

Adjunct Perspectives on Job Factors and Job Attitudes in Non-Traditional Institutions

Mario C. Martinez

University of Texas, Arlington

Matthew Martinez

Princeton University

Abstract: *Adjunct faculty scholarship disproportionately focuses on institutions that serve traditional students. Using Herzberg's job factors and attitudes as a theoretical lens, this study examines adjunct faculty at a large, non-traditional institution and their perceptions about how four job factors (communication, institutional practices, tools to do the job, and utilization of expertise) influence their attitudes about respect, commitment, and willingness to recommend the institution. Regression results confirm the importance of hygiene factors but also indicate that utilization of expertise (intrinsic motivator) influences all job attitudes.*

Key words: *adjunct faculty, non-traditional institutions, job factors, job attitudes, adult students*

Introduction

Statistics in literature on non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) document that this group accounts for between 66 (AFT, 2010) to 70 percent (Shuster & Finkelstein, 2006) of all faculty members. Recently reported data (Almanac, 2017-18, p. 15) show an aggregate of 66.3% of all faculty are indeed NTTF across all institutions in the United States, though there is great variation by sector. The Almanac's definition of NTTF includes

Mario C. Martinez is a Professor and Chair for the Educational Leadership department at University of Texas, Arlington.

Matthew Martinez is an economics major at Princeton University.

Copyright © 2019 by *The Journal of the Professoriate*, an affiliate of the Center for African American Research and Policy. All Rights Reserved (ISSN 1556-7699)

faculty not on the tenure track or faculty who work for an institution with no tenure system. The boundaries of tenure status include four-year, for-profit institutions with 99.7% of total faculty members who are NTTF, to 55.1% for public four-year institutions. Public two-year institutions make extensive use of NTTF faculty (79.9%), while the private four-year, non-profit sector reports 65.2% NTTF—lower than the public two-year sector but higher than the public four-year sector. Institutional type within the private four-year, non-profit sector varies greatly, and includes Stanford and the eight Ivy League universities, liberal arts institutions, and a relatively new group of institutions that focus on serving adult students.

The growing adult student market has drawn increasing interest from public four-year institutions as well. The adult population seeking postsecondary education now comprises some 28.7% of all undergraduate students and 76.5% of all graduate students (Almanac, 2017-18, p. 31), while the 18-year-old student age population across many states remains stagnant or even in decline. Such demographic trends help explain why public universities continue to join a crowded field of institutions that have launched online business units, separate from their traditional program operations, to attract the adult student. Those business units, institutions or sectors that focus on the adult student share many characteristics, including but not limited to corporate style approaches to marketing, primary utilization of online modalities, and a heavy reliance on NTTF.

The prevalence of NTTF has attracted scholarly attention for some time, though most studies are concentrated on institutions that primarily serve traditional students, such as public four-year institutions or community colleges (Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Kezar, 2013; Kramer, Gloeckner, & Jacoby, 2013; O'Mera, Terosky, & Neumann, 2008). The existing literature on NTTF is largely unified in its call for improved institutional culture and working conditions for this faculty group, which includes recommendations to increase pay, strengthen orientation and hiring practices, provide professional development, and improve communication with tenured faculty and administrators. These recommendations largely focus on job factors that are external to the individual, referred to as environmental or hygiene factors in classic studies on motivation (Herzberg, 1968).

An area of difference in the literature concerns the use of NTTF and its relationship to student success. A number of recent studies in the two-year sector (Howngwei, Campbell, & Mendoza, 2015; Rogers, 2015) finds no relationship between NTTF and student success, or no differences in student success based on faculty status, while earlier studies (Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Jacoby, 2006) suggest that higher utilization of NTTF equates to lower teaching effectiveness or student outcomes.

The areas of convergence and divergence in the literature emphasize the need for ongoing study of the NTTF population, as a whole and across different sectors and institutional types. The imperative for additional study on NTTF is heightened by the likelihood that institutions will increase the representation of this faculty group as they are encouraged by policy makers and board members to focus on scalability and technological solutions for educational delivery to adult students. *Scalability*, in this context, refers to standardized, low-cost delivery to the greatest number of students possible.

