, but they were arranged the same. At Bedford, the adjunct faculty space was one large room with a window and three separate desks, chairs, bookcases, and computers. I saw only one telephone. This same arrangement was

located on each end of two floors of the building and in each wing of the building.

Bedford had a sign that stated this was an adjunct faculty office area.

When I first arrived, I conducted my own personal tour of the facilities at both campuses, and then I had a second tour given to me by the gatekeepers. Dean Adkins, from Arlington, stated:

We do a pretty good job of providing them office space and computers. Now, we don't get them in the first run of computers, but I've managed to keep most of them in the pipeline for computers and office space, and there's no question that they have access to departmental secretaries or whatever else.

Vice President Barby, from Bedford, and I toured his facilities. After the tour, he explained the benefits that came with the office space provided:

They have access to an office, a desk, access to a computer—they have user ID's and passwords into the computers just like we do—so they have access to their e-mail account. Our license allows us to have Microsoft Office on our home computer, and adjuncts can take part in that so they can benefit in the regard having the software based on the institutional license.

It was interesting to me that each of the gatekeepers stated that they did not have office space this nice when they served as adjuncts. I noted that both campuses had nicer office space than I had when I served as an adjunct. As Professor Bender expressed, "It's shared space. They have their own desk but share the space—a nice, new space."

However, the office space was void (as I stated before) of any personal items. Adjunct Baxter stated, "We have a nice office space, but I prefer not to share a computer, so I do my work in my office at home with my own personal computer." Other adjuncts at

Bedford felt the same way as Adjunct Brooks, “I had to meet in an empty classroom for a private conversation with a student.” Professor Bell expressed that the university was planning on making the large room into “three cubicles for privacy.” Professor Bell explained:

Generally, it’s called ‘the pit’ because it’s a shared area. It’s a nice area. We’re recommending on the next building phase that they at least have cubicles or access to a closed office, and they’ll probably put those in the library. But, right now, they have to borrow a room or go to an empty classroom if they want a confidential conversation with students. There are two rooms, three desks in each room, and then one, two, three buildings—probably six different areas that they can go to have phones and computers and copiers and access to copiers and printers and the like. So, they have areas where they can meet with students and do work.

However, the adjuncts did not really complain much about office space. The exception to the shared office space belonged to the adjuncts who rated their own individual office space.

Temporary Full-Time Positions. Some “super adjuncts” (as Dean Baird called them) or “special adjuncts” (as Dean Adkins called them) had recently been given full-time temporary status by their respective universities. The adjuncts I interviewed achieving this status were Adjunct Ames from Arlington University and Adjuncts Bowers, Brooks, and Brown from Bedford University. Adjuncts Baxter and Burk (both had doctorates) were offered one-year contracts but turned them down—Adjunct Baxter because he made too much money at his full-time job and Adjunct Burk because she was

financially able to stay home while raising children. Both of these adjuncts planned on working full time in the future. It was obvious that the gatekeepers at both universities had selected their top adjuncts for me to interview.

The temporary one-year contracts elevated the status of the adjuncts who obtained them. These adjuncts were considerably more integrated into the universities. Dean Adkins commented,

We've got, right now in our school, two people who had been adjuncts for us now holding full-time positions. They're not tenure-track positions, but the pay is better. They had their own office space. I think we've provided some benefits. They are special adjuncts.

Vice President Barby stated that for one-year contracts "an outstanding adjunct will have their foot in the door."

Dean Baird explained:

We have what I call super adjuncts. We have a small number of faculty that are what we call full-time temporary. They're on a one-year contract. Those folks start as adjuncts with us then move to full-time status. Those adjuncts are encouraged to get their credentials in order that they can become full-time members of the faculty. So, we'd love to say you must go and get your Ph.D., but, on the other hand, one super adjunct (Adjunct Brooks) is teaching our beginning level class, doing an outstanding job. She's setting the standard for a couple of institutions in the area for what she's doing, and why require her to have a Ph.D., at least for as long as she wants to teach. Besides, she works cheap.

Vice President Barby spoke of the difference in salary for the temporary one-year contract faculty as opposed to when these employees were adjunct faculty. He explained:

You're going to be interviewing two faculty who have been long-term adjuncts who are now hired full-time, and I think their perspective might be important to you. There are differences between serving as an adjunct and serving as a regular faculty, and one of the big differences is going to be salary and the office space. They receive a limited benefit package, too.

One of these super adjuncts, Adjunct Brooks, was bragged about by her department chair, Professor Beckett. She was the one previously bragged on by Dean Baird. Professor Beckett stated:

Ways to integrate them—we also have a couple of other individuals that are slowly evolving, but they're terminally qualified. I think you're also going to be talking with Adjunct Brooks, and she is an individual who has had some publication when she was working at another university as a graduate student. She helped edit in some of the areas of some faculty book, faculty guidelines, and so forth. She gets paid a little extra, but it doesn't account for those services, it accounts for teaching, but we kind of expect that to be part of the package. The only reason that's not divisive is the fact that everybody on the main campus recognizes that she is an absolutely excellent instructor.

Adjunct Brooks had this to say about moving up to full-time temporary status: There's more information and more sharing and more opportunities within the department, knowing each other and knowing what's going on to be considered in the loop. Yes, I'm kind of semi in the loop. I'm not totally out of the loop like a

lot of them are, and, like I said, they've actually let me pick the textbook, and that's really pretty amazing.

Adjunct Brooks had her own office with her name on the door. She wanted me to interview her at her office. The office was full of her personal items and her personal touch. She explained why this office was so important to her:

At one point, I had to share an office. You had to fight really hard to get a spot, and, like I said, this was a fight even though I'm advising students and need to be on the computer. I would have to go outside or go in the other room to get on the computer where there was a phone. And, if I ever had to talk on the phone, someone was on the computer. That was kind of tricky. There is no privacy in sharing an office space. Because I keep up with students by e-mail and with advising, I need to be able to get on the system and have their files and be able to talk on the phone to them all at the same time without having to stretch the phone clear across the room. I guess it's also just a sign that you're a little bit more important that they gave you your space and a computer, and it's a recognition of that.

She went to Dean Baird and her department chair, Professor Beckett. When they realized how much advising she was doing, she not only got her own office but also a temporary one-year contract.

Another adjunct at Bedford, Adjunct Bowers, was put on a temporary one-year contract in 2002 and still held that status in 2004. She shared:

I think I was very lucky that I was brought on full time. I think that my relationship has gone on with the College of Education long enough that they've

seen that I'm not only autonomous, but I am responsible, flexible, and accountable, and that I have good student ratings. I think that has been good, but we do have a good relationship, and the fact that I knew our current dean when she was an adjunct. When they hired me for full time, in the fall of 2002, I was really desperate for more money and more challenges. I wanted to grow more. I wanted to do more. I am now considered a colleague. Now that I'm full time, I have a dedicated office and an annual contract.

In addition, Adjunct Brown, put on a temporary one-year contract this current year, talked about being treated as a colleague with full-time status:

I didn't feel that very much during the adjunct period. No. I feel it more now because the status of full time is different. As an adjunct, I would say no, that I never did feel that I was among colleagues when I was teaching.

The one adjunct, Adjunct Ames, I interviewed at Arlington who was placed on a one-year temporary contract, said:

Payday is great. Teaching classes is not that different, but I'm teaching five sessions this semester, so that's different. I had to adjust to that. I got a window office by myself, so that was thrilling. I am more active, and I go to the monthly faculty meeting now and participate more than I did as an adjunct. I was thinking of the university awards banquet. I was invited, but you have to pay to go, and I didn't want to until this year. I am planning on going because I feel like I make enough money that I can go to the country club—it's not really cheap, but I didn't think I could afford it as an adjunct, but I wanted to go.

Adjunct Ames had been hired on a one-year contract this current year and had agreed to start working on her doctorate. The issue of tenure was not important to any of the adjuncts I interviewed. Instead, all but one (Adjunct Albright who planned on retiring from adjunct teaching after nine years of service) hoped for a one-year temporary full-time contract with benefits. They were willing to start a doctoral program to obtain this status. Adjunct Allison stated after 17 years of service as an adjunct, he realized he no longer wanted to get his doctorate. He was satisfied with teaching part time while pursuing his full-time aspiration in his profession. All the adjuncts understood the power of a terminal degree on this status and inclusion in higher education.

Dean Armstrong stated he had hired two previous adjuncts for full-time tenure-track positions. He explained what put them in the position to be hired:

Completed a doctorate in the field. Taught part time, went back to school, worked on a doctorate, and they completed, the positions finally did become available and were successfully selected. Again, I suspect because people knew something about them. When you're looking at two people that equal, and you know something about one, it can't hurt.

Dean Barton echoed the responses of the rest of the administrators and department chairs on the subject of hiring adjuncts for permanent full-time positions. He stated:

I think, right or wrong, we often use adjunct status as somewhat litmus test in terms of their teaching ability. I've known several people in this profession that began as adjunct professors and then later on, after graduate work, found themselves on the full-time faculty.

In fact, the majority of the administrators and department chairs I interviewed had once served as an adjunct. The best situation for complete integration university-wide for an adjunct was obtaining full-time status, whether tenured or non-tenured.

University Parking Privilege. During my interviews on the subject of integration, I asked all the participants about parking privileges. I had no idea that I had uncovered issues of faculty rank, fair play, segregation, and recognition of worth. The adjuncts were upset at both universities on how parking privileges were handled by the administration.

At Arlington, the administration had determined that adjuncts were not allowed to park in faculty parking. Adjuncts parked in student parking. All the adjuncts interviewed were upset that they were barred from faculty parking areas closest to their buildings and forced to park in student parking. The administrators I interviewed apparently were not the decision makers on the parking situation. However, they echoed the administration's policy without defending it. Dean Adkins stated, "I've addressed this policy on parking, but I can't get it changed. Parking is a limited resource, and space is at a premium." The administrators and the department chairs had little else to say on the parking policy. However, the adjuncts expressed feelings of anger. Adjunct Appel responded:

Now, I'm mad about the parking. We don't get to park. We have to fight parking, and I think that's terrible because I think that if you come in here and you teach and they let you be a part of everything except the parking, that doesn't make any sense to me—why we are not allowed to park.

Adjunct Allison, a 17-year adjunct veteran, simply stated, "part time doesn't rate a parking sticker. All the adjuncts are upset about it." Adjunct Austin stated that adjuncts were "not afforded the privilege to park in the faculty parking lot," and this was

an example of adjuncts “knowing their place.” Most of the adjuncts told me wonderful, amusing stories about how they circumvented the system on parking. However, this was such an emotional topic that I was sworn to secrecy, and I promised not to reveal their creative trickery. One strong area of qualitative research was that I witnessed the full range of emotions—anger, hurt, and disbelief—that the adjuncts expressed over the parking. As one adjunct expressed, “I expected low pay but not being allowed to park was a shock.”

The concept was the same at Bedford on the subject of adjunct parking, but the circumstances were slightly different. At Bedford, the adjuncts had to pay for their parking the same as full-time faculty and administrators. The students paid less. Vice President Barby explained, “All faculty, staff, administration buy parking permits. So, we pay for parking and so does an adjunct. Adjuncts pay for parking just like we do. Everyone’s treated, essentially, the same.

Professor Bender said, “Adjuncts must pay for parking—so do I—we all do.” Professor Bell concurred, “We all share in the special privilege of paying for our parking.”

Professor Beckett advised:

They don’t get any special parking. Actually, the way that adjuncts get perks is to ask for them. If they are silent, they get nothing, and I think we could get parking, and we do get parking stickers for some of our adjuncts, but I think that they have to make the effort to ask. It’s on their initiative—not on ours. I park with the students here.

Adjunct Brooks stated the adjuncts' point of view on the subject of parking privileges:

Don't go there. It seems like when we were downtown, I had a faculty permit, but they don't do that here on this campus. I know that the concept is that they treat everyone equal, but since that's not equal pay, does that make a difference?

After reading her transcript during member checks, Adjunct Brooks amended the above statement to read:

What I meant was there is no designated faculty parking (that might be closer in). We have to pay for a permit, and we pay more than the students!

The adjuncts expressed frustration across the board on the issue of parking. They thought while it may seem equal, it was not equitable with the huge differences in salary.

The information collected concerning the practice university-wide at the administrative level showed limited opportunities available for input into university governance. Formal, university-wide orientation sessions were available at Bedford University, but not well attended by adjunct faculty. An adjunct faculty handbook was available at both universities and contained useful information on policies and procedures.

Adequate but shared office space, complete with desk, chair, computer, telephone, and bookcase, was available for adjunct faculty at both university locations. Adjuncts interviewed stated their goal was to obtain full-time temporary status at the universities. Four out of the 11 adjuncts interviewed had private office space provided since recently obtaining a full-time temporary position. The full-time temporary position allowed for higher pay, some benefits, and higher status. Four adjuncts who had recently obtained

temporary full-time one-year contracts were better integrated into the university environment. Parking was a divisive issue on both campuses confronting disturbing issues of faculty rank, status, and privileges.

All the adjuncts interviewed were upset over parking privileges. The adjuncts believed the administrators at both universities were not treating them equitably on parking. The issue brought out strong feelings concerning power, status, and privilege, and feelings of exclusion.

Opportunities for Integration at the Department Level. I wanted to understand how adjunct integration was taking place at the department level at the universities. Therefore, I collected data about opportunities for adjuncts' participation in orientation sessions, department level meetings, mentoring programs, and professional development.

During the course of the interviews, the English Department at Arlington University and the Education Department at Bedford University exemplified adjunct faculty integration. These two departments stood out as examples of welcoming and treating the adjuncts as colleagues.

Department Orientation Sessions. All the administrators expressed that it was up to the department chair to provide an adjunct faculty orientation session. Dean Armstrong explained, "We generally have the adjuncts meet with the department chair as well as people who teach the coursework that they are being asked to teach." Dean Adams said, "Well, (pause) orientation, that's not a difficult problem here because our departments are small. So, we see everyone on a regular basis. Communication is done informally for the most part." Dean Barton explained that at Bedford, "the university had one university-wide orientation. The one at the department level was optional for the

adjunct. There is an opportunity for departments to have break-out sessions after the orientation session, but that is optional.”

The department chairs at Arlington referred to the adjunct faculty handbook as a major orientation tool for the adjuncts. Professor Arnett stated, “For orientation, I give them the adjunct handbook, and they can call me or e-mail me with any questions they might have.” Professor Alley emphasized, “There is no formal orientation by the university or the department. There is no need for that. We give them the adjunct faculty handbook.”

Professor Andrews stated that the Nursing Department had an orientation session with their adjuncts because they deal with patient health issues. He explained:

Actually, we do it on a one-on-one basis with them. The lead instructors, or course coordinators for the particular course they’re teaching in, go out to them and do the orientation. That’s why we like to have the ones come back, so you don’t have to orient them (laughs).

Professor Bell, from Bedford, felt that “the adjuncts know they can call me anytime. All they have to do is ask if they have any questions. They know that.”

Professor Beckett said, “Yes, we have one big meeting by the university, and then the adjuncts meet one-on-one with me.” Professor Bender of the Education Department said, “Yes, we have a department orientation session complete with pizza and ice cream.”

When I asked Adjunct Albright if, in the nine years she had served in her department, she had attended an orientation session, she said, “No.” I asked her to further explain, and she said, “What’s to explain? The answer is ‘no.’” Adjunct Appel stated that her orientation evolved around the department chair. She stated, “I just go

down the hall.” Adjunct Ames taught in the Education Department, and said, “We have an orientation the beginning of each semester.”

At Bedford, Adjunct Black was aware of the university orientation session with a department orientation afterwards. She explained:

The one semester that I know that they had one, I wasn’t working that semester, and they told me I didn’t need to come because they thought they would have one again, but they never did, but I had been teaching for several semesters, so, I guess they felt like it wasn’t anything new to me.

Adjunct Bowers taught in the Education Department at Bedford, and she had an orientation session at the beginning of the fall semester. She served for eight years as an adjunct and was recently hired on a one-year contract. She concurred:

I know that since I’ve started working full time, I know that they do have a meeting for the adjunct faculty on this campus that specifically say, ‘come to this meeting—we will explain our policies’ and those kinds of things. An orientation session and so that’s very beneficial.

Adjunct Baxter stated, “I had one sometime, I think. It was well after I’d started teaching here, but I came here with a lot of adjunct teaching experience.” Adjunct Burk stated, “I have not had an orientation in quite some time.” The adjuncts exposed to their department’s orientation session saw it as beneficial. The other adjuncts seemed indifferent.

Department Meetings. The administration and the majority of the department chairs did not expect adjuncts to attend department meetings. However, two departments did expect their adjuncts to attend a couple of pre-determined faculty department

meetings held at a time the adjuncts could attend. Those departments were the English Department at Arlington University, and the Education Department at Bedford University.

At Arlington, Dean Armstrong explained why adjuncts are not invited to attend department meetings. He stated:

No. We don't do that for many reasons, which is their schedule. We're asking these people—primarily most of our adjuncts at this school are evening classes. Most of our faculty meetings are held during the day and decided that we only hold two to three faculty meetings during the course of the semester maximum, and they are targeted to specific issues.

Dean Adkins talked about the reason why adjunct faculty were not expected to attend department meetings. He expressed his viewpoint:

I think most departments are open to adjunct faculty participation. Some of them regularly invite people. One or two actually participate. I don't think there is an expectation for participation in most instances because of the realization—I think we all feel a little guilty about adjuncts, and so we don't want to require them to do much more than a good job at teaching their classes, and they're welcome, but if not, if they don't want to do it, then that's fine. And part of that, too, is that the typical adjunct, even within my department, is more likely to be at an off campus site or an even location, or an evening time, and, of course, the meetings are not held at those times.

Vice President Barby explained whether or not adjunct faculty members were expected to attend faculty meetings at Bedford. He commented:

No, Not that I'm aware of. Now, that could vary from department to department, but, I would say this is not the norm for adjunct to be expected, primarily because department meetings are held during the day, and many of our adjuncts teach in the evening and are employed otherwise during the day.

I don't think there would be any issue if they wanted to attend. Now, again, I can't speak for the department heads. But, typically, I think the adjuncts are encouraged to participate at as high a level as they are willing to participate, and the limitation is that the adjunct is not paid for it—committee meeting, time, that type of thing. As a full-time faculty member is a part of the structure, salary structure, to be members of committees, do research, and so on, so adjunct pay is not, from most people's perspective, the salary that's paid to adjuncts is not sufficient to warrant requiring them to attend.

I also wanted information on adjuncts' participation in the setting of the department goals and vision for the year. I wondered how well adjuncts were included in those discussions.

Dean Adams responded:

In a fairly limited way. I think the role of the adjunct faculty here is basically to teach courses, not necessarily have a great deal of input into program goals and outcomes. That varies from department to department. There are some adjunct faculty that have their input weighed a little bit heavier than others.

Other administrators echoed Dean Adams response. I found this to be the case at both universities.

Vice President Barby explained:

Probably minimal input. I think the department head would be open to input from the adjunct, but as far as an official role, I would expect that the adjunct faculty, unless it's an unusual circumstance—and we probably have some unusual circumstances—one in accounting, probably one in science. We have a science teacher who's been teaching in the biology area for 15 or 20 years as an adjunct and may have some input into some pre-med discussions or something like that. Certainly, the person, whom you will interview, Adjunct Brooks, has been around long enough that her input is probably weighed, but not required.

The majority of the department chairs did not expect adjuncts to attend the department meetings. They did not regularly invite adjuncts to the meeting but expected the adjuncts to ask or speak up if the adjuncts wanted to attend.

Professor Andrews of Arlington stated, "The information about the department meetings is available to them. But, they're not expected to attend, but they're welcome to attend." He went on to state that the times they held their department meetings made it difficult for adjunct faculty to attend—a sentiment that I would hear time and time again on this subject. Professor Arnett said, "Not that I know of. Information is given to adjuncts on a private basis or through e-mail." Professor Alley stated, "They are not required to be on any committees or attend any meetings, so, it's really up to them. It's up to them to my knowledge. I say to my knowledge because English might require they attend. I don't."

At Bedford University, Professor Beckett seemed frustrated with the situation. He felt:

They have been on occasion when they are integrated well, but most of my efforts to integrate them at the department level have met with some full-time faculty resistance, mostly passive resistance, and some active, but mostly passive resistance. When I have invited some of the adjunct faculty—our meetings are usually held when they are working somewhere—so, we haven't really tried to have meeting times that are convenient to both faculties.

Professor Beckett goes on to explain that Adjunct Brooks is now included in department level meetings since she had obtained full-time status on a one-year contract. He bragged:

She teaches for us. She is the best in the business of adjuncts, and why she is the best, we have full-time professors teaching, and she is more thorough, she is more complete, she explained it better than our full-time professors do, but they have much bigger egos and much bigger paychecks. She is the highest paid adjunct we have on this campus, but she also delivers more than her value. One adjunct we have, we have been paying him peanuts forever, but he provides value for us over and over again.

