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Abstract

The use of adjunct faculty is increasing in higher education institutions. In the United States nearly 90% of all instruction is led by adjunct faculty members in career colleges, the for-profit higher education institutions (AAUP, 2011). According to U.S. Department of Education statistical data (2010), in 1986 career colleges enrolled 300,000 students, and by 2008 the enrollment was 1.8 million. The growth of career colleges has outpaced that of traditional colleges, community colleges, technical institutes, and universities (AAUP, 2011).

While adjunct faculty members are the growing faculty majority, they are often absent in faculty leadership teams and lack the support needed to foster their workplace success (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007). Additionally, they do not receive benefits and lack job security and resources in their respective colleges (Gappa, et al., 2007). Moreover, research studies indicated that adjunct instructors have been absent on decision-making committees, underappreciated, and marginalized in higher education institutions (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Wallin, 2005). These workplace conditions have led to job satisfaction challenges among adjunct faculty working in traditional colleges (Gappa, et al., 2007).

While these challenging factors have been explored among faculty working in traditional colleges, to our knowledge, there is no literature that addressed the experiences of adjunct faculty members working in career colleges. Therefore, a qualitative research approach was chosen to explore the experiences of ten adjunct faculty members that worked in career colleges in the southeastern United States. Additionally, Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory was the theoretical lens used to explore the factors that influenced the participants’ job satisfaction. The data were inductively analyzed using Saldana’s (2009) first and second coding cycles, InVivo Coding, Process Coding, and Axial Coding. Six themes emerged from the in-depth interviews. Those themes are (1) Professional Inclusion, (2) Impacting Student Achievement (3) Academic
Freedom (4) Flexible Work Schedule (5) Recognition (6) Resources. The findings indicated that the participants were generally satisfied in their jobs.

The following research questions guided this study:

• What are the experiences of adjunct faculty members working in career colleges?
• What factors influence the experiences of career college adjunct faculty members?

*Keywords*: career colleges, adjunct faculty, traditional colleges, job satisfaction
Chapter 1
Introduction

Colleges are at a crossroads as traditional methods of teaching are challenged by the evolution of digital technologies that allow institutions to extend their reach by offering more classes to more students (Scott, 2010). Higher education institutions have increased the number of courses taught in the evenings, weekends, and online, while managing a reduced faculty budget (Leslie, 2002). The slumping economy coupled with the rising student enrollment contributes to the pressures faced by colleges in the United States (Scott, 2010). To meet the demands of students and manage the challenging budgets, colleges are employing adjunct faculty members (Leslie, 2002).

Adjunct faculty members are the part-time and contingent instructors hired to work on a term-by-term basis (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2005). Adjuncts often teach at multiple institutions or work a full-time job to meet their financial goals (Bergmann, 2011; Wallin, 2005). They are often ineligible for benefits and paid considerably less than full-time faculty per course (Wallin, 2005). However, colleges benefit financially because adjunct faculty members teach courses for a fraction of what full-time instructors command and at the most undesirable times—weekends and night (Scott, 2010).

Hiring adjunct faculty members is not a new phenomenon. The presence of adjuncts has allowed higher education institutions to manage budgets with flexibility and ease (Scott, 2010). They are called on to teach as needed with little prior notice, and can be dismissed as deemed necessary by the college administrators (Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Wallin, 2005).

A lack of job security, recognition, resources and low pay are key workplace factors that have adversely influenced the job satisfaction of adjunct faculty members (Gappa, Austin, &

Research studies have focused on job satisfaction factors impacting adjuncts in community colleges and universities (Cashwell, 2009; Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Green, 2007; Leslie & Gappa, 2002; Simons, 2010). However, to our knowledge, there is a gap in the literature concerning the experiences of adjunct faculty members working in career colleges, the for-profit higher education institutions. Ninety-percent of classroom instruction is led by adjunct faculty members in career colleges (AAUP, 2011). They are the new faculty majority, yet their voices are not heard (Baron-Nixon, 2007), nor represented in the current literature concerning job satisfaction.

**Definition of Terms**

*Career Colleges:* Private, for-profit higher education institutions. Also known as proprietary colleges, proprietary institutions, for-profits, and career schools.

*Adjunct Faculty:* Part-time instructors teaching at career colleges on an as-needed basis without contracts, benefits, and job security beyond the current course(s) they are teaching. Also known as adjuncts, part-timers, temporary faculty, instructors, and contingent faculty.

*Traditional Colleges:* Not-for-profit public and private higher education institutions that include U.S. community colleges, universities, and technical institutions.

*Job Satisfaction:* The positive perceptions employees have toward their work itself and the work environment. Two factors influence job satisfaction. Extrinsic factors, also known as hygiene factors (i.e. challenges with salary, working conditions, and job security), contribute to dissatisfaction in the workplace. Intrinsic factors, also known as motivational factors (i.e. responsibility, recognition, personal achievement, personal growth in one’s job), contribute to satisfaction in the workplace.

**Statement of the Problem**

In American society, higher education institutions are the pioneers in the refining and preparing of people for career opportunities through training and educational methods. Colleges prepare graduates to engage in service in ways that benefit individuals and communities (Gappa,
Adjunct faculty members lead the majority of student preparation in colleges. Seventy percent of all faculty teaching in public community and technical colleges are adjuncts (Wallin, 2005, p. 373). Nearly 90% of all career college faculty members are part-time employees (AAUP, 2011). Moreover, there is a significant trend in higher education to increase the dependence on part-time faculty (Leslie & Gappa, 2002).

With a surge in enrollments and emergence of career colleges, adjunct faculty members are more visible in higher education institutions’ classrooms than ever before (AAUP, 2011). Yet, they are often marginalized and strangers in their respective colleges (Gappa, Trice & Austin, 2007). Adjuncts address multi-course needs by teaching at the most undesired times (weekends, nights and early morning hours), yet they are not regarded as integral members of the academic community (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Wallin, 2005). They are viewed as secondary entities in higher education (Gappa & Leslie, 2002). Adjuncts are often excluded from decision-making decisions and faculty meetings (Umbach, 2007).

A significant problem that must be addressed is the job satisfaction of adjunct faculty members working in proprietary colleges. The extrinsic and intrinsic factors that impact the work itself and the work environment must be explored to better understand the experiences of career college adjuncts. This is very important with an increasing number of new faculty members entering the teaching ranks annually in career colleges.

There is a need to give a voice to this growing majority of faculty in career colleges. This study explored the work experiences and the influences on work of ten career college adjunct faculty members working in the southeastern United States.
Research Questions

In qualitative research studies, central questions along with an emergent methodology are prerequisites (Creswell, 2009, p. 129). Open-ended questions that are evolving and non-directional are common in qualitative research studies as well (Creswell, 2007, p. 107). The open-ended questions help participants feel comfortable in freely sharing their experiences. This study employed an Interview Protocol (Appendix D) that encompassed open-ended questions to better understand the experiences of ten participants (Creswell, 2013, Moustakas, 1994). The following central research questions guided this study:

- What are the experiences of adjunct faculty members working in career colleges?
- What factors influence the experiences of career college adjunct faculty members?

Significance of the Study

In reviewing quantitative and qualitative studies concerning adjunct faculty (Bergmann, 2011; Cashwell, 2009; Cunningham, 2010; Diener 1985; Dolan, 2011; Edwards & Shepherd, 2007; Fouche, 2006; Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Green, 2007; Hoyt, Howell, Glines, Johnson, Spackman, Thompson & Rudd, 2008; Kayworth, 2001; Leslie & Gappa, 2002; Scott, 2010; Truell, 1998) to our knowledge, there are limited studies that center on the experiences of adjunct faculty working in career colleges. The majority of research focused on traditional college faculty’s work experiences. Most closely related to the career college faculty experience, in the literature, is that of the community college adjunct faculty.

A central theme that permeated all national studies on adjunct faculty was their feelings of isolation and lack of administrative support (Grieve & Worden, 2000, p. 150). Studies indicated that adjuncts are paid a fraction of the salary offered to full-time faculty members teaching the equal amount of courses, and often excluded from shared governance (Grieve &
Worden, 2000; Wallin, 2004; Wallin, 2005). According to Gappa & Leslie (2007), pioneers in the study of adjunct faculty and supporters of adjunct faculty in higher education, “Adjunct faculty members are paid 25% to 35% less than full-time faculty members and work in isolation” (p. 87).

A study conducted by Greive and Worden (2000) found that adjunct faculty members lack job security and often are perceived as outside of the mainstream of the college community (p. 102). Beman (1980) added, “Unlike the regular faculty, adjuncts do not have lunch breaks, coffee breaks, nor casual conversations with colleagues and administrators” (p. 83). In sharing his experiences as a former adjunct, Beman (1980) added, “I was once given a mailbox two hours away, which I was presumably expected to check several times a week” (p. 83). Colleges have been content to pay poorly and use adjuncts as needed with little support (Leslie, 2002). Their voices have not been heard, nor have their experiences explored in career colleges.

Adjunct faculty members are often asked to enter the classroom, whether online or on campus, and accept the teaching role with limited, if any, support to ensure their success (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007). This experience has caused a lack of understanding of the philosophy of the college, inaccurate perception of the students, unclear thoughts concerning course syllabi, and little knowledge of alternatives that may be available (Smith, 1980, p. 17-18).

Begrum (2007) shared that if interaction is limited or nonexistent, trust cannot be developed. Trust must be present in the workplace to ensure employees’ satisfaction and success (Edwards & Shepherd, 2007). Such trust is established with the understanding of the intrinsic and extrinsic factors that influence the experiences of the adjunct faculty members. This study sought to explore and describe the experiences of adjunct faculty members working in career colleges.
**Practical Goals**

A practical goal of this study was to share the study’s findings with career college deans so they may become familiar with a particular set of intrinsic and extrinsic factors that influence the job satisfaction of adjunct faculty members. Additionally, this study sought to encourage adjunct faculty members to explore and describe their own intrinsic and extrinsic factors that influence their workplace satisfaction so their contributions and needs would become known and honored.

**Intellectual Goals**

The intellectual goal of this study was to address the gap in the literature by providing a description of the experiences of adjunct faculty members working in career colleges. While current research addressed traditional college adjuncts’ job satisfaction factors (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Leslie, 2002; Wallin 2005), to our knowledge, there were limited studies that focused on the work experiences of career college faculty members.

**Theoretical Framework**

Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory was the conceptual framework that guided this study. The theory was first introduced in Herzberg’s book, *The Motivation to Work* in 1959. This theory sought to explain the factors that motivated employees through identifying and satisfying their individual needs and desires (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). More specifically, Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1993) investigated whether different kinds of factors were responsible for “bringing about job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction” (p.55).

Herzberg’s research was conducted in the workplace of 200 engineers and accountants in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). The participants in Herzberg’s study worked at large fabricating plants, utilities companies, and small steel
manufacturing organizations (Herzberg, et al., 1993, p. 161). Participants in his study were asked to describe a time when they felt good and a time they felt bad in the workplace (Herzberg, et al., 1993).

The results of Herzberg’s study found that a bad work environment, a hygiene factor, dissatisfied participants (Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1993). Feelings of unhappiness and dissatisfaction were found to relate to the “conditions that surrounded the doing of the job, rather than the job itself” (p. 113). Herzberg, et al., (1993) also found that seldom did a good environment satisfy his participants. The job context factors identified by Herzberg were called hygiene factors (Herzberg, et al., 1993).

Hygiene factors operate to remove hazards from the environment, and they are “not a curative, but preventive “ in nature (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993, p.114). The hygiene factors found in Herzberg’s study were supervision, interpersonal relations, physical working conditions, salary, company policies and administration, benefits, supervision-technical, factors in personal life, status, and job security (Herzberg, et al., 1993, p. 114).

When hygiene factors “deteriorate to a level below that which the employee considers acceptable, then job dissatisfaction occurs” (Herzberg, et al., p. 114). However, Herzberg’s study found that when hygiene factors are optimal, “we do not get dissatisfaction nor much in the way of positive attitudes” and satisfaction (Herzberg, et al., 1993, p.114). The job context factors, hygiene, meet the individual’s needs for avoiding unpleasant situations (Herzberg, et al., 1993). Also, hygiene factors “are the factors that contribute to job dissatisfaction” (Herzberg, et al., p. 116). Hygiene factors do not motivate an employee to high levels of job satisfaction. (Herzberg, et al., 1993). Herzberg stated, “All we can expect from satisfying the needs for hygiene is the prevention of dissatisfaction and poor job performance” (Herzberg, et al., 1993, p.115).
The intrinsic factors found in Herzberg’s study lead to participants’ job satisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). In Herzberg’s study, participants reported feelings of happiness with their jobs with factors that “related to their job tasks, events that indicated to them that they were successful in the performance of their work, and to the possibility of professional growth” (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993, p. 113). Herzberg identified the job content factors as the motivation factors (Herzberg, et al., 1993). The factors that lead to positive job attitudes do so because they satisfy the individuals need for self-actualization, according to Herzberg (Herzberg, et al., 1993, p. 114). Motivation factors serve to bring about job satisfaction (Herzberg, et al., 1993, p. 115). The motivation factors found in Herzberg’s study were recognition, achievement, the possibility of growth, advancement, work itself, and responsibility.

Herzberg’s study concluded that hygiene and motivation factors were two significantly independent sets of work factors (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). To measure the two factors on the same continuum was found to be a fallacy (Herzberg, et al., 1993, p. xiv). Hygiene and motivation factors meet the needs of employees, but primarily it is the motivators that lead to job satisfaction (Herzberg, et al., 1993). Motivators, according to Herzberg, “fit the need for creativity, while hygiene factors satisfy the need for fair treatment” (Herzberg, et al, 1993, p. 116).
Table 1 shows Herzberg’s job factors with the corresponding definitions found in his study.

Table 1

*Herzberg’s Hygiene and Motivation Factors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hygiene Factors</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company Policy &amp; Administration</td>
<td>The adequacy or inadequacy of company organization and management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The harmfulness or beneficial effects of the company’s policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When viewed negatively they are not described as ineffective, rather as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>malevolent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors in personal life</td>
<td>Some aspect of the job that affected one’s personal life in such a way that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the effect was a factor in the individual’s feelings about the job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>The actual verbalization between individuals. The verbalization can be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>between employee and peers, employee and subordinate, and employee and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>superior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>Presence or absence of job security. The tenure and company stability or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>instability that is reflected in some objective way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>A sign or appurtenance of status as being a factor in one’s feelings about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the job. Examples shared by Herzberg include having a secretary in a new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>position or being allowed to drive a company car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision-Technical</td>
<td>The competence or incompetence, fairness or unfairness of the supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The supervisor’s willingness or unwillingness to delegate responsibility or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>willingness or unwillingness to teach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>Physical conditions of work, the amount of work or the facilities available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for doing the work. Adequacy or inadequacy of ventilation, lighting, tools,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>space, and other.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
such environmental characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Wage increases or the unfulfilled expectations of wage increases.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Motivation Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Successful or unsuccessful completion of a job, solutions to problems, vindication, and seeing the results of one’s work.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>An actual change in the status or position in the company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility of Growth</td>
<td>The likelihood an individual would be able to move onward and upward within his organization. To learn new skills or to acquire a new professional outlook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Some act of notice, praise or blame. The source could be almost anyone: supervisor, another individual in management, a client a peer, a professional colleague or the general public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Responsibility for one’s own work, the work of others or being given new responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>Actual doing of the job or the tasks of the job as a source of good or bad feelings about it. Jobs can be routine or varied, creative or stultifying, overly easy or overly difficult.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Adapted from *Motivation to Work* (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993, p. 44-50).*

Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory best served this study as it provided the theoretical lens to explore and understand the extrinsic and intrinsic factors that influenced the adjuncts’ work experiences.
Overview of Methods

This study embraced a qualitative research design. A qualitative study is a scientific research investigation that seeks answers to questions, embraces a systematic set of procedures to collect data, produces findings that were not readily known prior to the research study, and functions within the social contexts of a particular population (Creswell, 2013; Maxwell, 2005). Moreover, a qualitative research study attempts to make sense of the experiences of participants in terms of the meaning people bring to them (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011).

An inductive approach to data analysis was used in this study. The chief purpose of the inductive approach is to permit the research findings to “emerge from the frequent, dominant or significant themes inherent in raw data, without the restraints imposed by structured methodologies” (Iqbal, 2007, p. 17). According to Thomas (2003), the emergent themes are often left invisible because of the preconceptions in the data collection and data analysis procedures imposed by deductive data analysis such as those used in experimental and hypothesis testing research. Therefore, in this study, the researcher allowed the emergent themes to arise from the frequency of comments made during the in-depth interviews with the ten participants.

Summary of Contents and Organization

Studies have explored the job satisfaction, academic freedom, equity, collegiality, and respect of adjunct faculty in community colleges and universities (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Leslie & Gappa, 2002); however, there is a gap in the literature concerning the experiences of career college adjunct faculty members. This study was devised to address this literature deficient, while giving a voice to adjuncts working in for-profit colleges.
In Chapter 2, this study presented the most relevant literature on adjunct faculty. The literature highlighted the history of career colleges, the challenges faced by adjuncts, the benefits of using adjuncts, and the workplace satisfaction of adjunct instructors in traditional colleges.

In Chapter 3, the research design, research paradigm, research methodology, participant information, data collection, data analysis, trustworthiness of this study, and positionality statement were presented. In Chapter 4, a report of the research findings, descriptions of the ten participants, the six emergent themes, and the initial interpretation of the findings were discussed. In Chapter 5, a summary of this study, implications, conclusion, limitations, and final remarks were presented.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

This chapter examines the existing literature on adjunct faculty working in traditional colleges and universities. The literature presented in this chapter embraced the work of scholars that have studied adjuncts in community colleges, technical colleges, and universities.

Specifically, the following areas are included in this chapter: history of career colleges, challenges in career colleges, benefits of career colleges, growth of career colleges, adjuncts’ use in colleges, adjunct related taxonomies, adjuncts’ workplace challenges, adjunct instructors’ contributions versus full-time faculty, and adjuncts instructors’ workplace satisfaction.

Career Colleges

For decades adjunct faculty members have been utilized in a vast number of colleges (Freeland, 1998). Career colleges are no exception. By definition, a career college is a private, for-profit, proprietary higher education institution. More specifically, the Association of Private Sector Colleges and Universities (2012), a governing network of 1,800 for-profit institutions, defines career colleges as follows:

A private sector college or university is a postsecondary institution that provides professional and technical, career-specific educational programs. Most private sector colleges or universities pay taxes, yet receive no direct financial support from state governments unlike public institutions, not-for-profit institutions that receive state tax support or not-for-profit private colleges that pay no taxes. Completion of a private sector college or university program can range from doctoral and master’s degrees, to bachelor’s degrees, to associate degrees, to short-term certificates and diplomas. Private sector colleges or universities are owned and operated by private individuals, private investors and public corporations. (p. 4)

Career colleges date back to the fifth century (Kinser, 2006). There was a demand for educational services for Greek citizens and a desire for independent educational institutions in Athens, Greece. The instruction centered on the subject matter most desired by the students and
families (Coulson, 1999). These institutions responded to the changing and ever-evolving needs of students. Instructors became traveling educators to meet the growing student enrollment demands in several locations in Athens, Greece (Coulson, 1999). The career colleges, known as the proprietary educational system in Greece, were very successful. Their aim was to serve as many students as possible in the shortest amount of time (Coulson, 1999).