The increase in contract workers across industries, which would include NTTF, aligns with the goals of scalability and technological integration into solution delivery. Boiller's (2011) view of the future of work is that in a fast-changing world, organizations require speed and flexibility to compete and provide relevant functionality, and this in turn requires a flexible workforce. Ismail's (2014) application of the need for flexibility results in what he terms "staff on demand," enabling an organization to remain relevant, nimble and competitive...to become an exponential organization. As distasteful as such language sounds to higher education faculty and staff, Boiller (2011) and Ismail's (2014) observations seem to partly explain the increasing dependence on NTTF in higher education, and its likely upward trend—particularly among those institutions serving adult students. Maxey and Kezar (2015) acknowledge the trend toward a higher proportion of NTTF in higher education, as administrators, board members and policy makers push for reduced expenditures and greater flexibility of the academic workforce.

In consideration of the growing adult student population and the commensurate intensity of competition among institutions across sectors for those students, our exploratory study diverges from previous NTTF studies that predominately focus on traditional university and community

college contexts. Fissures in the literature already indicate that NTTF are not a homogeneous group, thus, substantiating the value of new streams of investigation. Little is known about the NTTF population in institutions and sectors that serve adult students, and where NTTF are disproportionately represented in the faculty ranks relative to industry norms. We create a starting point to understand this understudied segment of the NTTF population by focusing on one private, non-profit four-year institution that serves adult students, heavily utilizes online modalities, and disproportionately relies on NTTF for teaching. Our study institution is minority majority (students) and a designated Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI). Fifty-seven percent of adult undergraduates at the institution are Pell eligible. An investigation of such a university is a starting point so that understanding of NTTF in non-traditional institutions are not left to impressions, stereotypes or unconscious biases that may emerge based on negative media profiles of one sector of the industry that disproportionately relies on NTTF (namely, the for-profit sector). The questions for this segment of NTTF are similar to those that have been raised in previous studies: How engaged are NTTF in such institutions? What job factors are most important to NTTF in these institutions? How satisfied and committed are they in their jobs? How do the answers to such questions compare with findings from existing studies?

The general purpose of our study, then, is to deepen our understanding of NTTF who serve in institutions that focus on adult students, increasingly rely on technological modalities, and disproportionately depend on NTTF for teaching. In consideration of the existing literature on NTTF and motivational theory, we are specifically interested in: a) the degree that different job factors are present or absent in institutional settings that focus on adult students and disproportionately depend on NTTF for teaching, and b) the connection between the various job factors and job attitudes, or outcomes, such as respect and commitment.

Literature

In the literature review, we first briefly review Herzberg's classic two-factor theory, which provides a conceptual basis for the study purpose, questions, and survey design and analysis. Second, we review the literature on adjunct faculty in higher education, particularly as it relates to the concept of job factors. Throughout the section, we highlight areas

of alignment and contrast between the two-factor theory and the higher education literature on adjuncts, when relevant to our study.

Herzberg's Job Factor Theory

Herzberg's well-known hygiene-motivation or two-factor theory was first published in 1959 but widely disseminated in a 1968 Harvard Business Review article (Herzberg, 1968). The general concept of testing whether motivational or hygiene job factors (intrinsic and extrinsic) influence job attitudes (satisfaction and dissatisfaction), or outcomes, is relevant to different fields and occupations even today, including adjunct faculty in higher education. Herzberg found that hygiene factors do not promote job satisfaction, but they serve to primarily prevent job dissatisfaction. Conversely, *motivators* relate to the intrinsic nature of the work, and can produce satisfaction. Motivators are sometimes referred to as growth factors, to emphasize that they address higher order needs associated with growth relevant to the nature of the job and thus produce job satisfaction. Hygiene factors address lower order needs associated with basic environmental conditions in the work place, which is Herzberg's explanation for why such factors can only prevent dissatisfaction.

Herzberg's theory has proven a durable and useful guide for practicing managers and administrators because of its logical simplicity. For our study, we use the general concepts associated with the two-factor theory as a guide to study design; namely, whether certain job factors associated with adjunct faculty work influence specific outcomes. The specific identification of what job factors and outcomes to include in our study emerged from the original theory, the literature on adjunct or non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF), and feedback from higher education administrators. We did not ask respondents about satisfaction and dissatisfaction directly, but the study still follows Herzberg's approach of exploring job factors and their relationship to certain outcomes.