Professor Bell explained the way he handled his department. He introduced a new term, “water cooler meetings,” when describing the informal meetings taking place in his department. He stated:

We have occasional, but very infrequent, department meetings. We don't believe in a lot of department meetings. We have a lot of water cooler meetings, and we have online or telephone meetings. They're like get-togethers that are extremely informal. We find that at the informal meetings, people speak more freely than if

you're in a structured meeting. Adjuncts are included in the informal meetings we have, yeah. I do a lot of telephone meetings if adjuncts have issues, or if I have issues or questions or comments.”

Professor Bender, the Department Chair in Education at Bedford, started a combination faculty orientation session and department meeting that adjuncts were invited to and expected to attend. Professor Bender shared:

Yes, this last September, we met and fed adjuncts (pizza and ice cream), and I want to continue that networking and socializing. It was beneficial to us all, I think. It was a good idea (paused). I will continue with more adjunct training, more pizza and ice cream (laughed). I think more interaction would be a positive. Of course, we must pick a time that adjuncts and full-time could attend.

I wanted to find out from the department chairs the role adjunct faculty had in formulating department goals and mission. Professor Andrews of Arlington answered:

They don't. Now, let me tell you something. We have one part-time faculty now who does actually lecture, and she was hired last year with the goal of having a faculty retire this spring and fulfilling that position. Well, she has actually done lecture. She supervises students. She goes to the faculty meeting and pretty much participates. She does participate in the department. She is on a one-year contract.

Professor Bell of Bedford once again referred to his “water cooler sessions” that represented the informal way adjuncts either received or gave input. He stated:

They are very informal. In the sessions where we get together, we have coffee or water cooler sessions. They will say what they perceive their needs are, and we

share that. We will tell the adjuncts basically what we think the mission should be, and then they correct us usually on what it should be. As far as a formal meeting, again, we don't have that.

The English Department at Arlington and the Education Department at Bedford developed, along with their adjuncts and faculty, the department goals and mission during their combined orientation session and department meeting each fall semester. The adjuncts in these two departments experienced the most integration at the universities.

The adjunct faculty mirrored the statements of the administrators and the department chairs with the exception of the adjuncts serving in the English Department at Arlington and the Education Department at Bedford. Adjunct Albright stated a flat “no” when asked about attending any department meetings. Adjunct Allison stated, “I did in the past—probably the first couple of years every now and then. Then our faculty meetings were scheduled at a time I could not attend. They do send me the minutes.”

Adjunct Appel said she was welcome to attend her department meetings but not expected. She did get excited about what the English Department at Arlington required:

Actually, the English Department, they hold a lot of get-togethers, discussions, and all that. They want to keep the adjunct. They don't treat you like an adjunct there. You're not labeled, 'You're an adjunct, you can't do this.' They want you involved, and so, yes, they do. You're invited to their parties, you're invited to their meetings, they e-mail you everything. If you are a professor and an adjunct, both of you get e-mailed. In my department, they are so busy doing other things, they don't hold a lot of come-to-the-house parties.

Adjunct Ames explained what it meant to her to serve in the English department that included their adjunct faculty in their meetings. She stated:

You are less isolated, and the whole faculty really likes adjuncts in the English Department because it lessens their load. They can teach the upper division courses, and they don't particularly like to teach several sections of English composition, and so they welcome adjuncts. I don't think there's any expectation that you must share your opinions, but I think it's again welcomed. If you want to express your opinions, you would certainly have an audience.

Adjunct Ames recently received a temporary full-time position with the English Department. She stated that attending the orientation session and going to the department meetings helped her colleagues "get to know me better, both personally and professionally."

The adjuncts in the English department were not expected to attend every department meeting. The adjuncts were expected to attend the combination orientation session and department meeting. In addition, two other department meetings were held at a time and place adjuncts could attend.

On the subject of participation in the developing of the department level goals, vision, or mission, the reactions of the adjunct faculty at Arlington were mixed.

Adjunct Allison, a 17-year veteran adjunct, had previously explained he was not expected to attend department meetings, but on this question he felt consulted. He expressed:

My personal experience is, you know, whenever we make a decision to change anything in the department, I always feel like I'm consulted. We're changing.

We have changed our theory program in the past, and we're in the process of changing it right now, and our department chairman made sure I saw each of the books, possible textbooks that were under consideration, and he asked me for a review of each of those. Ultimately, the book that's been chosen recently was my suggestion of the four texts that we looked at. I'm not sure if I didn't look more closely at them than anybody else, but I looked at every page, listened to the tapes, because I'm going to be using it, and they were wise enough to know, hey, he's going to teach it. He's got to be comfortable with it, so there wasn't any kind of distinction between my input and theirs.

Adjunct Austin phrased his response in terms of how he was treated by his colleagues in relationship to goal setting by his department. He felt:

Well, the way that I am treated, even though I do not hold a doctor's degree. Most of the faculty that I'm dealing do hold earned doctorates; however, in my visiting with them, my asking questions within the related field, I'm having difficulty getting a concept across, I'm never looked down upon because my level of degree attainment is not as high as theirs, and I have a freedom to talk to them and visit with them and know that we are more than just colleagues, but there is also a friendship that has developed outside of the working relationship here.

Adjunct Appel expressed a similar response when I asked her about attending department meetings. She emphatically stated that "any type of goal you want to set, you just go down the hall to the department chair's office. It's always open for suggestions." When I redirected the query to try to get more at her department level involvement, she referred me once again to what the English department did.

The English department has a meeting at the beginning of every semester, and that is the big question that comes up. What are our goals for this semester? What do we want to see these kids accomplish? Now you have ten, twelve different people with all these different ideas, and they want your input, so, yes, you do.

You are a colleague, and that's what they tell you. We want you to be part of our group. We want you to be a colleague. I think the English department leans more toward that than any department that I've worked with so far.

However, she went on to further explain that within the department where she worked as an adjunct, the climate was "This is what it is—now you do it, and so you know what you're doing, and you just go do it." Adjunct Appel said that the department chair door was always open for her for clarification or consultation on department goals and directions.

Adjunct Albright stated emphatically that she had not been asked to give her input on the goals of the department. She stated, "Not in the nine years I've been here." Adjunct Ames said the department's goals, mission, and vision were outlined at the first orientation session and department meeting of the English department. She felt "fully informed and her opinions welcomed, not isolated." She went on to state that as a temporary full-time faculty member, she attended all department meetings, and had contributed on a more continuous basis in the accomplishment of the department goals.

The adjunct faculty members' experiences at Bedford were not all that different than Arlington University concerning their participation in department meetings and the setting of the department goals.

On the subject of attendance at department meetings, Adjunct Burk stated:

I have not been formally invited. Let me clarify that—I do get e-mails frequently from my department head, and through those I get information about what has happened in faculty meetings and when the next ones are going to be and what's on the agenda and so forth, but I have never been asked to be there, and I am assuming that's because they are always on the main campus, and that would be a long drive for me.

Adjunct Brooks felt the same way when she stated, “No, if you're talking about a department meeting where I have to drive an hour to the main campus—No.” Adjunct Brown stated the same reasons for not attending department meetings. She explained:

Usually, we have to meet at the main campus 60 miles from here, so it's kind of hard if I can't make it all the way to the main campus. I have gone to several, but not to every one of them. I think it's a handicap when I can't go, but they usually try to send me the minutes.

Adjunct Brown stated he felt that adjuncts should be invited and expected to attend some department meetings, but not all. I asked him if he had been invited to attend department meetings. He stated:

No, and let me clarify that—not until this semester. This semester, as I signed a full-time temporary contract, yes, but when I was strictly an adjunct pulling one or two courses in a semester, no.

I think oftentimes the administration will say that adjuncts can't attend department meetings because of the time problems. Your adjuncts are working,

generally, a full-time schedule some place, and the faculty meeting is going to be during the day.

Now, again, I can't speak for anybody else, but I do believe that I would be relatively safe in saying that most businesses, most industries, and most companies appreciate the fact that their employees are doing this, and I believe that most of them would accommodate an adjunct taking an afternoon to do this.

Adjunct Baxter expressed his frustration that department meetings were held at a time he could not attend. He explained, "If someone asked me to, I would, if I could, but there is the time thing. I work fifty hours a week somewhere else, and the faculty, I suspect, would prefer to meet during the day.

Adjunct Bowers felt completely integrated in the Education department. She explained that department meetings included the adjuncts. She described:

If I was not able to be present at the meeting, I was clued in with agendas and minutes of the meetings and decisions of what they decided, which made a big difference. We took on this portfolio structure, and the courses I teach are very strongly connected in those portfolio requirements. They also, for the first time—I'm sure they were doing it before—but adjuncts were included in setting professional goals, annual professional goals, professional development goals, which I really appreciated, but we were not required to fulfill all the additional requirements that the full-time faculty have to do, such as they have to do ten hours of service in the school, and they had to show additional growth and development. We were made aware of them, but I was not required to fulfill them.

Adjunct Bowers credited the philosophy of the new dean of the department on including the adjuncts into as many of the department functions as they felt comfortable. I asked Adjunct Bowers about the impact of that type of inclusion for her as a professional serving as an adjunct. She explained:

I felt less isolated. I was bolstered by information and the support from the department and from my department chair, and I didn't feel like my academic freedom or my autonomy was curtailed. I felt like I was given guidelines of what was expected of others so I could make sure I was in line with the department perspective and the department curriculum that the full-time faculty were doing and helped me know whether I measured up or not, regardless of getting high student response ratings. I wanted to know whether I was doing what I was supposed to be doing.

Adjunct Bowers this year obtained that status of temporary full-time faculty. She credits her new dean with the change of how the adjunct faculty were viewed in the department. She elaborated:

I often did feel left out of the loop. It would be on me, oftentimes, to contact the college to ask if there is a department syllabus or has the department syllabus changed. And then I would, even though every semester I would send a copy of my syllabus, I would never get feedback as to whether or not I was structuring my course in a fashion that was within department guidelines. I was autonomous basically, which I always thought as a positive thing because I saw that as confidence in me. I had very good faculty ratings from the students, so I always took that as a positive think, and I think I function very well autonomously. I was

able to compare their syllabus to my syllabus and correlate my assignments to meet with what the department was doing. I was never wanting to be a maverick out there on my own. I always made sure that I was using the same textbook that they were and stuff like that, and I think they relied upon that for me.

The last year that I was an adjunct, we had a new department head that came on and a new dean also as well in the college of education within that time period, and that department head, for the first time, consciously integrated the adjunct faculty in with the full-time faculty in a number of ways that at that time, the department head appointed course coordinators that gathered the faculty that all taught the same section or the same course together to make department decisions as a whole.

Adjunct Brooks stated, “I have helped with book selection. In fact, they let me pick the book, which is pretty amazing considering I was an adjunct. I did have input on the goals. I know what material I’m supposed to communicate. Our goal is to grow in numbers and turn out knowledgeable people.”

Adjunct Burk stated she had input on the goals and mission of her department but did not expect to be consulted even though she had a doctorate and served for 20 years as an adjunct. She simply stated, “Right now, I don’t foresee that I would help set the goals as an adjunct.” Adjunct Baxter stated, “Only informally—not in any formal way. Well, people ask, the department asks you what you think about something. We’re trying to do this, what do you think about that? You come to know the faculty in an informal way.”

Adjunct Black explained that in her situation, “I really haven’t helped set too many goals because I may teach two semesters in a row, and then not teach for another

two semesters. They do ask for my input, but I don't know how much my input counts against the full-time employees.”

Adjunct Bowers, from the education department, described the input and support she had in developing and accomplishing the department goals. She described:

Since 2002, we have course coordinators. I teach in the education department, so we have an education course coordinator that works with all of the faculty that teach that particular class, and because it's a core class for all the education majors, there's quite a few numbers of sections, so there's quite a few faculty that teach it, and one of the missions that we've done over the last two years is revise the objectives and outcomes for that particular class, and they've included me on it.

Adjunct Bowers went on to explain how the new direction of the new dean made a difference in her coursework. She described:

I think it allowed my students to feel supportive more directly in their endeavors in the college of education because they were having demands put on them for the portfolio, and I was more consciously able to answer their questions and more confidently able to interpret them for the students.

The adjuncts in the education department were not expected to attend every department meeting. However, they were expected to participate in the department meetings where the goals, mission, vision, policies, and procedures were outlined. According to Adjunct Bowers, this resulted in a more productive atmosphere that benefited her and her students.

In the departments other than the education department, it was largely up to the department head whether formally or informally the adjuncts either attended a department meeting or were asked their input on setting department goals, mission, and vision. The department chairs were the important link to the level of adjunct participation.

Mentoring Adjuncts. I wanted to understand the process used at the universities I visited for mentoring adjunct faculty. At Arlington, I asked the administration to describe how mentoring of adjuncts was taking place at the department level. Dean Armstrong suggested:

No, not a formal mentoring program. Again, I would just indicate that it's very informal, but it happens all the time. I've had one I've mentored for the last three years, and he has taught a class for us every semester in techniques and research, and he calls me about once or twice a week just saying, 'Hey, here's what I'm doing. Does this sound consistent?' Regular conversations. I know that happens with our others, too. They call and make sure that they're doing those things that we need for them to do under time standards and outcomes that have to be documented. We're very cautious, and if we find someone that is not collecting the right artifacts and not doing the right things, we don't use them again.

Dean Adkins simply stated, "There again, it's departmental. They do it, and they are certainly encouraged to do so, but there's no mandate to do that." Dean Adams, agreeing with Dean Adkins, relayed this analysis, "Loosely structured. It's basically the responsibility of the department chair to mentor their new adjuncts, and, from time to

time, that role is transferred to a regular faculty member. Our departments are small. Communication is done informally for the most part.”

I asked Bedford University administrators about adjunct faculty mentoring in their department and received similar responses to the administrators from Arlington. Dean Baird stated:

No, we don't. If the adjunct is reasonably wise, they will find a professor that happens to be there when they are and ask questions, but that's not a formal mentoring thing. We probably have more mentoring going on by the faculty secretaries as far as the dos and don'ts. We all learn that they're the ones that know what's going on, and, in fact, they always come to them with questions because they're the ones they see there all the time.

Dean Adams explained more what mentoring meant than how it was happening at Bedford. He explained:

Well, I think we need to mentor them into the policies, procedures of the institution, how we deal with students in particular. Grading policies—how we deal with grading policies, instructional policies. Basically, for us, the teaching faculties, we want our adjunct faculties to be familiar with all of the functions that are normally associated with teaching a course at the institution.

Dean Adams went on to say the mentoring process was left to the discretion of the department chairs.

At the department level, the department chairs at Arlington had a range of ways they handled mentoring their adjunct faculty. Professor Andrews stated their faculty was

mentored through an orientation session with him and, perhaps, some of the coordinators in the health related academic fields. He felt:

We need them familiar with our goals and expectations. The main thing we concentrate with them is how to interact with the students. We want the adjunct faculty to have a better sense of what the department is about.

For each of the major courses where we use the part-time instructors, there's one course coordinator who is responsible for their orientation and mentoring. That person is pretty much on call and available to them any time if they have any questions. And, like I said, we'll go out and actually visit the clinical sites periodically during the semester to see if they have any problems or questions at that time or just see how things are going.

Professor Arnett had trouble distinguishing an orientation session and a mentoring session. He decided:

It's not a mentoring. We don't come back and set up specific times, but the door is open. They'll come to you with questions. They'll come to me. I've got a note from one of the adjuncts that she's got to be out April 5th, the class is going to be in the computer lab, she's got somebody to take care of it, and all that stuff, and I would be happy to drop in on it. It's communication. There's one-on-one communication with me and the facilitators and the coordinators or the deans of the campus programs.

Professor Alley used the adjunct handbook in one-on-one sessions with him as a mentoring tool. He stated that if the adjuncts had any questions, they could e-mail him, telephone him, or come to his office.

At Bedford, Professor Beckett mentored his adjunct faculty members. He explained why this arrangement was successful for him and for the adjuncts in his department. He explained:

It's what I do, and it's pretty much what they did before I became the department chair. We've been doing this for quite a while, and I'm probably a little more thorough about trying to integrate them than other people because I empathize with them quite a bit, but I am also more concerned about what they are going to do in the classroom, and how it's going to impact our reputation. I want them to be successful. I cannot be successful if they are not successful. Their success is my success, and their success is the department's success.

Professor Bell mentored his own adjunct faculty mainly informally. He described:

Not a formal mentoring program for the adjuncts, and, again, it's because we're so close-knit. Most of the adjuncts are people that I've known for three, five, seven years, so the need for a formal mentoring program—it's not like you have a new person. These are time-tested individuals, so I think they are beyond the mentoring stage. If they have a question, they just call myself or the dean directly.

Professor Bender said that the education department did not have a formal program, but it did have a faculty mentoring program in place. She stated, "Not formally, but informally—yes—the adjunct faculty meet with full-time faculty—paired with this person as a resource."

The mentoring that adjuncts discussed ranged from one-on-one discussions with the department chair, pairing one-on-one with full-time faculty, and a one-on-one support system with other adjuncts. The key to a mentoring opportunity seemed to center on the involvement of the department chair.

At Arlington, Adjunct Allison, an adjunct for 17 years, stated that he was mentored by a full-time faculty member. He recommended that was the best way to mentor adjuncts. He stated that he had been around so much that he was the designated mentor for new adjunct faculty. Adjunct Allison explained:

I did. I'm not sure everybody does, and I've been a mentor to people. We'll have new faculty, and they'll say, 'He is the boss. Ask him any questions.' I am just the mentor to new adjuncts. There was one full-timer who I was a mentor to. It wasn't a subtle thing. My department chair said, 'He's going to show you how to get through this course,' and we met every week. I showed him, okay, we're doing this part of the text this week—we're doing the test on this day. It was just a one-on-one mentoring, but it was done for me when I first came here. The very first year, the entire year, a faculty member, who is now our department chair, met with me, and it wasn't his idea. It was the department chair who said, 'You will get together with him weekly and show him what you're doing and how to do stuff.' So, it wasn't like he said, 'I want to do this.' It was required, and it was an enormous help. It was fantastic.

It's probably why I'm as good at what I do as I am—because I didn't just have to go out there and wing it. He was with me. So, there was mentoring for me. Now, I don't know of anyone else who's had that circumstance.

I asked Adjunct Allison if he considered his job as a mentor a formal or an informal mentoring program. He stated it was informal. He answered, “Informal, right, but I actually had a formal, one-on-one mentoring situation with a full-time faculty member. He was assigned where we could get together 11:00 to 12:00 every Friday for the whole year. I absolutely recommend it. It was fantastic for me.

Adjunct Austin answered that he had a mentor. “It was about a year or two years ago. I am still working with that faculty member.” It turned out later in the interview the faculty member mentoring him was Adjunct Allison. It was interesting to note that Professor Alley’s words supported what the adjuncts were stating about their role as mentors. Professor Alley stated:

We have not done a mentoring program other than if there’s a problem, the department chair is called in to solve specific problems, but there is not specific mentoring. Informally, there is in my department—that the longer employed adjunct worked with the newly hired adjunct to ‘learn the ropes.’ I suspect that there is that kind of mentoring going on, but it’s informal.

Adjunct Appel was not teaching in the English department this semester, but still turned to the department chair in English as a mentor. She explained:

The education department chair is my mentor and, say for example, we make sure our grading agrees. If you deserve an A, you deserve an A, but they want to make sure a professor is not in here giving all A’s. Then, we do a departmental meeting where they give us a scenario on the papers, and then we rate those papers, and we, my mentor and I, compare ours, and then we go to a big meeting, and we argue our grading—why we think we are right. We do mentor things like that.

Now, in the department I am in now, I can't remember if I had a mentor, but we just never meet as a department. I can go down the hall and ask my department chair. However, basically, they cover each other down in English, and everybody checks on everybody down there, and I really do check with the English department if I need help.

Adjunct Ames, from the English department, stated that the English department mentored their adjuncts by fully encouraging participation in the orientation sessions and in two key department meetings held at times that their adjuncts could attend. The adjuncts were paired with full-time faculty to check their grading procedures for essays and to answer any departmental questions on policies and procedures. In fact, Adjunct Ames stated, "The only committee that I served on as an adjunct was the peer review committee. It's a committee within the department where you evaluate other members of the department." She stated she was asked to serve on the committee after being an adjunct for five years. Adjunct Ames was recently hired on a one-year contract. She felt that keeping office hours helped get her noticed in the department. She stated:

Adjuncts can have as big or as small a role as you want—it's not expected. We have office suites, so you really get to know your office mates that are in the other offices, the full-time members of the department, and so you develop a relationship with them. Again, depending on how much you want to, as an adjunct, because if you only want to spend a certain amount of hours at your office, then you're not going to have as much exposure.

Adjunct Austin shared Adjunct Ames' views on exposure. He expressed:

I can't say for certain that adjuncts all feel like I did as being an important part of the faculty within a department. My hope is that they are feeling that way—that adjuncts are accepted. What it does take that I have learned is that adjuncts need to have as much visibility on the campus as possible.