For-profit institutions have been the ideal educational settings for students seeking specialized training (Turner, 2006). In the United States, career colleges can trace their inception to the mid-seventeenth century when the Dutch established their own evening private courses and schools (Tuner, 2006). While the more traditional colleges focused on classical scholarly pursuits, merchants employed private instructors to deliver lessons in business and accounting (Tuner, 2006). As the new settlers’ population grew and aged, there was a need for more specialized vocational educational training that was not available in the traditional educational system, hence proprietary institutions began to provide a needed service (Ruch, 2001).

With early colonial colleges being established (Harvard, William & Mary, and Yale), there was still a gap in educational courses and schools that addressed the growing number of business, farming, and engineering training needs (Ruch, 2001). The traditional institutions only provided educational instruction in the area of religion (Ruch, 2001). By 1800, colonial colleges were reluctant to change to address the demands; therefore, in 1855, the first agriculture college was established, followed by a host of for-profit agriculture schools (Ruch, 2001).

Modern for-profit institutions trace their foundation to the proprietary business schools that surged in popularity in the United States during the nineteenth century (Ruch, 2001). In 1852, the most influential career college was founded, Bryant and Stratton College (Kinser, 2006). The efficiency and educational protocols of Bryant and Stratton College set the standard
embraced by career colleges in the early 1900s and today, including textbook selection processes and the standardization of curricula (Kinser, 2006).

At the beginning of the twentieth century, there was tremendous growth in the establishment of career colleges. The growth continued with the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act in 1972, which presented students the opportunity to utilize the Pell Grant, a federal financial need based subsidy for tuition cost (Breneman, Pusser & Turner, 2006).

**Challenges in career colleges.** In the 1990s, government agencies began to investigate career colleges that appeared to operate with the sole purpose of cashing in on the increased financial assistance afforded to students, rather than providing a quality education (Kinser, 2006). Federal reviews intensified in 2002 to investigate and ultimately close any institution that sought to enact financial fraud (Kinser, 2006). The investigations and consistent national reviews set the stage for more prominent and quality career colleges. The reviews have continued through 2011 (AAUP, 2011). In 2011, the U.S. Department of Education reviewed the financial practices and default rates of all career colleges (AAUP, 2011).

Tierney and Hentschke (2007) posited, “For-profit higher education has many of the markings of a disruptive technology” (p. 25). Others see the rising for-profit sector as increased competition, or even worse, a powerful force pushing higher education toward a market of *selling education*, rather than the providing quality education and services to students (Newman, Couturier & Scurry 2004, p. 18). Conversely, Berg (2005) argued that the key players among the for-profit institutions have “changed higher education and led the way to important and necessary changes” (p. 1).

**Benefits of career colleges.** According to Association of Private Sector Colleges and Universities (2012), career colleges should provide a quality education, manage the financial aid
with integrity and comply with all federal regulations. Berry (2005) found “All of private higher education—degree granting or not, for profit or not—were heavily dependent on their students receiving federally subsidized tuition assistance, in the form of both loans and grants” (p. 4). Without such financial assistance “most of the U.S. private higher education institutions would fold” (Berry, 2005, p. 4).

Ruch (2001) contributed a seminal work that distinguished career colleges from the traditional colleges. Having worked in both educational systems, Ruch (2001) described the fundamental differences. He posited that for-profit institutions have an apparent exclusion from research and scholarly productivity, a lack of tenure systems, a career focused curriculum, a customer orientation focus, an open or less selective admissions policy, a focus on the economically, socially, and politically marginalized prospective student, and largely served the underprepared student population (Ruch, 2001, p. 26). Additionally, Ruch's (2001) expressed that there are lessons traditional institutions can learn from the proprietary institutions:

1. *Respond to market forces*: Address the needs of the community with specialized educational programs.

2. *Adapt the organizational structure*: Embrace change to remain competitive and innovative.

3. *Redefine shared governance*: Leadership may not be localized as corporate or private owners direct management practices.

4. *Develop a strong customer orientation*: View each student as a customer seeking a service offered by the institution, and seek to provide the best-specialized product

Berg (2005) found that the role and narrow mission of career colleges are to concentrate on learning outcomes and the adaptation of business techniques to best prepare students for specialized job opportunities in a short period of time. The work of Berg (2005) and Ruch (2001) were closely aligned.
**Growth of career colleges.** According to the U.S. Department of Education statistical data (2010), in 1986 career colleges enrolled 300,000 students and by 2008 the enrollment was 1.8 million. This growth has outpaced that of traditional colleges. Between 1986 and 2008, career colleges grew by 8.4%, while traditional colleges by only 1.6% (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2010).

An interesting facet of for-profit institutions was its student demographics. The majority of students enrolled in traditional colleges were between the ages of 18-24, while the majority of those enrolled in career colleges were between the ages of 25-29 (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2010). The proprietary institutions address very specific needs for specialized educational training for a niche student (AAUP, 2011). Career colleges have offered flexible class schedules for working adults for decades (Tuner, 2006). With such a flexible schedule offering, an ever-increasing enrollment and a specialized curriculum, career colleges employ the largest number of adjunct faculty in higher education (Berry, 2005).

For-profit institutions are degree-granting schools. Two of the largest and most well-known career colleges are DeVry University and the University of Phoenix (Berry, 2005). They are focused on high-demand fields of study and stress convenience and short-term commitments for degree completion (Berry, 2005). Berry (2005) poisted:

They particularly focus on working adult students and charge more than most public colleges, but less than most privates. Their faculty is nearly all part-time temporary. These schools are an addition on a major scale to degree-granting higher education, many having grown by merger, and acquisition, as favorites with Wall Street. Most make extensive use of web-based distance education, with a few being completely web-based. Some estimate that the faculty of the for-profit sector may total as much as all of traditional higher education combined, meaning a million or more. (p. 2)

According to the Association of Private Sector Colleges and Universities (2011), 58% of allied health professionals and 11% of nurses in the United States were trained at one its member
schools in 2008-2009. Additionally, over three million students were enrolled in for-profit institutions in 2011 (Association of Private Sector Colleges and Universities, 2011). By 2014, the National Center for Education Statistics predicted enrollments would increase by 15% (Hussar, 2005).

**Defining Adjunct Faculty**

Adjunct faculty is defined as a part-time instructor teaching at career colleges on an at-need basis without a contract and teach as classes are assigned. Generally, benefits and job security are not afforded to this faculty population (Gappa & Leslie, 2002). According to the American Association of University Professor (AAUP) (1999), the leading national support organization for non-tenured faculty in the United States, adjunct instructors were considered non-tenured faculty, contingent faculty, part-time faculty, and substitute faculty in higher education. Two common challenges faced by adjunct faculty were a lack of long-term contracts and lack of commitment from the institution (AAUP, 1999).

While more than 50% of traditional college faculty and 90% of career college faculty were adjunct, many worked as many hours as full-time faculty, but without the similar pay, respect, resources and career opportunities (AAUP, 1999). Adjunct faculty members usually commuted between institutions and prepared for course instruction on a “grueling timetable, making enormous sacrifices to maintain interaction with their students” (AAUP, 1999, p. 3).

**Tuckman’s Taxonomy**

Tuckman (1978) conducted the first study on the adjunct faculty members’ workplace characteristics and roles. Tuckman (1978) lead a study focused on the part-time employment practices of postsecondary institutions. The taxonomy he developed served as the benchmark for adjunct faculty research through the 1980s and 1990s. With the increasing use of part-time faculty, several studies have attempted to define and categorize them (Bogert, 2004, p. 12).
Tuckman (1986) interviewed 3,763 part-time instructors. The findings lead to the creation of a mutually exclusive classification of adjuncts.

Table 2

_Tuckman’s Taxonomy_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjunct Category</th>
<th>Percent of Adjuncts in Category</th>
<th>Category Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Retired</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>Former full-time professional teaching with reduced course schedule. No interest in full-time career opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>Teaching to establish experience and earn pay while pursuing advance degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopeful Full-Timers</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>Pursing full-time position while teaching part-time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Mooners</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>Work 35+ hours weekly outside of academe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeworkers</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>Work part-time to accommodate personal commitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Mooners</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>Teaching part-time while working less than 35 hours outside of academe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Unknowners</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>Teaching with rationale unknown.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Biles and Tuckman’s Taxonomy_

Biles and Tuckman (1986) established another typology based on the employment situations of adjunct faculty. The two scholars found four employment classifications:

1. _Moonlighters_ were employed in another job and taught one course. They had no fringe benefits, tenure, sabbatical, advisees, committee work, or departmental vote.

2. _Twilighters_ were not employed outside the institution, but the institution chose not to employ them full-time. They had no departmental vote, but received prorated fringe
benefits and longer contracts.

3. *Sunlighters* were like full-time faculty in every aspect except the amount they work. They received prorated benefits, committee assignments, advisees, and tenure and sabbatical eligibility. Their probation period was a maximum of seventeen semesters, and they had an opportunity to negotiate full-time status.

4. A person that was on occasional part-time leave or taught part-time for a short period of time. They may return to full-time status or continue in the part-time phase. This category included but is not limited to women who have small children. (p. 13)

The work of Tuckman (1978) was the cornerstone of many studies that focused on adjuncts. These studies have focused on various aspects and characteristics of part-time faculty (Biles & Tuckman, 1986). Additionally, other scholars have researched the increased use of adjunct faculty. Those studies have a sole focus on adjuncts that worked in traditional colleges and universities (Gappa & Leslie, 1997; Leslie, 1998), the characteristics of part-time faculty in traditional colleges (Clery, 1998; Gappa & Leslie, 1997; Mellander & Mellander, 1999), and the quality of part-time faculty in traditional colleges (Freeland, 1998; Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Gappa & Leslie, 1997; Green, 2007; Leslie, 1998; and Wallin, 2004).

**Gappa and Leslie’s Taxonomy**

Gappa and Leslie (1993) continued the work centered on adjunct faculty and enhanced the literature that was originally established by Tuckman (1978) and Biles and Tuckman (1986) with the creation of new employment classification of adjuncts working in higher education.

**Career-enders.** This employment classification was derived from Tuckman’s (1978) semi-retired category. Gappa and Leslie (1993) expanded the category to include those approaching retirement. This population of faculty was well established in their work and careers (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

**Specialists.** The classification included faculty with expertise in a professional field. Their passion for teaching was the sole reason they served as adjuncts.
Aspiring Academics. Faculty with aspirations to be fully engaged and active participants in the institutional governance comprised this classification. Additionally, their preference was to be “recognized and rewarded members of the faculty with a status at least similar to that currently associated with the tenure-track or tenured faculty” (Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 48). This group included adjunct faculty who held terminal degrees or were doctoral candidates that desired full-time teaching careers (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Also in this group were part-time faculty members that taught only a few hours, as well as those that worked at several institutions. The latter of the two were known as “freeway fliers,” as they often traveled from one institution to another, and another to earn a living (p. 48).

Freelancers. Based on Tuckman’s (1978) part-unknowners, part-mooners, and homeworkers categories, Gappa and Leslie (1993) devised the freelancers. This adjunct faculty group was part-time employees that worked by choice, and did not desire a career in academics.

Cohen and Brawer (1996) supported the claim of Gappa & Leslie (1993) concerning freelancers. “Part-time faculty may be more directly connected to the practical aspects of their work, and they may have a greater level of knowledge than most full-time faculty” (p. 87).

Employing Adjuncts

Foster and Foster (1998) suggested hiring part-time faculty provided benefits to the colleges they were employed. Additionally, adjunct faculty members were diverse with some being “recent graduates who brought fresh ideas, conversation, and the latest news from graduate programs to the students and established professors” (Foster, et al., 1998, p. 30). Adjuncts were “excellent teachers combining enthusiasm and an innovative spirit with a serious scholarly outlook” (Foster, et al., 1998, p. 30).

In the 2004, the U.S. Department of Education’s National Center of Education Statistics
reported that 67% of new faculty hired at public two-year colleges was adjunct (p. 93).

Increasingly, part-time faculty members are replacing aging and retiring full-time faculty and teaching the majority of college introductory courses in the U.S. traditional colleges (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007).

According to the 2004 National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty, 96% of adjuncts were in nontenured appointments, and despite the temporary nature of their employment, they had occupied their nominally temporary positions for an average of seven years (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007, p. 95). Additionally, adjuncts worked on average fourteen hours per week to complete their paid activities (outside of the classroom) and faced an uncertain teaching load that varied each term (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007).

In Berger’s (2002) study, 37% percent of adjunct faculty members taught only one class per term, 26% taught two classes, and 16% taught more than three. Berger’s (2002) found that adjunct instructors play integral roles in higher education institutions in the United States (Berger, 2002, as cited in Gappa, Austin, & Trice 2007, p. 96). Wallin (2005) added, the use of adjunct faculty would continue to soar based on:

- Increases in instruction-related costs as it relates to revenue
- Efforts by academic administrators to achieve staffing flexibility
- The number of individuals with advanced degrees who have been unable to obtain full-time teaching positions
- The growth in college enrollments and the leadership’s decision to fill positions with minimum overhead cost

**Adjunct Faculty Challenges**

Satisfaction in the work setting is a challenge for adjunct faculty members. In a study conducted by the American Council on Education, 50% of faculty reported they were unhappy
with work conditions in their respected institutions (American Academic, 2010). Additionally, one-third of those that taught Humanities reported an overall dissatisfaction with their work setting and jobs (American Academic, 2010).

According to Gappa, Austin, and Trice (2007), adjuncts find their work environment challenging due to a lack of resources, lack of administrative support, and lack of security (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007).

**Lack of resources.** Adjunct faculty members face a host of challenges as part-timers in higher education. A lack of basic resources has been a common challenge for adjuncts (Wallin, 2004; Witt, Wattenbarger, Gollattscheck, & Suppiger, 1994). While colleges have come to depend on the low-cost labor pool known as adjuncts, the resources are often limited at best (Wallin, 2004, p. 5).

Wallin (2005) found that full-time faculty members had office hours, advisement opportunities, and multiple hours for preparation, while part-time faculty usually prepared at their homes, in faculty lounges, or even in their cars prior to entering the institution (Wallin, 2004, p. 380). Adjuncts were not afforded offices and the essential administrative support that their full-time faculty colleagues enjoyed (Wallin, 2004). Adjunct faculty members often shared space with student-workers or fellow adjunct faculty members due to limited workspace for class preparation, student advisement, and grading of assignments (Wallin, 2004).

**Lack of support.** Adjuncts faculty receive little support from their administrators (Banachowski, 1996; Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Haeger, 1998; Rifkin, 2000; Wallin, 2005; Wallin, 2004). Part-time faculty members are a bargain for colleges (Freeland, 1998, p. 4). An institution can save a considerable amount of money by hiring adjuncts. Hiring part-time faculty is less costly because the pay scale is usually lower than full-
time faculty, which is often set by course and is usually stagnant (Banachowski, 1996; Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Leslie & Gappa, 2002). While colleges have gladly welcomed adjuncts to teach, they have not embraced them as integral members of the faculty (Gappa & Leslie, 2003).

In a study conducted by Gappa, Austin, and Trice (2005), they found that adjuncts lack support from their full-time colleagues, and college administrators. The study indicated that adjuncts felt isolated, and invisible in their work (Gappa, et al., 2005, p. 74).

In a study conducted by Fountain (2005), twenty-six adjunct faculty members were interviewed and shared their experiences on faculty pay. Nineteen of the adjunct faculty expressed they were unfairly compensated based on the number of courses taught (p. 61). Twelve percent thought they were treated unfairly while teaching as an adjunct faculty and attributed their job title of part-time faculty as the reason for such treatment (p. 61). Such dissatisfaction can influence performance and retention of quality faculty (Gappa & Leslie, 2003).

Adjunct faculty members represented a saving on health-care insurance, sick leave, and pension in a study conducted by Leslie (2002). Colleges have saved on average 60%-75% on faculty pay with the hiring of part-time faculty (Montana, 2011). The average pay for an adjunct was $12,100 in 2002. (Berry, 2005). Adjuncts are not supported and underpaid (Berry, 2005, p. 27). Additionally, adjunct faculty members typically work several jobs. Seventy-three percent of adjuncts instructors have other employment beyond academia to simply maintain a basic standard of living (Berry, 2005, p. 7).

College leaders have more autonomy when adjuncts comprise the majority of the faculty pool (Bergmann, 2011). Bergmann (2011) found that when adjuncts are the majority and not full-time faculty, there was a marked decrease in faculty participation in the colleges’ shared
governance. When adjuncts are excluded and not supported, adjuncts’ perception of the work environment is negatively impacted (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007).

**Lack of security.** Gappa, Austin, and Trice (2007) found that adjuncts were concerned about their work security. Adjuncts were hired on a term-by-term basis with no assurance of teaching assignment for future terms (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007). Additionally, adjunct instructors can be dropped from the payroll at the stroke of a pen (Bergmann, 2011).

In a 2010 University of Michigan study of 343 part-time faculty members, participants shared they perceived their work as temporary (Bergmann, 2011). To increase their visibility the participants assumed additional roles in the college (Bergmann, 2011). Others in the study shared the greatest challenges were the lack of a contract, lack of opportunity to secure additional work, and an uncertain teaching schedule each term.

Bergmann (2011) posited that adjunct faculty members taught too many students in too many classes too quickly to work without security, status, an office, and limited support. Bergmann’s (2011) study recommended the following protocol to foster job satisfaction among part-time faculty:

- **Belonging and respect:** Being treated with respect by colleagues; not being seen as second tier; knowing who they are; not being invisible.

- **Hiring and continuing employment:** Adequate notification of new term courses to be taught, or insight if no courses will be offered to adjunct to teach.

- **Career development and advancement:** Offer opportunities such as workshops, mentoring relationships, receipt of teaching awards and recognition.

- **Integration into institutional life:** Encourage collaboration between full time and part-time faculty; inclusion in departmental governance; create an environment where part-time faculty members feel engaged and connected to each other and the institution.
Adjunct Faculty Commitment

Rifkin (2000) explained that the last minute hiring of adjunct faculty members might be a conflict with institutional policies concerning classroom management and syllabus preparation, which can impact the quality of instruction. However, a key benefit of using part-time faculty is flexibility (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Rhodes, 1996). One of the greatest advantages of flexibility is the institution’s ability to quickly adapt to varying enrollment demands (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Rhodes, 1996). Employing adjunct faculty allows institutions to hire with short notice and have teachers in the classrooms the same day or night (Gappa, Austin, Trice, 2007; Rhodes, 1996).