We found no application of Herzberg's classic concepts in the adjunct faculty literature. Our study application therefore deepens insight into the adjunct population generally and those who serve non-traditional students specifically. The application of Herzberg's two-factor theory aligns with the call in the literature to address working conditions and increase the meaningfulness of adjunct work.

Adjunct Faculty Job Factors and Outcomes

Much of the literature on adjunct faculty addresses working conditions or the relationship between adjunct faculty and student success. References to possible differences among NTTF by discipline, status (full versus part-time), institutional type, or sector while acknowledged are not always easily comparable across or even within studies. Consensus exists among the various studies, however, in a call for increased support for NTTF as their ranks grow within the faculty profession and across the entire spectrum of institutions.

A wealth of studies on NTTF address working conditions or the degree to which NTTF work in a supportive culture. Kezar's (2013) case study analysis of 25 departments at master's level institutions asked interviewees to discuss their perspectives on institution and department policies; department values, norms, and beliefs; description of teaching and advising, and relationship to departmental policies; and role and interaction with others in the department, such as communication, collegueship, and information. Kezar's study utilized Blumberg and Pringle's (1982) framework on work performance, which consists of willingness to perform, capacity to perform, and opportunity to perform, but with an emphasis on the latter. The opportunity to perform includes job factors such as equipment, materials, actions of coworkers, leader behavior, mentoring, organizational policies, rules and procedures, norms, and information. The opportunity to perform job factors and those categories populating Kezar's (2013) interview protocol strongly align with Herzberg's hygiene factors, as they are environmental or part of the work context.

Kezar (2013) proposed a typology of department cultural types for adjuncts, and she subsequently developed a survey instrument (Delphi Project, 2016) to assess those cultural types. Although there is no indication of statistical validity or reliability associated with the department cultural instrument, the 26-item questionnaire logically builds on the case study research and addresses job factors informative to our study. Importantly, the instrument contains two questions that address utilization of expertise, something we equated more strongly with a motivator than a hygiene factor.

A range of studies on adjunct faculty in two- and four-year institutions also address working conditions and calls for improvements in pay, benefits, contractual policies, and communications (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Hollenshead et al., 2007; O'Mera, Terosky, & Neumann, 2008)—all items that align with hygiene factors. Gehrke and Kezar (2015) constructed a survey and asked academic deans in colleges of arts and sciences about hiring practices and policies (again, hygiene factors) and found that NTTF remain under-supported in these and other areas. Hoyt's (2012) quantitative exploration found that quality of students, honorarium, teaching load, obtaining teaching preferences and schedules, and collaborative research with faculty (all hygiene factors) are predictive of adjunct job satisfaction. Kramer, Gloeckner, and Jacoby (2013) found that part-time faculty at community colleges are satisfied with their roles but concerned about salary, benefits, and long-term security (hygiene factors).

Gappa, Austin, and Trice (2007) link job factors (employment equity, autonomy, professional growth, flexibility, and collegiality) to faculty performance; they do not link hygiene factors to faculty performance. The researchers found that respect is at the center of all these characteristics and related to a set of what they term outcomes: satisfaction, meaningfulness of work, and organizational commitment. While Gappa et al. (2007) address several job factors and their effect on performance, they conflate job factors and outcomes when viewed through Herzberg's framework. They categorize meaningfulness of work (a broad description of a job factor that is a motivator) with satisfaction and commitment (outcomes). Nonetheless, the attention to respect, commitment and satisfaction in this and other studies (Bland, Center, Finstad, Risbey, & Staples, 2006; Gehrke & Kezar, 2015; Halcrow & Olson, 2008; Kezar, 2013) signifies their importance throughout the literature.

A final topic tangential to our purpose but critical to acknowledge pertains to student success and course taking with adjunct faculty. Some studies show lower graduation rates and less likelihood of transfer for students taking more courses from adjunct faculty (Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Jacoby, 2006). A host of recent studies focused on the community college context, however, contradict these findings. Howngwei, Campbell, and Mendoza (2015) found that the proportion of part-time faculty in community colleges is not

negatively associated with student's likelihood of degree and/ or certificate completion. Rogers (2015) tested what he calls the tacit assumption that full-time faculty are more engaged in their institution, and that this engagement translates into student success. Rogers examined employment status of faculty on the success of students enrolled in four, two-course sequences and found no statistical difference of faculty status on student success.