At Bedford University, Adjunct Brooks looked no further than her department chair for mentoring. She shared that “it was probably more me seeking out this person because this person hired me, and it was the natural person to go to.” Adjunct Brooks explained that she paired herself up with her department chair because “he will stand behind me and support me.” Adjunct Brown said informally he had sought out a faculty member. He shared:

Not traditional mentoring. I've used one of the instructors out at the main campus as a sounding board. In fact, there are two of them out there that I've used as a sounding board, but I wouldn't call it a mentoring relationship.

Adjunct Brown went on to explain the mentoring he felt the department did provide. He shared:

And starting in 2002, when I was strictly an adjunct, there was a faculty member who came and observed in my class. That was usually the department head, and then plus the department head met with me to review professional development goals, and so I believe that they're still continuing that with the adjunct faculty. Right now, I am instructor status, and I'm not adjunct. I'm full time, but I'm on an annual contract.

Adjunct Burk responded that “I'm not aware of any mentoring program. I've never been approached with one.” Adjunct Baxter stated, “Dean Baird and I talk. I

usually call Dean Baird.” He did state he would visit with the department chair informally if he had any questions. Adjunct Black stated that if she needed a mentor, “I either call the secretary or I ask the full-time instructor that’s housed here.”

Adjunct Bowers stated that as an adjunct in the education department, she had been assigned a mentor that was a full-time faculty member. In addition, the faculty member observed her classroom and provided feedback. All the adjuncts had stated that they were evaluated each semester through student evaluation, but Adjuncts Bowers and Brown experienced a peer review in addition to the student evaluations. At Arlington University, Adjunct Ames in the English department was the only adjunct I interviewed who had a peer evaluation in addition to the student evaluations required for all adjunct faculty.

At both of the universities, the department chair played the most important role in determining how much adjunct faculty members were mentored. Once again, the English Department at Arlington University and the Education Department at Bedford provided peer faculty mentoring programs and peer review for their adjuncts.

Professional Development. Professional Development opportunities were limited for adjunct faculty. The administrators and the department chairs at both universities cited budget restraint as a major reason. Release time was given if adjuncts wanted to go to conferences on their own initiative and at their own expense. It was not clear if adjuncts’ pay would be docked if they attended. It seemed that if the standard existed to dock the adjuncts, it was loosely enforced.

The administration at Arlington stated that internal opportunities on campus were available to adjuncts but not outside conferences. Dean Adkins explained:

Anything that's available on campus is open to them. The law of magnificent prohibits both the rich man and the poor man from sleeping under bridges, which is to say that both faculty and adjuncts can take advantage, for instance, of our technology training. But our technology training is 8:00 to 5:00, Monday through Friday, and if an adjunct is primarily an evening person, then they can't take advantage of the opportunity.

So, there's a lot of those kinds of things that sound better than they are.

But, otherwise, any of the lectures, whatever else on campus, any other activities on campus, training opportunities are open.

Dean Adams stated, "The institution provides no funding for adjunct faculty to attend professional conferences. Adjuncts' professional development opportunities are limited." Dean Armstrong explained it was a matter of personal desire and initiation of the adjunct faculty. He expounded:

Not on the campus, no. I know some adjuncts personally and professionally that go out and do things. That's because of the interest in their own field. Most of them, we hope, will do that. We see it on their resume' as they turn them in, but we don't require, and again beyond that, look to see that they do hold the right preparation and experience to do the thing that we're asking them to do.

At Bedford, the administration faced the same financial dilemma.

Dean Barton stated if money were available and it did not impact on sending a full-time faculty member, he would consider sending an adjunct to an outside conference. He explained:

Only if all travel money were gone, and that does happen, and we work within budget constraints and occasionally, budget monies are gone. I'm not trying to twist your question. If adjuncts were being allowed to go, and full-time faculty were being denied, there would be friction, but I think as long as monies were available, I think we would welcome adjuncts' attending conferences.

Dean Baird expressed that he wanted adjuncts interested in furthering their training by attending meetings, but his budget did not allow for it. He lamented:

We hope they do attend professional conferences. We don't have anything specifically with that in mind. We don't have dollars to set aside to allow adjunct faculty to travel to professional meetings. They have gone on occasion, but rarely.

I don't know of any situation where they have gone to a meeting and actually had to miss class. They might go with the department, another member of a specific department to a meeting, but they pay their own way. Oftentimes, the meetings that they might be going to are—that they might be going to in a professional capacity anyway, then their employer might pay their own way.

Vice President Barby explained the challenges of sending adjunct faculty to professional conferences. He stated:

To my knowledge, we have never paid for an adjunct to go to a conference or to travel to—it's all budget driven. To my knowledge, that has never been the case for us.

I think there have been circumstances where a faculty member who had some kind of special event, arrangements were made for them to make up their

class or have someone come in to teach the class while they were gone for a conference or something like that. I'm sure that has been the case a number of times and not had their salary docked for that as long as arrangements were made.

If those dollars that were used from adjuncts were deducted from what was available to regular faculty for travel, I would think that in tight times that we have right now, it could be a problem because travel is very limited. Only people who are presenting are paid to go to conferences. That's kind of a standard right now at most institutions. So, I would think it would be a challenge to do that for adjuncts now. In other times, it probably wouldn't be an issue.

The academic department chairs had limited professional development available at the department level. Professional conferences outside of campus were at the initiation and expense of the adjunct. Professor Andrews said at the department, the health related courses required professional development training for their adjuncts at local medical facilities. However, he stated, "They generally don't participate in professional development when it comes to teaching. That's why we've developed a couple of handbooks for them and added an orientation process to that because it is a different world for medical training."

Professor Alley explained that "if they go to a conference, it's because of something they're interested in. This is not required as a part of their job. They pay for it themselves. There's limited funding for full-time faculty to go."

In Bedford, similar stories emerged. Professor Beckett expressed his frustration: We have an adjunct here that I have been trying to get involved in professional development. She very much wants it—we have the money to give it to her, but

the faculty directs that. My faculty directs the funds, and they are reluctant to let her get into their pie.

Professor Bender, whose education department met with success in several aspects of adjunct faculty integration, showed little success for sending adjuncts to conferences. She stated, “Professional development? They mainly go to conferences on their own because of their full-time job or just because they are professionals. If they don’t miss their classes too much, I don’t think release time is a problem.”

Professor Bell felt that adjuncts would face being docked if they missed their classes to attend a professional conference. He explained:

No. Now, I’ll qualify that no. The official release time—no. If it was a big important conference, as far as being able to attend it—yes, and I’ll put it this way, we would teach their classes for them. But as far as the official, to through the policy that regular faculty go to, no. The bad thing about when adjuncts miss a day, even when we teach their class, which we do, is they are docked that day of pay.

The adjuncts mainly addressed the professional development opportunities available to them inside their own department. Many of the adjuncts expressed they do attend professional conferences at their own expense.

Adjunct Ames explained the professional development opportunities provided to her as an adjunct faculty member in the English Department at Arlington. She remarked:

My department has a monthly meeting, which I did not attend all of them, but they also have lots of other functions besides meetings. They have what’s called faculty development at least twice a year where, since I teach composition, they

would have the whole faculty come together with adjuncts and discuss how to grade compositions, and lots of social events and adjuncts are included.

Adjunct Appel stated that she had not gone to a professional conference, but said, “I would like to do that. I probably could if I wanted to. I don’t think they would pay an adjunct’s way. I think you would have to pay your own way.” Adjunct Austin stated he goes to conferences along with full-time faculty, “I will go, but I will pay my own way.” Adjunct Ames said she pays her own way to conferences but that she gets release time, “Those days that I had to be at a conference, they were accommodating.” However, Adjunct Ames reiterated, “Our faculty development I mentioned earlier—at least twice a year we meet at the English department, and we go over topics to assign, and we read student papers, and I’ve really found that very helpful.”

In Bedford, Adjunct Brooks simply stated, “Never been invited to one, never inquired about one, so, I don’t really know if that would be a possibility. I suspect it wouldn’t, not so much because I’m an adjunct, but because of budget constraints.

Adjunct Black stated that the university had never sent her to a conference, but that she goes to professional conferences on her own. She said the department supported her. “They said if I can get my classes covered, then go right ahead and go, so I did.” Adjunct Burk stated that when she attended conferences at her own expense, release time “has never been an issue.” Adjunct Bowers explained that professional development opportunities at the department level were available in the education department through their department orientation, meetings, mentoring programs, and peer review.

The consensus of the participants was limited opportunities were available for the

adjunct at the university. Due to budget restraints, adjuncts received release time but had to pay their own way.

Networking Opportunities. Little social networking opportunities existed for adjunct faculty. At both campuses, social functions were mainly informal get-togethers among social groups. As Dean Armstrong stated, “We don’t have any for our own faculty, so we certainly don’t have for others.” Dean Adams explained that “I think those opportunities are there for adjuncts as they are for regular faculty, but we don’t have anything formalized.” Dean Adkins seemed to agree with the other two administrators I talked with that all opportunities for socializing were informal.

At Bedford, Dean Baird explained that having a campus for non-traditional students resulted in few opportunities for formal get-togethers. He explained:

Relatively few. We invite them to most of our parties and shindigs, but most don’t come. Now, they’re like our non-traditional students in a sense. They come, they do their job, they go home. They don’t necessarily want to socialize. We try to be friendly, and we try to include them in our social activities. We have a few that show up in caps and gowns for graduation, and they’re invited. We had a situation—we still do to some extent—the academic regalia of our adjuncts—the rental price was paid for by the university in order to get them to come, and that worked to some extent, but you see, even there, they come and show up by academic rank—they’re last.

Vice President Barby felt that it was difficult to schedule events at a time that adjuncts could attend. He expressed:

I think typically the adjunct is not expected to attend because, in most cases, they're either in a school position where they're teaching during the day, during regular meetings, or they're working in the work force during the day. The majority of our adjuncts have other employment, and that precludes any kind of involvement beyond teaching a class and minimal advisement.

Dean Barton's comments concurred with Dean Baird and Vice President Barby.

He elaborated:

Very informal, and, again, certainly all of the departmental activities are open to adjuncts. Again, somewhat because of the time constraints, if they are held in the daytime hours, adjunct faculty are typically working at these times. I don't see much participation in activities by the adjuncts.

The department chairs all answered with the same opinion as Professor Andrews expressed, "Not many, I don't think. I mean, they're allowed to participate in all the university activities, lecture series, and all the cultural activities we have, but they're not required."

Professor Beckett echoed the same comments on informal gatherings—that adjuncts would be invited but not expected to attend. He did mention he gave Adjunct Brooks a free pass for the athletic season because "she is a basketball nut, so I gave her my basketball pass, and she seemed pleased with it. I wanted to say thank you for doing a good job." Professor Bell said adjuncts and full-time faculty would meet for coffee every now and then, "not formal—more spontaneous."

The adjuncts had a wide range of responses on their social opportunities at the universities. Adjunct Appel stated she was comfortable going to the department level

informal parties, but not the university's faculty banquet. She explained, "No, it's usually department by department. They do hold a big faculty event, and I don't feel comfortable doing that. When the university has their big dinners and picnic, I just don't go. I don't know them well enough."

Adjunct Ames felt welcomed to go the English department Christmas party. She felt:

A faculty member would have a Christmas party, and I would go—things like that—and also the awards banquet. The English department has an awards banquet. The adjuncts are invited. Essentially, you can play as big or as small a role as you want. They're not really expected to do those things, like to go, but they're welcome.

Adjunct Austin expressed the same viewpoint. He stated, "We've had do few individuals that will call together a little group, you know, if you want to come over sometime, but that's very informal—nothing formal."

In Bedford, Adjunct Brown said that when the opportunity arises, "it was spontaneous. Hey! Come go with us—that sort of thing." Adjunct Baxter said, "I know virtually no one here. That is not their fault. My focus is on teaching—not for a social outlet. I do visit informally with my department chair or with Dean Baird."

Adjunct Brooks stated that she was invited to attend a retirement party. She explained:

I received a memo about a going away party for certain professors. I was invited to attend. There was a department Christmas party last year where the other two

full-time people were invited, and I wasn't. Don't get me wrong—I was okay with that. I think sometimes they just don't think about me. It's not deliberate.

Adjunct Burk said, "On occasion, when staff members have retired or when they have been moving on to other opportunities, I've been invited to come and participate in those parties."

At both universities, there were few occasions for social networking opportunities for adjunct faculty or even full-time faculty. However, informal meetings did occur on a spontaneous basis.

Satisfaction of the Adjunct Faculty. With the exception of the parking situation, all the long-term adjuncts at each university stated they liked their job, university, students, and co-workers. When I asked the adjuncts about the reasons they were satisfied teaching at the university, one major concept emerged—that they were not nameless. "Nameless" was a concept I heard at both universities from the adjuncts. This was quite unexpected. They spoke that at these two universities, the department chairs and faculty members they worked directly with knew their names.

Adjunct Allison spoke of the fact, "I am consulted and respected," as important to him. He mentioned that his name was recognized in the university. I looked Adjunct Allison up on the Arlington Web site and found his name within the department. I found articles on him in the school newspaper, and his name was listed beside the classes he taught in the Arlington class schedule for fall, 2003 and spring, 2004. He had served as an adjunct for 17 years, and he was recognized by the university.

Adjunct Austin explained, "I don't see myself any less important as an instructor here. I am respected as a colleague." He said he was recently in an article in the school

newspaper with Adjunct Allison and two full-time faculty members. I looked the article up and found the picture and article about the four faculty members. The article and the picture called all four “faculty members.” The term “part-time” or “adjunct” was not used. Adjunct Allison’s name was listed in the class schedule. In fact, all the adjuncts names were listed in the class schedule. These were long-term adjuncts at their universities and had achieved a level of recognition and respect. This was important to all of the adjuncts at both universities. Adjunct Ames stated:

The university makes you feel a part of the university—you don’t feel like just temporary help, and I think e-mail has actually, really, helped a lot because, as an adjunct, you’ve got all the same e-mail that faculty members do, so that really ties you into the university system. They know you through e-mail.

At Bedford, Adjunct Brooks talked about the concept of not being “one of those nameless.” She explained:

What it means to be to be integrated is that you are respected and appreciated as part of the team, which is one reason why, when I had an opportunity to go to a different university two years back, I ultimately didn’t go there because I was treated as part of the team here. I could tell over there I was just going to be an adjunct, one of those nameless workers. Why even learn the name?

Adjunct Black explained why she left another adjunct position to come to work at the Bedford campus. She elaborated:

The other place I taught at as an adjunct, I just wasn’t happy, and I would go home and say, ‘this is not the place for me.’ In fact, one of them asked me to come back and teach one time, and I said, ‘No.’

When you walked in the office, they didn't know your name. They didn't know what you taught. When you got hired, they would walk by you and not know you. You would try to remember them, but then they might change the class time before you ever get back there to teach, and sometimes they would have people that wouldn't help you. Once I showed up for a class that had been cancelled due to low enrollment. No one bothered to tell me.

Adjunct Brown and Adjunct Bowers mentioned similar needs of recognition. This deep desire to not be nameless and be recognized was an important concept or key to retaining good adjuncts. At Bedford, when I walked through the campus, I noticed the names of the adjuncts I interviewed on their office space, in the class schedules, and in the school newspaper. In addition, I found them listed on the university Web site. In fact, their names and office locations were found on the Web site. In addition, several of the adjuncts had individual Web pages that I accessed from the faculty or department Web site. This helped confirm that they were recognized by the university.

All the adjuncts I interviewed did not appreciate it when the word "Staff" appeared in the class schedule instead of the adjunct's name. Adjunct Bowers explained, "I considered myself to be a permanent part-time faculty member (laughs). A permanent adjunct and I would joke because that's an oxymoron." In addition, lack of recognition or professional courtesy was stated as a problem. Adjunct Burk shared:

I once showed up for my class only to learn that the department chair had given the class to a full-time faculty member since his class did not make enrollment. He needed the class to meet his teaching load. The dean called me personally and apologized.

Bedford Adjunct Baxter explained another frustrating situation:

It's the pits when you are part time, and they call you at the last minute to teach a class and don't give you time to prepare. I like the challenge of teaching and want to do my best, and then they don't give you time to prepare.

Several adjuncts explained that at one time or another, they had to call the department secretary to get a class roster or to see if their class had made enrollment. Personal recognition, knowing their names, and keeping them informed about the teaching assignments were important to keeping the satisfaction level high for adjunct faculty.

All but one of the adjuncts at Arlington stated that they hoped for a one-year temporary full-time contract with benefits. They saw this as the best way for adjuncts to achieve integration. Adjunct Allison decided he did not want a full-time position. He explained:

There are two things different between being full time and part time—benefits and responsibility—and they're both equal. I don't have, of course, any health insurance. I don't have any retirement. I get, really, for the hours I put in, one-third of what a full-time person doing the same job is paid—one-third. On the other hand, the responsibilities of the full time, I've come to know over the years, more and more and more, and I do not want to have.

Adjunct Ames had been hired on a one-year contract this current year and had agreed to begin her doctoral program. She stated that there were more department meetings than she expected, and the main difference was she was treated as a colleague. In addition, she stated:

I am teaching the same courses. They haven't added any. I think I am better, though, because I am more available. I have my own office. My office hours are longer, and I've noticed that students really like to come in during the afternoon where before, as an adjunct, I didn't keep very many afternoon office hours, so that's a difference.

Three of the adjuncts at Bedford had recently obtained a full-time temporary position. They had individual office space and expected to attend university and department meetings. In addition, they stated they were now "treated as colleagues." Adjunct Brown stated:

As an adjunct, there's no traditional type benefits offered. There is the intrinsic benefit that I get from feeling that I've done a good job. And that's either on an up day or a down day. Overall, at the end of the semester, I did a good job. I have some benefits now, but more responsibilities come with the job.

Adjunct Bowers went into detail on the difference in being part-time and now full-time faculty. She expressed worry on just how long the service of temporary full-time status extended for and when that contract might end. She explained:

Well, it's funny because when I considered myself as an adjunct instructor, one of the benefits I liked was the mailbox and e-mail. Just like my part-time students. I didn't have to go do any department meetings, and anything I really needed to know, they would either send me a memo or call me, and I knew enough about meetings, and especially the college of education, and all the committees—I was really glad I didn't have all those additional demands on me. I also saw that being an adjunct faculty member is a very well-paid part-time job. If I had gone and

tried to earn equivalent income in another part-time job, I would have had to work more hours on the job. Now, of course, as an adjunct, the way we have our classes structured here is I would come once a week and teach three hours; but, of course, there's a lot more work that goes into it that it's hard to say how many hours that is, but still, it's on my own time, and there's very few jobs that I would be able to work three hours a week and pick the rest of the hours when I wanted to work and get equivalent pay.

Now that I'm working full time, and I'm seeing the equivalent as if I had worked 12 hours as an adjunct versus 12 hours as a full-time faculty member, the disparity in the income is just shocking. They've hired me to teach a three credit hour summer class, and I taught a three credit hour class as an adjunct last July. I haven't asked the question yet of what's the difference. Am I going to go back to being paid as an adjunct this fall, or am I going to be paid as a faculty member? I haven't even approached that question yet because I haven't signed a contract yet, so I don't want to pop the bubble yet. The difference in the pay is tremendous between a full-time instructor and adjunct. There really isn't any opportunity in either position for a pay increase.

Adjunct Brown raised several unanswered questions concerning the issue of temporary full-time contract. However, for the adjuncts I interviewed, issues of tenure were not important. The data revealed what a majority of the long-term adjuncts wanted was the status of temporary full-time. With this status, the adjuncts were more fully integrated into the department they served at the university.

Roadblocks to Integration

All the administrators agreed that time and distance, budget constraints, and lack of vision concerning part-time faculty were the greatest roadblocks to integration of adjunct faculty. The administrators focused their comments in terms of how the adjuncts' service benefited the university. Dean Adkins, from Arlington University, said:

Well, the obvious, of course, is time and location. I think it's also fair to say that that's not a priority to anybody with the possible exception of a few adjunct faculty members. I think I have never seen anybody with a real vision for adjuncts.

You know, part of the culture that makes it so difficult to think about adjuncts is this. I can remember when I was an adjunct myself. I was so dang glad to have a chance. It's like one of my favorite stories, you know, if they'd have said \$1,000 a year, I'd have said, 'I don't have that much—can I make payments?' So, I think that does hurt—that the really dedicated ones, they love it, too.

We've got an adjunct whose evaluations are stronger than some of our full time, and I can go back to a time in which I had an adjunct that was better than the full time. I haven't been that happy in my teaching results the last few years, so, in terms of those numbers, I've had adjuncts do better than me. So, guess what—you've got to evaluate that, but there is resistance in faculty to thinking that, and, in fairness, adjuncts don't do all the other things that faculty do, and they don't have as many pressures and things.