Adjuncts vs. Full-time Faculty

In Bolge’s (1995) study, he found there was no marked difference between the effectiveness of part-time and full-time faculty. The study measured the amount of learning by the students relative to the status of the instructor and concluded that students taught by full-time faculty fared no better than students taught by part-time faculty (Bolge, 1995, p. 3). The study also reported the hiring of adjunct instructors to be a good practice and stated that more research should be conducted on concerning this faculty population (Bolge, 1995).

In a more recent study of adjunct faculty members, Gappa, Austin, and Trice (2007) reported that the academic workplace needed to be reconsidered in order to best serve and support adjunct faculty (p. 136). They found a need to embrace the skills and talents of adjunct faculty and involve them in the college’s decision-making and governance processes.

Baron-Nixon (2007) added the involvement of adjunct faculty members enhanced the academic community as it allowed them to serve as valuable resources beyond the classroom (p. 34). In Baron-Nixon’s (2007) study on institutional commitment to adjunct faculty, the findings
suggested three practices that colleges should use to ensure faculty inclusion.

Table 3

*Adjunct Faculty Participation Practices*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practices for Faculty Commitment</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation on Faculty Leadership Teams</td>
<td>Regular involvement in reporting to leadership team on adjunct faculty related needs/issues. Consultants on matters that may affect or be affected by part-time faculty involvement. Part-time faculty having their own voice on an institutional level. A setting for raising part-time faculty issues of which full-time faculty may not be aware.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Participation in Open Forums | Part-time faculty can contribute valuable input and carry information back to their colleagues by participating in:  
  - Campus wide discussions  
  - Planning activities  
  - Preparation for accreditation  
  - Faculty convocation  
  - Graduation ceremonies  
  - Short-term task forces |
| Service on Committees | Part-time faculty can be invited to serve on campus wide or college standing committees as well as special committees, including personnel committees that evaluate part-time faculty’s performance. Such varied committees as those focused on uses of technology, curriculum development, approval of new courses, or student affairs. |

*Note:* Adapted from Baron-Nixon, 2007, p. 34-35.

**Workplace Satisfaction**

Adjunct faculty members often lack resources, lack support, and lack job security. This growing faculty majority has been excluded from decision-making opportunities, received limited recognition, and lack support in higher education (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007). Adjuncts simply have desired to be treated as equals (Fountain, 2005).
The Essential Elements of Faculty Work was developed to address the challenges faced by adjunct faculty (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007). It has its origin in the research study conducted by the Baxter Healthcare Corporation. In 1997, the organization surveyed employees on their work experiences. The study revealed that workers found some aspects of their work as entitlements and others as benefits. The findings of the study revealed that workers took for granted some entitlements; however, job satisfaction was achieved with the presence of respect in the workplace. From the study, Gappa, Austin, and Trice (2007) devised the five-workplace elements that lead to job satisfaction among adjunct faculty. Those elements are listed and defined below.

**Equity:** The opportunity for fair and equal treat of all faculty members, regardless of status (full or adjunct). To have access to resources and services (office, equipment, and advancement opportunities).

**Academic freedom:** The opportunity to share and express views on academic improvements and course instruction, to include additional resources to advance learning without institutional censorship. Such freedom for all faculty members should go forth among colleagues, college leaders and students, as applicable to the audience.

**Flexibility:** Opportunity to led changes to work schedule, course instruction, and contributed openly and meaningfully to institutional meetings and departments regardless of status (full or adjunct).

**Professional growth:** Opportunity to extend beyond the current status and role and seek new challenges and stretch the knowledge base with support from administrators and colleagues in the institutional for personal and professional satisfaction and advancement.

**Collegiality:** Opportunity for faculty, regardless of status (full or adjunct), to have a sense of inclusion and engagement in the institution community. A sense of respect, valued-member of the institution, a feeling of connection to colleagues, administrators, and the decision making process as an integral member of the shared governance body.

Gappa, Austin, and Trice (2007) concluded there was value in assessing the factors that influenced the work of adjunct faculty. They found:

- It fostered good communication and positive interaction
• It encouraged a climate where academic freedom flourishes

• It was a crucial and lasting investment in a college’s most precious resource: the faculty members and the intellectual capital they bring to their work (p. 320).
Chapter 3

Research Design

To understand the experiences of adjunct faculty working in career colleges this study employed a qualitative research design with in-depth, open-ended questions, document reviews and direct observations. In a qualitative study, the research is comprised of interpretive practices that make the world visible (Creswell, 2013, p. 43). Qualitative studies afford self-collection of the data, complex reasoning to establish categories and themes from the data, and the organization of the data into meaningful units to ultimately share the findings (Creswell, 2013, p. 45).

This study embraced the qualitative research design, along with Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory. These frameworks informed the study to address the research questions, while exploring the experiences of adjunct faculty working in career colleges.

Research Questions

Qualitative research studies are comprised of research questions that are “evolving, and nondirectional” (Creswell, 2013, p. 138). More specifically, research questions in a qualitative study allow the exploration of the experiences of participants (Creswell, 2007). Open-ended questions permit the understanding of the historical and cultural setting of the experiences (Creswell, 2013, p. 25).

In order to understand the experiences of adjunct faculty working in career colleges, the following central questions guided this study:

- What are the experiences of adjunct faculty members working in career colleges?
- What factors influence the experiences of adjunct faculty members in career colleges?
Research Paradigm

The interpretive framework, social constructivism, informed the central research questions. Creswell (2013) posited that social constructivism provides discourse on the process of interaction among participants. It focuses on the specific context in which people live and work in order to understand the historical and cultural settings of the their experiences (Creswell, 2013, p. 25). Qualitative research is analogous to interpretive research (Creswell, 2013, p. 25). Moustakas (1994) added that the constructivist landscape is frequently present in qualitative studies where the participants describe their experiences.

Qualitative Research

A qualitative study affords the opportunity to study a problem or experience, collect data, and establish themes from the findings through semi-structured interviews (Creswell, 2013, p. 44). Maxwell (2005) added that qualitative inquiry focuses on specific situations or people while highlighting the importance of describing the means by which participants make meaning of a phenomenon. Employing a qualitative research design was important to this study, as it provided the opportunity to study experiences where there was limited literature on the topic (Creswell, 2009).

Site and Participants

Criterion-based Sample

Educational researchers rarely can investigate a problem of an entire population; therefore, selecting a sample of individuals was paramount to conducting this study (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003, p. 163). Additionally, the data collection was more than simply focusing on the actual types of data and procedures; it also included gaining permissions to conduct this study,
while employing good qualitative sampling strategies (Creswell, 2013). This study employed a criterion-based sampling protocol to acquire participants.

Criterion-based sampling is a deliberate sampling protocol. The following criterion was used to recruit and purposely select participants:

1. Participants must have taught in a career college for at least one year.
2. Participants must be willing to participate in one 90-minute interview at a time and location that facilitates an open, and freely engaging interview.
3. Participants must agree to the use of audio recording of the interview.
4. Participants must agree to the publishing of the data in the dissertation with all personal information being held confidential, and a copy of the study made available for their review after completion of the study.

Recruitment

After approval from the Northeastern University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB), the recruitment for participants began within twenty-four hours. Creswell (2013) shared that a vital step in the recruitment of participants in a qualitative study is to find people that offer quality data (p. 147). To ensure an organized process was in place to recruit qualified adjunct faculty members, a Request for Site Access Letter (Appendix A) was emailed to two-career college Deans of Education in the southeastern United States.

The letters served as the initial communication medium to gain access to the email addresses of all adjunct faculty members that met the criteria-based sampling. A Dean of Education responded within a day of receipt of the letter (Appendix A) and shared the names and email addresses of ten adjuncts. At the request of the researcher for additional potential participants, the Dean shared eleven additional adjunct instructors’ contact information. After receipt of twenty-one potential participants email addressed, the Recruitment Letters (Appendix
B) were sent. Nineteen adjuncts responded and expressed interest in participating in this study.

Three of the nineteen responded via telephone to share their interest.

**Sample size.** Ten adjunct faculty members working in career colleges in the southeastern United States participated in this study. This is consistent with the recommendation of Ritchie, Lewis, and Elam (2003). A smaller sample can render rich and thick data, as “there is a point of diminishing returns to a qualitative sample, as the study goes on more data does not necessarily lead to more information” (p. 1). Mason (2010) emphasized that the selection of participants should be high enough to ensure data saturation, but not so large that the data becomes superfluous (p. 2). When repetitiveness is seen in the data, and no new themes are established in the data collection and they are unlikely to emerge, data saturation is achieved (Mason, 2010).

**Informed Consent**

Each consent form was reviewed and approved by the Northeastern University’s IRB office prior to any contact with participants. The nineteen adjuncts that met the criteria for participation were emailed the Informed Consent Letter (Appendix C). The Informed Consent Letter (Appendix C) was discussed in detail with each potential participant by telephone. After providing clarity and answers to all questions, the participants were asked if they would like to participate in this study. Participants were asked to retain the emailed copy of the Informed Consent Letter (Appendix C) for their records and review. With affirming responses, an interview date was scheduled with each participant.

The participants in this study had the right to participate based on the prescribed criteria, and the right to decline participation at any time and for any reason without repercussion (Creswell, 2013; Moustakas, 1994).
Data Collection

In-depth Interviews

In qualitative research, there is an opportunity to make meaning or interpretation of the received data (Creswell, 2009). Therefore, robust data are paramount to ensure validity of the findings (Creswell, 2009). It is normal practice to have a small number of participants who participate in in-depth interviews (Thomas, 2003). Open-ended questions encouraged such discovery and exploration in this study.

In-depth semi-structured interviews were the primary data collection method. Six interviews were conducted via telephone, and four were conducted, in person, at the participants’ college. In-depth interviews afforded the researcher the opportunity to better understand the experiences of adjunct faculty members. The interviews were conducted between August 2012 and January 2013.

Semi-structured interviews involved posing structured questions along with probing deeply using an open-form of questionings (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003, p. 240). This approach promoted informal communication and engagement where adjuncts could share their experiences freely (Kvale, 1996). With predetermined questions in the Interview Protocol (Appendix D), the researcher was able to guide the interview process in an effective manner. Participants were encouraged to elaborate on their responses, and the researcher purposely listened without interruption. An interactive and informal process guided each interview through the open-ended and probing follow up questions, as recommended Creswell (2007).

The interviews were designed to address participants’ professional backgrounds, workplace experiences, and reflections on the factors that influence their work experiences. Kvale (1996) added that a quality interview should encompass short questions and longer
answers from the participants (p. 145). In this study, the researcher encouraged the participants to share their experiences freely, as their responses would only inform this study without interruption and judgment.

**Audio-Recording**

To capture the data in the six in-depth telephone interviews, Free Conference Call.com was used. Each participant was informed of recording system via email. Participants were given the telephone number and access code to dial in for their scheduled interview. By preserving the words of participants, the experiences could be captured with the use of the audio recording devices (Creswell, 2013). The recording device was acquired and tested after the IRB approval. The recording device was tested with a non-participant, and again during the pilot study for assurance of its accuracy.

For the four in-person interviews, an iPhone recorder application was used to record the interviews. The recording device was tested prior to each interview and the iPhone battery was fully charged to avoid recording interruption or lost of data.

**Pilot Study**

A pilot study was conducted with an adjunct working in a career college. The pilot study included the use of the Interview Protocol (Appendix D) to ensure the questions were relevant and helpful in answering this study’s research questions. The in-depth interview was conducted by telephone and was audio-recorded using FreeConferenceCall.com. Only the researcher reviewed the audio-recorded interview. The pilot participant shared detail responses during the sixty-four minute interview. Responses were robust on the influences that impacted the workplace experiences. After the interview, the pilot participant was asked to share insight on the questions to ensure they aligned with the purpose of this study and would offer answers to the
research questions. The participant found the questions to be of quality and that they should not be changed.

The pilot participant did make one recommendation, explaining that working in a career college was vastly different than traditional colleges. The suggestion was to strongly encourage participants to expound on their experiences toward working in a career college setting and to “fully disclose” how they truly felt about their work. The pilot participant stated that participants might not fully share their experiences if they think the findings will be shared with their superiors. The researcher gladly accepted the advice shared.

**Interview Protocol**

An Interview Protocol (Appendix D) was created to guide the data collection. Each interview was conversational and informal (Kvale, 1996, p. 125). The researcher created structured questions with probing follow up questions to capture the adjunct instructors’ experiences and influences on their work.

Kvale (1996) explained that good interview questions contribute thematically to knowledge production and dynamically to promoting a good interview interaction (p. 129). Thematic questions align with the topic of the interview and to the root of the investigation (p. 129). One thematic question posted in this study is “Describe your work at the college you teach as an adjunct instructor.” Dynamic questions that promoted a positive interaction and maintained the flow of the conversation were used as well (Kvale, 1996, p. 130). The dynamic questions were short. The restating of a portion of the participants’ responses for clarity encouraged positive interaction.

The Interview Protocol (Appendix D) encompassed relevant questions based on the research questions that included introductory, follow-up, and probing questions (Maxwell, 2005;
Kvale, 1996, p. 133). A good interview protocol sheet ensures organization and the best use of the participants’ time (Creswell, 2013). Therefore, prior to the start of the interviews, participants were advised of the length of the interview and its purpose. Confirmation of each was received prior to conducting the interview.

**Implementation of interviews.** The ten interviews ranged from fifty-five minutes to ninety minutes in length. The length of the interviews allowed time for the reconstruction of the experiences. Each interview was audio-recorded. Six interviews were conduct via telephone and four were conduct in person. The process for telephone and in person interview was the same. A follow up meeting was conducted with nine participants. The follow up meetings were between sixty minutes to eighty minutes in length. One participant was unavailable for the follow meeting, but responded via email that his experiences were shared completely in the first telephone interview.

The Informed Consent Letter (Appendix C) was reviewed with each participant, prior to conducting the interview. This was the second review of the letter. After confirmation to continue, the interviews commenced with informal pleasantries. After five minutes of general conversation, the participants were asked to hold for a moment, while the researcher activated the audio-recording feature.

Each interview proceeded with the reading of the opening paragraph on the Interview Protocol (Appendix D), and the questions were asked in the order listed. When a participant elaborated on their experiences, the researcher did not interrupted. The goal was to encourage each participant to share freely and openly their experiences. The researcher did seek clarity by restating the participants’ responses to ensure accurate capture of the work experiences. Pauses, laughs, and sighs were memoed and recorded on the margins of each participant’s Interview
Protocol (Appendix D) for data analysis. Also, the non-verbal cues and office observations in the four in person interviews and follow up meetings were memoed and used in the data analysis.

At the conclusion of the questioning, the advice of the pilot study participant was employed. Each participant was asked to elaborate on their experiences as an adjunct working in career colleges. Afterwards, the participants were asked if they had any other information or experiences they would like to share. Next, the participants were read the closing paragraph on the Interview Protocol (Appendix D). The researcher paused to offer time for any questions, reflections, and new data. Last, the participants were asked to hold on for a moment while the audio recording device was being deactivated.

Upon completion of the recording, the participants were asked if there was any information they desired to share that would not be a part of this study. Each simply thanked the researcher for being asked to participate. They were assured that their experiences were valued and would be held in confidence with the use of pseudonyms. Also, each was informed of the opportunity to review their transcription for accuracy during the member-checking phase of this study.

**Second interviews.** Ten interviews were conducted in this study. Initially, six interviews were conducted by telephone. After reviewing the data of the six participants, the researcher sought to strengthen the study by interviewing four additional participants, in person, at their respective colleges.

Four interviews were conducted at the participants’ colleges with their permission. Nine of the participants were available for a follow up meeting. One participant was unavailable for the follow meeting, but responded via email that his experiences were shared completely in his telephone interview transcription.
The follow up interviews were between sixty minutes and eighty minutes in length. The in person follow meetings were organized to ensure the researcher had an understanding of each participant’s workplace experiences. Also, the meetings offered the opportunity for participants to elaborate on any influences on their workplace experiences. Probing questions related to the Interview Protocol (Appendix D) were asked to ensure clarity of the findings and to learn of any new experiences. A written copy of the findings was shared with each participant for review and discussion during the meeting. No new experiences were shared, however, participants did elaborate on experiences shared in their initial interviews.

**Instruments, Collection and Storage**

**Instruments**

FreeConfernceCall.com was the instrument use to record six participants initially interviews. An iPhone Recorder application was use to record the four in person interviews and follow up meetings. The consent letters (Appendix A-D) were used to recruit and inform participants, as well as to conduct in-depth interviews. Also, MAXQDA computer software program was used for data transcription coding the qualitative data.

**Storage.** All data are stored in locked file cabinets in a home office. Each audio-recorded interview was labeled with an assigned pseudonym. The transcribed data will be stored for three years in separate locked folders in a home office file cabinet and on a password-protected computer. Only the researcher has access to the locked file cabinets and knowledge of the computer password.

**Data Analysis**

An inductive approach was used to analyze this study’s data drawing on the hit and trail strategy (Kesten & Pneuli, 2005). It encompassed recording of extracted data for summarization
into themes (Kesten & Pneuli, 2005). Qualitative data can effectively be analyzed by an inductive method. The general inductive approach draws on researchers uncovering the emergent themes from the raw data acquired in qualitative researcher via interviews (Thomas, 2003).

The principal purpose of an inductive approach is to allow research findings to emerge from the frequent, dominant or significant themes inherent in raw data, without the restraints imposed by structured methodologies (Thomas, 2003, p. 2). Thomas (2006, p. 238) shared that key themes are often overlooked, or left invisible because of the predeterminations in the data collection and data analysis procedures levied by traditional methodology (i.e. Phenomenology, and Ethnography).

The purpose for using the inductive approach was:

• To condense extensive and varied raw text data into a brief, summary format
• To establish clear links between the research objectives and the summary findings derived from the raw data
• To develop of model or theory about the underlying structure of experiences or processes which are evident in the raw data (Thomas, 2003, p 1).

Most inductive studies report a model that has three to eight main categories in the findings. (Thomas, 2003; Thomas, 2006). Additionally, Thomas (2006) added that an inductive approach provides a convenient and efficient way of analyzing qualitative data not afforded with the use of traditional research methods of analysis.

**Coding Cycles**

Saldana’s (2009) first cycle and second cycle coding methods guided the data analysis of this study. The interviews were reviewed three times to best understand the experiences of the participants. The first review began one hour after conducting the interview. The second and third review was one day after the first review. During the latter two reviews, the sighs, laughs,
and pauses that were recorded in the margins of each Interview Protocol (Appendix D) were reviewed simultaneously to ensure their accuracy and placement. After three reviews of the audio-recorded data, the researcher commenced transcribing the interviews. The interviews were manually transcribed in a quite home office where the audio recording could be played via an external computer speaker for clarity and loud sound. The transcription process required five hours per interview to ensure all data were capture with accuracy.

Next, data analysis continued with the uploading of the textural data into MAXQDA, a qualitative data computer software program. Afterwards, each transcript was uploaded in this qualitative computer software program. The transcriptions were reviewed to ensure the data uploaded correctly prior to the start of the coding process. Upon verification, the coding process began.