In summary, Herzberg's classic framework can add clarity to the important research on working conditions and outcomes for NTTF and the role they play in educational delivery. The competing conclusions about the relationship between NTTF and student success underscores the importance of learning more about this growing population of faculty across all sectors of higher education.

Methodology

Our study employs survey design and analysis of adjunct faculty perceptions of support and engagement at one non-traditional non-profit, private institution. The institution is a master's level university, serves adult students, and depends on NTTF faculty to fulfill its teaching mission. NTTF teach approximately 90% of courses. Institutional documents and policies from the institution use the term "adjunct," and the study instruments and references to our work therefore use that terminology. We preserve the NTTF nomenclature when referencing other studies that prefer that language, however.

The quantitative analysis of adjunct faculty perceptions in an understudied institutional context is a natural extension and complement to the foundational, qualitative work on adjunct cultures (Kezar, 2013) and studies that identify commitment and respect (Gappa et al., 2007; Bland et al., 2006) as important themes to the adjunct population. A study of adjunct perceptions at non-traditional institutions that focus on serving adults extends understanding of this universe of adjunct faculty and the role they play across higher education sectors.

Instrumentation

Survey development aligned with our primary purpose to study adjunct job factor themes related to Herzberg's constructs of hygiene factors and motivators, and whether such factors relate to a set of outcomes (job

attitudes, in Herzberg's language). The first part of the survey contained three demographic questions: longevity at the institution, teaching load, and dependency on adjunct teaching as a livelihood. The job factor items leveraged from Herzberg's framework, existing adjunct literature and Kezar's questionnaire to assess department culture for NTTF (The Delphi Project, 2013). The department culture questionnaire directly connects to Kezar's (2013) qualitative adjunct culture study, and a range of issues with respect to adjunct faculty, including but not limited to hiring practices (Cross & Goldenberg, 2009), working conditions (O'Meara et al., 2008) and policies (Bland et al., 2006). We synthesized these various inputs and constructed four job factor categories relevant to the institution's adjunct population under study: Communication, Utilization of Expertise, Institutional Practices, and Tools to Do the Job. Four survey questions correspond with each job factor category is summarized in Table 1.

Each job factor question was rated on a four-point scale, ranging from Strongly Agree (first of four choices) to Strongly Disagree (last choice). For all items, lower ratings and cumulative means indicate a more favorable rating.

A central design feature addresses whether the job factors impact outcomes. The three survey items related to outcomes included perceptions of respect, commitment, and whether the faculty member would recommend that a colleague teach at the institution (hereafter simply referred to as recommend). Respect and commitment are prominent themes in the adjunct literature. The recommend question, as an outcome, emerged from expert feedback during survey development. A panel of seven administrators and faculty—which included presidents, provosts, and two faculty—provided feedback on a draft of the survey. The panel offered minor input on the job factor items, but several administrators suggested we include a “recommend” question. The recommend question is pervasive in feedback surveys today, and administrators often equate it to satisfaction and what Reichheld (2006) refers to as the ultimate question.

Table 1. Survey Categories and Corresponding Item Questions

Communication (Hygiene)	Utilization of Expertise (Motivator)	Institutional Practices (Hygiene)	Tools to Do the Job (Hygiene)
I regularly attend department faculty meetings	Institution places high value on my teaching expertise	Adjunct hiring practices conducted professionally	Institution provides professional development opportunities
I regularly receive mentoring and guidance from my department/institution	Institution places high value on practical experience I bring to classroom	Hiring or contract renewal process gives me sufficient time before courses	Institution provides resources I need to do job effectively
Department evaluation feedback of my teaching is useful to me	I help develop and/or assess student learning outcomes	Strength of orientation to institution	Institution provides information that relates to students and teaching
Full-time colleagues communicate with me regularly about job relevant information	I teach courses that align with my expertise	Collaboration in course scheduling	Institution provides student advising information

Finally, we did include one question about compensation (my compensation at this institution is fair), since salary is an extrinsic reward Herzberg (1968) links to dissatisfaction; and, like respect and commitment, is a contemporary and recurring topic in the literature. Compensation was not treated as an outcome variable or part of one of the four constructs, but rather as a predictor, along with the other demographic control variables.