Dean Adams mentioned the problem with time and distance. In addition, he recognized the contributions of some of the top adjuncts to the university. Dean Adams expressed:

Well, I think policies are something that tend to be a problem. I don't know that adjuncts are treated as any different in terms of their citizenship within the academic community, but, policies and procedures tend to change, and sometimes those changes don't get down to the adjunct faculty in a manner that it should. Sometimes we overlook a lot of things because we have been doing things in a regular fashion so long we think it's simply understood that knowledge should be gained or should be acquired or already acquired.

Part of the problem is that our adjunct faculty is on campus for a limited amount of time—maybe they don't want to be on campus for additional hours and come to do their business and want to leave and go about whatever they want to do, and I think that's one of the things that makes it a little more difficult to integrate adjunct faculty more into the university functions. Then, again, we have a few adjunct faculty that are probably around as much as the regular faculty. The ones that are around—I can think of one in particular—we take advantage of the opportunity to integrate that individual into a lot of things.

Dean Baird, from Bradford, commented on how important adjunct faculty were to the university. He expressed:

I think the biggest problem we have is the feeling of many regular faculty that adjuncts are only hired because they're cheap. They're the grist, if you will. They can come and go while they maintain their normal load. Want to add

another class? Why, we'll get an adjunct. If, the next semester after that, we don't want the class, that person is left hanging, and I think that's where we tried to operate a lot differently with adjuncts because they are a major piece of our operation. We tried to make sure that every semester they were doing a good job. They were employed. Quite frankly, what we would do if we had additional classes we didn't have adjuncts? Now, that is more true in some areas than others, and yet we still had a very low ratio of adjunct to full-time faculty.

Vice President Barby touched on the financial situation as a roadblock to integration. He stated:

The financial situation is probably the biggest hurdle—trying to justify requiring an adjunct faculty member to attend meetings or spend hours in the office of whatever, come to social functions, even commencement. It's difficult to justify that based on paying them what we pay them a credit hour. So, that's probably the biggest hurdle—how to deal with that. Probably a stipend or increase in per credit hour would be the solution. That is occurring in some certain circumstances.

Dean Barton felt the time that adjuncts worked was the major factor or roadblock. He expressed:

Well, I think there are some roadblocks that are just built into the system. One, they are part time and after regular, normal working hours. Adjuncts often show up after the regular faculty have left for the day. I was up here a couple of nights ago, and the only one in the building as an adjunct professor holding class.

Everybody else was gone. There's just that problem with the time that they're here.

They're not here as a part of the normal work day when committee meetings are being held—people are sitting around talking about ideas. I think that's probably the biggest constraint is just getting regular faculty together with adjunct faculty because of the time constraints. Like I said, there's quite a bit of informal mentoring going on. Those help break some of the barriers. Some of our professors do an excellent job of holding in the adjunct faculty within their sections and making them feel a part. Other than that, I don't see any real constraints.

We certainly try our best to make them feel a regular part of the faculty, that they're an integral part of the department and the college of education. We use a good number of adjunct faculty.

In fact, Dean Baird wanted to use more adjunct faculty. He stated:

It is to our advantage that we are urban. We have companies, we have hospitals, we have research groups with Ph.D.'s, many of them, scientists all over the place, that could come to us and add a flavor to our programs, and the result of that is, I think, we're missing a big boat.

For example, I think that we have a situation largely in the area of business and communication where school law, business law, international law—that's a changing situation. Those are changing daily, weekly, monthly, yearly—those change, and I think that's an area where a qualified professional in the field can probably do a better job than a full-time faculty member; but, where we're

imparting theory that would be implied, I think, therefore, we need to have the full-time faculty individuals.

Dean Baird elaborated that Bedford University attracted non-traditional students who often preferred to attend the university in the evenings or on weekends. He stated, “In this case, the adjuncts are the only university employees that the students were familiar with.” He stated that top qualified adjuncts were plentiful within the city of 400,000 people which surrounds the Bedford branch campus. This situation provided a large pool of qualified adjuncts for the university. Arlington, on the other hand, had a more limited adjunct pool from the rural area.

Dean Barton believed roadblocks happen when “adjuncts are seen as support rather than an integrated part of the mainstream.” All the administrators mentioned adjuncts’ working hours, time constraints, and amount of pay as roadblocks that hinder the integration of adjuncts.

The department chairs concurred, but added another roadblock was that the adjuncts needed a doctorate to get a full-time position. In addition, the department heads believed that adjuncts are seen as more committed to their full-time job than to the university, and that adjuncts do not face the same demands associated with academia as full-time faculty.

Professor Andrews stated, “Well, the main one, again, is that they work full time at other jobs and just teach part time for us, and that really limits how much they can do—interact with the university in the university culture.”

Professor Alley, of Arlington, talked about the differences in responsibilities between part time and full-time faculty. He explained:

Well, adjunct faculty do not have, in my opinion, they do not have the responsibility to be here full time. There are certain duties and obligations that they don't have to do—they are not required to do—advise students, attend what I will call regular faculty meetings, but meetings of the entire faculty. They do not have to worry about the things of tenure promotion. They do not have to worry about the activities associated with the academic advancement. I'm sure that there might be some adjuncts trying to get on full time and would therefore make the effort on their own to do these sorts of things, but, in my department, they are not required.

Professor Beckett felt the part time and the full time were at odds with each other.

He elaborated:

I think, on the part of the full-time faculty, I think they just prefer not to think about adjuncts, and if they think about them at all, they think about them as a problem, and I think that's part of the problem. I think the other part of the problem is that the adjuncts really don't express much interest or desire to become integrated. They kind of want to get in and do their thing and get out. So, you have a group that wants to ignore them, and you have a group that wants to be ignored.

Professor Bell mentioned that adjuncts were not hired to do research, "They teach regular classes at irregular hours." Two of the department heads stated that adjuncts were not formally recognized in the organizational chart for the universities. Professor Bell explained that a roadblock existed with a "top-down system with layers to go through at each step, I am not sure where the adjunct fits into the organizational system we have."

All department heads at both universities emphasized that “adjuncts just need to express an interest, and they are welcome” to do more at the department level. However, the burden or emphasis was on the initiative of the adjunct.

The adjuncts saw their isolation, especially the irregular hours they teach, as a major roadblock. In addition, the adjunct believed that the lack of communication was the big roadblock.

Adjunct Ames responded about the isolation the adjuncts face. She said:

Definitely the isolation factor—just the nature of the job—you do it alone in the classroom. The English department here is really good about assigning mentors, and so each adjunct has a full-time faculty member that they can go to and get help. I think that compensates for the isolation because you have that person—that contact person that you feel that it’s really part of their job to help you. You don’t feel like you are, you know, bothering them because they’ve been assigned to you.

Adjunct Allison felt the insecurity of the job as an adjunct was a major roadblock.

He voiced:

This is the way I see it, and the way I know it is, and I know there is pressure from above to cut here, cut there. It’s been tough for the last few years, but I’ve been there before. The first year that I worked here, at the end of the year, I’d worked like crazy, worked as hard as I possibly could, so I’d be asked back, and I remember the department chair calling me and saying, ‘sorry, we’re not going to ask you back next year.’ I was devastated because I’d done everything I could, and I think he knew that. In the fall, a week before the semester started, I got a

phone call, 'We need you.' I think they know they need us, yet when they tell us we can't come back, it's because from way up above, we've got to cut, we've got to cut, we've got to cut.

Two of the other adjuncts I interviewed felt that the university's limiting them to teaching only three courses a semester as a roadblock. Adjunct Austin explained:

That's a tough question. The only tough thing would be the number of load hours we are allowed to teach. Currently, I believe that maybe statewide that adjuncts are only allowed nine contract hours because after that, the state then starts paying the benefit packages and all that. That might be the biggest roadblock. A second one would be, and again, this is not in my case here. The second roadblock would be the advantages of having an actual regular office with an extension for me to use with a computer in the office as well.

For Adjunct Albright, the roadblock was a lack of communication. She explained:

First of all, when you first come, you don't know what's going on, and I've been here nine years, and sometimes you don't know who to ask the questions, and sometimes, like with the computer, I should have been given one a long time ago as far as I'm concerned. I should never have to go to a federal agency to get a computer.

And then there are things like I wanted to be able to build a Web site on the university's Web site for my students to be able to study practicals, and there was a class going on here that taught you how to build a Web site, and I asked to take it, and I was told "no" because I was part time, and I said I'll just do it the

hard way then, and I was discouraged from doing that because I was told that the students would not be interested, and it would take too long to load.

I did it anyway, and two of the people in my department helped me. Sometimes you don't even bother to ask because you know the answer when you're part time.

Adjunct Burk, from Bedford, expressed that the adjuncts' treatment can be a roadblock. She shared:

I can only think of the most typical type things that could happen. Having adjuncts teach the most undesirable courses—having them teach at the undesirable times—just things of that nature. I think if adjuncts felt like they really were being treated like they were the bottom of the totem pole, like they essentially are, that they become disheartened and lose interest and not put up with those types of things, especially with the compensation that's involved. It wouldn't be worth the time.

Adjunct Brooks explained, “You may be an adjunct, you come in one night a week, and the full-time people that work in that department maybe aren't even there that evening, so you don't even know who you're integrating with. You don't know the full-time people.”

Adjunct Brown felt that the administration and department chairs' mindset about adjunct participation was a roadblock. He believed:

I think the biggest ones are time and travel and the mindset—that adjuncts don't want to do this, or won't want to do this, or won't take the time to participate. I think that's a preconception that really should be addressed a little better, maybe

in some type of an orientation session with adjuncts. Find out—would you be willing to or could we structure such time or what time would we have to structure it for you to participate. I think time is the most difficult thing to get around.

Adjunct Baxter had served as an adjunct for 15 years. He stated that he envisioned himself as an “independent contractor. I’m hardly here but at night. I know virtually no one here but my department chair and dean.”

It was interesting that the administrators and department chairs felt the adjuncts just needed to ask to participate more in the university functions. As Dean Armstrong and Vice President Barby stated, “They are certainly welcomed but not expected.” Dean Adkins and Dean Barker asked, “How much can we expect of them to participate for what we pay them.” The adjuncts, all of them, stated at one time or the other, they were waiting for the administrators or the department heads to ask them or invite them to participate. This was a major roadblock that presented itself throughout the interview.

The main concepts that came from the respondents were that more communication, involvement, and recognition were needed to combat the roadblock to integration. The opportunities for dialogue among the groups presented itself as an important concept on the subject of roadblocks to integration.

Organizational Structure’s Effect on Adjunct Integration

The hierarchical nature of higher education, the emphasis on full-time faculty, the lack of recognition of adjunct faculty, and the exclusion of adjuncts were the concepts that emerged from the data centering on the organizational structure of higher education and its effect on adjunct integration.

Dean Armstrong felt:

This is a special category of faculty, and people understand that. You're not working full time, you're working part time. You're working on an as-needed basis. This is not my opinion, and these people are not faculty for the university in the sense of others that have gone through a selection process, are peer reviewed, and must be forced to maintain and hold certain standards of professionalism and service throughout the course of the year. These people are held to a little different set of standards. Their level of involvement depends on the department. I think it depends on the person in charge of the department. We have a system in place that can either enhance or can stifle creativity and involvement. It's going to be determined by the leadership level.

Dean Adkins explained the need for adjuncts and the barriers for adjuncts in the system. He elaborated:

In reality, the organizational structure of higher education today is dependent upon adjunct faculty, so there's a sense in which we are organized with budgets and with other goals and all these other kinds of things because if you're going to get to where you say you're going, and do what you say you're going to do, you're going to have to draw an adjunct faculty, so, in that sense, we're dependent.

Now, it's interesting to me that the other way of saying that, the other side, is that the organization the organization has barriers all the way through it, and some of those are very subtle. They are almost like catch 22's. So, for instance, listen to what we say when we're talking about our adjunct full-time participants.

They don't participate in governance. So, all at once, we've decided that the faculty member's job—we've redefined the faculty member's job—and in doing so, we've excluded adjuncts from being faculty members, not only by virtue of salary and number of hours, but by the number of roles that we expect of them even. It may be expectation and not just amounts, but I think that we almost define them as like fly-by-night's.

I'm sure that there are academic institutions in which tenure is bragging rights, and so it's one more excuse to look down your nose at an adjunct faculty who has not even been able to get full-time status, but, essentially here, tenure is largely symbolic. It's just not an issue, and people sometimes put weight on things, but I just can't imagine people pulling rank on faculty, tenure or not. If you don't get tenured, now that's embarrassing, but, practically speaking, we've got adjuncts that are practically as tenured as some of our full-time faculty.

They've been here as long.

Dean Adams centered his thoughts on the problems with communication in the higher education organizational structure. He remarked:

Well, the organizational structure is somewhat of a hindrance because most of the structure is a top-down approach. That probably discourages communication.

We've developed adjunct faculty handbooks in an attempt to try to make certain that new faculty get what they need.

Dean Adams went on to exclaim that “We have a few adjuncts that are around as much or more than regular faculty.”

Vice President Barby talked about the hierarchy embedded in higher education.

He stated that faculty were classified by the number of hours they teach. He stated:

I don't think there's much room in what's currently in place for the adjunct other than what we currently see as an external entity, essentially. Higher education is a very proprietary type of organization like many large organizations, but, because of the fact that faculty are very proprietary, for an adjunct or any outside person, they always say the hardest step is getting your foot in the door, and this is kind of a closed society in a sense, so, for the adjunct to be included into the system, I think there would have to be some restructuring done and maybe rethinking of the values of higher education because it's just a very closed system. From my experience and perspective, adjuncts are treated as a separate class.

Dean Barton believed that the organizational structure produced "adjuncts feeling they are just a small cog in a big machine." Dean Baird expressed frustration at the lack of vision higher education has in its relationship with adjunct faculty. He expounded:

We need an adjunct coordinator since we are highly dependent on having excellent adjunct faculty. I see more use of adjunct faculty in the future; therefore, we need the ability to control the destiny of our adjunct faculty with a more coordinated effort. Administrators need to be mindful of the proper care and feeding of our adjuncts. I believe that it would be in everybody's best interest if we could have an adjunct coordinator, but that's not going to happen with our structure.

All the department chairs mentioned that adjuncts were not formally recognized in the organizational structure or administrative chart of the university. I examined the

organizational charts of both universities and confirmed that adjuncts were not represented. Professor Andrews pointed out that “The whole structure is a roadblock in itself. The structure is for full-time faculty—not adjuncts.” Professor Alley explained, “Our policies and procedures are basically written for full-time faculty, so the rules do not apply to the adjuncts.”

At Bedford University, Professor Bender expressed similar concerns that the department chairs at Arlington pointed out. She stated:

I don't think it fosters integration. I'm not sure the adjunct is seen in the organizational structure. They are there to teach—to bring practical experience to the students. They are very good at what they do—they are needed, but I'm not sure they are actually “seen” in the structure.

Professor Beckett was quite emphatic when he stated the lack of vision concerning adjunct faculty in the higher education institutions. He emphasized:

In my 25 years in higher education, I've never heard of a task force or a committee or anything on adjunct faculty. I've never heard of a temporary committee. I've never heard of a permanent standing committee. I've never heard of any institutional resources being used in that direction. It seems like it's the other way around—they would prefer not to spend anything on adjuncts, but they need them when they need them; they want them when they want them—right now; and they want them to do a good job because we'll fire them if they don't. We're quick to fire them if they don't do a good job.

Professor Beckett went on to explain that the university needs excellent adjunct teachers and had high expectations for the adjunct but preferred not to

spend any money on behalf of the adjuncts.

The adjunct faculty realized that in the organizational structure of higher education, they were not recognized and were vulnerable. Every adjunct saw their position in the organizational structure as dependent upon the department chair. The department chair was their advocate and their mentor. Adjunct Albright explained:

I don't know if it affects or hinders integration because usually in situations like that, you go to your immediate supervisor, and they go up from there, and that's in any organization.

Professor Allison said, "I don't know about the structure, but certainly individuals like my dean and department chair need to be supportive. If they weren't, we would be slashed and burned because the vice presidents and up think we are expendable."

Adjunct Austin stated, "I do know that if I were to pursue any full-time teaching status, the advancement of degrees would be required."

Adjunct Baxter emphasized that in the organization, "I am an independent agent. You take care of yourself." He further remarked:

There's a hindrance in the traditional academic, not so much here, but in research, the traditional sort of structure and what is expected of a professor, to some extent, means you're in a different group. You're not doing research; you're not counseling students; you're not fostering graduate students—those kinds of things. That structure is not real conducive.

Adjunct Brown felt that it was a management problem. He explained:

Well, people are people, and there's always going to be people who are upset by, gee, he got to go and he's just an adjunct. That, to me, becomes a management

problem—an administrator’s problem. If you’re going to integrate your adjuncts into your coursework or your program, you’re going to address those possible administrative problems as you get your full-time faculty involved in integrating these adjuncts, and it’s going to come to the place, I think, when you say, well, we have this conference. What do you think about sending adjuncts and so and so to the conference? The full-time faculty will be in a position of supporting that because they recognize what it’s going to do for the program as a whole. So, I think you get around that in other ways.

Adjunct Brooks bluntly stated:

The bureaucracy doesn’t care about integrating adjuncts. It’s the bureaucracy—it’s this ridiculous chain you have to go through just to get two extra chairs in your classroom. I don’t want to be integrated into a bureaucracy. I’m okay with being outside of that. I like to see my input from time to time on specific things related to what I teach.

The adjuncts recognized the power of their department chair in how much they were allowed to teach and in how much input they had in the department. As one adjunct expressed, “Adjuncts need a supportive chair that will stand up for us.” They recognized their vulnerability during budget cuts. They all recognized that for a tenure-track full-time position, the structure demanded a doctorate degree.

Summary

The data collected about adjunct integration centered on a series of interview questions asked of 23 participants at two universities. The open-ended interview questions were based on Senge’s (1994) learning organization model. The

administrators, department chairs, and adjuncts (with at least three years of service) were purposely chosen for their unique perceptions and multiple perspectives. The participants were chosen with the help of the gatekeepers at each site of study. University documents and relevant papers presented further insight into the realities of adjunct faculty integration at the campus sites.

Four categories emerged from the data and provided the separate sections that focused on the meaning of adjunct faculty, the ways adjuncts were integrated in day-to-day practice, roadblocks to adjunct integration, and the organizational structure's effect on adjunct integration. The data collected on the meaning of adjunct integration centered on three areas: The meaning of being adjunct faculty, the meaning of integration, and participants' viewpoints on more adjunct participation or integration.

On the concept of what it meant to be an adjunct at the two universities, the administrators and the department chairs viewed the adjunct in terms of how the use of adjuncts benefited the institution. Their responses focused on the prestige of working in higher education, along with the credentials, professionalism, and expertise the adjuncts brought into the department. The adjunct participants focused on the internal rewards they received from the experience.

All the participants believe integration of the adjunct faculty meant more opportunities for communication, involvement, and recognition within the university community. In addition, they explained how better integration would ultimately benefit the students that the university served. Similar concepts on more opportunities for communication, involvement, and recognition were expressed by the administration and department heads on how increased participation by adjuncts in their departments would

benefit the university. The adjuncts viewed the subject of more integration through how it benefited them by better communication and increased exposure, respect, and involvement. They felt if they improved themselves, they would ultimately improve their students.

The data collected centered on specific ways adjunct integration occurred in actual day-to-day practice, both university-wide and at the department level. The majority of the administrators, department heads, and adjunct faculty members responded that adjuncts were not expected to serve on university committees, develop the strategic plan for the university, attend department meetings, formulate department goals, or attend professional conferences. Two departments proved to be the exception.

The English Department at Arlington University and the Education Department at Bedford University welcomed and integrated their adjuncts with the departments. Adjuncts had orientation sessions, mentoring opportunities, and department meetings slated at a time they could attend. The adjuncts in these departments were invited to give their input into developing the goals and mission of the department. The adjuncts reported huge satisfaction in serving in these two departments.

Bedford University conducted a university-wide adjunct orientation session with break-out sessions at the department level. Arlington University did not have a university-wide orientation session and let their department chairs decide if an orientation session was necessary at the department level. However, both universities provided an adjunct faculty handbook and adequate but shared office space for the adjuncts. Most networking opportunities for adjunct faculty were informal ones consisting mainly of going out to lunch or after hours.

At both of the universities, adjuncts could move up to a temporary full-time position. One adjunct from Arlington and three adjuncts from Bedford interviewed for this study had recently obtained that status. These adjuncts believed the elevation to temporary full-time status accorded them the best opportunity to experience full integration at universities.

All the administrators and department chairs agreed that time and distance, budget restraints, and lack of vision concerning part-time faculty were the greatest roadblocks to the integration of adjunct faculty. One dean proposed hiring an adjunct coordinator to solve the problem.

The adjunct faculty saw their isolation, irregular hours, and lack of opportunities to communicate with their peers (including deans and department chairs) as the biggest roadblocks. The main concepts that emerged from all the participants were that more communication, involvement, and recognition were needed to combat the roadblocks to integration.