**InVivo Coding.** Following the recommendations of Saldana (2009), InVivo coding was used to code the actual words and phrases of each participant. This elemental method of coding permitted the extraction of indigenous terms common to the participant (Saldana, 2009). Saldana (2009) added that InVivo coding is highly advised when researchers are seeking to respect and honor the participants’ voice. The researcher used the MAXQDA color-coding system to readily identify the participants’ words and phrases for continued ease of use and to maintain organization in the coding process.

**Axial Coding.** Codes were assigned to the transcribed texts that were central to the purpose of this study. This included the participants’ responses to situations and problems in their career colleges. The codes were derived from the actual reoccurring words or phrases expressed by the participants. Axial Coding was appropriately used to reduce the number of initial codes. By using the color-coded system in MAXQDA, the researcher was able to identify
the reoccurring words and placed them in coding folder in the software program.

Axial Coding, a second cycle coding method, was used as a transitional coding method to aid in sorting and re-labeling of the data (Saldana, 2009). Per the suggestion of Schmidt (2004), in the case where a code qualified to fit into several categories, the more dominant category was chosen to house the data. Additionally, categories were combined to decrease redundancy. The data were analyzed until no new themes arose from the in-depth interviews.

**Pattern Coding.** The Pattern Coding method was instrumental in uncovering the emergent themes, their meaning and how each aligned with the research objectives. Northcutt and McCoy (2004) shared researchers uncover how one category relates to another in the data. Pattern Coding aided in the identification of emergent themes. This coding method brought together the collected data and allowed the meaningful units of analysis to emerge. Miles and Huberman (1994) suggested that Pattern Coding is simply a means of grouping the sum of data into smaller sets (p. 69), which allows for the commonalities to arise and the establishment of the emergent themes.

A rigorous and systematic reading and coding of the transcripts allowed the major themes to emerge (Thomas, 2003). After reviewing the interrelationships of the codes and finding the redundancy of information regarding experiences of adjunct faculty members working in career colleges, data saturation was achieved.

Next, the themes were organized in written form so they could be presented in Chapter Four. The emergent themes are displayed in a diagram, and indicate how they align with the research objectives.
Trustworthiness

Validity and Credibility

Validation in qualitative research is an attempt to assess the accuracy of the findings as best described in the research study (Creswell, 2009, p. 206). Creswell (2009) explained that validation is strengthened by the extended time spent in the field conducting research to gain thick descriptions and by establishing closeness with participants to foster value and accuracy of a study (p. 207). Kvale’s (1996) qualitative interview construct was used to ensure a rich study would emerge with the use of in-depth interviews with ten participants.

To validate the data, member checking was also employed. Member checking afforded each participant the opportunity to review the transcribed interview for accuracy. Additionally, each participant was asked to share any updates or deletions to the transcribed data to ensure its accuracy. Each participant responded via email confirming the data was accurate. Member checking is the most critical technique for establishing creditability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

A follow up, in person, meeting was held with nine of the ten participants. The participants reviewed their data, and the findings of this study. Each participant shared their experiences had been captured and concluded the findings to be aligned with their workplace influences. The follow up meetings served as a chance for the researcher to gain clarity on the participants’ data, and another member-checking opportunity.
Ethical Considerations

The researcher had served as an Admissions Representative and Adjunct Faculty in several career colleges in the southeastern United States. Having experienced dissatisfaction and satisfaction in the aforementioned roles, it was imperative not to share personal experiences with the participants. Also, it was important not to align personal workplace challenges with those expressed by the participants. To ensure a professional and open mind to the participants’ experiences, the researcher manually recorded his workplace experiences, reviewed them prior to beginning this study to ensure they would not be an influence in this study’s recruitment of participants, the interviews and data analysis. This ethical and professional decision allowed the data to be analyzed as new information being heard and reviewed for the very first time.

Protection of Human Subjects

Approval from Northeastern University’s Institutional Review Board was received prior to conducting this study. The Recruitment Letter (Appendix B) and Informed Consent Letter (Appendix C) were used to recruit and inform participants of this study. All participants were informed of the nature of this study, its purpose, and their rights prior to participation. Participants received a copy of the Informed Consent Letter (Appendix C) for their review and record via email. The Informed Consent Letter (Appendix C) was reviewed with each of the ten participants. This review was conducted via telephone. Moreover, to ensure their anonymity, pseudonyms were assigned, and their respective institutions are not referenced in this study.

Participants were informed of their privacy and protection that would be maintained throughout this study. The participants volunteered to participate in this study. Each participant was informed of their right to discontinue participation at any time without repercussions or impact on their past, current or future work opportunities.
There were no benefits to participants beyond contributing to a research study that may serve helpful to Career College educators to better understand the experiences of adjunct faculty working in career colleges. There were no perceived risks to the participants.

**Positionality Statement**

Qualitative researchers today are much more forthcoming about their qualitative writings than in the past (Creswell, 2013, p. 214). Researchers are more connected and less all knowing about the study in their display of the literature. Creswell (2013) posited that there is an increased concern about the impact of the writing on the participants (p. 215); therefore, researchers are partnering in research with the participants. Moreover, Creswell (2013) shared there is a concerted effort to engage the participants as partners in the research to ensure the embracing of reflexivity. This is the process of supporting the opportunity to openly share biases, values, and experiences to the phenomena in a qualitative study (Creswell, 2013, p. 316).

My experience as an adjunct faculty working in a career college is real and has meaning concerning this study. As a former career college adjunct instructor, I have experienced a lack of respect from administrators. For example, there are instances where ideas for improved textbook selections, faculty in-services, and professional development trainings have been simply ignored. The suggestions were not included on faculty agendas, nor were there any responses from administrators as to why the suggestions were not considered. This experience, at times, led to personal workplace dissatisfaction.

As an adjunct that has worked at several for-profit colleges, I have experienced a lack of recognition, advancement, and resources within the work environment. The absence of these factors has impeded the ability to achieve the highest level of instructional success.
As a part-time college faculty member, the work of fellow adjunct faculty is cherished and respected. Career college adjuncts comprise a team that teach in the early mornings and late nights with limited resources, sparse recognition, yet they are dedicated to the mission of improving the lives of each student at any ethical cost. This axiological assumption, a process of making values known, is the impetus for this study.
Chapter 4

Report of the Research Findings

The purpose of this study was to understand the experiences of adjunct faculty members working in career colleges and the influences on their experiences. The following research questions guided the study:

- What are the experiences of Adjunct Faculty working in career colleges?
- What factors influence the experiences of Adjunct Faculty working in career colleges?

This study was framed through the theoretical lens of Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory. Specially, this study’s research focused on the adjunct instructors’ job satisfaction, which is defined as how employees feel about their work and the various facets of their jobs (Spector, 1997, p. 2).

In 1959, Fredrick Herzberg proposed a two-factor theory to explain the job factors that result in satisfaction and those work factors that prevent job dissatisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). The two factors are extrinsic or hygiene factors and intrinsic or motivation factors (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993).

Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1993) found that hygiene factors were maintenance factors that contributed to job dissatisfaction, if they were not present. Also, Herzberg’s study found that hygiene factors prevented dissatisfaction, when present, however, they did create sustainable satisfaction in of themselves (Herzberg, et al., 1993). Moreover, Herzberg found that sustainable satisfaction was not in the job context, but in the intrinsic job factors, thus, satisfaction is achieved from the work itself (Herzberg, et al., 1993).

Motivation factors, according to Herzberg (1974), included such factors as recognition, personal growth, and achievement. These job content factors lead to job satisfaction, according
to Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman (1993). To motivate employees the work itself must be challenging, enriching and interesting (Herzberg, et al., 1993).

Additionally, Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman (1993) concluded that feelings of satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not opposites, rather they are totally different job factors altogether. Furthermore, Herzberg (1974) explained that hygiene and motivation factors are not on one continuum, but rather two continuums with one leading to dissatisfaction and the other leading to satisfaction.

This chapter is organized into three sections intended to describe, analyze, and interpret the data. First, the background of participants and their work content are presented. Second, a thematic summary of the findings from the data is presented. Finally, an interpretation of the initial findings is discussed.

**Description of the Participants**

Data were collected through in-depth semi-structured interviews, observations, and document reviews from August 2012 to January 2013. Ten adjunct faculty members voluntarily served as participants. The Dean of Education at a career college in the southeastern United States shared the names and email addresses of twenty-one adjunct faculty members for consideration. Each adjunct was emailed the Informed Consent Letter (Appendix C).

The first ten available adjunct instructors that expressed interest and met the selection criteria comprised this study. Of the ten selected, seven participants taught General Education courses, two participants taught Business Education courses, and one faculty member taught Allied Health courses. The participants worked at small career colleges with student populations ranging from three hundred to six hundred students. The participants were employed at four different career colleges at the time of this study. Each of the colleges offered certificate
programs in Allied Health and associates degrees in Business, Fashion, Medical, and/or Art Design. Two of the four colleges offered bachelor’s degrees in Business. Publicly traded investment groups in the United States owned each of the four schools.

Table 4 describes the participants by ethnicity, gender, age, number of years they have taught as an adjunct, and a number of colleges at which they have worked. Pseudonyms were used to protect the privacy of the participants. Barbara, Eugene, Gail, Joseph, Rosamond, and Susan were the first to be interviewed. Their interviews were conducted via telephone. Stephany, Allan, Shawntelle, and Holland were interviewed in person at their respective colleges. A second round of interviews with nine of the participants occurred face-to-face. One participant indicated that he was not available for a face-to-face meeting, but shared, via email, that his experiences were accurately captured in his transcript.

The participants in this study were diverse with four White participants, five Black participants, and one Hispanic participant. The participants ranged in age from the mid-twenties to sixty years of age. Additionally, adjuncts ranged in teaching experience from one year to eighteen years. Sixty percent of the participants held a bachelor’s degree, thirty percent held a master’s degree, one held a doctorate in education, and one held no degree, but a certificate in an Allied Health field of study.
Table 4

**Participant Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjunct’s Name</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Years Teaching</th>
<th>Highest Degree Earned</th>
<th>Number of Schools Taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Certificate/No Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosamond</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephany</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawntelle</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Barbara.** Barbara is a White adjunct instructor who taught Business Management courses at three for-profit colleges for eight years. A graduate of a large state university, Barbara has a Masters in Business and several certificates in Information Technology. She learned of a career college teaching position while searching for jobs on Career Builder.com, a job posting website. Barbara indicated that she found teaching at career colleges very fulfilling. She expressed that she liked the small classes and the ability to bring her real-world experiences into each class. Also, she shared that teaching in the career college setting was more exciting than working in K-12 education and traditional colleges. Barbara indicated that her work was more fulfilling because she was working with “adult learners that were career-focused.”
Barbara has taught Business courses at a community college and a local public school. She indicated that “the daily lesson plans, hall monitoring, discipline issues, and the routine in traditional education” were not job duties she had to undertake in the career college setting. Barbara indicated that the students “really want to learn, and I impact lives...and I like that!”

As a parent and former elementary teacher, Barbara reported that she was in pursuit of flexibility when she applied for her first career college teaching position. She shared that her career college teaching schedule offered the chance to continue to teach while caring for her family. Barbara also expressed a love for education and spoke of the value of young adults obtaining a degree or specialized training. She shared that her parents were very instrumental in leading her into education. Her mother was a homemaker, and her father was a schoolteacher for thirty-seven years. “They preached education everyday,” according to Barbara.

Barbara freely shared examples of her work experiences in the initial telephone interview and the follow up interview that was conducted on campus. She indicated that she was proud of her work, the students she had taught, and the many compliments she had received from alumni. She indicated she was committed to her job and had a passion for teaching at career colleges. “There is nothing better than what I do.” Barbara mentioned that “helping students” as one of the highlights of her work. However, she discussed that she was not comfortable with “the overt disconnection” between her and the college administrators.

Barbara shared that she felt excluded from the business department, and indicated that “adjuncts are isolated” at the college. She expressed that the administrators do not support her, and her ideas were considered unimportant. Barbara posited that full-time staff was supported in their work. The administrators and full-time staff and faculty work so closely together,” according to Barbara. Barbara continued, “I try not to think about the bad stuff here…I have no
power to change anything [sigh].”

Barbara’s enthusiasm was apparent in her behavior. She smiled and laughed when discussing her commitment to being “a good adjunct” faculty member and “helping students reach the goal of earning a college degree.” She gave an in-depth review of how she prepared her day, and how each day brought new challenges that were welcomed. Barbara shared, “I get so excited about what I will learn from the students each day.” There was a sense that she was happy in being a career college adjunct instructor.

**Eugene.** Eugene is a White adjunct instructor who taught Allied Health courses at one career college in the evening sessions for five years. Additionally, he was an entrepreneur and had managed his own business for twenty years. Eugene’s brother and four other men comprised his Heating and Air Conditioning business. Educationally, he did not obtain a college degree; rather he completed a certificate program that qualified him to teach Allied Health courses at the career college where he worked. He indicated that his work experiences and certifications provided the qualifications to be selected for the position.

Eugene described how he obtained his position. While visiting a friend that worked at a career college, Eugene was offered a teaching position. “I thought it was a nice gesture,” but Eugene expressed that he was not seeking a teaching job. The program director called him a few weeks later, and only then did Eugene seriously consider the job. Eugene had no prior teaching experience. Initially, he agreed to teach one class for one term, but he soon discovered a “new love,” according to Eugene. He shared that teaching soon became a “good way to give back” to others. Eugene was the only male teaching an evening class in his department at the time of this study.

In the telephone interview, the conversation was informal and Eugene expressed that he
was very excited about being a participant. He expressed that he did not feel he was qualified to participate. His assumption was participants in a graduate level study must have a college degree. I assured him that he was qualified according to the selection criteria.

Eugene openly shared how the evening faculty worked together “like family” to solve workplace challenges. There was a sense of resolve in his department, and if one person didn’t have the answer, another adjunct instructor would “help out to find a solution,” according to Eugene. He also shared an experience on how adjuncts impacted the lives of students. Eugene explained that a student in his class had lost his job and needed transportation to continue in the program. During a class break, Eugene shared this information with another adjunct faculty member, and they worked together to find a carpool for the student. He stated “We came together and found a solution for this young man.”

Eugene expressed that his family was his greatest support system, and spending time with them was important. He expressed, “This position works good for me.” Eugene indicated that he had time to operate his business, time to teach in the evenings, and quality time with his family.

Eugene was not available for a second interview.

Gail. Gail is a Black adjunct instructor with four years of teaching experience at one career college. She has a Bachelor’s degree in Business and another in Psychology. She taught herself Spanish by watching the Spanish cable channels and was the sole Spanish teacher at her college. She shared that she was considered a role model by her students and indicated that she believed her work was a calling from God. A church member told her about a career college that was expanding its course offerings and she pursued the position.

While she had worked several other jobs outside of academia, including as a tax preparer, Spanish-to-English translator, and account manager, teaching at a career college was the “one
job that was most gratifying,” according to Gail. Gail explained that counseling the students and the flexible work schedule were “the greatest benefits” as an adjunct instructor. Initially, hired to teach Spanish courses only, she volunteered to teach other General Education courses because she was motivated to be a role model for minority students. She went on to share that students “need to see that a woman can be successful and single.”

In the telephone interview, Gail acknowledged she was multi-tasking. She had just left her college and was driving to her other job. We had to stop a few times to allow her to focus on the drive. When asked if we should reschedule, she was adamant that “now is the best time.” She informed me that with her Bluetooth hands-free service she could freely engage in conversation. After she connected the device, our interview continued without interruption. I was sure to follow up with Gail in a second interview as she, at times, seemed distracted in her responses. Although distractions were present, Gail did not hesitate to answer any questions. A follow up interview ensured that she was free of the distractions present in the initial interview.

In the second interview, Gail expressed that she was happy to be a part of this study. She stated, “I can’t believe I will be mentioned in a dissertation!” She also apologized repeatedly about driving during our first interview. She wanted to ensure her experiences were “heard and understood.” Gail indicated that the member checking of her initial responses did reflect her thoughts, but the opportunity to elaborate on them was appreciated. According to Gail, no one had inquired about her work experience in the past. She stated, “I have always wanted to tell someone about my work.”

In the second interview, Gail indicated that she had helped students with learning the fundamentals of Spanish without classroom resources. “No one in leadership ever asked if there were classroom materials I needed to help my students.” She expressed that learning Spanish
required repetition of hearing the words and speaking the words. She shared that she had requested an audio-recorder so students could hear themselves speak the language, and a DVD player to play Spanish related lessons. Administrative support was non-existent concerning her request. “I had to buy my own recorder and bring in a DVD player,” according to Gail.

Joseph. Joseph is a Black adjunct instructor who has taught General Education courses at two career colleges for eight years. He earned a doctorate in 2012 and found that “teaching adults brought together” his two passions—education and leadership. In addition to teaching, Joseph owned a real estate business. He shared that he had provided free home-buying seminars to his students. He stated, “Helping others achieve their goals is my goal.”

Joseph indicated that his biggest challenge was that “my work is not appreciated.” He did share, “I love the students and the work schedule,” but Joseph expressed that the college administrators do not value his contributions to the college. He worked very hard to assist his students, but Joseph expressed that his administrators did not honor his talents.

Joseph has taught General Education courses in the morning, evening, and weekend hours. He described teaching as a service to others rather than a job. Prior to teaching in a career college, he thought he would pursue law school. However, after marriage “the plan changed,” according to Joseph. He chose to pursue a Master’s degree, start a business, and earn a doctorate.

Joseph’s interest in teaching came when he was a guest speaker for a fraternity brother’s General Education class. He became interested in the flexibility his friend enjoyed as a bivocational professional.

In the telephone and face-to-face interviews, Joseph was vivacious as indicated by his expressed desire to meet in person to elaborate on his work experiences. He shared very explicit examples of his experiences. Joseph indicated, “I thought teaching at a career college was no
different than teaching at a traditional college, but I soon learned that career colleges are businesses, and the students are our customers.”

Sharing his work experiences seemed to be refreshing for him. Joseph shared that “this is the first time I have been asked to discuss how I feel about my work.” His body language indicated that he was interested in discussing his experiences. Joseph leaned forward towards me as he discussed his work. He was engaged throughout the second interview. Joseph added that he had rarely talked to anyone about his teaching, because “most of my family and friends think it’s not a real college.”

Joseph expressed that his family and friends viewed career colleges as schools that were not accredited and lacked academic standards. He went on to state, “It feels great to talk about what I do and the students I serve.” He was proud of his work as an adjunct instructor. With great excitement and detail he shared interesting stories about his work, students, and his business opportunities. Joseph is a man of many interests, but proclaimed teaching to be his “most prized service to mankind.”