Data Collection and Analysis

The institutional research office for the study university provided the email addresses to the entire adjunct population for the institution ($n=2,446$). All recipients received an email explaining the survey and inviting their participation. The survey was open for two weeks, and we sent three reminders over the course of this time. Eight-hundred and sixty-six recipients returned surveys for a 35.4% response rate—well within the recommended lowest limit of 20% for survey research found by Keeter, Kennedy, Dimock, Best, and Craighill (2006).

Among respondents, 23.7% have been affiliated with the institution less than 2 years, 24.4% more than 10 years, and 51.9%

between 3 and 10 years. The majority (46%) teach between 1-3 courses a year, while 54% teach 4 or more courses. Approximately 75% of respondents designated that working as an adjunct is not their primary livelihood. We link this profile result to two institutional characteristics: education is by far the biggest academic unit in the institution and draws on current and retired practitioners to adjunct, and the institution advertises its use of industry experts who partner with the academic units in course delivery.

Survey respondents rated 24 job factors, outcomes, and compensation items on the previously described four-point scale. We ran standard descriptive statistics on all 24-survey items and then analyzed the four job factor constructs (Communication, Utilization of Expertise, Institutional Practices, and Tools to Do the Job). The literature on adjunct faculty that makes use of surveys (Grehke & Kezar, 2015) and departmental culture assessment (Delphi Project, 2016) provides evidence of face validity of cultural or job factor constructs, though there is no documentation of statistical validity or reliability. Part of our design, then, advances instrumentation by conducting reliability tests on each job factor construct to increase confidence that survey items clustered together under expected groupings.

A Cronbach's alpha test was run for each of the four construct categories to ascertain if the groupings yielded a statistically reliable category, before those categories were used in subsequent regression analyses. The Cronbach analysis yielded the following results: Communication = .68, Utilization of Expertise = .61, Institutional Practices = .70, and Tools to Do the Job = .73. Nunnally (1978) indicates 0.7 to be an acceptable reliability coefficient, though lower thresholds often appear in the literature. Although two of the constructs are close but do not meet Nunnally's recommendation, we deemed them sufficient for exploratory analysis, with appropriate cautions during interpretation.

Our primary analytical interests revolved around regression analyses, particularly regressing the respect, commitment and the recommend outcome questions against the four job factors, compensation, and demographic control variables. We ran standard ordinary least squares (OLS) multiple regressions as a baseline and then ordered probit analyses (ordinal regressions) for additional insight and comparability. The ordered probit method does not assume equal

distance between item choices of the dependent outcome variables (respect, commitment, and recommend), and the marginal effects analysis output provides the overall probability that an average respondent will decrease the rating for an outcome variable given a unit decrease in rating for a given predictor variable (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2012, p. 459).

Results

Table 2 provides a summary of descriptive statistics for the four highest and four lowest rated survey items, along with their associated category themes. The three highest ranked survey questions had the lowest standard deviation, in corresponding order with the means. The lower standard deviations indicate a higher degree of respondent agreement than a higher standard deviation. The three lowest ranked survey items had the three highest standard deviations, though not in exact corresponding order with the means. Also notable is that expertise-related survey items appear in the highest and lowest ranked positions, which suggests strong feelings about intrinsic job factors at both extremes.

Table 2. *Comparison of Highest and Lowest Mean Ratings and Associated Standard Deviations.*

Category Theme	Survey Item Summary Description	Rank (by mean)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Expertise	Teaching expertise valued	1	1.17	.47
Outcome	Commitment	2	1.38	.59
Expertise	Practical experience valued	3	1.47	.62
Practices	Collaboration in course scheduling	4	1.55	.90
Outcome	Pay	21	2.31	.82
Tools to Do Job	Institution provides student advising information	22	2.55	1.12
Communication	Attend faculty meetings	23	2.57	1.03
Expertise	Help develop/assess learning outcomes	24	2.63	1.15

The four job factor constructs, along with compensation and the three demographic control variables, were regressed against each of the three outcomes. In order to gain more visibility into compensation, we created separate dummy variables for each of the four choices (Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree) associated with the “My

compensation is fair” survey item. OLS and ordered probit regressions were run for all three outcomes, for a total of six models. The results and comparison of coefficients for the two models per outcome are shown in Table 3. The table only displays significant coefficients below the .05 level, to allow for visual comparison of the two models at a standard significance level.