The hierarchical nature of higher education, the emphasis on full-time faculty, the lack of recognition of adjunct faculty, and the exclusion of adjunct faculty were the major concepts that emerged from the data collected concerning the organizational structure's effect on adjunct integration. In addition, the data revealed the power of the department chair in determining to what extent the adjunct would be integrated into the department.

In addition, the adjuncts explained how they resented being “nameless” at the universities where they worked. A major key to their satisfaction was recognition. They wanted the universities where they worked to know and recognize their names either on their Web sites and/or in their class schedules. This emerged as an important concept in

long-term adjunct satisfaction with the institutions where they worked. The long-term adjuncts at the universities for this study explained they felt recognized by the university and the department where they worked.

Qualitative methods helped in recording the emotions and feelings of the participants. Site observation, especially viewing the office spaces of the adjuncts, added to understanding the scenario the participants described. In addition, by viewing the class schedules, school newspapers, and universities' Web sites (several of the adjuncts had their own personal Web pages listed on the department/faculty Web site), I was able to verify the information the adjuncts gave me that they were not "nameless" in the university system, but, indeed, recognized by their names, a major point adjuncts stated as important for feeling satisfied while working as an adjunct.

I read the strategic plans of both universities and found no mention of adjunct faculty, nor were adjunct faculty featured in the universities' organizational chart. Bedford did briefly mention in their strategic plan on technology that adjuncts should have technology training provided it stated that the training was optional. By examining the enrollment data of both universities and their North Central Accreditation Report, I was able to confirm the number of adjuncts being utilized and the number of students and full-time faculty at both universities. These documents added insight that helped in verifying the data collected from the participants.

Walking through the campus on my own and then with a guided tour provided by the gatekeepers helped me get a feeling and an orientation to the university climate. I saw their office spaces, the cafes, and student union where they met informally for

networking opportunities. This proved a great help in understanding the adjunct faculty integration into the university culture.

There were three important concepts that emerged from the data collected from this multi-site case study on the integration of the adjunct faculty. All the participants' perspectives were in agreement that the keys to the integrated adjunct faculty member centered on better communication, involvement, and recognition.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The theoretical lens of Senge's learning organization theory was used to analyze the data presented in this chapter. According to Senge (1994), bureaucracies based on the chain of command, hierarchical power, and specialized experts do not always see their interrelationships and interdependence with each other or to the effective operation of the system as a whole. To determine to what extent cooperation and inclusion was happening in an organization, I used five areas of Senge's (1994) model—systems thinking, shared vision, mental models, team learning, and personal mastery—what he calls disciplines.

By using the five-discipline model for developing supportive learning organizations, adjunct/part-time faculty interaction with administrators and department heads was analyzed with data collected (from multiple sources) and gathered at the two universities (multi-sites) selected for this case study. For example, open-ended interview questions and documents were analyzed for evidence of how employees view their interdependence in making the organization function effectively (called systems thinking), in having common goals (called shared vision), in dropping false assumptions through open dialogue (called mental models), in fostering group empowerment for effective team building (called team learning), and in empowering the individual to reach their full potential (called personal mastery).

Senge's (1994) learning organization provided a framework to analyze power relationships in organizations, circles of causality, and patterns that either support or prevent collaboration and integration. In addition, analysis focused on how useful

Senge's (1994) model was in examining patterns, themes, comparisons, and categories that lead to understanding factors that help or hinder integration of the adjunct. The analysis provided in this chapter answered the second and third research questions: In what ways does Senge's (1994) learning model explain these descriptions (collected from administrators, department heads, and adjuncts) of adjunct/part-time integration. In what ways does it not?

Systems Thinking

Senge (1994) believes, "The organizations that will truly excel in the future will be the organizations that discover how to tap peoples' commitment and capacity to learn at all levels in an organization" (p. 2). Senge (1994) speaks of learning organizations that function "together in an extraordinary way, who trusted one another, who complemented each other's strengths and compensated for each other's limitations, who had common goals that were larger than individual goals, and who produced extraordinary results" (p. 2). According to Senge (1994), "Small changes can produce big results in an organization" (p. 63). Senge's theory is based on interrelationships and interdependence on each other, not on chain of command and hierarchical power.

Systems thinking helps people in the organization break the complex problems apart by seeing patterns of behavior and participants' interconnectedness. Systems thinking is a "discipline for seeing wholes. It is a framework for seeing interrelationships rather than things, for seeing patterns of change rather than static snapshots" (Senge, 1994, p. 68). It is a discipline for seeing the "structures that underline complex situations" (p. 69) that help people within the organization turn from passive indifference to active participants in shaping change.

Senge (1994) believes this “sense of connection to a large whole” (p. 3) produces teamwork and a sense of community among employees who work for institutions, regardless if they are part-time or full-time members.

Through interviews with adjunct faculty, I learned that the English Department at Arlington University and the Education Department at Bedford University showed evidence of systems thinking and evidence of an emerging learning community. Adjunct Ames from Arlington University volunteered that adjuncts were seen as important in the English department, “The whole faculty really likes adjuncts in the English department because they lessen their load. Faculty can teach the upper division courses, and they don’t particularly like to teach several sections of comp [*sic*], and so they welcome adjuncts.” The department included adjuncts in their once-a-year orientation meeting, and at the same time, the department’s goals were outlined. The department had assigned full-time faculty as mentors to the adjunct faculty; had peer review committee meetings that included the adjuncts; had the same number of students in adjunct classes as full-time faculty (a cap of 22 students); had department social functions where adjuncts were invited; and had a department awards banquet where adjuncts were included and participated. As Adjunct Ames explained,

We have what’s called faculty development at least twice a year where the whole faculty would come together along with the adjuncts and discuss how to grade compositions. We have lots of social events, and adjuncts are included.

When I interviewed adjuncts at Arlington from other departments, several referred to the English department as an example of integration. As Adjunct Appel expressed,

Actually, the English department, they hold a lot of get-togethers, discussions, and all that. They want to keep their adjuncts. They don't treat you like an adjunct there. You're not labeled 'you're adjunct, you can't do this.' They want you involved. You're invited to their parties, you're invited to their meetings, they e-mail you everything. If you are a professor and an adjunct, both of you get e-mailed. In my department, they are so busy doing other things, they don't always have time.

In the Education Department at Bedford University, the department chair held an orientation session and combined it with a department meeting in the evening at a time the adjuncts could attend. Department goals for the year were discussed. In addition, policies, procedures, and the syllabus procedures were explained. I interviewed the department chair and an adjunct who attended the event, and both expressed what a great experience this was for the department. I observed their enthusiasm for these integrated meetings. Faculty mentors were assigned to each adjunct in the department, and the mentors were expected to conduct a peer evaluation to help with the adjuncts' development within the guidelines of the department.

Unfortunately, these two departments, while excellent examples of integrating adjunct faculty, were the exception—most adjuncts, at both universities, answered that they had never been asked to attend university meetings. The vast majority of administrators, department heads, and adjuncts responded that they were not expected to attend meetings, serve on committees, attend professional conferences, or take part in formulating department goals or the strategic plan for the university, even though all the administrators, department heads, and adjuncts stated that the word integration meant that

adjuncts were invited to be a part of the university community. Moreover, integration meant more communication and involvement. Professor Bell, from Bedford, stated it this way, “integration meant coordination with everyone marching to the beat of the same band within each department’s mission.” This statement illustrated Senge’s (1994) concept of systems thinking.

A major roadblock to integration was expressed by administrators and department heads concerning the hierarchical bureaucracy of higher education where no one interviewed seemed sure where adjuncts fit within the system. As Arlington University’s Dean Adkins explained, “The organizational structure of higher education today is dependent upon adjunct faculty while excluding adjuncts from being faculty members.” The administrators and department chairs said that adjuncts were not part of the organization or not seen in the organizational structure or chart. Professor Bender explained, “I’m not sure the adjunct is seen in the organizational structure. They are here to teach. They are needed, but I’m not sure they are actually seen.”

In fact, all the department chairs expressed that adjuncts were not formally recognized in the organizational structure of the university. A look at the organizational chart of the universities revealed they were not included. Professor Beckett, from Bedford, expressed his frustrations with this lack of vision when he stated,

In my 25 years in higher education, I’ve never heard of a task force or a committee or anything on the adjunct faculty; I’ve never heard of a temporary committee; I’ve never heard of a permanent standing committee; I’ve never heard of any institutional resources being used in that direction.

The policies and the procedures of higher education were written with full-time faculty in mind. Professor Alley explained, “The whole structure is a roadblock. The structure is for full-time faculty, not adjuncts.” Dean Baird from Bedford suggested that an adjunct coordinator was needed for the “proper care and feeding of the adjuncts.” He believed more adjunct faculty will be utilized by the university in the future. All administrators and all department heads interviewed expressed more needed to be done for the adjuncts to be included in the university organization. They felt that orientation sessions, adjunct faculty handbooks, and more department level involvement were a start. These concepts showed elements of systems thinking with orientation sessions, handbooks, and shared meetings involving adjuncts.

All the administrators and department chairs mentioned that adjuncts were an important and needed part of the efficient running of the university system. They spoke in terms of how the adjuncts benefited the university. However, even though the meaning of adjunct integration was beautifully expressed as more involvement and communication; according to the data collected, in actual practice, systems thinking was not happening on a university-wide scale but only emerging within some departments. More opportunities for communication and increased participation was needed for systems thinking to more fully develop at the universities.

Shared Vision

Shared vision becomes a shared picture of the organization that promotes team learning and team togetherness with core values, principles, and guiding practices (Senge, 1994, pp. 9-12). As Senge (1994) views the organization, “When people in an organization focus only on their position, they have little sense of responsibility for the

results produced when all positions interact” (p. 19). Shared vision brings forth a sense of connection to the larger whole . . . a sense of working together as a great learning organization team.

All the adjuncts expressed in their interview questions centering on shared vision that integration meant that adjuncts were recognized as a part of the university system. However, the administration and the department heads (except the English department interviews at Arlington and Education department interviews at Bedford) felt that part-time faculty would not want to serve on any committees or attend meetings because of the pay they received. Professor Bender asked, “For the amount we pay them, how much should we, as administrators, expect from the adjuncts?” Dean Adams felt that too many responsibilities for what we pay might cause “us to lose the best ones.” However, every one of the adjuncts interviewed said they would attend a department meeting or serve on a committee if asked and if the meetings were held at a convenient time and location. The adjuncts stated that they did not want to attend all department meetings but did want to attend a reasonable number for what they are being paid. Adjunct Albright stated it this way, “Adjuncts would actually be a part of the university and the department that they serve” if they attended department meetings. Adjunct Bowers attended her department meetings and said she felt “bolstered by information and support from the department and department chair.”

The administrators and the department chairs felt better integration for adjuncts would provide opportunities to interact with full-time faculty for interfaculty discussions on teaching, content, department goals, curriculum, scope and sequence, and course information. However, the administrators and department chairs all stated that adjuncts

were not expected to attend university meetings (with the exception of the English Department at Arlington and the Education Department at Bedford). Therefore, the ability to interact under these circumstances made the interchange between adjuncts and faculty difficult to accomplish. This made shared vision limited for the adjunct faculty.

Adjunct Brooks emphasized, “You don’t know the full-time people, especially when you teach at night, so you don’t even know who you’re integrating with.” The deans and department heads stated, in their view, there was not a clear vision for adjuncts in their department. Dean Adkins explained, “I think it is also fair to say that’s not a priority to anybody, with the possible exception of a few adjunct faculty members. I have never seen anybody with a real vision for adjuncts.”

An adjunct faculty orientation was held once a year at Bedford, and adjunct faculty handbooks were provided by both universities. However, shared vision implies that adjuncts are included in face-to-face interchanges and have input into formulating the goals and visions for the department and university. After reading the adjunct handbook, I recognized it contained good, helpful factual information but should not replace shared opportunities with adjuncts in face-to-face interchange.

According to the data collected for this case study, very limited opportunities were reported for adjuncts to participate in the shared governance of the university or in the departments they serve. All the participants stated that adjuncts did not serve on the strategic planning committee for the university. All participants, in their interviews, commented that more adjunct integration was desirable for a shared vision, and they noted this as beneficial to all concerned. However, in practice, only pockets within specific departments were putting the concept of adjunct integration into practice.

Mental Models

Mental models form from ideas consisting of what people carry around in their head, such as images, assumptions, and beliefs that “shape how we act” (Senge, 1994, p. 175). Senge (1994) believed deeply ingrained assumptions and generalizations should be exposed by opening up a dialogue among participants to rid themselves of outdated and erroneous thoughts. Participants within the organization needed to discover hidden assumptions and inconsistencies that keep them from working as a team and “seeing each other as colleagues” (p. 245).

One issue where mental models existed that divided the adjunct from the rest of the university community at both universities was the issue of parking privileges. At Arlington, adjuncts were expected to park in student parking, not faculty parking. Adjunct Ames, who felt so integrated within the English Department at Arlington, said she felt segregated from the rest of the English faculty with the faculty parking situation. All the adjuncts interviewed at Arlington used this as an example of “knowing their place” at the university. The administration stated that lack of parking spaces placed faculty parking at a premium. The parking situation brought out issues of privileges, status, and indications of hierarchy.

Administrators and department heads mentioned at various times throughout their interviews how they wished they could pay adjuncts more to show their appreciation for the adjuncts’ services. However, they failed to recognize how the privilege (or perk) of faculty parking status would make the adjuncts feel appreciated and recognized by the university. According to the adjuncts, the present situation made them feel segregated, unappreciated, and devalued.

At Bedford, adjuncts had to pay for parking like everyone else who worked at the university. The administration stated that every employee was equal in this way. However, the adjuncts expressed frustration because they felt that while it may seem equal, it was not equitable with the huge differences in salary. Adjunct Brooks felt, "I know that the concept is that they treat everyone equal, but since there is not equal pay, does that make a difference." Vice President Barby stated, "Adjuncts pay for parking just like we do. Everyone is treated essentially the same." According to the adjuncts' interviews at Bedford, a reduced parking rate adjusted to their salary would be appreciated. So far, they have not won this perk even though administrators voiced time and time again during their interviews they wished they could pay their adjuncts more to show their appreciation. By opening up a dialogue among the participants on this issue, inconsistencies (mental models) would be exposed that block treating each other as colleagues. The administrators did not understand the issues of recognition and hierarchical power that their decision on parking brought forth, but the adjuncts understood that the parking situation represented symbolically their lack of status in the system.

Administrators and department heads mentioned integration meant bringing the adjuncts more into the fold with faculty members. However, a mental model or misconception existed with administrators and department heads who expressed that adjuncts just needed to ask to participate more in university functions. Professor Bell stated, "All they had to do is ask if they have any questions. They know that." Professor Arnett stated, "They can call me or e-mail me with any questions they have." From the adjuncts point of view, all the administrators or department heads had to do was ask them

to participate. Adjunct Albright stated that she had not been asked, “Not in the nine years I’ve been here.” Adjunct Baxter expressed, “If someone asked me to, I would if I could.” In addition, administrators and department heads expressed feelings of guilt in asking adjuncts to do more for what they are paid. Dean Adkins said, “I think we all feel a little guilty about adjuncts, and so we don’t want to require them to do much more than a good job of teaching.” The adjuncts felt the administration needed to just ask them how much participation was appropriate for what they were getting paid and with the times they teach. In addition, Professor Beckett stated the perception existed that “you have a group that wants to ignore adjuncts, and you have a group of adjuncts that wants to be ignored.”

The department chairs in the English Department at Arlington and the Education Department at Bedford held a different view on adjunct participation than the other department chairs interviewed on integration. They held orientation meetings and department meetings that included, invited, and welcomed their adjuncts. Adjunct Ames and Adjunct Bowers expressed that they felt “less isolated” and “fully integrated” into these departments. Senge (1994) stated misconceptions among groups and individuals result when preconceived assumptions about employees replace open communication.

Dean Baird, from Bedford University, believed it was a wrong assumption, “the perception by some that adjuncts are hired because they are cheap when, in fact, they are a major piece of our operation.” All the administrators and department heads expressed the importance of adjuncts to the university they serve. Adjunct Appel expressed, “I know I contribute to the university.” Another misunderstanding that the department heads mentioned resulted when adjuncts seemed to not understand that they do not face the same activities or pressures associated with academic advancement that full-time

faculty face. Dean Armstrong pointed out, “These people are not faculty in the sense that they have gone through a selection process, peer review, and hold certain standards of professionalism and service throughout the course of the year.”

In addition, according to the administrators and the department heads, whether or not adjuncts were viewed as colleagues depended on the individual adjunct. Some adjuncts were viewed as colleagues while others were not. Dean Baird called these adjuncts “super adjuncts,” and Dean Adkins called them “special adjuncts.” However, when the adjuncts were asked that same question, all the adjuncts viewed themselves as serious, long-term adjuncts and colleagues. Several of the adjuncts interviewed expressed the same view as Adjunct Baxter, “If you’re hired as faculty, you’re just that—faculty.” However, the administration viewed adjuncts as Dean Armstrong stated, “a special category of faculty.” Vice President Barby concurred, “Adjuncts are treated as a separate class.”

Another false assumption cited was that adjuncts were not interested in full-time positions. In the interviews, the majority of the adjuncts expressed an interest in obtaining a full time position. However, none of the adjuncts interviewed were interested in obtaining tenure. The adjuncts I interviewed expressed their goal was to obtain a full-time temporary position with benefits. Adjunct Ames and Adjunct Brooks stated this was the best way “to be treated as colleagues.” In the review of the literature, putting long-term adjuncts on one-year contracts meets standards of good practice under the guidelines of the American Association of University Professors and the American Federation of Teachers. More dialogue, involvement, recognition, and open communication were needed to overcome the mental models that block integration.

Team Learning

Team learning produces group empowerment, group compassion, and group commitment to the organization. Participants learn to think together by encouraging a dialogue that allows a “free-flowing of meaning through a group, allowing the group to discover insight . . . and to recognize the patterns of interaction in teams that undermine learning” (Senge, 1994, p. 10).

Unfortunately, administrators and department heads cited budget restraints for adjuncts not having more professional development opportunities through their attendance at professional conferences. Professor Alley explained that “If they go to a conference, it is because of something they’re interested in. This is not required as part of their job. They pay for it themselves—there’s limited funding for full time to go.” However, adjuncts were allowed release time to attend professional conferences if they paid their own way, which many adjuncts said they did.

Adjunct Bowers (in the Education department) had opportunities for professional development inside her department. She explained:

The department head, for the first time, consciously integrated the adjunct faculty in with full-time faculty in a number of ways. The department head appointed course coordinators that gathered the faculty that all taught the same section or the same course to make department decisions as a whole.

Adjunct Appel admired the English Department at Arlington. She stated, “You are a colleague, and that’s why they tell you, ‘We want you to be a part of our group. We want you to be a colleague.’”

In virtually all the departments (at both universities), with the exception of the English Department at Arlington and the Education Department at Bedford, the department head served as the informal mentor to the adjuncts. In the English Department at Arlington, Adjunct Ames explained that adjuncts were paired with full-time faculty members. Adjunct Bowers said she had an assigned faculty mentor. They stated this made them more integrated and part of the team. Social networking opportunities were limited to informal, spontaneous lunch or dinner meetings with the department chair or other faculty members. They did state it was rare for the university to have a formal social function at the university. They did attend an occasional informal gathering at faculty members' homes or coffee after hours. These were great opportunities for seeing each other as "colleagues." Professor Bell called these informal get-togethers "water cooler sessions."

E-mail was cited as a way that most adjuncts communicated with the personnel of the universities they serve. In fact, Adjunct Ames stated, "E-mail actually helps a lot" with communication. All the adjuncts had office space equipped with telephones and computers. However, most of the adjuncts shared the office with other adjuncts, but there were a few departments where adjuncts who reached temporary full-time status had their own office space.

Every adjunct saw their position in the organizational structure as dependent upon the department chair. The department chair was their advocate and informal mentor. At Bedford, Dean Barton showed elements of team learning when he explained:

Ideally, adjunct faculty are mentored by members of the full-time faculty beginning with the syllabus preparation through methodology through

evaluations. I think sometimes adjunct faculty are hired, given a textbook, put in the classroom, and left.

Adjunct Brooks stated that integration and team building meant, “You’re consulted, you’re informed, and your input is important to the department.” The adjuncts expressed their best hope for being a part of the department team was to be placed on temporary one-year contracts. Four of the 11 adjuncts interviewed had been placed on one-year contracts this year. The four explained that they were now fully integrated into the departments they serve and viewed as colleagues (with parking privileges). They were a part of the team and had a sense of belonging within the group. They expressed great satisfaction with their jobs with this turn of events. Communication and involvement were important components to building team learning.

Personal Mastery

Personal mastery consists of ideas of personal responsibility, personal sense of mission, and personal growth within a supportive environment. Senge (1994) sees personal mastery as linking the “connection between personal learning and organizational learning, in the reciprocal commitment between individuals and organizations, and in the spirit of an enterprise made up of learners” (p. 8). According to Senge (1994), “The sense of connectedness and compassion characteristic of individuals with high levels of personal mastery naturally leads to a broader vision . . . to a vision beyond their self-interest” (p. 171).