**Rosamond.** Rosamond is a Black adjunct instructor who once served as a full-time faculty. She has worked as an adjunct faculty member for three and a half years solely because she had not secured a full-time teaching position. Rosamond shared that she had applied at several career colleges and vocational institutions for leadership positions, but had not been offered a full-time position. Teaching as an adjunct allowed her to seek full-time work by “pursuing interviews without scheduling conflicts.” Rosamond has taught Business courses at three career colleges with her Masters in Business Administration.

Her career college experience was immense. She served as a department chairperson, academic advisor, career services coordinator, and full-time faculty member. As an adjunct,
Rosamond found that her true desire was to have more time for her personal explorations. She was a member of a travel club, and treasured the cruises the group had taken over the past six years.

In the telephone interview, Rosamond was blunt when discussing her workplace challenges. I asked if the interview needed to be rescheduled. Rosamond shared that she had just completed a meeting with her Program Director and felt her concerns were not fully heard. She apologized, asked for a “moment to calm down,” and the interview continued in a more informal and engaging manner. Her meeting was concerning the absence of adjuncts on the scholarship committee. Rosamond indicated that she had requested the meeting with her Program Director, but after a few weeks of not receiving an appointment, she made another request.

During the discussion about her work experiences, Rosamond expressed, “I am frustrated” with the college’s administrators. This was interesting to hear because Rosamond was a career college administrator for over twenty years. It appeared that her experiences as an adjunct had given her an opportunity to reflect on the workplace challenges encountered by other adjuncts. Rosamond posited, “I see things so differently as a adjunct instructor.” She shared that adjuncts are “always the forgotten ones.” Adjuncts were not asked to join committees, according to Rosamond.

In the second interview, Rosamond was very warm. Her demeanor changed for abrupt in the initial telephone interview to kind and more engaging in the second face-to-face interview. She offered me coffee, inquired about the progress of this study, and was encouraging toward the completion of my doctorate. She expressed that she was happy to be a participant in this study, and shared that she wanted to “see how the study could help new adjuncts.”
**Susan.** Susan is a Hispanic General Education adjunct instructor who has taught for eighteen years at six career colleges. She learned of a teaching position through her local newspaper. A single parent with a Bachelor’s in Mathematics, teaching was her only source of income. She shared that there was a point when she traveled to five schools in one day to ensure enough classes to pay her bills. While her travel has been intense and sporadic with ever-changing class schedules, Susan indicated that she appreciated the flexibility in her work. She stated, “I determine my work schedule, and how often I want to work. When I need more time with my girls, I can be there for them….It does not get any better.”

During the telephone interview, Susan asked for some questions to be repeated. She expressed that her first language was Spanish and simple repetition of the questions would be helpful in ensuring her understanding of the questions. She spoke with a soft tone and was very polite during both interviews. She often would ask if she had answered the questions fully. I reassured her that the goal was to hear her experiences and offered time for her to elaborate freely.

The second interview occurred face-to-face and at this time Susan requested less repeating of the questions. The written overview of the analyzed data and themes were presented for her review. Susan appeared very happy that a follow up meeting was provided. This gave me an opportunity to follow up closely with questions that Susan initially asked to be repeated in the telephone interview. Susan expressed her appreciation for the opportunity to meet in person to review the interview questions, and to provide clarity on her work experiences. “No one had ever asked,” according to Susan, about her work experiences.
**Stephany.** Stephany is a White General Education adjunct instructor with two years of teaching experience at one career college. She has a Bachelor’s degree in Sociology. Stephany believed that her teaching position was perfect for her lifestyle. She stated, “This job is flexible.” She was studying for the GRE with the hopes of beginning a Master’s in Education program. Her mother, a retired teacher, encouraged her to teach at a career college that was close to their home. Stephany shared that she enjoyed teaching in the afternoons. She expressed, “I can sleep in [laugh], and study for the GRE in the mornings.

During the initial face-to-face interview, I noticed that Stephany was dressed in business attire. She indicated that she was only dressed in business attire because her class was participating in mock job interviews. Stephany expressed that typically she would be dressed casual to teach.

We met in a classroom that was down the hall from the full-time faculty offices. Stephany shared that adjuncts do not have office space and sometimes lacked the resources to fully do their jobs. Stephany also shared that she brought in her own classroom supplies and had set up a “Google chat” room for her students because there were not college-provided resources and email accounts. She also shared that “The work doesn’t stop even if the resources aren’t here.”

In the second interview, Stephany shared that she had decided on a few colleges to apply to for her Master’s degree. Also, she had decided to purse teaching opportunities at a few other colleges to gain more teaching experience, while remaining at her current career college. Stephany stated, “I want to be the best at what I do.” She also shared that her experiences had been very positive, despite the lack of resources, and office space. When asked to elaborate on her experiences, Stephany shared, “I am a trooper [laugh]. I know how to survive and make it
work.”

**Allan.** Allan is a Black adjunct instructor with the least amount of teaching experience among the ten participants. He has taught General Education courses at two career colleges, while writing his graduate thesis. Allan has a Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees in Political Science. His girlfriend recommended that he apply for an open position at her career college, and he was hired soon after to teach Law and Ethics.

Allan indicated that he appreciated his teaching job. He expressed, “I have good relationships with the other adjuncts.” He did share that he was “somewhat uncomfortable” with how information was not available to adjunct instructors. According to Allan, adjuncts are updated through “word of mouth” only on departmental changes, while the full-time staff and faculty are emailed information. Allan posited, “I don’t understand why I do not have a faculty email account, and informed about what is going on in the department.” He also shared that inclusion issues warranted administrative attention, however, “it’s not a deal breaker” towards not continuing to teach.

In the initial and second interviews, Allan was dressed in khakis and a polo shirt. Allan expressed that adjuncts were very casual in their attire. Like Allan, Stephany, and Eugene’s colleges had a casual faculty dress policy as well. In his responses to the interview questions, Allan was very concise and direct. His demeanor indicated that he was only interested in sharing the facts and no additional information. Allan sat up right in his chair and maintained eye contact in both the initial and second interviews. I asked Allan to elaborate on factors that influenced his work. I posed follow up questions to ensure his experiences were captured. He gladly offered more details. His experiences centered on what he had observed from his girlfriend, who is an adjunct, and other adjuncts, along with his one-year teaching experience. Allan indicated that his
girlfriend served as a mentor to him and had helped him as a new instructor. Additionally, he shared that two male adjuncts had become friends and had offered advice on free web-based grading software programs and teaching strategies.

The most interesting part of the interview was Allan’s lack of knowledge about his college. He indicated that, “No one ever gave me a tour of the school and I had no formal orientation.” He attributed what he does know to having his girlfriend as a colleague. His girlfriend, who was not a participant in this study, had worked four years at the college.

It was a challenge for him to identify which room was available for the first and second interviews. Allan shared that adjuncts could not schedule a classroom for meetings; however, full-time faculty and staff could do so at anytime. After he found an unoccupied classroom, the interview began and flowed well. The room was a science lab with high-top tables. The interview was held in the back of the room to avoid any interruptions, at Allan’s recommendation.

Shawntelle. Shawntelle is a Black General Education adjunct instructor with four years of teaching experience at two career colleges. She has a Bachelor’s degree. Shawntelle expressed that she enjoyed teaching Psychology. A married mom of three, Shawntelle has taught afternoon and evening classes. She shared her work scheduled offered time for her to be with her children before they left for school. Shawntelle expressed without prompting, “My job is the best!” A former sales consultant, the opportunity to be home more and travel less were the reasons Shawntelle pursued a teaching position at a career college. “Things are not perfect” at the colleges, according to Shawntelle, but she expressed that she appreciated her job and valued her work. Shawntelle also shared that “the leadership here has no idea of how we help these students on a daily basis, but I am not here for gifts, but a thank you would be nice from my program
In the initial interview, Shawntelle discussed how the career college setting was “business not student centered.” Career colleges, as described by Shawntelle, “focused on the dollars from enrollment numbers.” Adjuncts, in Shawntelle’s opinion, were concerned about the well being of the students. She shared that the students’ success was very important. Shawntelle went on to share, “I give them the very best of me.”

In the second interview, Shawntelle expressed how excited she was to be an adjunct instructor. She contemplated teaching an additional class. The college was offering an Abnormal Psychology course that she was interested in teaching. Also, during the interview, she discussed that she was considering writing a proposal to start a Psychology club for students, but she was unsure how it would be received. Shawntelle expressed that other adjuncts had made similar suggestions to the program chairperson, but they did not receive favorable feedback.

Holland. Holland is a White adjunct instructor who has taught General Education courses at two colleges for three years. Holland is married with a young son. His wife is a principal. He has a bachelor’s degree in English. In his spare time, he often reads to students at his wife’s school. Holland learned of an adjunct teaching position through his brother-in-law. His brother-in-law is a former Dean of Education at an online career college.

Holland found that teaching at a career college was much different than traditional colleges. He shared that there are more rules and policies in career colleges. At one college Holland was required to wear a necktie and nametag. He shared, “I am a laid back guy.” Additionally, Holland discussed that the policies at his colleges were antiquated. He shared, “If it weren’t for the flexible work hours, I can’t say I would be teaching.” The expectations are greater for adjuncts, than full-time faculty, according to Holland. “There are full-timers that do
not wear a tie, based on Holland’s experience.

During his initial and second interviews, Holland asked, “Would it be ok for me to take off this tie?” After becoming what appeared to be more relaxed, he candidly shared his experiences. Holland indicated that is he was unhappy with the way in which adjuncts were being treated in his department. He expressed that “adjuncts are treated differently than the full-time faculty.” Holland indicated that administrators provided full-time faculty with offices and support. He added that adjuncts at his colleges do not have the support of administrators, nor do they have offices. Holland shared that he felt this was “appalling and unfair.”

The interviews occurred in the office of a full-time faculty member. Holland requested the use of the office for each of the interviews. Like the other participants, there was no designated office space assigned to Holland.

**Data Collection Challenges**

Although reporting the challenges of data collection were not expected, this difficulty provided significant insight into the trials adjunct instructors face, and I believe it was important to share this experience.

**Gaining access to participants.** The first challenge experienced in the data collection process in this study was finding the adjunct instructor when I arrived at their campus. Each campus had a front office administrative assistant who was unaware of the names of the adjuncts and their location in the building upon my arrival. The only means of reaching the adjuncts was via an email and telephone call from the college’s parking lot. Several of the participants had to come to the front office of the college to sign me in and escorted me to a room for our interviews.
**Location for the campus interviews.** It was also challenging to find a location in which to conduct the interviews on each campus.

In College One, the meeting was held in the first available classroom. The school was comprised of two buildings in a small mall area. The classroom where we met was strewn with empty soda cans and water bottles. The classrooms appeared to seat thirty students. The front of the classroom had two long desks where an instructor may sit when class is in session. The walls had pictures with quotes that focused on academic success.

In College Two, the meetings were held in full-time faculty members’ offices that the participants had received permission to use, prior to my arrival. In one interview, the degrees and numerous academic honors of the full-time faculty member were displayed on the wall in the office. There were two laptops and a cherry-colored bookshelf behind the office desk. The office was next to the full-time faculty mailbox area and the Program Directors’ offices. There was a radio playing Jazz music softly in the office.

In College Three, the school was in a shared office space with a printing shop and restaurant. The school was in a one-story building. At the entrance were the administrative assistant’s desk area, and to the left was the admissions office. The meeting was held in a Science lab, as it was the only room available, according to the participant. During the meeting, the smell of food permeated the air from the neighboring restaurant. The meeting space was large and very quiet.

In College Four, the school was located next to two fast food restaurants and a life insurance company. The school had pictures of graduates, testimonials of students’ success, and pictures of the administrators and full-time faculty on the walls. The job titles of the administrators and full-time faculty members were listed under each of their names. The
financial aid and admissions offices were at the front of the school. The student lounge consisted of two wooden picnic tables to the left of the college’s entrance.

There were no available administrative offices, according to one participant, so the meeting was held in a classroom that was unoccupied. During the meeting, employees of the college would peer in the room where we were conducting the interview, and then they walked away without interruption. The classroom did not have a door.

**Thematic Outline**

This section of Chapter Four presents the six emergent themes that resulted from the data analysis. In Table 5, an outline of the themes is listed along with the way in which they were defined in the current study. The inductive data analysis strategy suggested by Thomas (2003) was used in this study. Patton (2002) posited that inductive analysis “involves discoveries, patterns, themes, and categories in one’s data” (p. 453). The goal of using the inductive data analysis, according to Thomas (2006) is to “allow research findings to emerge from frequent, dominant, or significant themes inherent in the raw data” (p. 238).

Data analysis commenced directly following the interview process. I began the data analysis by listening to each interview to verify that the data were properly recorded, prior to the transcription process. This allowed me the opportunity to make initial sense of the data that were captured (Creswell, 2009; Thomas, 2003).

The inductive analysis process outlined by Thomas (2006) provided an efficient and systematic set of steps for analyzing the qualitative data in this study. Thomas (2006) outlined three systematic guidelines for inductive data analysis. The guidelines are (1) condense raw data into brief, summary format; (2) establish clear links between the research objectives; and (3) develop a framework of the underlying structure of experiences that are evident in the data.
The first step was to understand the experiences of the participants via close readings of transcriptions. This allowed me the opportunity to gain a sense of the language used to gather initial impressions about the data. My aim was to maintain an open-mind when reading each transcript, and to be cognizant that important text may be in a response to a different question, as questions were not always answered in sequence as listed on the Interview Protocol (Appendix D).

Following the initial readings, key words and phrases were noted in the margins of the participant’s Interview Protocol sheet (Appendix D). This was the beginning phase of microanalysis, which is the line-by-line analysis that helped in uncovering the experiences of the participants (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

The next step was to revisit the interview transcripts and identify additional key words, statements, and phrases in the data. InVivo Coding, a first step coding method, was used in this inductive data analysis procedure. The purpose of InVivo Coding is to honor the voice of participants and use their direct language as codes and not research-generated words or phrases (Saldana, 2009). This literal coding method was use to capture the actual words of each participant.

The data was analyzed by reviewing each transcript statement-to-statement, line-by-line, and data-to-data. I compared interview statements within each interview and compared those statements to other participants’ interviews. Additionally, the earlier interviews that were conducted via telephone were compared to the interviews conducted face-to-face. This was done to explore any new data or ideas that may have appeared. This constant comparison method was used throughout the data analysis process. In this step, units were clustered together through constant comparison by identifying similarities or differences among the meaning units.
step helped in establishing clear links among the data, as recommended by Thomas (2003).

The third step required the repeating of the aforementioned procedures for each interview transcript and the organization of the meaning units into clusters. I constantly revisited the original transcripts and re-coded and further analyzed. The analysis of the themes led to clearer explanations about the research objectives and allowed me to present the findings in a meaningful way in this chapter.

Themes are identified to “capture something important about the data in relation to the research questions and represent a level of patterned response or meaning with the data set” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 82). This inductive analysis step was conducted with the use of the Saldana’s (2009) axial coding. The purpose of axial coding was to “strategically reassemble data that were split” during the initial coding process. Axial coding was ideal for this inductive analysis step as it facilitated the further examination of this study’s interview transcripts, and helped in regrouping similarly coded data (Saldana, 2009).

The fourth step in the inductive data analysis involved the integration of the previous steps and creation of an exhaustive description of the experiences of the participants for the presentation of data in this study. The themes and their descriptions were reviewed for clarity and consistency with the experiences shared by each participant. Pattern Coding was used in this step of the inductive data analysis. Pattern Coding allowed me to group the summaries of the data into smaller units, which rendered more concise themes (Saldana, 2009). The data analysis continued until the data were summarized into Thomas’ (2006) recommended three to eight themes.
Table 5

**Thematic Outline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Inclusion</td>
<td>Adjunct instructors perceive that they are integral members of the faculty and considered as important contributors to their departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Freedom</td>
<td>The independence of adjuncts to decide how best to lead the instruction in their respective classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacting Student Development</td>
<td>The ability to impact students’ physical, social, mental, and emotional growth and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Work Schedule</td>
<td>The ability to work morning, nights and/or weekends while exploring other professional and personal endeavors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgment</td>
<td>The appreciation of adjunct instructors’ work in the college that is expressed through verbal praise from the college administrators and other faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>College provided materials to perform assigned duties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Themes**

Qualitative data can be effectively analyzed via an inductive coding process (Thomas, 2006). Initially, 29 codes were identified in the raw data. These codes were narrowed down to six major themes through close reading of the raw data, “creation of categories, and the overlapping of coded and uncoded text” (Thomas, 2003, p. 4).

Saldana’s (2009) first cycle and second cycle coding methods guided the inductive data analysis. In the first cycle, the in-vivo coding method was used to analyze the actual words, statements and phrases from the participants’ data. During this process, I analyzed the most frequent displayed words and short phrases in the participants’ data (Saldana, 2009, p. 3). This data analysis phase involved the extraction of indigenous common terms (Saldana, 2009).

Following the first cycle coding method, axial coding, a second cycle coding method,
was used to further analysis the data. Axial Coding was appropriately used to reduce the number of initial codes. I used a color-coded system within the qualitative computer-program system, MAXQDA, to identify the reoccurring words in the initial 29 codes. With axial coding, I sorted and re-labeled the data. This reorganization of the initial codes led to a reduction in the codes by placing reoccurring codes in the same category.

After reducing the codes via axial coding, pattern coding, another second cycle coding method, was employed to further analyze the meaning of the codes. In this second cycle coding phase, I uncovered how the categories related to others and the meaningful units emerged. Pattern coding afforded the opportunity to also group the sum of the data into smaller units (Saldana, 2009).

The major themes of this study were derived from the constant comparison method, along with the first and second coding methods via the review of the interrelationships of the codes and the redundancy of information regarding the participants’ experiences. Next, the themes were organized in written form so they could be presented in Chapter 4.

From the inductive analysis, six themes emerged. Table 6 shows the six emergent themes, the frequency of themes in the units of data, examples of the initial codes interconnected to the themes, and number of participants that shared experiences related to the themes.
Table 6

*Frequency of Emergent Themes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Examples of Codes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th># of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Inclusion</td>
<td>Lacking Support</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Help from Program Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absent Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacting Student Development</td>
<td>Changing lives</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspiring students daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students overcoming challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Freedom</td>
<td>Be creative</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Administrative Interference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Work Schedule</td>
<td>Teach at different schools</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free in the mornings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement</td>
<td>Invisible at work</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>No college email address</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of office space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No classroom supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Theme 1: Professional Inclusion**

In this study, Professional Inclusion is defined as the adjunct instructors’ perceptions of their integration into the education department as integral members of the faculty. One participant shared, “Adjuncts are excluded from faculty meetings and other events that full-time staff and faculty are involved in at my college.”

Eight of the participants expressed that they were not included in faculty events. Eugene
stated that adjuncts are not being considered for open full-time positions. Susan shared that adjuncts are not invited to sit with full-time faculty and administrators during graduation ceremonies. Others expressed similar matters related to faculty meetings and faculty inclusion.

Gail stated:

> When there is a faculty meeting, I try to attend. I have noticed that the agenda is always focused on the full-time faculty and administrators. I feel like an intruder at the meetings. I recall someone asking why was I attending the meetings. It appears the meetings are for full-time employees, and not for adjunct instructors. But I continue to go because I want to know what is going on at my college.