Table 3

Regression Model Coefficient Comparison Results for OLS/Ordered Probit

Variable	OLS			Probit		
	Respect	Commitment	Recommend	Respect	Commitment	Recommend
Communication	0.26	0.12	0.13	0.57	0.34	0.32
Expertise	0.35	0.29	0.22	0.68	0.67	0.45
Practices	0.16	0.15	0.3	0.31	0.35	0.65
Tools			0.09			0.3
Compensation			0.29		0.51	0.79
Longevity		-0.15			-0.49	
Livelihood		-0.19	-0.12		-0.64	-0.34
R ²	0.4	0.35	0.51	0.24	0.26	0.33

Note : Only results significant below .05 level shown in table

The general patterns in both regression approaches are similar for all outcome models and all significant predictor variables, with the exception of the presence of compensation in the ordered probit commitment model (.51, $p = .03$) but absence in the OLS commitment model. The higher R² OLS values for all three models indicate higher explanatory power than the ordered probit models, but the ordered probit models are more stringent as they account for the uncertainty of not assuming equal distance between outcome survey item choices (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2012, p. 466).

The Communication, Utilization of Expertise, and Institutional Practices job factor constructs were significant in all models. The job factor questions and outcome variables were rated on the same scale (Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree), thus, the positive coefficients indicate directional alignment between survey items ratings comprising each construct and the outcome variable ratings. The more positively respondents rated communication with colleagues and their departments, the more they felt their expertise was utilized, and the more effective they felt institutional practices facilitated their work, the more positively

they rated respect, commitment, and recommend. Tools to do the Job was only significant in the recommend model and, like the other three job factor constructs, shows positive coefficients for both OLS and ordered probit models.

Compensation also was rated on the same scale as the outcome variables, and was significant in the ordered probit commitment model as well as in both recommend models—but noticeably absent in the respect models. Importantly, the significance of compensation in the commitment and recommend models only was for the lowest compensation choice option (Strongly Disagree). Longevity was significant in both commitment models, but the negative coefficient indicates that longer employment at the institution corresponds to less commitment, which is counterintuitive. Those who indicated adjunct teaching at the institution was not their primary livelihood were less likely to be committed or recommend the institution.

The marginal effects analysis from the ordered probit regressions calculates two statistics: 1) the probability that the average respondent assigns the highest rating to a given outcome, and 2) the independent variable with the largest impact on the outcome rating, as measured by the probability that the average respondent will decrease the rating for an outcome variable given a unit decrease in rating for a given predictor variable (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2012, p. 459).

For respect, there is a 49% probability that any given respondent would assign the highest rating to this outcome (Strongly Agree). The probabilities for commitment and recommend were 69% and 44%, respectively. For every unit decrease in rating for Utilization of Expertise, there is a 27% probability that the rating for respect drops and a 21% probability that the rating for commitment drops. Thus, Utilization of Expertise was the highest impact job factor for two of the three models. The highest impact job factor for the recommend model was Institutional Practices. For every unit decrease in rating for Institutional Practices, there is a 26% probability that the recommend rating drops as well.

Discussion

Herzberg's job factor theory draws explicit attention to motivators and hygiene job factors and their relationship to what we designate as outcomes. Previous studies (O'Meraet al., 2012; Kezar, 2013) on adjunct faculty disproportionately focus on hygiene factors, and those that include respect and commitment (Gappa et al., 2007) do not explicitly equate such variables with job factors or outcomes. For our study, the Herzberg lens helps delineate motivation and hygiene job factors from outcomes for adjunct faculty at a non-traditional institution.

The descriptive analysis of means and standard deviations provides an initial indication of the importance of motivators in adjunct work. Survey items associated with the Utilization of Expertise construct appeared in two of the top three rated survey items and the lowest rated item. The regression results confirm the importance of Utilization of Expertise, as this construct is a significant predictor in all three outcome models. Utilization of Expertise is also the highest impact job factor on the respect and commitment models. Given the consistent prominence of Utilization of Expertise emerging from the descriptive and inferential analyses, we suggest that motivators should play a more prominent role in future studies on adjunct faculty. Understandably, the focus has been on what might be considered basic work needs—hygiene job factors—but studies are incomplete if they omit motivators or do not systematically integrate them as a formal component of study design.