The data collected uncovered that for the adjuncts there were intrinsic and extrinsic rewards for serving the university part time. All the adjuncts interviewed stated their love of teaching, passion for teaching, or enjoyment of teaching as the primary

motivation for accepting the job as part-time/adjunct and for their long-term service as adjuncts. Adjunct Ames stated, “I get to do what I love, which is teaching.”

All the adjuncts stated during their interviews that they were serious adjunct faculty members and took great pride in the high evaluations they received from their students. They felt strongly that their services were needed and that they were an asset to the university and to their department. Adjunct Burk stated, “I make a contribution” and “use my expertise to make a contribution.” They knew their students appreciated from their student evaluations, and this fact was deeply motivational for them. Throughout their interviews, the adjuncts would, at various times, list their contributions to the university. It was a source of pride that their expertise was called upon by higher education. They expressed a great sense of satisfaction in the job they did for the university. Adjunct Appel, Arlington University, expressed it this way:

I participate in higher education, I can make my own hours, I am needed for my expertise, I can share my gift for teaching, I know I am sharing my talent, I know that its [*sic*] worthwhile for my students, and I enjoy teaching.

All the adjuncts emphasized how much they enjoyed the interaction with college students. Every one of the adjuncts had attended professional conferences in their field. They did this on their own initiative and at their own expense. Adjunct Albright stated, “When I improve myself, I improve my students.” This idea of intrinsic rewards motivating personnel presented itself time and time again in the interviews with the adjunct faculty at both universities. The adjuncts felt a deep sense of mission, personal responsibility, and personal growth in their service to the universities, a prime example of Senge’s (1994) concept of personal mastery.

For Senge's (1994) model of personal mastery to truly manifest, there must be a supportive environment, sense of connectedness, and reciprocal commitment between individuals and the organization. This presented mixed results in the data collected at the universities. All the adjuncts expressed a desire to be recognized for their contributions and a desire to be appreciated by the university and the department they served. Their desire for recognition and appreciation confirmed other research studies found during the review of the literature prior to conducting this research. At various times, every adjunct expressed that they knew the budget restraints on the university resulted in low compensation for part-time faculty. They were aware that the university needed their services, but they did not know if the appropriate administrators appreciated or were aware of their contribution. They expressed how important perks such as parking, an invitation, a note of appreciation, a stipend, or an e-mail from colleagues meant in making them feel supported and connected to the university.

Several of the adjuncts expressed that when they served as adjuncts at other universities or community colleges, they were "nameless." One adjunct stated before coming to Bedford, she worked at a community college where the department chair walked right by her and did not recognize her. She expressed how hurt and discounted she felt. Adjunct Brooks explained that she didn't want work at another university as an adjunct. "I was just going to be an adjunct, one of those nameless." Adjunct Ames said, "They know you through e-mail." Looking at class schedules, Web sites, and school newspapers confirmed that at both universities, these long-term adjuncts' names were used in publications.

At both Arlington and Bedford, the adjuncts' names were listed as the instructor for the course on the class schedules. This was important to the adjuncts and seen as a form of recognition of their service to the university. The gatekeepers selected their top or "super" adjuncts for the interviews. These adjuncts had nice offices, e-mail accounts, Web sites, and their names appeared in the class schedules. In addition, the adjuncts exhibited a sense of humor about their job. Adjunct Bowers called herself "permanent part-time."

However, even with the distinction of being considered top adjuncts at their universities, the adjuncts still faced uncomfortable situations where they did not feel valued. Most of the time, these situations involved lack of communication. One adjunct showed up to teach a class that had been cancelled due to low enrollment, and no one had bothered to tell her. Another adjunct recalled he had to call the secretary to determine if his class (starting in two days) had made enrollment and to obtain the class roster. Another adjunct showed up for a Saturday class to find the door locked to the classroom and could not find anyone to open the classroom. The adjunct said this was so embarrassing in front of the students. Once, one of the adjuncts showed up for class only to discover that the department chair had given the class to a full-time faculty member to teach since the full-time instructor needed the class to meet his teaching load. The chair had forgotten to call and inform the adjunct of the change. As Bedford Adjunct Baxter explained another frustrating situation,

It's the pits when you are part time, and they call you at the last minute to teach a class and don't give you time to prepare. I like the challenge of teaching and want to do my best, and then they don't give you time to prepare.

All the adjuncts felt devalued on the issue of parking privileges. Incidents such as the examples given frustrate adjuncts' personal goal to do a good job and did not make them feel connected, valued, or in a reciprocal commitment with the university. Time and time again in the interviews, the adjuncts expressed how important a supportive department chair was in feeling included at the university. As Adjunct Bowers explained,

I often felt out of the loop, and it would be up to me to contact the university about whether the class made enrollment or to get a syllabus. Then a new department head was hired, and she consciously integrated the adjunct faculty with the full time. She coordinated the whole faculty, and that included the adjuncts. Information was shared. I felt bolstered by the information and support from the department. I felt less isolated.

For Senge's (1994) concept of personal mastery to take place, adjuncts needed to feel a sense of accomplishment, pride, recognition, appreciation, collegiality, and belonging to the university and the department they serve. The university administrators and department chairs needed to pay attention to the intrinsic rewards that motivate adjuncts and help them to meet those intrinsic rewards through shared opportunities. The adjuncts expressed their need for a sense of connectedness to the university. The adjuncts stated that they served the university for rewards other than money.

Salary was considered important, and higher pay was definitely cited as a need. However, the sentiments of the group of adjuncts I interviewed reflected that adjuncts were not teaching for the pay, especially since it was so little, it was viewed as supplemental income. What the adjuncts were interested in was obtaining a one-year

temporary full-time contract. Four of the 11 adjuncts had already been placed on one-year contracts. Adjunct Baxter was confident that he would be hired on a one-year contract when he retired from his present job (that paid more than a full-time professor earned). In addition, Adjunct Burk, with a doctorate degree, planned to accept a one-year temporary full-time contract when her children were older. The one-year temporary full-time contract was seen as a future goal for the adjuncts plus an intrinsic and extrinsic reward for their long service to the university.

Summary

The analysis provided in this chapter answered the second and third research questions: In what ways does Senge's (1994) learning model explain these descriptions (collected from administrators, department heads, and adjuncts) of adjunct/part-time integration? In what ways does it not?

Explanations for Adjunct/Part-time Integration

Senge's (1994) model helped to gain a fresh perspective on the adjunct experience in higher education. Furthermore, Senge's (1994) model helped to show relationships and patterns that emerged from the data collected that added to the knowledge gained from the review of the current literature over the adjunct experience in higher education. Senge's (1994) learning organization model provided a strong framework for analyzing patterns, causality, and relationships that either supported or prevented collaboration and integration.

Evidence of systems thinking was found within the English Department at Arlington and the Education Department at Bedford but not found to be happening on a university-wide scale. The organizational structure of higher education did not recognize

adjunct faculty even though the organization was highly dependent on their services. The policies and procedures were written for full-time faculty with adjuncts not present on the organizational chart of the universities they served. For systems thinking to take place, higher education would need to recognize the role of the adjunct to the system as a whole. An adjunct faculty orientation was conducted at Bedford, and both universities provided adjunct faculty handbooks. However, integration of adjuncts was not happening on a university-wide scale but only emerging with some departments.

According to the data collected, very limited opportunities were reported for adjuncts to participate in the shared vision of the university or in the department they serve. They were not expected to attend university or department meetings which made interchange between adjuncts and faculty difficult to accomplish. The English Department at Arlington and the Education Department at Bedford were the exceptions in that adjuncts attended two department meetings and helped in formulating the goals and mission within these departments.

Lack of communication promoted mental models that led to wrong assumptions and misconceptions. Issues of parking privileges, job opportunities, attendance at department meetings, and career motivations for employment needed more dialogue opportunities between adjuncts, department heads, and administrators. Adjuncts wanted to participate more at the department level and were waiting to be asked by the department heads, while the department heads were waiting for the adjuncts to ask them to participate more.

For team learning to take place, the department head was the key. Every adjunct saw their position in the organizational structure as dependent upon the department chair.

The department chair was their advocate and mentor. The adjuncts expressed their best hope for being a part of the department team that was to be placed on temporary one-year contracts.

For personal mastery to take place, adjuncts needed to feel a sense of accomplishment, pride, recognition, appreciation, collegiality, and belonging to the university and the department they serve. The university needed to pay attention to the intrinsic rewards that motivated the adjuncts and help the adjuncts to meet those intrinsic rewards through shared opportunities and a sense of connectedness to the university.

No Explanation for Adjunct/Part-Time Integration

The portion of the questions concerning Senge's(1994) model that asked, "In which ways did it not" describe adjunct/part-time integration in higher education I found troublesome. I believed it did describe how integration in higher education can take place within the hierarchical structure of higher education by using Senge's (1994) five disciplines as models. However, it was confusing at times because information in the separate categories (systems thinking, shared vision, mental models, team learning, and personal mastery) sometimes overlapped. Then I realized that the overlapping of the data among the five categories provided the patterns and chain of evidence needed for the trustworthiness of the data. Therefore, instead of nice and neat distinct layers or categories, I found that each piece of the interviews built on previous pieces of the data thus allowing for analysis of power relationships, circles of causality, and patterns to emerge that either supported or prevented the collaboration and integration of adjuncts. Therefore, this overlapping of the data into the different categories showed that Senge's

(1994) model was useful in examining patterns, themes, comparisons, and categories that led to understanding factors that help or hinder integration of the adjunct.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND COMMENTARY

This chapter contains the summary of this case study, conclusions, and implications based on the data collected and analyzed from this qualitative multi-site case study on the integration of part-time/adjunct faculty at two regional universities located in a Midwestern state. The research questions are addressed with implications and commentary concluding the chapter.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to explore and gain insight into part-time/adjunct faculty integration within the hierarchical organizational structure of higher education. Multiple perspectives were collected on the subject of adjunct integration from administrators, department heads, and part-time faculty and viewed through the lens of Senge's (1994) learning organization model. The purpose was accomplished by conducting in-depth, open-ended interviews with six administrators, six department heads, and 11 part-time/adjuncts at two regional universities located in a Midwestern state. In addition, the purpose was accomplished through document analysis of university records, handbooks, Web sites, strategic plan, and accreditation reports, and through site visitation for personal observation of the adjuncts' environment at each university.

The data needed for this case study centered on rich thick descriptions of what adjunct integration meant as described by higher education part-time/adjunct faculty, department heads, and administrators. In addition, based on the descriptions of integration provided by the participants, insight was obtained on the extent adjunct integration was taking place at their respective university campuses. The participants

were purposely selected based on direct connection to the adjunct experience in higher education and were employed by the university for at least three years. These adjunct faculty members were seen as more connected with the university. Multiple sources of information were provided by examining university documents and records. These documents added insight and helped to confirm the data that was collected. The 23 participants provided the multiple perspectives needed to verify the findings of the study.

An extensive review of the current literature concerning the adjunct experience in higher education well documented the working conditions and discrimination many adjunct faculty faced. Emerging research called for more collaboration and integration of the adjunct. However, research was needed to understand what integration meant to the adjunct instructor and the university that employed them. Little research existed that explored in what ways the hierarchical organizational structure embedded in the higher education system could foster integration. This study was conducted to help close that gap in the literature. Therefore, data collected focused on the meaning of adjunct faculty, the ways adjuncts were integrated in day-to-day practice, roadblocks to integration, and the organizational structure's effect on adjunct integration.

I made sense of the data by examining the interviews, responses, site visitation, and document analysis through the use of Senge's (1994) learning organization theory. I used Senge's (1994) model to form categories of information for analysis. The information gathered was sorted into these categories and examined for evidence of systems thinking (interdependence and interconnectedness), shared vision (shared governance and shared opportunities), mental models (false assumptions), team learning

(team building and team empowerment), and personal mastery (personal growth and potential).

Findings

Senge's (1994) five disciplines proved a useful lens for exploring factors in bureaucratic institutions that either fostered or hindered employees, regardless of part-time or full-time status, from full inclusion within the organization. Senge's (1994) learning organization model provided a strong framework for analyzing patterns and relationships that either supported or prevented collaboration and integration. The five disciplines, systems thinking, shared vision, mental models, team learning, and personal mastery (Senge, 1994) each provided a distinct category to view the data. However, instead of nice, neat layers, I found the data sometimes overlapped and fit into more than one of these five categories. This overlapping of the data among the five categories provided the patterns and chain of evidence needed for the trustworthiness of the findings. Each piece of the interviews (along with document analysis) built on previous pieces of data and allowed for an in-depth examination of adjunct integration at the two universities.

Systems Thinking. The strongest evidence of systems thinking was found within the English Department at Arlington University and the Education Department at Bedford University. Both of these departments (located at different universities) realized their interdependence and interconnectedness with the part-time adjuncts. They held a combination orientation session and department meeting at a time and location that adjuncts could attend. Department goals were outlined for the year with part-time and full-time faculty input.

In addition, full-time faculty were paired with adjuncts as mentors. Adjuncts were evaluated by student evaluations and by a peer review. The adjuncts not only were welcome but invited to attend a department social. In both of these departments, the faculty realized the importance of all faculty, regardless of rank, participating and contributing to the department policies, procedures, and goals. The adjuncts from these two departments reported they felt less isolated, better informed, and fully integrated into the departments. This, in turn, benefited the department and the students.

However, these two departments were the exception. The vast majority of administrators, department heads, and adjuncts responded that adjuncts were not expected to attend department meetings, serve on committees, or develop the strategic plan for the university. In addition, the organizational chart did not mention or recognize the part-time faculty. I confirmed that adjuncts were not present on the organizational chart when I viewed the organizational chart at each university. When commenting on the roadblocks that hinder integration, the main response centered on time and distance, budget restraints, and lack of vision, and the hierarchical structure of higher education that did not recognize the services of the adjunct faculty. The adjuncts added isolation, irregular hours, and lack of communication with their peers. All 23 participants stated that the adjuncts fulfill a needed service to the university. All the participants pointed to the organizational structure of higher education as an impediment to integration. The hierarchical nature of higher education, the emphasis on full-time faculty, the lack of recognition of adjunct faculty, and the exclusion of adjuncts were cited as problematic in the organizational structure that hindered systems thinking.

Both universities had adjunct handbooks and either a formal or an informal mentoring program for the adjuncts. One university, Bedford, had a university orientation session for adjuncts once a year. Other orientation sessions were held at the discretion of the department chairs. The use of handbooks, orientation sessions, and mentoring programs showed evidence of systems thinking at the universities. Yet, in actual practice, according to the data collected, adjunct integration was not happening in the universities on a grand scale but only emerging within some departments. For systems thinking to truly take place, opportunities for increased communication, involvement, and recognition needed to take place at the two universities and in more than two departments.

Shared Vision. The adjunct faculty handbook, produced as a separate publication especially for adjuncts at Arlington and found in a separate section within the faculty handbook at Bedford, showed evidence of knowledge sharing by the universities. Several department heads stated this as the primary way they disseminated information to adjuncts. After reading the adjunct handbooks, I recognized the handbooks contained good, helpful, factual information on the goals, mission, policies, and procedures of the universities. However, the handbooks should never replace networking opportunities for adjuncts for face-to-face interchanges with full-time faculty or department heads. Shared vision implies adjuncts' inclusion in the formulation of the goals and vision within the department and the university they serve.

Only two departments (English at Arlington and Education at Bedford) exhibited the shared vision concept of all faculty meeting together to discuss the department goals and vision for the year. The department chair served an informal role as mentor to the

adjuncts at both universities. How much information that was shared and how much involvement the adjuncts had in the department were left up to the discretion of the department chair. The English Department at Arlington and the Education Department at Bedford had a formal mentoring program that paired full-time faculty with part-time. In addition, at Arlington, the department head of a health related field had adjunct faculty mentored by full-time faculty due to working with health concerns of patients.

In the interviews, the prevailing thought was that there was not a clear vision by the university that included the adjuncts. However, one administrator (Bedford) suggested an adjunct coordinator should be hired. Nevertheless, limited opportunities were reported for adjuncts to participate in the shared governance of the universities or in the departments they serve. In practice, only pockets within specific departments were putting adjunct integration into practice. For shared vision to take place, more departments needed to provide their adjuncts opportunities for participation.

Mental Models. The issue of parking privileges at both universities was a source of misunderstanding and contention that segregated the adjuncts and made them feel unappreciated and devalued. The lack of parking spaces placed faculty parking at a premium. At Arlington, the adjuncts had to park in student parking and were not allowed to park in faculty parking areas. At Bedford, adjuncts paid for their parking privileges the same as everyone else. This was seen by the administration as treating everyone as equal, but the adjuncts felt that the parking was not equitable with the huge differences in salary. At both universities, the adjuncts felt the parking situation made them “know their place” at the university. The parking situation was symbolic for issues of privilege,

recognition, and lack of status for the adjuncts. It was not just a matter of fairness, but of acceptance.

Another mental model or misconception existed between adjuncts and administrators over the concept of participation. The administrators stated that all the adjuncts had to do was ask to participate more, and they would be welcomed. The adjuncts stated they wanted to participate more, but the administration had not asked them. All 23 participants stated they wanted the adjuncts to be more involved in the university. However, all the participants stated the other side should initiate the conversation. All participants questioned how much involvement should be expected considering the low compensation and part-time status of adjuncts. In addition, many administrators expressed guilt for asking adjuncts to participate more considering their pay. Yet, they were more reluctant to give adjuncts perks or incentives. The adjuncts expressed the administration should just ask them what they thought was fair. The adjuncts stated two to three university meetings a semester were not unreasonable if scheduled at times they could attend. In addition, administrators felt part-time faculty did not believe they fully understood the professional requirements on full-time faculty.

The adjuncts expressed unanimously that they were not interested in issues of tenure. When adjuncts spoke of full-time employment, they meant a one-year temporary full-time contract with some benefits included. In fact, four of the 11 adjuncts had recently obtained this goal. By understanding the desire for temporary one-year contracts, administrators and department heads could better realize adjunct motivation for employment. To overcome mental models, more opportunities and open dialogue

between administrators and the adjuncts must take place. The mental model concept called for more communication, involvement, and recognition concerning adjunct faculty.

Team Learning. E-mail was cited as the most frequent form of adjuncts' communication with the university and for imparting university information. The adjuncts had nicely equipped offices but did share them with other adjuncts. I used an adjunct's office as my own while at Arlington and found the room adequately equipped. At Bedford, the adjuncts shared a well-equipped office. Collegial opportunities were limited to informal, spontaneous get-togethers over lunch or dinner. Budget restraints prevented professional development opportunities at professional conferences for adjuncts. However, they were allowed release time to attend conferences if they paid their own way, which many adjuncts did. Every adjunct saw their position in the organizational structure and their involvement with the department team as dependent upon the department chair. It was largely up to the department chair to invite them to a meeting at a time they could attend. In addition, the department chairs were responsible for mentoring opportunities for the adjuncts. The department chair was the adjuncts' direct line for opportunities of communication and participation.

The adjuncts expressed their best hope for being a part of the department team was to be placed on temporary one-year contracts. Four adjuncts explained the difference it made by being placed on one-year contracts in that they were now fully integrated into their department, considered part of the team, and viewed as colleagues. Team learning took place by the willingness of the department chairs to include the adjuncts in the department with opportunities for inclusion and membership. The adjuncts, in many

cases, needed to make themselves more visible by asking to participate more in the departments.

Personal Mastery. The administrators and department heads sometimes failed to understand the intrinsic rewards adjunct faculty received from their jobs. The administrators and department heads cited the prestige of working in higher education as the top motivation for taking the job. The adjuncts unanimously cited their love for teaching and passion for teaching as the top motivation. In addition, the adjuncts unanimously cited their enjoyment in sharing their expertise with students and contributing to the department. The adjuncts unanimously expressed that their services were needed by the university, but were unsure if they were appreciated by the university.

Recognition and appreciation by their peers and the students they serve were internal motivating forces for the adjuncts. Every administrator and department head expressed regret they could not pay the adjuncts more. All the adjuncts would appreciate higher pay, but that was not the top issue. In fact, they all expressed that they would not accept the position of adjunct faculty based solely on the pay—especially since it was so low. They had other motivations—intrinsic motivations—to teach in higher education. The wise administrator should understand those motivations and tap into that reservoir. The adjuncts were willing to share their expertise, love of teaching, and enjoyment of student interaction with the university in exchange for salary compensation and recognition within a collegial environment.