Allan expressed that he felt disconnected from his department. Allan shared:

> I don’t feel a part of the education team. I like my work, but adjuncts are mistreated. Full-time instructors are notified of updates within the department, but I never know what’s going on. This isn’t good. I am totally unsupported.

Allan also discussed that the administrators at his college “treated full-time staff and faculty much differently” than the adjuncts. He indicated that full-time faculty discussed their challenges in the faculty meetings and received feedback, however, “we are not informed on when these meetings were being held.”

When discussing workplace inclusion, several participants indicated that they experienced some challenges. Susan shared, “I feel like I am not a part of the faculty.” Holland posited, “I feel like a child that is always seeking permission to be a part of the group.”

While this workplace challenge was openly shared with me during the interviews, no participant had discussed their experiences with specific individuals. However, a few had initiated conversations with decision makers related to inclusion. Barbara indicated that she had requested a meeting several times to speak with her Program Director to discuss her workplace concerns. Stephany initiated a meeting with her administrator to seek support in starting a student organization at her college.
Professional Inclusion is a workplace factor that was not addressed in the workplace.

**Theme 2: Impacting Student Development**

All participants discussed Impacting Student Development. Impacting Student Development is defined as the ability of adjuncts to impact students’ physical, social, mental, and emotional growth and development. Joseph shared, “We help students by finding alternatives to their issues.” Holland added, “I empower my students.”

Eugene indicated that helping students was a central reason why he arrived early and stayed late at his college. Stephany explained that she “absolutely enjoyed” helping students reach their goals. Susan expressed that the students enrolled in the career college were “so focused” on completing their studies. However, she indicated, “The students have so many challenges that influence their studies.”

Participants discussed that many of the students in their colleges had reading challenges, financial concerns, criminal backgrounds, and transportation issues that often influenced their focus during classes. Eugene indicated that in his Allied Health program, “I have students with multiple convictions. I have worked to help them realized that they can have a productive career, despite their pass.” Joseph expressed that he found that he could influence the lives of the students as well. “They just need a helping hand,” according to Joseph. He shared, “I am motivated to help students; it’s a service I provide to them. Allan shared, the students had a “lack family support,” and he felt that the adjuncts at his school felt good about helping students reach their goals. Allan added, “It makes you feel good inside and inspires you to continue to teach here.” Allan also indicated that without the support of faculty the students would not complete their programs.

The participants indicated that they worked to understand the needs of their students.
Barbara shared, “They are hungry for education!” Shawntelle expressed that her students come ready to learn and see “failure or quitting college as not an option, but only a few have alternatives when personal issues arise.” Joseph shared many of the students “worked two jobs, come to school between their work hours, and often struggle to stay afloat.” Eugene indicated that he must help his students, because “I am the only support system available to them.”

Rosamond, a former full-time faculty member, said the “desire to succeed was most noticeable among those students who have tried traditional colleges, but did not graduate.” Rosamond, Shawntelle, and Eugene expressed that the career college students were special to them, and “helping them make it,” according to Rosamond, are very important. Gail shared that she provided a “safe place” for students to disclose their life challenges.

My students can come to me with their issues. During our classes, I allow a few minutes for daily reflections. This is a time for students to either share aloud an issue or to write it down and submit it to me for private review. We have a rule of no judgment of others during this time. I have found that they just need a listening ear. It’s hard to learn while you have a litany of external factors pressing upon you. The class takes time to reflect (Pause). There are times that I even disclose a few of my own worries, so students understand that they are not in this alone, and to know that others have daily challenges as well. We keep our reflections (Chuckle) clean and presentable for the classroom setting, but we do allow for sharing. This is an important part of my class, and it’s my gift of dedication to my students.

Participants also expressed how they work to impact students’ emotional growth and development. Holland added, “I have been a financial advisor (laugh), a big brother, and a shoulder to lean on for students.” He also shared that “I do this because I want to influence students to stay in school.” Susan indicated, “At each school I teach, my students know it’s my mission to help them graduate. I want them to become difference makers.” She also shared, “It’s my job to encourage students to be great and overcome the issues.”

Impacting Student Development was a workplace tenet that was present in the workplace.
Theme 3: Academic Freedom

Academic Freedom in this study is defined as the adjunct instructors’ independence in deciding how best to lead the instruction in their respective classes. This theme was discussed by seven of the ten participants.

The participants shared that they enjoyed having independence in their classrooms to present content via the Internet and through field trips. The ability to have governance over how they taught content without administrative interruptions was discussed by participants. Barbara, Shawntelle, Stephany, and Joseph shared how they have been creative in their teaching methods. Rosamond reflected:

Whatever it takes, I do. We were discussing death and grief in a class. No students seemed interested. So, I had students go to a cemetery, and come back and discuss their experiences. It was eye opening for everyone. This type of thing you can’t do in the traditional colleges, but I was able to do this at my college.

The participants explained that they managed their classes the way that best met the needs of their students. Barbara shared, “The students are so diverse and each term you must adjust to meet their needs.” Shawntelle added that with her level of independence she managed her class like a business. She expressed, “Students know their roles are to perform at a high level. I assist with supporting their academic development.” Shawntelle added, “I get results this way.”

Joseph, Stephany, and Holland felt it was essential to employ different teaching strategies each term. Stephany rationale was that “Students are smart enough to know when the instructors are not giving their best, so change is a must.” Several of the participants allowed their students to use their smartphones in classes to help with research. Joseph shared, “Students were using the phones anyway to text...so I made the best out it.” They are using devices now for learning,” according to Joseph. Holland indicated that he used Facebook and Face-Time on his mobile
telephone with his students and encouraged these social mediums among students for engagement and learning.

Academic Freedom was a workplace factor that was present in the workplace.

**Theme 4: Flexible Work Schedule**

In this study, Flexible Work Schedule is defined as the adjuncts’ ability to work mornings, evenings, and/or weekend hours while pursuing other endeavors. Also, this theme includes the adjuncts’ decision to teach as many or as few classes as they desire each term. This was the most discussed theme. The workplace flexibility offered participants time to explore other work opportunities, spend more time with family, and pursue personal endeavors. The participants discussed flexibility as the self-governing of their work schedules.

Allan, who at the time of this study was completing a graduate degree, expressed how satisfied he was to have a job that did not conflict with his studies. He said, “I don’t take my job home with me, so I have the time to focus on completing my degree.” Stephany, an educator who indicated that she enjoyed her mornings off, offered that working afternoons and studying for the GRE worked well with her teaching schedule. She stated, “I am free!”

The opportunity to teach while pursuing other professional opportunities was important to Eugene and Joseph as well. Both were business owners with busy work schedules, but had time to teach at their respective colleges. Susan indicated that her flexible work schedule offered time to teach at several career colleges. She added:

I have been teaching for many years. With a diverse teaching background, I have been fortunate to teach a vast amount of classes at six colleges. Some colleges have offered me one or two classes and others have offered six courses. So, I try to teach wherever there are open courses. Because this is my only job, I can teach early mornings or late nights. I have taught on Saturdays. My girls are in college now, so I have the time to dedicate to more classes. With years of experience, I have learned there are always classes to teach, if you are available to teach anytime and open to driving.
All participants shared that each term their work schedule was so vastly different with course offerings, and they appreciated the variation. Joseph indicated that he chose when he wanted to take a term off from teaching. One participant noted, “My flex schedule is why I can teach as a adjunct.”

Flexible Work Schedule was a workplace factor that was met in the workplace.

**Theme 5: Acknowledgement**

Acknowledgment is defined in this study as the appreciation of the adjuncts’ work. Appreciation is expressed through verbal praise from the college administrators and other faculty members. This theme was discussed by all of the participants. Some participants expressed their education leaders did not recognize their work. Allan expressed, “My Program Chairperson has never mentioned my name as a volunteer tutor. I have sacrificed personal study time to help out at my college.” Joseph indicated that his work had not been complimented at his college. He shared an experience where he had organized an event:

I invited a community leader to serve as a guest speaker. Notification was sent to the Dean to seek his permission. In the email, I requested other faculty be informed of the tentative date so they could invite their students. In the email response, the Dean did not acknowledge me as the organizer. He only listed the General Education Chairperson’s name on the email that went out to faculty. I was not mentioned at all. I was told that the Dean praised the General Education Chairperson, not me, for a job well done in a faculty meeting. The speaker is a personal friend and my former colleague. He [the guest speaker] only came because of my relationship with him. There was a total disregard for me as a faculty member. (Sigh) I continue to do my job, because I know I am helping students.

Holland shared his concern towards job acknowledgement. He stated that it is a “blatant disrespect for what we do.” In the college’s handbook at Gail’s college there was no mention of adjuncts’ names. Additionally, Gail expressed, “We want to be acknowledged for our contributions.” Stephany added that she believed that adjuncts “had done some amazing things”
at her college, but were overlooked. She wanted to change this mind-set by discussing her contributions with the college’s leadership.

I am thinking of creating a Psychology club here [at the college]. But some other adjuncts have warned me not to get too excited. I have been told that adjuncts teachers have recommended other clubs and new organizations, and the administration never considered their proposals. We have ideas and care about the college’s success as well. I will see how it goes.

The participants shared they do not focus on the lack of acknowledgement from administrators, but instead they expressed their focus is on the good qualities of their jobs. Holland shared, “Listen, I focus on the positives.”

Although the college administrators did not acknowledge the work of the participants, professional colleagues in the workplace addressed this workplace tenet. Allan indicated, “I have received accolades and encouragement from other adjuncts.” Eugene added, “The evening faculty provides support and uplift each other.”

College administrators and full-time faculty did not address acknowledgment as a workplace factor, however, fellow adjuncts and students addressed it. This workplace factor was addressed by fellow adjuncts.

**Theme 6: Resources**

Resources are defined as college-provided materials for adjuncts to perform their duties. Nine of the ten participants shared detailed insight related to this theme. Among the resources that were necessary to do their jobs, but not readily available were classroom materials, office space, and office equipment. Barbara shared there was an ongoing shortage of white board markers in the classes.

Gail added there was a lack of office space for adjuncts to use to meet with students and grade students’ work. Participants indicated that they lacked access to school telephones to call
students for conferences, and audio-visual equipment.

Although participants all mentioned a lack of resources, each of them followed their observations with statements about how they improvised to obtain the resources they needed. Participants indicated that they have used hallway space, storage areas, and even the parking lot to conduct student conferences and meetings. Allan shared, “There’s no adjunct office, so I become creative when I need one [laugh].” Additionally, he expressed that he had established a “Google Voice” telephone number that was dedicated to students. The telephone number, according to Allan, allowed students the opportunity to text questions to him on a dedicated telephone number, at no cost to him, the college or students. Several participants shared that they did not have school provided email addresses, but found alternative means to communicate with their students.

Shawntelle indicated that the adjuncts in her college “created a buddy system” where resources were shared among the instructors. Eugene described how he provided resources and support for other faculty members:

I have a projector I use in my business, so I just bring it with me every night so someone can use it, if they need it. We don’t have one to use at night. It’s a way of making sure the work is done. At night there are just a few of us on campus. I do not know what resources are there for the day faculty, but we don’t have much available to us.

There was a sense of teamwork around ensuring the required resources were in place. Where there were no solutions, participants found an alternative. The lack of resources were challenges in the workplace that were overcome by self-managing the issues, and finding solutions via teamwork.

In addition to creating a system of sharing, participants have equipped their classrooms using their own funds. Joseph, Rosamond, and Shawntelle shared they often made a list of what they needed for their classes and purchased the items. The purchases were not reimbursed, nor
mentioned to administrators.

The college administrators did not address resources; however, the participants found materials to address this workplace job factor successfully.

**Interpretation and Initial Findings Derived from Data**

Ten adjunct faculty members working in career colleges in the southeastern United States participated in this study. Each participated in an in-depth semi-structured initial interview, and nine of the ten adjunct instructors participated in a second face-to-face interview at their respective colleges. From the analyzed data, six themes emerged.

This section further discusses the findings, providing an initial interpretation of the results in the context of Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory, the theoretical framework used in this study.

Frederick Herzberg led one of the earliest studies on job satisfaction. Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1993) discussed a two factor approach to job satisfaction. The two-factor approach included extrinsic and intrinsic workplace influences (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). The extrinsic factors were termed as hygiene factors, and the intrinsic factors were termed as motivation factors (Herzberg, et al., 1993).

According to Herzberg, hygiene factors are the job context factors and the motivation factors are the job content factors (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). The job context factors relate to the environment in which the employee works, and motivation factors relate to the work itself (Herzberg, et al., 1993). Herzberg noted that the hygiene factors addressed the employees’ physiology needs, while the motivation factors addressed the employees’ psychological needs (Herzberg, et al., 1993).
Hygiene Factors in this Study

Professional Inclusion. This theme can be categorized as a hygiene factor. According to Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959), interpersonal relations in the workplace is a hygiene factor that correlates to this theme. The interpersonal relations factor in Herzberg’s study is defined as the “actual verbalization interaction between the employee and their superior, peers, or subordinates (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993, p. 46).

Additionally, this major theme also can be discussed in relation to Herzberg’s supervision hygiene factor. Herzberg Two-Factory theory defined supervision as the competence or incompetence, fairness or unfairness of the supervisor (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993)

In this study, eight of ten participants indicated that they had experienced the absences of professional inclusion. Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) found that when supervision and support is not addressed in the workplace, employees became dissatisfied (Herzberg, et al, 19993). Susan indicated, “I have been made to feel like a stranger at college graduations.” Based on the findings in this study, participants were dissatisfied with absence of professional inclusion. Allan shared, “I have no support from my Program Chairperson.”

Furthermore, the findings indicated that participants were not included in faculty events, and they were not happy with their experiences surrounding this major theme. Herzberg posited that when a hygiene factor is absent, employees will become dissatisfied and job performance would be adversely impacted (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). While participants in this study were dissatisfied with the absence of this hygiene factor, they indicated they focused on the more satisfying factors in their work. Stephany shared that while there were work challenges, she continued to “render the best instruction” to her students. This finding supports Herzberg’s assertion that when hygiene factors are not met in the workplace employees became
dissatisfied. However, this finding repudiates Herzberg’s study that “job performance declined when hygiene factors were not present in the work” (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993, p. 45). Joseph shared, “I give my best everyday to my students.”

**Flexible Work Schedule.** In this study, a flexible work schedule can also be classified as a hygiene factor due to the fact that it relates to the job context. Herzberg discussed the employees’ thoughts about the adequacies or inadequacies surrounding company’s policies, work schedules and administration as hygiene factors (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993, p. 48). Herzberg, et al., (1993) found that positive feelings towards company policies, work schedules, and administration do not lead to satisfaction. However, in this study, all participants indicated favorable experiences concerning this factor in their respective colleges. Shawntelle indicated, “I get so much accomplished in my day because of my flexible teaching schedule.”

All participants shared an appreciation for their flexible work schedules. Flexibility in this study centered on the participants’ ability to decide when they would like to teach (mornings, evenings, or weekends), while pursuing other professional and personal endeavors. Gail shared she was “free to pursue other opportunities” because of her work flexibility. Gail worked as a Tax Preparer and Account Manager, while teaching. She shared that “each day is fulfilling for me because of my flexible teaching schedule.” Stephany expressed that she appreciated having her morning hours available to study for the GRE, while teaching in the afternoons. Also, Stephany expressed, “I love my work schedule.”

This theme was discussed the most among all the themes presented in this study. Participants discussed this workplace tenet repeatedly during their in-depth interviews. Susan and Joseph shared that their workplace flexibility afforded them the opportunity to work at several colleges. Without the presence of a flexible work schedule, the participants explained
that they would have been unable to serve as adjunct instructors. Allan stated, “As a graduate student, I needed a job that would not conflict with my coursework, and teaching as an adjunct fit well in my schedule.” He added that he was pleased with his work schedule and appreciated the various times he could teach. Eugene expressed that his work schedule complimented his other professional endeavors. Susan indicated, “It’s a blessing to have a wonderful schedule that gives me time with family.”

For participants, flexibility represented an opportunity to own a business, spend extended time with family, and earn an income to support their financial needs. Each positive experience the participants shared was related to their workplace flexibility. For example, Eugene shared that he managed his business in the day and taught at night. His flexible work schedule offered the time to visit with his children at school and have lunch with his wife whenever he chose.

According to Herzberg, hygiene factors when present in the workplace would lead to the avoidance of dissatisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). Furthermore, Herzberg findings indicated that hygiene and motivation factors are on two continuums and are not opposites of the other (Herzberg, et al., 1993). In this study, the participants were not dissatisfied, as this hygiene factor was met in the workplace. This workplace factor did allow participants to experience job satisfaction because their work schedules were flexible. For example, the flexible work schedules allowed participants to work with students and impact their social, mental and academic growth and development. Joseph indicated that he appreciated his flexible teaching schedule, “I teach when I want, take time off when I need, and it does not impact my status as an adjunct.”
**Resources.** According to Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1993) the physical conditions of work, the amount of work and the facilities where the working is being conducted are known as the working conditions (p. 48). The working conditions, as described by Herzberg, are hygiene factors (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). Those conditions, according to Herzberg, include space, tools, and other environmental characteristics (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993, p. 48). When the hygiene factors are present in the workplace there is no dissatisfaction (Herzberg, et al., 19993). Resources, in this study, can be categorized as working conditions, which are hygiene factors.

In this study’s findings, the participants discussed they did not have office space, telephones, and college provided classroom materials. Therefore, upon first interview, these workplace factors were not met. However, further assessment indicated that while these were not provided in traditional ways, adjunct instructors found ways in which to obtain the resources they needed for the job. For example, Eugene shared that there was not a projector to use in the evening classes. However, he shared his personal projector with other adjuncts who needed one.

Several participants indicated that their classes did not have markers to write on the whiteboards. Joseph shared that he purchased markers for his classes so the instruction would continue with our interruption. Rosamond indicated, “Adjunct faculty members are like family and we support each other in the classroom.”

Since the participants improvised to obtain the resources they needed, this workplace factor was met.
Motivation Factors

**Impacting Student Development.** Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory defined the work itself as a workplace motivation factor (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). The authentic content of the job and its positive or negative effect upon the subordinate is defined as the work itself (Herzberg, et al., 1993, p. 48). Whether boring or interesting, easy or challenging, the work itself is a job satisfier (Herzberg, et al., 1993, p. 48). According to Herzberg’s findings, motivation factors lead to job satisfaction when present in the workplace (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). Impacting student development can be categorized as a motivation factor.

One factor related to the work itself is the ability to impact student development. The opportunity to help students with their academic growth and development was important to the participants. Joseph indicated that helping students achieve academic success was “personally rewarding” and led to “feelings of happiness.” He also shared that teaching was a “service, and not a job.”

Participants indicated that they impacted student emotional growth. Eugene shared that he had helped a student find a student-carpool during a time when the student was without work and a car. He indicated that the student contemplated withdrawing, but “after a discussion with a fellow adjunct” a solution was presented to the student.