The regression results confirm the ongoing importance of hygiene job factors on outcomes. Communication and institutional practices are significant predictors for all outcomes in both the OLS and ordered probit models. Positive or negative feelings associated with communication and institutional practices significantly influence positive or negative feelings associated with respect, commitment, and recommend. Institutional practices also are the highest impact job factor on the recommend model, underscoring the importance of basic needs associated with hiring and orientation and their influence on a faculty members' willingness to recommend the institution to a colleague.

Tools to Do the Job also encompasses hygiene factors and include professional development opportunities, adequacy of resources to fulfill teaching responsibilities and access to information to serve

students. Tools to Do the Job also influences the recommend outcome. Respondents are likely more confident recommending the institution to colleagues if they feel adequately equipped and resourced to fulfill their teaching duties. Buckingham (1999) identified resources as one of twelve critical elements related to employee engagement; and professional development opportunities and resources are prominent study constructs in the adjunct literature (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Hollenshead et al., 2007; O'Mera et al., 2008; Kezar, 2013).

The three variables identified as controls in Table 3 also warrant discussion. We remain unsure how to interpret the negative association between longevity and commitment, as we expected longer affiliation with the institution to positively influence commitment. Our initial guess is that those who have been with the institution the longest accept the job factors associated with adjunct work at the institution, but they would easily work for another institution if a better opportunity arose. Less dependence on the institution for primary livelihood also negatively associates with the commitment and recommend outcomes, and our speculation for this result is similar to the longevity explanation.

Finally, the lowest rated compensation option (Strongly Disagree that compensation is fair) influenced both recommend models but only the ordered probit commitment model. Our interpretation of this within the study framework: if compensation is pushed below a certain ceiling, it results in negative feelings about job attitudes related to commitment and the willingness to recommend the institution to a colleague.

Interestingly, compensation did not emerge as significant in the respect model. Compensation is arguably the most explicit and direct hygiene job factor, while respect is arguably most strongly linked to satisfaction of the three outcomes in the study. When viewed through this lens, the absence of compensation in the respect model would mirror its absence in determinants of satisfaction in Herzberg's original work. This would not explain the presence of communication and institutional practices in our respect model; it only postulates that as the most obvious hygiene job factor, compensation has no bearing on respect that an adjunct faculty member feels at the study institution. Utilization of expertise, communication and institutional practices are the job factors that most influence respect.

Implications

Adjunct faculty who teach adult students and work in non-traditional institutions or for traditional institutions with separate online units are an important segment of the adjunct population. Our study reveals similarities across the adjunct population in higher education as represented by previous studies, but there are also differences across segments. Communication, institutional practices, and resources that facilitate adjunct tasks and functionality are critical job factors in our research results and other studies on NTTF.

Our findings also indicate that compensation was not as prominent an issue as previous studies suggest, but the majority of faculty from our study do not depend on the institution for a living. When compensation crosses below a certain ceiling threshold, however, our respondents indicate an effect on outcomes, particularly their willingness to recommend the institution to a colleague and, to some degree, the commitment the faculty feels to the institution. We recommend administrators in non-traditional institutions consciously balance fair compensation with the drive for efficiency and cost reduction inherent in goals to scale and reduce marginal costs. Our results show that perceptions of unfair compensation have real impacts on certain job attitudes, which could eventually impact teaching and institutional culture.

Compensation merits additional attention in future studies, to ascertain potential distinctions on attitudes toward compensation between adjunct faculty who serve in traditional and non-traditional institutions. Our study question on compensation provides a foundation for quantitatively understanding adjunct pay, but it was limited by the four ordinal choice options. A focused study that addresses specific levels of pay would provide a more nuanced understanding of the link between compensation and outcomes such as commitment and respect.

Conclusions

Our study emphasizes the importance of including motivators in future research related to adjunct faculty. The regression analyses identify Utilization of Expertise (a motivator) as the most influential job factor on outcomes. Utilization of Expertise was significant in all three outcome

regression models and the job factor with the most impact on respect and commitment in the marginal effects analysis. When all of the results are viewed within the context of the marginal analysis probability that respondents would rate respect and commitment with the highest rating (Strongly Agree = 49% and 69%, for respect and commitment, respectively), we propose that the intrinsic feelings associated with utilizing one's expertise compensates for the lack of hygiene job factors—to a certain point.