All 23 participants stated that the university organization was dependent upon adjunct faculty for effective and efficient operation of the institution. However, recognition of adjunct faculty on campus was limited to a few departments that saw their

interconnectedness and decided to include the adjunct faculty. They reported this resulted in well trained, informed, and satisfied adjuncts, along with improved interfaculty relationships. The adjuncts expressed that recognition of their contribution to the university was truly important to them. The adjuncts asked not to be “nameless,” but to be recognized by name in universities’ publications. I found evidence of the adjuncts’ recognition in class schedules and on the faculty Web site. In addition, the ability to obtain a temporary one-year contract was cited as important. The data gathered found that helping the adjunct faculty members reach their desired level of personal mastery or personal goals would result in a better adjunct faculty experience at the university and increased adjunct satisfaction. In addition, according to the adjuncts, a real sense of connectedness and belonging would emulate from helping one another achieve goals and fulfill potentials.

Conclusions

Part-time/adjunct faculty provided an important role at the two universities I studied. What I observed and recorded confirmed the research from the literature that adjuncts were needed to keep costs down, to add flexibility to the scheduled course offerings, to keep faculty-to-student ratio reasonable, to help during enrollment surges, and to teach classes that regular faculty did not want to teach (Bach, 1999; Fulton, 2000; Moser, 2000; Rhoades, 1996, Shumar, 1999). It was a wrong assumption to perceive that they were hired solely because they were inexpensive. The administrations at both universities acknowledged their growing dependence on adjunct faculty. Adjuncts provided a valuable service to the university.

However, despite the increased dependence on part-time/adjunct faculty, research indicated that they “are not integrated into the life of the programs in which they are teaching (by invitation to department meetings) or to the academic community (by support for their research and professional development” (American Historical Association, 2001, pp. 4-5). The data I collected and analyzed from the case studies supported these findings. The vast majority of administrators, department heads, and adjuncts responded that adjuncts were not expected to attend department meetings, serve on committees, or help develop the strategic plan for the university or department they served. This seemed amazing since the 23 participants voiced the need for more interfaculty interactions and discussions on instruction, department goals, content, curriculum, scope, sequence, and course information. Several adjuncts felt that they did not even know who to integrate with since they were so isolated. In addition, professional development opportunities only existed if the adjuncts paid their own way to conferences. However, the universities allowed release time for the adjuncts to attend professional opportunities. Little support for professional development was accorded the adjuncts. Administrators cited budget restraints as the cause.

Research from the review of the literature well documented the poor working conditions and discrimination many adjunct faculty face (Church, 1999; Dubson, 2001; Fulton, 2000; Leslie & Gappa, 1993). However, at both universities, I found adequate, not poor, working conditions for the adjunct faculty. The office spaces of the adjuncts were well equipped. In fact, the majority of the adjuncts interviewed were satisfied with their shared office space complete with computers, phones, and e-mail accounts. However, they did comment they lacked privacy. The main area of discrimination cited

was the dissatisfaction by all adjuncts at both universities with the parking situations. Adjuncts at Arlington had to park in student parking instead of faculty parking. This resulted in the adjuncts' feeling segregated, unappreciated, and undervalued by the university they served. At Bedford, adjuncts paid the same parking fee as full-time faculty and administrators at the university. This was not seen as fair or equitable considering the difference in salary. The situation with parking was seen as symbolic of their lack of status and acceptance.

Several examples of adjunct faculty inclusion were found at the two universities I visited. Both universities had an adjunct faculty supplemental handbook for communicating the universities' goals, policies, and procedures. In addition, both universities had formal and informal mentoring programs through the department heads. At Bedford, a university-wide adjunct orientation session happened once a year.

In addition, two departments, the English Department at Arlington and the Education Department at Bedford, had truly integrated their adjuncts into their departments. It was strikingly clear that they valued their adjuncts to an extent not found in other departments. Both of these departments offered several department meetings (combined with an adjunct orientation session) that allowed faculty members, regardless of rank, to share in the formulation of goals, policies, procedures, and information for the semester. In addition, faculty members were paired with adjuncts for peer mentoring and evaluations. Social opportunities were accorded the adjuncts within the departments. In fact, according to their interviews, the adjuncts were welcomed and formally invited. The department chairs and the adjuncts expressed great satisfaction with this supportive environment.

The interviews from these departments helped gain insight on how part-time/adjunct integration can take place within the structure of higher education. These two departments exhibited what Senge (1994) called a learning organization that was inclusive of all members regardless of rank.

The participants described what full adjunct integration for the university would produce. Their comments centered on adjuncts that would be better prepared, better trained, better informed, and better involved at all levels of the university. However, in spite of glowing rhetoric, when I delved into specific ways the integration of adjuncts was happening at the universities, the realities emerged of how difficult it was to operationalize the concept within the higher education structure. The research study found integration was difficult to accomplish if adjuncts were not even seen in the organizational structure or chart. In addition, the policies and the procedures of higher education were written with full-time faculty in mind. Several of the department chairs I interviewed stated there was not a clear vision for adjuncts in higher education nor any institutional funds being used in that direction. However, according to Senge (1994), “Small changes can produce big results in an organization” (p. 63). I found evidence of integration in the English Department at Arlington and the Education Department at Bedford. They truly integrated their departments to be learning communities through encouraging systems thinking by including adjuncts in department activities, providing shared vision by including adjuncts in orientation and department meetings, breaking through mental models by treating the adjuncts as valued colleagues, promoting team learning by providing mentors and departmental professional development opportunities,

and allowing personal mastery by recognition of the contribution to the department, for their faculty, regardless of rank.

Deans and department chairs in higher education must understand the intrinsic rewards that adjuncts expressed as the reason they accepted this low paying job in the first place. Every one of the adjuncts expressed the love they have of teaching and the enjoyment they received from their interactions with the students as the primary motivation for working as an adjunct. They expressed how much they needed to be recognized by the university as a whole for the contribution they make through their commitment of time and expertise. They had little exposure to university governance, and administrators felt they did not fully understand all that was involved in full-time faculty professional requirements. They were not interested in issues of tenure. Their goal was to receive a one-year temporary contract that included some benefits. For Senge's (1994) learning model to become reality, adjuncts needed to feel a sense of accomplishment, pride, recognition, appreciation, collegiality, and belonging to the university and the department they serve. The adjuncts stated they serve the university for rewards other than money. Three major concepts emerged from the study: The need for increased opportunities for communication, involvement, and recognition of the adjunct faculty.

Implications and Recommendations

With the increased dependency on adjunct faculty, it was in the best interests of all stakeholders to examine the relationship that exists among administrators, department heads, and part-time faculty that might increase their collaboration. This research study helped in gaining insight in finding specific ways that all faculty, regardless of rank, can

work together with a spirit of respect and democratic principles that enriches the whole educational community.

Through qualitative questions that encouraged the respondents to share their particular stories and describe their feelings and emotions, valuable insight was added in understanding adjunct integration. This research study added a fresh perspective in understanding what integration meant as described by part-time faculty and the universities they serve. In addition, by examining university records and documents that pertained to the adjunct experience and by observing first-hand adjunct faculties' realities at two universities, knowledge was gained on factors that encouraged inclusion and/or exclusion within the university environment. By using the lens of Senge's (1994) learning model, a strong framework was provided for analyzing the patterns and relationships that either supported or prevented collaboration and integration. Therefore, this study proved valuable to current research, theory, and practice.

Implication for Research

This study added to previous knowledge and any future study of the adjunct experience in higher education. Insight was gained on understanding what adjunct faculty integration meant in the words and emotions of practicing, long-term adjuncts, department chairs, and administrators at two regional universities located in a Midwestern state. Further research should provide opportunities that delve beyond this study to include community colleges and research universities. In addition, research should extend to discovering what adjunct integration meant to full-time faculty that were not department chairs. In addition, this was a bounded study to include only long-term adjuncts. Insight on short-term adjuncts' feelings and perceptions would make an

interesting study that would build upon this study of adjunct integration. The adjuncts in this study referred to other adjuncts working at night as on the “night watch.” More research was needed to explore how adjuncts on the night watch can be more integrated into the community.

In addition, more research was needed into factors that result in adjunct faculty satisfaction at all levels of higher education institutions. This study revealed that more examination was needed on how much part-time faculty understand the professional responsibilities and obligations of the full-time faculty. How much of the professional expectations that full-time faculty experience are the part-time faculty willing to assume?

The whole area of temporary full-time faculty contracts begged for exploration. This study found these contracts were most desirable to the adjuncts. Questions exist that need more information, such as what happens if their one-year contract was not renewed—do they return to adjunct faculty status? How many times or years might one-year contracts be extended? How might temporary one-year full-time contracts threaten full-time faculty?

In addition, further research should be conducted that used Senge’s (1994) learning community model as a lens to examine adjunct faculty integration at community colleges and research universities. By using Senge’s (1994) model, more research studies might build a greater depth of understanding on how adjunct faculty can be better integrated within the organizational structure of higher education at all institutional levels.

Implication for Theory

Senge's (1994) learning organization model presented a strong framework to analyze relationships and patterns that either supported or prevented collaboration and integration. Senge's (1994) model gave a needed theoretical lens to examine integration of employees within a bureaucracy. For systems thinking to take place, higher education needed to recognize the role of the adjunct to the system as a whole. By using Senge's (1994) model, the study found the organizational structure did not recognize adjunct faculty. The policies and procedures were written for full-time faculty with adjuncts not present on the organizational chart. However, at the same time, the organization was highly dependent on excellent, knowledgeable adjuncts. However, evidence of systems thinking exhibited itself through adjunct orientation sessions, mentoring programs, and providing adjunct faculty handbooks. The lens of Senge's (1994) model helped in understanding what constituted thinking of each person's or employee's connectedness to the whole and how each person's role benefited the other persons in the system.

Shared vision emerged when common goals were developed through working and interacting together for the good of the whole group. Examples of adjuncts' attending department meetings and helping in formulating department goals exhibit the concept of shared vision. Dropping false assumptions through open dialogue and communication were important to break through the mental models people form about other individuals or groups. Adjuncts wanted to be invited to attend meetings and become more involved, while department chairs wanted the adjuncts to ask to participate. Senge (1994) gave a model for breaking through these impasses that prevent effective communication. Most organizations benefit from effective team building called team learning by Senge.

Senge's (1994) model helped to realize that the department chair was the key to adjunct inclusion as part of the team at the department level. In addition, adjuncts expressed their best hope for being part of the department team was to be placed on temporary one-year contracts.

For Senge's (1994) personal mastery to take place, adjuncts revealed they needed to feel a sense of accomplishment, pride, recognition, appreciation, collegiality, and belonging to the university and the department they serve. In addition, what else I found was that long-term adjunct faculty wanted to be recognized by their names in universities' publications. Adjuncts did not want to be "nameless" at the universities where they worked. This was key to retaining qualified long-term adjuncts. This concept extended beyond Senge's (1994) concept of personal mastery—it was a matter of personal pride. Several of the long-term adjuncts interviewed at both universities had either quit or changed universities (even if it meant lesser pay) if they were not recognized by their names in the universities' class schedules or by their department chairs.

Senge's (1994) theoretical lens was a useful model for anyone wanting to study how to keep excellent adjuncts involved in the university. The model revealed that for any employee in a bureaucracy to feel included, they needed communication, involvement, and recognition. The model presented a useful lens for analyzing complex organizational structures, such as higher education, for ways to build learning communities that involve and include all employees regardless of rank.

Implication for Practice

Collegial opportunities for all faculty members, regardless of rank, bring out the best standards of practice that higher education cherishes. All the participants in this study stated adjuncts were an important and needed part of the effective and efficient running of the university system. Several thoughts or recommendations for good practice emerged from the data in this study.

Include the adjunct faculties' participation in the social and professional affairs at your colleges. This action will increase the motivation and the job satisfaction of the adjunct faculty members. It is a practical solution that will cost very little in terms of resources, but will result in social and professional gains for the adjunct faculty members and the university system as a whole. Allowing the adjuncts to fully participate in the social and professional affairs of the university will increase their professional status within the educational culture. The administration stands to gain from supporting this recommendation because retaining adjuncts saves the university money, and the recommendation will cost very little to implement. The deans and department chairs stand to gain from supporting this recommendation because they will recognize that it is in their best interest to retain excellent adjunct faculty members. The full-time faculty stand to gain from supporting this recommendation because the retention of excellent adjuncts benefits them in reduction of their class load, class size, teaching assignments (especially lower level, freshman general education classes that they may not want to teach). In addition, students benefit by the retention of better qualified and informed adjunct faculty as their instructors.

Institute an orientation session (university-wide at least once a year and at the department level each semester) that recognizes the importance of adjunct faculty members to the university. This is a time for part-time and full-time faculty members to bond as colleagues, to share information, to present the faculty and adjunct faculty handbooks, and to explain the policies of the university. Again, this is a practical solution costing very little in terms of resources. Invite the adjunct faculty to the orientation sessions and have the sessions at a time that is convenient for the part-time faculty to attend. Many telephone conversations and misunderstandings can be replaced by the up front, face-to-face sharing of information, faculty handbooks, e-mail addresses, department schedules, department syllabi, school calendars, and university policies during the orientation session (both at the university level and the department level). In addition, long-term adjuncts' names should be listed beside their classes in class schedules and recognized on the university Web site. For long-term adjuncts, being "nameless" is interpreted as they are not valued by the university.

Have the Vice President for Academic affairs, supported by the deans and department heads, issue a policy statement that directs all employees, regardless of rank, to be an active, integral part of the university's goals and vision, and that all employees' comments and suggestions concerning the college or university are welcomed and valued. This would promote openness, group empowerment, and shared goals that enrich the learning environment. It is practical and does not cost much in terms of resources. Administrators should recognize departments that exemplify quality integration efforts with their adjunct faculty members. The gain would be a university that truly cares about the opinions of its members. This policy should appeal to the administrators' and faculty

members' sense of equity, fair play, professionalism, collegiality, and democratic principles. Students are then educated in an atmosphere of democratic principles that demonstrate respect and equity throughout the learning organization.

Invite adjuncts to participate in the strategic planning of the university and encourage committee chairs to include adjuncts in their membership. Have a dialogue with adjunct faculty members on how much participation in the university governance they would want considering their part-time status and low compensation. Let the open dialogue be the communicative guide to the level of participation expected of the adjuncts. Explore funding possibilities for professional development opportunities for adjunct faculty members. In addition, have opportunities within the university for adjunct faculties' professional development.

Recognize departments for their efforts in integrating their adjunct faculty. Consider hiring an adjunct faculty coordinator who will help bridge the communication gap with day and night adjuncts. The adjunct coordinator can be a liaison between the university, the department, and the adjuncts. Resources for the position are well worth the expenditure for the benefits that such a position provides the university. In several cases, especially with non-traditional students taking night and weekend classes, adjuncts are the main representatives of the university. Therefore, the best practices put forth on the adjuncts' behalf benefit the university and the students the university serves.

Whenever possible, excellent adjunct faculty members should be considered for full-time positions. Many adjuncts are not interested in issues of tenure. Adjuncts expressed interest in temporary one-year contracts that include some benefits. Adjuncts

holding temporary one-year contracts report that with this change in status, they are better integrated into the university, treated as professionals, and valued as colleagues.

The American Association of University Professors (2001) and the American Federation of Teachers (2002) have issued separate reports containing standards for the fairer treatment of adjuncts and have called for increased collaboration between full and part-time faculty. Both research reports recommended the following concerning adjuncts:

- Opportunity for professional development
- Regular evaluation based on established criteria consistent with responsibilities
- Opportunity for appeal or grievance in the event of allegedly substantial violations of procedure, discrimination, or denial of academic freedom
- Access to all regular departmental communication
- Integration in collegial processes related to contractual responsibilities for teaching and curricular planning

Furthermore, recognizing the growing dependence of colleges and universities for excellent adjunct faculty, and the need for a more integrative approach, the American Association of University Professors offered these additional recommendations on professional standards for part-time faculty.

Example of Standards:

- All appointments must have a description of specific duties required.
- Compensation for part-time employees should correspond fractionally to full-time compensation, including essential fringe benefits, such as health and pension contributions.

- Timely notice of non-reappointment should be extended to all faculty, regardless of length of service.
- Institutions should provide resources necessary to perform assigned duties in a professional manner.
- Part-time faculty should be given fair consideration when positions are converted to full time.

(American Association of University Professors, 2001)

The standards presented by the American Association of University Professors and the American Federation of Teachers are based on treating the adjunct instructor as a respected professional and valued colleague. The standards reflect justice, fairness, equity, and respect. However, as previously presented, the discrepancy between the standards outlined by these two professional organizations and the actual practices at most higher education institutions is wide. My research study is important in closing the gap between the standards outlined by the American Association of University Professors and the American Federation of Teachers and the actual practices at most higher education institutions.

Concluding Remarks

In conclusion, the enactment of the recommendations will result in a better educational environment for all the stakeholders in education, but especially for the biggest stakeholders of all—the students at the colleges and universities. While conducting this research, one of the administrators suggested an adjunct coordinator be hired for the proper care and feeding of the adjunct faculty members. At first, this remark seemed condescending, but I just could not get the remark off of my mind. The more I

thought about it, the more I realized that the proper care or training of the adjunct is just what is needed in higher education. Therefore, from this conversation, I found the title for the case study. I believe the proper care of adjuncts is important.

In addition, after conducting this study, as a college administrator, I will make every effort to make sure the adjuncts under my care will not feel “nameless.” I plan on having increased communication, involvement, and recognition of adjunct faculty members.

Adjuncts who want to be more included in the higher education institutions they serve, I believe, are well advised to make themselves more visible in the organization. The adjuncts I interviewed, what administrators called “super adjuncts” or “special adjuncts,” did not wait for an invitation to join in department functions, they asked to be included. The four adjuncts receiving temporary full-time status called themselves “serious adjuncts” and were assertive in their efforts to integrate themselves in the system.

Administrators need to think in terms beyond just how adjuncts’ service benefited their university. Administrators need to think about and tap into the intrinsic rewards that motivate adjuncts to service. Administrators, department chairs, and adjuncts need increased opportunities to dialogue with each other. Administrators need to ask their adjuncts how much involvement they feel is reasonable with what they are paid and the times they work. In addition, adjuncts must be recognized for their service to the university and department they serve. Adjuncts have a need to feel valued for their contributions to the university. This is an important concept in retaining qualified, serious adjuncts.

Therefore, I believe this research study is important to extend our knowledge and our understanding of treating each other as colleagues. My study adds to the research literature with specific ways that part-time, full-time faculty, department heads, and administrators can work together within a spirit of respect that enriches the educational community.

Bibliography

- American Association for Higher Education. (1996). Making a place for the new American Scholar. *New Pathways: Faculty Careers and Employment for the 21st Century, Inquiry #1*. Washington, D.C.: R. Eugene Rice.
- American Association of University Professors. (n.d.). *Part-time and non-tenure track faculty*. [On-line journal] Retrieved March 3, 2001, from <http://www.aaup.org/>
- American Association of University Professors. (n.d.). *Statement from the conference on the growing use of part-time and adjunct faculty*. [On-line journal] Retrieved March 3, 2001, from <http://www.aaup.org/>
- American Federation of Teachers. (2002, July). *Standards of good practice in the employment of part-time/adjunct faculty: A blueprint for raising standards and ensuring financial equity*.
- American Historical Association. (n.d.). *Summary of data from surveys by coalition on the academic workforce*. Retrieved February 21, 2001, from <http://www.theaha.org/caw/cawreport.htm>
- Approaches to staff development for part-time faculty. (1986, July 1). *Eric Digest*. (Report No. EDD00036). Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED). (ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Los Angeles, CA. CIQ11705).
- Arlington University. *Adjunct faculty handbook*. University publication.
- Arlington University. (2001). *North Central Association self-study report* (Tech. Rep.). University publication.

- Arlington University. (2003, March). *Spring, 2003 enrollment statistics and demographics report* (Tech. Rep.). University publication: Office of Institutional Research and Office of Admissions and Records.
- Bach, P. (1999, Spring). Part-time faculty are here to stay. *Planning for Higher Education: The Quarterly Journal of the Society for College and University Planning*, 27(3), pp. 32-40. [On-line journal] Retrieved July 20, 2001, from EBSCO Host database.
- Banachowski, G. Advantages and disadvantages of employing part-time faculty in community colleges. *ERIC Digest*. Los Angeles, CA: ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges, 1997. (ED 405 037). [On-line journal] Retrieved February 2, 2001, from http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed405037.html
- Bedford University. (2003). *Faculty handbook*. University publication.
- Bedford University. (2001). *Five-year strategic Technology Plan* (Tech. Rep.). University publication.
- Bedford University. (2002). *North Central Association self-study report* (Tech. Rep.). University publication.
- Bedford University. (2004). *North Central Association self-study report* (Tech. Rep.). University publication.
- Bennis, W. (1989). *On becoming a leader*. Reading, MA: Perseus Books.
- Church, J. (1999, May/June). Laboring in the dream factory, part II. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education (QSE)* 12(3), p. 251, (12 pages). Retrieved July 20, 2001, from EBSCO Host database.