Also, participants shared experiences on impacting students’ academic achievement. Barbara and Susan indicated that the opportunity to help students achieve the goal of college graduation was satisfying. Susan said, “I am committed to seeing all students earn their diploma.” Barbara shared that she tutored students to ensure they had the opportunity to pass their coursework.

The findings surrounding this theme align with Herzberg’s work itself job factor. The
work itself job factor, according to Herzberg, is a motivation factor that lead to job satisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). This study’s findings indicated that participants were satisfied with this workplace factor.

**Acknowledgement.** Herzberg shared that recognition, a motivation factor, is an act of verbally acknowledging a person, and their work (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993, p. 44). Recognition of a person and their work, according to Herzberg, et al., (1993) can “be the source of almost anyone” (p. 45). A supervisor, someone in management, a peer, or professional colleague can provide employee recognition (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993, p. 45).

In this study, participants shared that while full time faculty and administrators did not acknowledge their work publically, acknowledgement did come from fellow adjuncts and students. Acknowledgement, in this study, can be categorized as a motivation factor.

All participants in this study shared experiences surrounding this theme. Shawntelle shared, “We are not recognized by administrators.” Susan echoed this sentiment and expressed that adjunct faculty members were not recognized at graduation. Joseph expressed that “my work is not viewed by administrators as important.”

While the administrators did not recognize the work efforts of the participants, the participants did indicate that their work was supported and acknowledged by fellow adjuncts. Susan shared, “I have taken coworkers to lunch to celebrate events.” Stephany indicated that she has met with adjuncts to discuss how best to organize a new student organization and received feedback from her peers. Joseph added that an adjunct faculty member gave him a thank you card after he organized a student event on campus.

Acknowledgement in this study aligns with Herzberg’s recognition motivation factor. When adequately addressed in the workplace, recognition of the employees’ work can lead to job
satisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). The participants indicated that their professional colleagues and students acknowledged their work.

**Academic Freedom.** The work itself factor, as described by Herzberg, focuses on the “actual doing of the job or task of the job as a source of good or bad feelings about it” (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993, p. 48). The work itself workplace factor is a motivation factor (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). Additionally, Herzberg found that work itself could be routine or varied and creative or stultifying (Herzberg, et al., 1993, p. 48). Academic freedom can be categorized as a motivation factor.

Seven of the ten participants shared experiences surrounding academic freedom. The opportunity to determine the content to be presented to students and the methods to present the material were the prominent experiences found in the participants’ data.

The other workplace factor that academic freedom aligns with is Herzberg’s responsibility motivation factor, which is the degree of control an employ has over their work (Herzberg et al., 1993). Shawntelle shared that she appreciated using her own teaching methods to “reach all students” in the classroom. Barbara shared, “I have no interruptions from administrators” concerning how best to introduce content to the students. “I am in charge of the content and how I choose to teach it,” posited Allan.

Consistent with Herzberg’s assertion that motivation factors lead to job satisfaction, the findings from this study indicated that the participants expressed satisfaction with their academic freedom. This job factor was met in the workplace. Joseph shared, “I can be creative in my teaching.”
Summary of Interpretation and Initial Findings

The findings in this study indicated that each theme aligned with Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory. The Professional Inclusion theme, a hygiene factor in this study, was not met. Work Schedule, a hygiene factor in this study, was addressed and led to no dissatisfaction based on the findings. Another hygiene factor in this study was Resources. Resources, while not addressed by the college administrators, participants supported each other and found the needed materials to do their jobs. Thus, this job factor was met and no dissatisfaction arose.

Concerning the motivation factors in this study, Academic Freedom was addressed and led to job satisfaction. Impacting Student Development, a motivation factor, was addressed and led to job satisfaction as well. The other motivation factor in this study was Acknowledgement. College administrators and full-time faculty did not address this factor, however, fellow adjuncts and students provided verbal praise to the participants. Based on the findings, Acknowledgement was addressed.

Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman (1993) concluded that when hygiene factors are high, meaning there is a greater presence of no dissatisfaction than dissatisfaction, and motivation factors are high, meaning a greater presence of satisfaction than no satisfaction, an ideal workplace with little complaints has been created. This study’s findings align with Herzberg’s conclusion, and it appears that the participants’ may work in an ideal work setting.
Chapter 5
Summary, Implications and Conclusion

Summary

The purpose of this study was to explore the work experiences of adjunct faculty members working in career colleges. Additionally, the goal was to understand the factors that influence the participants’ work experiences. The following research questions guided this study:

• What are the experiences of Adjunct Faculty working in Career Colleges?

• What factors influence the experiences of Adjunct Faculty working in Career Colleges?

A qualitative research design was used to explore the participants’ work experiences and data were analyzed inductively. Ten adjunct faculty members, six women and four men, comprised this study. Participants were selected via criteria-based sampling. All participants taught in a career college in the southeastern United States. Seven participants taught General Education courses, two taught Business courses, and one taught Allied Health courses. Semi-structured in-depth interviews, documentation review, and direct observation were used as data collection methods. The initial interviews ranged from fifty-five minutes to ninety minutes in length. Six interviews were conducted by telephone using FreeConferenceCall.com, and four in-depth interviews were conducted in-person at the participants’ respective colleges.

A second interview was conducted with nine of the ten participants to discuss and confirm this study’s findings. The second interviews ranged from sixty minutes to eighty minutes in length.

This chapter is divided into three sections: Implications for Theory, Implications for Research, and Implications for Practice. The conclusion, limitations, and final remarks are presented in this chapter as well.
Implications for Theory

Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory was used as the theoretical framework for this study. Through the inductive analysis of the data, the findings confirmed many components of this theory and indicated areas for further exploration. These are discussed in this section.

Hygiene Factors

Hygiene factors, as described by Herzberg, are extrinsic workplace influences that, if not met could lead to workplace dissatisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). If they are met, they can lead to no dissatisfaction, but are never provide sustainable satisfaction (Herzberg, et al., 1959). Herzberg’s examples of hygiene factors include Company Policies and Administration, Supervision, Interpersonal Relations, Status, Working Conditions, Job Security, and Salary. Three hygiene factors were identified in this study. They are Professional Inclusion, which aligns with interpersonal relations and supervision, Flexible Work Schedule, which aligns with the working conditions, and Resources, which also aligns with the working conditions.

The findings confirmed Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory that hygiene factors lead to dissatisfaction or no dissatisfaction, and motivation factors lead to satisfaction or no satisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959).

Professional Inclusion. The first theme that emerged in this study was professional inclusion. According to Herzberg’s taxonomy, this could be characterized as a hygiene factor since it relates to the job context (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). The job context is the workplace factor that surrounds the job itself (Herzberg et al., 1959). This job factor was not met in the participants’ workplace, and this is consistent with Herzberg’s findings.

There are number of ways in which findings from this study enhances previous theory. Herzberg found that when job dissatisfaction occurred, employees job performance declined
Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman (1959). However, the findings in this study showed that the participants’ productivity did not decline when professional inclusion was not met. Participants continued to work closely with students, create new student organizations, and shared resources with fellow adjuncts to ensure they were adequately performing their jobs. Thus, this study has the ability to impact theory and adds to Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory concerning the hygiene factors.

Another way in which this theme enhances theory is it alignment to Herzberg’s supervision workplace factor. Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) defined supervision as the social and technical aptitude of managers to be fair in allocated work and support of its employees. In this study, professional inclusion focused on how adjuncts are integrated and supported in the education department. Within this study, supervision and professional inclusion encompassed the same extrinsic work factors and confirms Herzberg’s findings that supervisors’ treatment and support of employees must be met for no dissatisfaction to occur. In this study, this hygiene factor was not met, and thus, dissatisfaction was present.

Resources. The second theme that emerged in this study was resources. Resources were categorized as hygiene factors because the alignment to Herzberg’s working conditions work factors. Working conditions, according to Herzberg, is job context factors (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959).

The theme that emerged from this study, resources, was similar to working conditions in many ways. For example, working conditions, according to Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1993), related to the adequacy of the facilities, to include office space, and the tools to perform the work. While Herzberg emphasized that the working conditions must be met by the organization, this study showed that these needs could be met in other ways. Thus, with further
exploration, this finding could lead to a more nuanced perspective with regard to hygiene factors and how they can be met in the workplace.

**Flexible Work Schedule.** A flexible work schedule can be categorized as a hygiene factor as it is external to the job. If not addressed in the workplace, this factor can lead to job dissatisfaction and if it is addressed, according to Herzberg, it will lead to no dissatisfaction, but not satisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). This was consistent with the findings of this study. Every participant referred to the flexible work schedule as a major contributor to their pursing the job and a reason that they were able remain in their adjunct position. However, job satisfaction itself was not related to this factor. Thus, the findings related to flexible work schedule confirm Herzberg’s assertions that, when met, hygiene factors lead to no dissatisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993).

The importance of job flexibility cannot be underscored. All of the participants indicated that without this factor, they would not be able to remain in their positions. Thus, meeting this job factor allowed for the motivational factors to occur, but without this need being met, most adjunct instructors would have chosen to leave their positions despite satisfaction resulting from other factors.

The findings surrounding this theme can be further explored to uncover if there is in fact a continuum between hygiene and motivation factors where either factor can influence satisfaction and dissatisfaction. This exploration would add to the discussion on Herzberg’s hygiene factor.
Motivation Factors

Motivation factors, according to Herzberg, are workplace factors that include the job content (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). According to Herzberg, if a motivation factor is met, satisfaction could occur, however, if not met, no satisfaction will occur (Herzberg, et. al., 1993). The motivation factors are intrinsic factors (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1967).

The job content factors include advancement, promotion, the work itself, responsibility, growth, and recognition (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). In this study, three motivation factors were identified. Those factors are Academic Freedom, which aligns to the work itself, Impacting Student Development, which aligns to work itself, and Acknowledgment, which aligns to recognition.

**Academic Freedom.** Academic freedom can be categorized as a motivation factor as it relates to the work itself (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). Herzberg defined the work itself as the actual content of the job and its positive or negative effect on the employees (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). In this study, academic freedom is defined as the independence of adjuncts to decide how best to lead the instruction in their respective classes. This emergent theme aligns and supports Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory. Herzberg references creativity in the job as a work itself job factor that leads to job satisfaction, if met in the workplace (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). Creativity and academic freedom are very similar, and the findings showed that this factor was addressed in the workplace and lead to job satisfaction in this study.

Additionally, the findings surrounding academic freedom indicated that this workplace factor only existed because of the lack of administrative support and professional inclusion. While Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1993) found that hygiene and motivation factors are
on two continuums; he did not recognize that they might be interrelated. For example, participants in this study indicated that the lack of professional inclusion, a hygiene factor, contributed directly to academic freedom, a motivation factor. That is, it was because of the lack of administrative support and inclusion that adjuncts were allowed to be creative in their classroom instruction, promoting student cellular telephone use as a learning tool and organizing class field trips to expose students to real-world experiences beyond the classroom lessons.

The participants repeatedly referred to academic freedom as one of leading contributors to their workplace satisfaction.

**Impacting Student Development.** Impacting student development could be categorized as a motivation factor since it is a job content factor that focused on the actual work. According to Herzberg, the work itself job factor includes the actual work and the routine or varied job that is performed (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). The work can be exceptionally easy or excessively challenging (Herzberg, et al., 1993). The findings in this study indicated that the work with students included addressing challenges that impacted the students’ social, mental, and academic growth and development. This finding aligns with Herzberg’s Two-Factor motivation factor, and the work itself workplace factor. This motivation factor was met in the workplace and led to job satisfaction.

**Acknowledgement.** Acknowledgement was a theme that emerged in this study. This could be characterized as a motivation factor because it relates to Herzberg’s recognition workplace factor. Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1993) discussed recognition as doing things well in the job and having the opportunity for reward and acknowledgement. Acknowledgment extends the definition of recognition as its origin, in this study, centers on the verbal praise and acceptance of adjunct faculty members’ contributions to the college, rather than
the receipt of rewards or incentives for doing the work.

Additionally, Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory indicated that recognition could be derived from a host of sources, including peers, supervisors, and professional colleagues (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). In the context of this study, professional acknowledgment was also derived from a number of sources including peers and students with whom the adjunct instructors worked. Thus, it is consistent with Herzberg’s theory that when met, employees are satisfied.

**Summary of Implications for Theory**

In summary, the findings confirmed Herzberg’s theory showing that when hygiene factors are not met, dissatisfaction will occur. However, when they are met, employees do not display job dissatisfaction. Similarly, the findings confirmed that when motivation factors are met, individual experience satisfaction in their work. Herzberg does acknowledge, however, that the lack of motivational factors leads to no satisfaction resulting in a decrease in work performance (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). Since all participants in this study identified motivational factors, this assertion could not be confirmed.

In addition to confirming Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory assertions, the qualitative nature of this study provided the opportunity to identify additional job-related factors that may be considered hygiene or motivational factors. For example, academic freedom does not appear on Herzberg’s list of motivators that is distributed in his quantitative assessment. Thus, by adding this motivational factor, it may be easier to understand why faculty members find satisfaction in their jobs.
Implications for Research

The findings in this study indicated that the experiences of adjuncts working in career colleges are worthy of further exploration. There has been a wealth of research on adjunct instructors working in traditional colleges, community colleges, and technical institutions (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007). However, based on the current literature there are a limited number of studies that address the workplace satisfaction of adjuncts working in career colleges. The goal of this study was to give a voice to this unrepresented faculty by exploring their job satisfaction, while addressing the gap in the literature.

This section of the chapter discusses job satisfaction studies that have been conducted in the field of education as they relate to the findings of this study. In addition, it offers recommendations for future research.

Job Satisfaction Studies

In Schulz’s (2009) study, 930 adjunct faculty members were surveyed in an Iowa Community College concerning their job satisfaction using Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory. Overall, the study found that participants were satisfied in their job, with 85% reporting they were satisfied. The findings showed that classroom autonomy and workplace independence were the leading job satisfaction factor. However, using survey methodology, this study did not ask about the impact of faculty on student development. Based on the findings of the current study, the ability to impact student development was clearly a high contributor to workplace satisfaction for the participants interviewed. Thus, future research should further explore this as a potential motivational factor, which may not currently be measured by the currently existing quantitative surveys related to hygiene and motivation factors.

In a 2001 qualitative study with 64 Minnesota Colleges’ adjuncts, using Herzberg’s Two-
Factor Theory, Berning found adjuncts were dissatisfied in their work. Overall, Berning’s (2001) study found that adjuncts are not integrated in the academic culture in colleges. In this current study, the participants interviewed discussed they too lacked personal inclusion and administrative support. A further exploration of the interpersonal relations between adjuncts and college administrators could be a hygiene factor that leads to greater understanding of the data in a qualitative study.

In studies conducted by Gappa and Leslie (2002), Gappa, Austin, and Trice (2007) and Wallin (2005), the researchers found that adjuncts were displeased with work their hours that included teaching mornings, late nights, and weekends. Each of the survey methodologies used by the aforementioned researchers did not explore adjuncts working in career colleges. Additionally, the findings in this study refuted the previous research concerning adjuncts feelings towards work hours. In this study, a flexible teaching schedule was a most important factor for participants to accept and remain in their adjunct positions. To this end, further research could be conducted to study the working conditions, and how they impact job satisfaction.

Bogert (2004) conducted a study with the Chief Academic Officers, Program Directors, and 26 adjunct faculty at three Florida community colleges using Herzberg’s Two-Factor in a qualitative case study. Through the use of faculty focus groups, the study found that adjuncts were highly satisfied with the teaching itself, and one of the highest levels of satisfaction was among the interaction between adjuncts and full-time faculty. In this current study, participants also indicated that they were satisfied in their job due to their actual work. Several motivational factors, to include impacting student development and academic freedom, attributed to this job satisfaction. Different from Bogert’s (2004) findings, in this current study, participants did not experience job satisfaction based on interactions and professional inclusion in their respective
colleges.

Research on the professional engagement and interpersonal relations between full-time and adjunct faculty in career colleges could be further explored to learn if these factors lead to job satisfaction, as found in Bogert’s (2004) study.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

This study began the discussion on adjunct faculty experiences in career colleges and the influences upon their work. The ten participants shared new insight and meaningful influences on their job dissatisfaction and satisfaction. While the findings yielded rich data, there is a need for additional studies on this faculty population.

Imminent studies should be conducted to continue adding to the limited literature on this growing faculty majority. These studies could extend the literature not only by focusing on this understudied population, but also by exploring additional workplace factors that contribute to dissatisfaction and satisfaction. The following are some general recommendations for future research.

Future studies can improve the lives of adjuncts, enhance the faculty culture, and offer more in-depth references to the workplace factors that are specific to the career college faculty.

The first recommendation is to conduct a qualitative study at large career colleges that offer graduate degrees and online courses in the Northeast, Southwest, Midwest, and West regions of the United States. These colleges comprise a multi-national enterprise with locations throughout the United States and Canada. These experiences may add new data to better understand the experiences of faculty working in career colleges beyond the southeastern United States.
The second recommendation is to conduct an in-depth case study to explore the dynamics discussed by participants in this study through other data collection methods.

A third recommendation is to conduct a quantitative study that would provide verifiable, replicable data to solidify this study’s findings. This could address factors not incorporated in the commonly used cross-sectional surveys to include impacting student development, academic freedom and flexible work schedule, as defined in this current study.

**Implications for Practice**

The participants’ data showed there are hygiene factors and motivation factors that influenced work experiences that faculty, administrators, and other associated with adjunct instructors should consider.

While the motivation factors were more frequently presented in the data, participants did express workplace challenges that were initially present that had been overcome. For example, the participants’ administrators did not provide resources; however, each participant worked closely with fellow adjuncts and found the resources to perform their duties. One participant shared that he purchased the needed materials. Another shared that he shared his resources with others faculty during the evenings classes.

**Recommendations for Adjuncts Instructors at Career Colleges**

**Professional Inclusion.** To effectively address professional inclusion in career colleges, adjuncts will need to share their desire to be involved in shared governance. In this study, participants expressed that they had not communicated their workplace challenges with their administrators. This workplace factor, professional inclusion, could be addressed by adjuncts volunteering to serve on committees at their colleges, requesting a meeting time with their Program Directors or Deans to openly share their workplace needs.
More candidly, adjuncts during their meetings with administrators, can ask are the opportunities for adjuncts beyond classroom instructor in order to learn the perceptions administrators have towards their inclusion in the department.

**Acknowledgement.** In this study, participants shared they were praised for their work and contributions to their colleges by peers and students; however, they did not receive the same recognition from administrators. While the participants embraced the accolades from others, the findings in this study indicated they desired praise from administrators.