In addition to the importance of motivators, our results suggest that the job factors that influence outcomes cannot be neatly compartmentalized. It is a combination of motivator and hygiene factors that contribute to respect, commitment and recommend. Finally, our study shows that adjunct faculty working for non-traditional institutions should be fairly represented in the literature and not automatically pooled with a singular profile of a “typical” adjunct faculty.

References

- American Federation of Teachers. (2010). American academic: A national survey of part-time/adjunct faculty. Washington, DC: AFT.
- Almanac, 2017-18. (2017). *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Washington, D.C. Vol LXIII, 43.
- Baldwin, R.G., & Chronister, J.L. (2001). Teaching without tenure. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Baldwin, R.G., & Myrwrwinski, M. (2011). Contingent faculty as teachers: What we know; what we need to know. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 55(11), 1520-1542.
- Boiller, D. (2011). *The future of work: What it means for individuals, businesses, markets and governments*. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute.
- Bland, C., Center, B.A., Finstad, D.A., Risbey, K.R., & Staples, J. (2006). The impact of appointment type on the productivity and commitment of full-time faculty in research and doctoral institutions. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(1), 89-121.
- Buckingham, M. (1999). First break all the rules. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- The Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success. (2016). *Department Cultures and Non-Tenure-Track-Faculty: A Self-Assessment Tool for Departments*. Retrieved on July 1, 2016 from <https://pullias.usc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Departmental-cultures-survey-FINAL.pdf>
- Gappa, J., Austin, A., & Trice, A. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's strategic imperative*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Gehrke, S.J. & Kezar, A. (2015). Supporting Non-tenure-track faculty at 4-year colleges: A national study of deans' values and decisions. *Educational Policy*, 29(6), 926-960.

- Halcrow, C. and Olson, M.R. (2008). Adjunct Faculty: Valued resource or cheap labor? *Focus on Colleges, Universities, and Schools*, 2(1), 1-8.
- Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 46(1), pp 53-62.
- Hollenshead, C., Waltman, J., August, L., Miller, J., Smith, G., & Bell, A. (2007). Making the best of both worlds: Findings from a national institute-level survey on NTTF. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for Education of Women.
- Howngwei, Y, Campbell, D. & Mendoza, P. The Relationship Between the Employment of Part-Time Faculty and Student Degree and/or Certificate Completion in Two-Year Community Colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 39(11), 986-1006.
- Hoyt, J.E. (2012). Predicting the satisfaction and loyalty of adjunct faculty. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 60(3), 132-142.
- Ismail, S. (2014). *Exponential organizations*. New York: Diversion Books, p. 59.
- Jagar, A., & Eagan, M.K. (2009). Unintended consequences: Examining the effect of part-time faculty members on associate's degree completion. *Community College Review*, 36, 167-194.
- Kramer, A.L., Gloeckner, G.W. & Jacoby, D. (2013). Roads Scholars: Part-Time Faculty Job Satisfaction in Community Colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 38(4), 287-299.
- Keeter, S., Kennedy, C., Dimock, M., Best, J., & Craighill, P. (2006). Gauging the impact of growing nonresponse on estimates from a national RDD survey. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 70(5), 759-779. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4124225>
- O'Meara, K., Terosky, A., & Neumann, A (2008). *Faculty careers and work lives: A professional growth perspective*. ASHE Higher Education Report. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

- Rogers, G.S. (2015). Part-Time Faculty and Community College Student Success. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 39(7), 673-684.
- Kachigan, S. K. (1991). *Multivariate statistical analysis* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Radius Press.
- Keeter, S., Kennedy, C., Dimock, M., Best, J., & Craighill, P. (2006). Gauging the impact of growing nonresponse on estimates from a national RDD survey. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 70(5), 759-779. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4124225>
- Maxey, D. & Kezar, A. (2015). Revealing opportunities and obstacles for changing non-tenure track faculty practices: An examination of stakeholders' awareness of institutional contradictions. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 86(4), 564-596.
- Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Reichheld, F. (2006). *The ultimate question: Driving good profits and true growth*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Tabachnick, B. C., & Fidell, L. S. (2012). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson Allyn & Bacon.
- Shuster, J.H., & Finkelstein, M.J. (2006). *American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.