- Cox, A. (2000, December 1). Study shows colleges' dependence on their part-time instructors. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 12-14.
- Cox, A. M., & Leatherman, C. (2000, December 1). Study shows colleges' dependence on their part-time instructors. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 47(14), p. A12, (3 pages). [On-line journal] Retrieved June 6, 2002, from EBSCO host database.
- Creswell, J. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design. Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Crotty, M. (1999). *The foundation of social research: Meaning and perspectives in the research process*. London: Sage Publications.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (1994). *The handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dever, J. T. (1997, Fall). Reconciling educational leadership and the learning organization. *Community College Review*, 25(2), p. 57, (7 pages). [On-line journal] Retrieved March 21, 2003, from EBSCO Host database.
- Di Giacomo, S. (1999, May/June). The new internal colonialism. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education (QSE)* 12(3), p. 263, (6 pages). [On-line journal] Retrieved July 20, 2001, from EBSCO Host database.
- Dubson, M. (Ed.). (2001). *Ghosts in the classroom: Stories of college adjunct faculty—and the price we all pay*. Boston, MA: Camel's Back Books Publishers.
- Fulton, R. (2000, May/June). The plight of part-timers in higher education. *Change*, 32(3), p. 38. [On-line journal] Retrieved February 21, 2001, from <http://webenfl.epnet.com/fulltext.asp>

- Gappa, J. (1984). Part-time faculty: Higher education at a crossroads. *ERIC Digest 84-4*. Washington, D. C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education. Retrieved February 21, 2001, from *ERIC Digest* database.
- Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1997) Two faculties or one? The conundrum of part-timers in a bifurcated workforce. *American Association for Higher Education, Inquiry #6*.
- Greenbaum, T. L. (1998). *The handbook for focus group research*. (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Hodkinson, D. (2003). *Faculty in higher education: Adjunct realities within a dual system*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma.
- Holden, C. (1997, December 19). Adjuncts in academe. *Science*, 278, (5346), p. 2063. [On-line journal] Retrieved February 20, 2001, from EBSCO host database.
- Krier, D., & Staples, W. (1993, Fall/Winter). Seen but unseen: Part-time faculty and institutional surveillance and control. *American Sociologist*, 24(3/4), p. 119, (16 pages). [On-line journal] Retrieved July 20, 2001, from EBSCO Host database.
- Krueger, R. (1994). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Lane, K. (2002, April 15). Only partway there. *Community College Week 14*(18), p. 6, (4 pages). [On-line journal] Retrieved June 6, 2002, from EBSCO host database.
- Leatherman, C. (2001, January 26). Part-time faculty members try to organize nationally. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 47(20), p. A12, (2 pages). [On-line journal] Retrieved June 6, 2002, from EBSCO host database.

- LeCompte, M., Millroy, W., & Preissle, J. (1992). *The handbook of qualitative research in education*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, Inc.
- Leslie, D., & Gappa, J. (1993). *The invisible faculty*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (2000). *Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences*. In N. D. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research*. (2nd Ed.). (pp. 163-188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lundy, K., & Warme, B. (1990). Gender and career trajectory: The case of part-time faculty. *Studies in Higher Education*, 15(2), p. 207, (16 p, 7 charts). [On-line journal] Retrieved July 19, 2001, from EBSCO host database.
- Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Mertens, D. (1998). *Research methods in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Moser, R. (2000). The AAUP organizes part-time faculty. *ACADEME*. [On-line journal] Retrieved February 20, 2001 from <http://www.aaup.org/ND00Mose.htm>
- Murphy, M. (2002, March 29). Adjuncts should not just be visitors in the academic promised land. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 48(29), p. B14, (2 pages). [On-line journal] Retrieved June 2, 2002, from EBSCO host database.

- Opotow, S. (1990). Moral exclusion and injustice: An introduction. *Journal of Social Issues*, 46(1), 1-20.
- Ott, J. (Ed). (1996). *Classical Readings in organizational behavior*. (2nd Ed.). Orlando, Florida: Harcourt Brace & Company.
- Pedersen, R. (2001, April 20). It's time to clean up higher education's dirtiest little secret. *Community College Week*, 13(17), p. 4, (2 pages). Retrieved July 19, 2001, from EBSCO Host database.
- Rhoades, G. (1996, November/December). Reorganizing the faculty workforce for flexibility: Part-time professional labor. *Journal for Higher Education*, 67, pp. 626-634. [On-line journal] Retrieved February 21, 2001, from http://web6.infotrac.galegroup.com/itw/in...A19155709&dyn=24!ar_fmt?sw_aep=odl_nwosua
- The role of faculty unions in reducing the reliance on adjuncts. (2000, October 20). *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 47(8), p. B6, (1/2 page). [On-line journal] Retrieved June 6, 2002, from EBSCO Host database.
- Roueche, J., Roueche, S., & Milliron, M. (1995). *Strangers in their own land: Part-time faculty in American community colleges*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.
- Roueche, S. (1999, January 25). Making friends of strangers. *Community College Week*, 11(13), p. 4, (2 pages). [On-line journal] Retrieved October 4, 2001, from EBSCO Host database.

- Saltzman, G. (2000). Union organizing and the law: Part-time faculty and graduate teaching assistants. *The NEA 2000 Almanac of Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.
- Scarff, M. (2000, May 15). The full-time stress of part-time professors. *Newsweek*, 135(20), 10. [On-line journal] Retrieved February 21, 2001, from EBSCO Host database.
- Senge, P. M. (1994). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Currency/Double Day.
- Shumar, W. (1999, May/June). Laboring in the dream factory, part I. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education (QSE)* 12(3), p. 239, (12 pages). [On-line journal] Retrieved July 20, 2001, from EBSCO Host database.
- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Starratt, R. (1996). *Transforming educational administration: Meaning, community, and excellence*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Tierney, W., & Bensimon, E. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Townsend, R. (2000, October). Part-time faculty surveys highlight disturbing trends. *Perspectives*. [On-line journal] Retrieved February 21, 2001, from http://www.theaha.org/perspectives/issues/2000/0010/pt_survery.htm
- Townsend, R. (2000, April). Part-time teachers: The AHA survey. *Perspectives*. [On-line journal]. Retrieved February 21, 2001 from <http://www.theaha.org/perspectives/issues/2000/004/004new1.cfm>

- U.S. Department of Education. (2001, April). *Background characteristics, work activities, and compensation of faculty and instructional staff in postsecondary institutions: Fall, 1998*. [On-line government report] Retrieved June 6, 2002 from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2001/2001152.pdf> (required Adobe Acrobat Reader)
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). *1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF: 93), Part-time instructional faculty and staff: Who they are, what they do, and what they think*, (NCES 2002-163). Washington, DC: Conley, V., & Leslie, D. Project Officer: Linda J. Zimbler.
- Valadez, J., & Anthony, J. (2001, February). Job satisfaction and commitment of two-year college part-time faculty. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, 25(2), p. 97, (12 pages). [On-line journal]. Retrieved October 4, 2001, from EBSCO Host database.
- Wilson, R. (2001, May 4). Proportion of part-time faculty members leveled off from 1992 to 1998, data show. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 47(34), p. A14, (1/2 page). [On-line journal] Retrieved June 6, 2002, from EBSCO Host database.
- Yin, R. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Yin, R. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Appendix A

Example of Cover Letter

Dear _____,

I am a doctoral candidate at Oklahoma State University. I am asking your participation in a research study. Confidentiality is guaranteed. You are free to decide not to participate at any time. Your participation or lack of participation will not in any way affect your relationship to the institution. For this study, open-ended one-on-one interviews will be the method for collecting the data for the study.

The purpose of this study is to explore the role of adjunct faculty participation in the school organization.

1. The open-ended interview session will last approximately 60 minutes.
2. I will ask five to ten questions and would like your permission to tape record the session.
3. Again, confidentiality will be honored.
4. If you agree to participate in this study, I will contact you again with the date, time, and location.
5. In addition, if you agree to participate, I will ask you to sign a research consent form.
6. Please contact me within two weeks to let me know if you agree to participate in the study.

I appreciate your help.

Sincerely,

Deena Fisher
OSU Doctoral Student
Contact: Deena fisher
3308 Bent Creek Drive
Woodward, OK 73801 - (580) 254-3237 (Home)

(Modeled after Creswell, John (1998). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design*.)

Appendix A

Research Consent Form

"I, _____, agree to participate in a research project conducted by Deena Fisher. I understand that data collected during this study will be used by Deena Fisher to complete a doctorate in Educational Administration at Oklahoma State University.

By agreeing to participate in this study, I agree to do the following:

- 1. participate in a one-on-one interview that would last approximately 60 minutes and will be audio taped;
- 2. participate in a short follow-up telephone or in-person interview; and
- 3. participate in reviewing for accuracy the interview questions as written up by Mrs. Fisher.

I further understand that:

- 1. the confidentiality of all data collected by the research will be protected through the use of numerical identifiers and pseudonyms rather than names for both individuals and the school district; access to the data will be limited to the researcher and her major advisor;
- 2. data collection is expected to be completed by Spring/Summer, 2004;
- 3. this research is being conducted with the intent of contributing to the existing research, theory, and practice regarding organizational change and its impact on individuals.

This investigation is entitled *A qualitative multi-site case study: The integration of part-time adjunct faculty within the hierarchical organizational structure of higher education.*

I understand that participation is voluntary, that there is no penalty for refusal to participate, and that I am free to withdraw from this project at any time without penalty after notifying the researcher.

If I have questions regarding this study, I may contact Deena Fisher at 580-256-0047, 580-254-3237, dkfisher@nwsu.edu; her major advisor, Dr. Adrienne Hyle, 405-744-9893, aeh@okstate.edu; or the OSU Internal Review Board, Oklahoma State University, 203 Whitehurst, Stillwater, OK 74078, 405-744-5700.

I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: _____

Time: _____ (a.m./p.m.)

Name (printed)

Signature

I certify that I have personally explained all elements of this form to the respondent before requesting him or her to sign it.

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Deena Fisher, Researcher

Appendix B
Interview Protocol

Based on the purpose of the study, the problem statement, and the theoretical lens, I plan to ask part-time/adjunct faculty, full-time faculty, and administrators the following open-ended interview questions:

Adjunct Instructors: (Note: The following questions will be asked using the lens of Senge's (1994) learning organization model for evidence of systems thinking, shared vision, mental models, team learning, and personal mastery. In addition, the questions are constructed in such a way to reflect the position, power, and responsibilities of the adjunct faculty member within the university structure).

1. How long have you been an adjunct faculty member? What motivated you to accept the job as adjunct? Talk to me about what it means to be an adjunct instructor at this institution.
2. What does the word or concept of "integration" mean to you as an adjunct instructor?
3. In what ways are adjunct faculty members being integrated into the academic life of this university?
 - a. Were you or any adjunct faculty member asked to serve on or participate in the strategic plan for the university?
 - b. In what way did you or any adjunct faculty member participate in developing department goals, mission, or vision?
 - c. What committees do you serve on in the university?

- d. Do you or other adjunct faculty members attend department meetings regularly? Why or why not?
4. What roadblocks, if any, do you see that hinder integration?
5. How does the organizational structure affect higher education's integration of the adjunct faculty? In what ways does it foster integration? Hinder integration?
6. What if adjuncts were more integrated into the educational organization? Would you describe that scenario?
7. Do adjuncts have professional development opportunities at this university? Are they considered for full time positions if a job becomes available?

Full-time Faculty Members: (Note: The following questions will be asked using the lens of Senge's (1994) learning organization model for evidence of systems thinking, shared vision, mental models, team learning, and personal mastery. In addition, the questions are constructed in such a way to reflect the position, power, and responsibilities of the full-time faculty member within the university structure.)

1. Tell me about yourself? How long have you been a faculty member? What is your academic field? Talk to me about what it means to be an adjunct instructor at this institution.
2. What does the word or concept of "integration" mean to you as the term relates to adjunct faculty and full-time faculty relationship?
3. In what ways are adjunct faculty members being integrated into the academic life of this university?

- a. Were you asked to serve or participate in developing the strategic plan for the university? Were adjunct faculty asked to participate?
 - b. In what ways did/do adjunct faculty participate in developing department goals, mission, or vision?
 - c. What committees do adjuncts serve on at the university?
 - d. Do they attend department meetings regularly? Why or why not?
4. What roadblocks, if any, do you see that hinder integration?
 5. How does the organizational structure of higher education affect the integration of adjunct faculty? In what ways does it foster integration? Hinder integration?
 6. What if adjuncts were more integrated into the educational organization? Will you describe that scenario?
 7. Do adjuncts have professional development opportunities at this university? Are they considered for full time positions if a job becomes available?

Administrators: (Note: The following questions will be asked using the lens of Senge's (1994) learning organization model for evidence of systems thinking, shared vision, mental models, team learning, and personal mastery. In addition, the questions are constructed in such a way to reflect the position, power, and responsibilities of the administrator within the university structure.)

1. Tell me about yourself. How long have you been in administration? What is your academic field? Talk to me about what it means to be an adjunct instructor at this institution.
2. What does the word or concept of "integration" of adjunct faculty mean to you as an administrator?

3. In what ways are adjunct faculty members being integrated into the academic life of this university?
 - a. Were adjunct faculty asked to serve or participate in the strategic plan for the university?
 - b. In what ways did/do adjunct faculty participate in developing department (or university) goals, mission, or vision?
 - c. What committees do adjunct serve on in the university?
 - d. Do they attend department meetings regularly? Why or why not?
4. What roadblocks, if any, do you see that hinder integration?
5. How does the organizational structure in higher education affect the integration of the adjunct faculty? In what ways does it foster integration? Hinder integration?
6. What if adjuncts were more integrated into the educational organization? Will you describe that scenario?
7. Do adjuncts have professional development opportunities at this university? Are they considered for full-time positions if a job becomes available?

Appendix C

Case Study A

DEENA FISHER
P. O. BOX 1046
WOODWARD, OK 73801
580-256-0047

May 25, 2004

Dear Participant:

Recently you participated in a research study (for my dissertation) on adjunct/part-time faculty. I want to thank you for your participation. You have the right to review for accuracy the interview questions as written up by Mrs. Fisher. This is in rough form as I had this transcribed from listening to our taped interview. Grammatical errors are unavoidable in this format. Please check for **accuracy of content** in the interviews. Again, confidentiality of all data collected will be protected through the use of numerical identifiers and pseudonyms rather than names for both individuals and for school districts. Access to the data will be limited to the researcher and her major advisor.

Please review for any major errors or misrepresentation of your comments and return to me (Mrs. Fisher) by **June 8, 2004. If I do not hear from you by June 8,** I will use portions of the interview as presented.

Sincerely,

Deena Fisher

Appendix C

Case Study B

DEENA FISHER
P. O. BOX 1046
WOODWARD, OK 73801
580-256-0047

June 2, 2004

Dear Participant:

Recently you participated in a research study (for my dissertation) on adjunct/part-time faculty. I want to thank you for your participation. You have the right to review for accuracy the interview questions as written up by Mrs. Fisher. This is in rough form as I had this transcribed from listening to our taped interview. Grammatical errors are unavoidable in this format. Please check for **accuracy of content** in the interviews. Again, confidentiality of all data collected will be protected through the use of numerical identifiers and pseudonyms rather than names for both individuals and for school districts. Access to the data will be limited to the researcher and her major advisor.

Please review for any major errors or misrepresentation of your comments and return to me (Mrs. Fisher) by **June 16, 2004. If I do not hear from you by June 16,** I will use portions of the interview as presented.

Sincerely,

Deena Fisher

APPENDIX D

ADJUNCT FACULTY HANDBOOK
ARLINGTON UNIVERSITY

INDEX

Introduction.....	1
Adjunct Faculty Contracts	1
Adjunct Faculty Salaries.....	1
Faculty I.D. 's, Library Privileges, and Audio Visual	1
Postage and Duplicating	1
Office Hours.....	2
Receiving/Sending Mail.....	2
Teaching Responsibilities and Absences	2
Pre-arranged absences.....	2
Emergency/illnesses.....	2
Canceling Classes	2
Syllabus.....	2
Textbooks.....	2
Campus Class Rosters.....	3
Grade Reports	3
Posting of Grades.....	3
Evaluations.....	3
Closing the Campus or the Higher Education Centers	3
Building Use Policies.....	4
Filing Mileage.....	4
Risk Management	4
Long Distance Phone Calls.....	4
Supplies and Secretarial Assistance.....	4
Equal Opportunity & Affirmative Action Policy.....	4
ADA Statement.....	5
Communicable Diseases Policy	5
Political Activities.....	5
Drug-Free Workplace Policy	5
Requirements	5
Information	6
Sexual Harassment.....	6
Appendix A-Agreement on Guidelines for Classroom Copying.....	7
Appendix B-Grading System.....	10
Appendix C-Directory	13

APPENDIX E

FACULTY HANDBOOK
BEDFORD UNIVERSITY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FALL 2003 ACADEMIC CALENDAR	1
FALL 2003 FINAL EXAM SCHEDULE	2
CAMPUS HOURS	
Hours of Operation	3
CLASSROOM PROCEDURES	
Classroom Intercoms	3
Room Temperature	4
Classroom Supplies	4
Food and Drink in Classrooms	4
Cellular Phones	4
FACULTY SERVICES	
Faculty Support Personnel	4
Faculty Office Space	4
Faculty Mailboxes	4
Message Service	4
Mail Service	4
Typing/Copying Requests	5
Class rosters	5
Syllabi	5
Calling Trees	5
Office Hours	5
Grades	5
Travel Expenses	5-6
University Vehicle	6
Custodial Services	6
Make-up Exams	6
COMPUTING/MULTIMEDIA	
Computer/Printers	6
User ID/Password	6
Computer Service	6
Multimedia Equipment	6
Computer Lab	7

SAFETY ISSUES	
Campus Police	7
Emergency Procedures	7
Lost and Found	7
DINING	
Food Service	7
CAMPUS LOCATION	
Campus Maps	7
CLASS CANCELLATION PROCEDURE	
Class cancellations	7
Bad Weather Policy	7-8
PARKING PERMITS/ID'S	
Parking Permits	8
Faculty ID's	8
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITES	
Students with Disabilities	8

VITA

Deena Kaye Fisher

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctorate of Education

Thesis: THE PROPER CARE AND FEEDING OF ADJUNCT FACULTY—A QUALITATIVE MULTI-SITE CASE STUDY: THE INTEGRATION OF PART-TIME ADJUNCT FACULTY WITHIN THE HIERARCHICAL ORGANIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Major Field: Higher Education Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Elk City, Oklahoma, on December 20, 1950, the daughter of Earl Dean and Rosa Lee Music.

Education: Graduated from Elk City High School, Elk City, Oklahoma, in May, 1969; received Bachelor of Arts Education degree in Social Science, May, 1979, Summa Cum Laude, from Southwestern Oklahoma State University, Weatherford, Oklahoma; received a Master's of Education in Social Science and a Master's of Education in School Counseling from Southwestern Oklahoma State University, Weatherford, Oklahoma, in May, 1983, and May, 1999, respectively. Summer Graduate Program, 1997, Pacific University, Forest Grove, Oregon; Summer Graduate Program, 1991 and 1990, University of Central Oklahoma, Edmond, Oklahoma; Summer Graduate Program, 1980, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma; Summer Graduate Program, 1979, Oklahoma City University, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. Completed the requirements for the Doctorate of Education degree with a major in Higher Education Administration at Oklahoma State University in December, 2004.

Experience: Dean, Woodward Campus of Northwestern Oklahoma State University and Assistant Professor in American History, 2002 to present; Director, Woodward Campus of Northwestern Oklahoma State University and instructor of social science, August, 1996 to 2002; adjunct instructor for Northwestern Oklahoma State University, August, 1989 to

1996; department chairman, A. P. American government and American history instructor, Woodward High School, Woodward, Oklahoma, August, 1989, to August, 1996; instructor in political science and American history at Southwestern Oklahoma State University, Weatherford, Oklahoma, August, 1987 to May, 1989; Upward Bound guidance and career counselor and social science instructor, El Reno Community College, El Reno, Oklahoma, January, 1987, to August, 1989; adjunct instructor, El Reno Community College, El Reno, Oklahoma, August, 1985, to January, 1987; instructor in American history at Yukon High School, Yukon, Oklahoma, September, 1986, to September, 1987; instructor in social science, Cordell High School, Cordell, Oklahoma, August, 1979, to May, 1985.

Professional Memberships: Member, Higher Education Alumni Council of Oklahoma, 2004; Member of Association of College Administrators Professional Association, 2004; member of American Association of University Women, 2004; member of National Council for the Social Studies, 2004; member of College and University Faculty Assembly, 2004; member Delta Kappa Gamma International Society, 2004; member National Social Studies Supervisors Association, 2004; member Phi Delta Kappa International, 2004; member Phi Alpha Theta, 2004; member Oklahoma Council of Social Studies, 2004; selected for membership in the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi, Oklahoma State University, 2003; recipient of the Delta Kappa Gamma Society International Blanche Moon Scholarship of \$3,000, 2004; recipient of the \$5,000 Maycle K. Southall Scholarship from Delta Kappa Gamma Society to use in pursuit of doctoral degree, 2001.