Similar to addressing professional inclusion, adjuncts should become active champions by expressing what they need to be most successful and satisfied in the workplace. Beyond sharing their workplace successes, adjuncts may consider forming an adjunct committee that meets monthly via an online chat. During this chat the adjuncts can discuss their creative teaching methods, students’ success, and share professional testimonials of their best practices. This group could have officers and one member of the committee could attend the monthly faculty meeting and report back to the group. Additionally, the adjunct committee could invite one administrator a month to attend their online meeting, so they may learn of the great work adjuncts are doing and become engaged with their adjunct faculty members.

**Resources.** Participants in this study shared that their colleges did not provide resources needed to perform their duties. However, the work was not impacted, as the participants worked in concert with other adjuncts to ensure they had the resources. The need for resources was not shared with the administrators. The adjuncts in this study were resilient and creative. They did not focus on the lack of resources available; they found alternatives to the workplace challenges and preformed their duties as assigned.

For adjunct instructors working in career colleges it may be a good strategy to establish
good relationships with other adjuncts. Working in conjunction with a peer can provide support, as found in this study. Adjuncts in this study praised each other’s efforts, shared classroom materials, and coordinated times to use full-time faculty members’ offices. In addition to working in partnership with a fellow adjunct faculty member, it may be wise to build rapport with full-time faculty. Full-time faculty can share insight on decisions made in the department, can offer leadership to a new adjunct faculty member, and usually will have an office that can be available to an adjunct for use. Making the connections in the workplace to address resources was clearly a workplace tenet that led to the participants in this study overcoming the lack of office space and classroom materials.

Adjunct instructors should consider themselves as resources and should share their talents with other faculty and staff to provide assistance and receive such from others in the workplace. By doing so, a sense of team and community can be created to reduce the presence of a lack of resources and services among all faculty.

**Academic Freedom.** The participants in this study shared that they appreciated the opportunity to self-govern their courses by choosing which teaching methods and content would best engage their students. Additionally, the findings in this study indicated that this workplace factor was satisfied through a hygiene factor, professional inclusion, not being met in the workplace. It is important for adjuncts to identify their workplace hygiene and motivation factors and determine the correlation, if any, between all workplace factors.

Adjuncts should be independent thinkers and creative in their classroom instruction. The participants in this study found satisfaction in having freedom in determining how they taught their courses without administrators’ involvement. Adjuncts should consider what content, teaching methodologies, and technologies they can employ in their classes with limited
administrative support. Additionally, adjunct faculty members in a career college should know they may have to serve as mentors and support staff to students to address social, mental, and academic growth and development, in addition to teaching.

Whether it is a lack of professional inclusion, limited resources, or a feeling of not being recognized by college administrators, adjuncts have a job to perform, and students are counting on them to be at their best each day. A no-excuses mantra should be embraced by adjuncts. Adjuncts should express their needs to administrators, while ensuring they are collaborating with peers, creatively exploring options, and always improvising to ensure work resources are present.

**Recommendation for Administrators at Career Colleges**

Sweeney (2009) shared that a good start to embracing adjuncts would be valuing their input, providing fair treatment, honoring their contributions, and asking their opinions. The undervalued faculty members are the largest faculty group in traditional and career colleges (AAUP, 2011). The majority of adjuncts, 77%, have jobs outside of academe (Gappa, 2000, p. 76). This faculty majority lack job security and viable status in the academic culture (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Wallin, 2004).

**Professional Inclusion.** The findings in this study indicated that adjuncts were not embraced as integral members of the faculty. One participant questioned if his administrator knew his name. The data showed that participants desired to have this hygiene factor met in the workplace; however, administrators did not always address this need. Based on the findings, administrators should consider this workplace factor in their respective colleges.

Administrators could consider involving adjuncts in the shared governance of the college. The adjunct faculty members can be asked to attend the monthly faculty meeting via cellular telephone, if off campus, or in-person. To future engage the adjunct faculty, the administrators
can request that adjuncts share their insight on faculty-related agenda items.

Additionally, administrators can request that a full-time and adjunct faculty members work in tandem to share ideas as a faculty team.

**Resources.** In this current study, participants indicated that they found alternatives to obtaining resources, as they were not readily available at their colleges. While participants found solutions to this initial workplace challenge to perform their duties, each expressed that supplies were limited at the college. Administrators, based on the findings in this study, were not informed of the adjunct instructors’ needs. To best address the resource workplace tenet, there are several recommendations that I offer.

Administrators could consider a web-based medium where faculty can access the available resources whether on campus, in their car, or at home. The college could provide an intranet site that all instructors could access to preview a list of available resources. In addition, there are limited or no offices for adjuncts, administrators could establish day a team-teach approach in the administrative area. For example, a night faculty would have access to the office at night, and a day faculty would have access in the day. Where there is a shortage of desk space, the administrator could allow faculty to use their office for student advisement and meetings as a show of inclusion in the department. Each faculty member would have a school provided locked file cabinet to house his or her personal effects.

**Acknowledgement.** While peers and students recognized the work of adjuncts in this study, the participants indicated that they were not acknowledged by their administration. For administrators, it may be helpful to be aware of the adjuncts needs and successes that may warrant recognition.
Administrators could work a flexible schedule one or two days a week, so they may be on campus in the evenings and on the weekends. During this time, the administrator could provide light refreshments during a class break and invite adjuncts in for a few moments as a reprieve from students for a social chat. This time may yield important information that the administrators would otherwise not receive in their traditional workday.

Another recommendation would be for administrators to obtain each adjunct instructor’s email address, and periodically send an email to engage the faculty member. The emails could be short, a few sentences, and request that adjuncts share any needs or questions.

In addition to the communication recommendations, administrators can create an adjunct faculty counsel. This counsel would meet quarterly to discuss one success and one challenge. Each adjunct would discuss their workplace challenges and successes among their peers, and the group would decide which job factors would be on their agenda for discussion. The meeting would occur on campus and would allow adjuncts that are off-campus to call-in to participate. The goal is to have a short meeting that allows the administrators to know the most pressing needs and to hear the successes of the adjunct faculty members.

The aforementioned recommendations to administrators could create a partnership in education where adjuncts feel interconnected with their administrators. For the administrators, they could become knowledgeable about the talents and services adjuncts bring to the college beyond their teaching skills, and thus allow for greater success in the overall operations of the career college.

**Recommendations for Hiring and Managing Adjuncts at Career Colleges**

The findings in this study showed that adjuncts appreciated flexible work schedules, impacting student development, and academic freedom. Additionally, the findings indicated that
adjuncts desired recognition from administrators and wanted to be considered integral members of in their departments.

When considering someone for the adjunct position, the college should seek a professional that works well with little direction. Also, the candidate should be creative in their planning of lessons and helping students to reach their academic goals. A hiring administrator should ensure the candidate appreciates an ever-changing work schedule and can improvise to get the job done.

After hiring the adjunct, the administrator should provide a communication medium by which they can learn of the needs and support the successes of the adjunct. The administrator should be fully aware that the adjunct instructor will forge an interpersonal relationship with fellow adjuncts to support their work. As a caution, the administrator should know that the adjunct faculty member might not freely share their workplace needs; therefore, providing a supportive work environment may be essential to the success of the new employee.

**Conclusion**

This study was conducted to explore the experiences of adjunct faculty working in career colleges. More specifically, this study was conducted to understand the influences on the work experiences of career college adjuncts. In Chapter One, the statement of the problem, practical and intellectual goals, and the theoretical framework were discussed. Chapter Two was a review of the literature relevant to career colleges, adjuncts and job factors that influence adjuncts’ workplace satisfaction. The third chapter introduced the research design, sampling protocol, data collection, data analysis methods, and the trustworthiness of this study. Chapter Four presented a description of the ten participants, a thematic outline, the emergent themes, and the initial interpretation of this study’s findings.
There were six emergent themes that resulted from the inductive data analysis:

1. Professional Inclusion
2. Impacting Student Development
3. Flexible Work Schedule
4. Academic Freedom
5. Acknowledgment
6. Resources

The participants in this study indicated they were enthusiastic and shared their experiences openly and freely. The findings showed that the participants were innovators. They collaborated to ensure the essential classroom resources were present to perform their duties; they supported and acknowledged other adjunct’s work. The only dissatifier, in this study, was professional inclusion.

The ten participants were aware of the strengths and challenges in their workplaces. They made a concerted effort to forgo becoming dissatisfied with their work and embraced a teamwork mantra in their respective colleges to ensure their work efforts remained effective and professional. Stephany chose to create a new student organization, while Allan volunteered time to tutor students from other disciplines.

Participants did not rely on their administrators to change their leadership methods toward providing support, classroom and office equipment, and acknowledging their work. The findings indicated that the participants acknowledged each other’s workplace successes, shared resources to perform their duties, enjoyed impacting student development, and employed innovative and creative teaching methods in their classes to remain satisfied with their work.
Limitations

This study included ten adjuncts that worked in the southeastern United States in small career colleges with enrollments that ranged from three hundred to six hundred students. The participants had only taught in the southeastern United States and had limited college teaching experience prior to accepting the career college position.

The first limitation was the study was comprised of only adjuncts teaching at small career colleges in the southeastern United States. The participants worked at colleges that mainly offered associate degree programs. Additionally, the ten participants all worked in the same city. While this study provided findings that may be present in the work experiences of other adjuncts, the findings cannot be generalized to all adjuncts working in career colleges in the United States. There are many career colleges that offer graduate and online courses. Adjuncts teaching in those settings may have different work experiences than participants in this study.

Another limitation of this study is the data collection methods. In-depth semi-structured interviews were the primary data collection method. Documentation review and direct observations were used to collect data as well in this study. Through direct observations the interactions between adjuncts and administrators may have presented additional data in this study.

One additional limitation in this study was the diversity among the discipline represented. While the age, gender, and ethnicity were diverse components in this study, 70% of the participants taught general education courses. A more diverse mix of adjuncts from various undergraduate degree programs and graduate level programs would have offered a more diverse participant sampling.
Final Remarks

Adjuncts must remain steadfast, unmovable, and use their voices to ensure job satisfaction. Career college adjuncts should become partners in education by sharing their talents with administrators, expressing needs as they arise, and working in concert with administrators to ensure that the desired faculty support and professional inclusion are adequately addressed.
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Appendix A

Request for Site Access Letter

Dear ____________________:

My name is Telvis Rich, a doctoral student in the Education Department in the College of Professional Studies at Northeastern University in Boston, MA. I am writing to gain access, with your approval, to the adjunct faculty members’ email addresses with whom you work so I may advertise my study and recruit participants from your college.

The purpose of the study is to have adjuncts share their experiences. With the increase in adult learners returning to college, and others entering for the first time, there is an increase in the number of part-time faculty joining the teaching ranks in our nation’s career colleges.

The results of this study will hopefully serve as a reference that will afford college administrators and faculty the opportunity to better understand the work experiences of adjunct faculty in an effort to enhance the work environment and support part-time faculty members.

The selection criteria are as follows:
1. Participants must have taught in a career college for at least one year.
2. Participants must be willing to participate in one 90-minute interview at a time and location that facilitates an open, and freely engaging interview.
3. Participants must agree to the use of audio recording of the interview.
4. Participants must agree to the publishing of the data in the dissertation with all personal information being held confidential, and a copy of the study made available for their review after completion of the study.

In this study, it is important to explore the perceptions adjunct faculty members have towards their work via interviews. Interested adjunct faculty will be asked to participate if they meet the aforementioned criteria. All interviews will be confidential, and the names of each participant and their respective colleges will not be included in the study. Pseudonyms will be used for each participant to ensure their privacy in the findings of the study. The audio-recorded interviews will be destroyed after data analysis.

Thank you for considering your adjunct faculty for this study. Please send the adjunct faculty members’ names and email addresses to me at rich.t@husky.neu.edu. If there are any questions, I can be reached at 404.901.3626.

Sincerely,
Telvis M. Rich, Doctoral Student
Dear ____________________,

My name is Telvis Rich, a doctoral student in the Education Department in the College of Professional Studies at Northeastern University in Boston, MA. The Dean of Education at your college shared your email address with me. I am conducting a study to understand the experiences of adjunct faculty members that work in career colleges, and you were recommended for consideration.

The purpose of the study is to have adjuncts share their experiences. With the increase in adult learners returning to college, and others entering for the first time, there is an increase in the number of part-time faculty joining the teaching ranks in our nation’s career colleges.

The results of this study will hopefully serve as a reference that will afford college administrators and faculty the opportunity to better understand the work experiences of adjunct faculty in an effort to enhance the work environment and support part-time faculty members.

The selection criteria are as follows:
1. Participants must have taught in a career college for at least one year.
2. Participants must be willing to participate in one 90-minute interview at a time and location that facilitates an open and freely engaging interview.
3. Participants must agree to the use of audio recording of the interview.
4. Participants must agree to the publishing of the data in the dissertation with all personal information being held confidential, and a copy of the study made available for their review after completion of the study.

In this study, it is important to explore the perceptions adjunct faculty members have towards their work via interviews. One interview will be conducted with you at a location and time that is most convenient. The interview will be audio-recorded and will be approximately 90 minutes in length. The interview will be confidential. Your name and college’s name will not be included in the study. Pseudonyms will be used to ensure your privacy in the findings of this study. The audio-recorded interview will be destroyed after data analysis.

The decision to participate in this research project is up to you and know that you will remain anonymous whether you choose to voluntary participate or not in this study. If you do not participate or if you decide to quit, you will not lose any rights, benefits, or services that you would otherwise have as an employee of the college.

If you meet the selection criteria and interested in participating in the study, please call me at 404.901.3626 or email me at rich.t@husky.neu.edu with a telephone number to contact you to further discuss your participation.

Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Telvis M. Rich, Doctoral Student
Appendix C

Informed Consent Letter

Northeastern University, College of Professional Studies, Doctor of Education Program
Principal Investigator: Dr. Tova Sanders
Student Researcher: Telvis M. Rich
Title: Partners In Education: The Experiences of Adjunct Faculty Working In Career Colleges

Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study

Why am I being asked to take part in this research study? We are inviting you to take part in this study because you have taught at least one year as an adjunct faculty member in a career college.

Why is this research study being done? The purpose of the study is to understand the experiences of career college adjunct faculty members and the influences that impact their work.

What will I be asked to do? You will be asked to participate in one interview. At the beginning of interview, you will be asked to give a brief description of your biography and some background on the experiences leading up to becoming a part-time faculty member working in a career college. You will then be asked to share insight on your experiences and influences as an adjunct faculty member working in a career college.

Where will this take place and how much of my time will it take? The interview will take place either over the phone or at a convenient public location (e.g. local library, café) at a time that best suits your schedule. The interview will be approximately 90-minutes in length and will be audio-recorded for transcription and analysis purposes only. After the interview is transcribed, you will be contacted by the researcher and asked to review the content and share if the data is accurate. This process should take no more than an hour of personal review.

Will there be any risk or discomfort for me? There is no foreseeable risk or discomfort for you. You can stop an interview for any reason and at any time. If you decide to discontinue participation in the study, any data collected or recorded will not be used in this study.

Will I benefit by being in this research study? There will be no direct benefit to you for taking part in the study. However, your answers may help us understand more about the experiences of adjunct faculty members that work in career colleges. The findings of this study may be used to develop means to better support adjunct faculty members by understanding their experiences and the influences therein.

Who will see the information about me? Your part in this study will be confidential. Only the researchers on this study will see the information about you. No reports or publications will use information that can identify you, your college, or any individual in any way. The audio-recorded interviews will be held in a secured location and will be destroyed after data analysis. Your name and the name of your college will not be used in this study.

Can I stop my participation in this study? Your participation in this research study is completely voluntary. Even if you begin the study, you may quit at any time. If you do not participate or if you decide to quit, you will not lose any rights, benefits, or services that you would otherwise have as an employee of the college.

Will I be paid for my participation? You will not be paid for your participation in this study.

Who can I contact if I have questions or problems? If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to contact Telvis M. Rich at 404.901.3626 or rich.t@husky.neu.edu, the person mainly responsible for the research study and interviewing. You can also contact the Principal Investigator, Dr. Tova Sanders at 202.549.3240 or t.sanders@neu.edu.

Who can I contact about my rights as a participant? If you have any questions about your rights as a participant, you may contact Nan C. Regina, Director, Human Subject Research Protection, 960 Renaissance Park, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115. Telephone: 617.373.4588 Email: irb@neu.edu. You may call anonymously, if you wish.

Please keep this form for your records. Thank you.
Appendix D

Interview Protocol

**Primary Questions for the Interview**

*(Audio-recording begins)*

**Introduction:** Thank you for taking the time to participate in this study. We have reviewed the consent form together, you have been provided a copy of the form for your records and you have given your verbal consent to participate. This interview will last approximately 90 minutes and is being audio-recorded for transcription and analysis purposes only. The information shared in the interview will be confidential. Your name and school’s name will not be included in this study to protect your privacy. Before we begin, do you have any questions? Please share some background information with me.

How many years have you taught as a part-time faculty member in a career college?

How many career colleges have you worked as an adjunct instructor?

Please share the age range that encompasses you? 20-25___; 26-30___; 31-35___; 36-40___; 41-46___; 47-50___; 51-55___; 56-60___; 61-65___; 66-70___

What is your ethnicity? White/Caucasian___; Black/African American___; Hispanic___; Asian___; Other________________

Today we will focus on your work-related experiences as an adjunct instructor and the influences on those experiences. Is this okay? Great! Let’s begin.

1. Briefly describe how you began teaching as an adjunct instructor.
   
   Prompt: Why did you decide to become an adjunct instructor?

2. Describe your work at the college you teach as an adjunct instructor.
   
   Prompt: Tell me about a typical day as an adjunct instructor from the time you wake until you go to sleep.

3. Describe your relationship with co-workers and administrators at the college you teach as an adjunct instructor.

4. Describe your relationship with the person who has been the most influential in your teaching as an adjunct instructor in a career college.
5. Tell me a story about an interaction with the person who has been most influential in your teaching experience.

   Prompt: Describe what exactly happened.

   Prompt: Describe how you felt during this experience.

6. If applicable, describe a time when you were dissatisfied as an adjunct instructor.

   Prompt: Describe what you felt during this experience.

7. If applicable, describe a time when you were especially satisfied as an adjunct instructor.

   Prompt: Who was involved and what role did they play?

8. Describe your overall sense of satisfaction with your role as an adjunct faculty member.

   Prompt: Describe factors that contributed to any sense of satisfaction.

   Prompt: Describe factors that contributed to any sense of dissatisfaction.

9. Describe what motivates you in your work as an adjunct faculty?

10. What is satisfying in your work at the college you teach as an adjunct instructor?

Close: Thank you for taking time to meet with me today. Know, your information shared today is held in confidence and will only inform this study. How are you feeling? Are there any questions? This interview will be transcribed. Afterwards, I would like you to review the content for accuracy. The goal is to ensure the essence of your experience is captured. The transcribed interview will be emailed to you for review. The review should only take approximately an hour of your time. Please review and share any updates or changes that are needed. If the data is accurate, please let me know as well in your email response. I will adhere to your updates, and then prepare the findings for final analysis for completion of this study. Is this okay? Great. Thank you again. (Audio-recording ends)