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ABSTRACT

Grounded in the extant literature, the purpose of this qualitative study was to explore adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments at two campuses of a public urban university system in the Northeastern United States. The study utilized Herzberg et al.'s motivation-hygiene theory, also known as two-factor theory, and Husserl's transcendental phenomenological research design. The central research question was "What are adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching contracts?" The data collection consisted of a demographic questionnaire, open-ended semi-structured interviews with twelve adjunct faculty who taught under multi-year contracts from 2017 to 2020, a focus group discussion, and a multi-year contract dossier published by the faculty labor union. The Moustakas' modified van Kaam's seven-step method of analysis of phenomenological data served to conduct data analysis for theme development, and descriptions of meanings and essences of participants' lived experiences. Three themes emerged: Partial job satisfaction, institutional recognition, and *bells and whistles* [emphasis added]. The study's main finding was that multi-year contracts provided the twelve adjunct faculty partial job satisfaction due to temporary job security, which resulted in temporary job stability and lessened anxiety. Their partial job satisfaction stemmed from perceiving the multi-year contract as an institutional recognition of longevity and teaching performance devoid of additional benefits and improved working conditions.

*Keywords*: perception, partial job satisfaction, multi-year teaching appointment, motivation, job security, lived experience, transcendental phenomenology
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Overview

After nearly a century of reliance on non-tenured faculty to train human capital in the United States of America (U.S.), higher education institutions (HEIs) have introduced multi-year teaching appointments (MYTAs) to ameliorate the lack of job security, stability, and satisfaction adjunct faculty perceive of their part-time teaching employment (Eagan et al., 2016; Kezar, 2012). The U.S. Education Department’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) reported that 762, 400 (46%) out of 1.5 million faculty in 2018, were adjuncts (NCES, 2019). Over the past decade, colleges and universities have increasingly instituted multi-year teaching (MYTCs) contracts (Elliott-Negri, 2018; Tolley & Edwards, 2018). The number of contingent faculty with multi-year appointments increased from 17.2% in 2015 to 22.3% in 2018. Similarly, the number of adjunct faculty with multi-year contracts rose from 5.4% in 2015 to 8.4% in 2018 (Contract Length, 2017, 2020). This Chapter provides a framework for exploratory phenomenological research on adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments. Besides this Overview, the Chapter includes a Background section outlining a summary of the most relevant literature and three sub-sections about the historical context in which the problem has evolved; the social context milieu in which adjunct faculty have functioned; and the theoretical context guiding the study. Other sections are Situation of Self, Problem Statement, Purpose Statement, Significance of the Study, Research Questions, Sub-questions, Definitions, and a Chapter Summary.

Background

This section focuses on the historical, social, and theoretical contexts of adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with part-time teaching contracts. The historical context includes
how this issue has evolved. The social context focuses on how adjunct faculty have coped with their institutional standing, mobility, and aspirations in the U.S. higher education establishment over the past nine decades. Moreover, via the theory of motivation, I examined the theoretical context researchers have used to analyze the adjunct faculty plight.

**Historical Context**

Over the past nine decades, higher learning institutions have heavily relied on part-time faculty to train the U.S. human capital (Danaei, 2019; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Tuckman, 1978). The American Association of University Professors (AAUP), regarded as one of the most authoritative faculty affairs sources in the country, validates this fact (AAUP, 2020). In one of its surveys, AAUP reported that following the U.S. Great Depression, between 1975 and 2008, non-tenured part-time and full-time faculty increased by 25% (2020). As shown in Figure 1, out of all faculty in 1975, 45% were full-time tenured and tenure-track, and 55% had contingent contracts, including full-time non-tenure-track, part-time, and graduate student employees.

Forty-five years later, in 2015, full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty had dropped to 30%, while contingent faculty increased to 70%. In the same period, part-time faculty steadily increased from 24% in 1975 to 33% in 1995 and 40% in 2015. However, full-time faculty decreased steadily from 29% in 1975 to 25% in 1995 and 21% in 2015. In addition to cited data, the U.S. Education Department’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) reported that between 1999 and 2018, there were fluctuations in the rate of full-time and part-time faculty (NCES, 2019).

There have been fluctuations in the proportion of part-timers versus full-timers. From 2011 to 2018, an estimated 7% of part-time faculty drop took place. Kezar and Scott (2019) found that non-tenure-track faculty, including adjuncts, make 70% of the professoriate in the
United States. Regardless of fluctuations in the proportion of part-time versus full-time faculty at any given time, the plight of adjunct instructors for stable employment has remained unchanged.

**Figure 1**


Note: As per AAUP policy, materials displayed on its sites may be “displayed” or “redistributed for non-commercial purposes” including “research,” and “teaching.” Cited materials “must be” attributed to the AAUP respective source (see https://www.aaup.org/privacy-policy-terms-use).

In reviewed studies published over the past five years, researchers found that the trend of unstable employment among part-time faculty has persisted over the years (Kezar & Bernstein-Sierra, 2016; Mech, 2017; Ott & Dippold, 2018; Ott & Cisneros, 2015; Pons et al., 2017; Rogers, 2015; Seipel & Larson, 2018; Smith, 2019; Vicente, 2018; Walters et al., 2019; Yu et al., 2015). These researchers have consistently corroborated that part-time faculty are hired on a semester basis and do most of the teaching without assurance of job security, stability, job satisfaction, and benefits customarily afforded to tenured and full-time faculty. In a survey of adjunct faculty
conducted in the Spring of 2020, 41% responded to the lack of job security (American Federation of Teachers, 2020).

To address the lack of adjunct faculty’s job satisfaction resulting from working conditions, higher education administrators have incorporated multi-year teaching appointments (MYTAs) in U.S. colleges and universities (Baldwin & Chronister, 2011; Kezar, 2012). MYTAs are also called multi-year teaching contracts (MYTCs) and consist of more than one academic year. Higher education administrators and faculty union leaders have indicated that the primary purpose of MYTCs is to provide adjuncts job security, the guaranteed workload of minimum contact teaching hours, professional and office hours, stable income, accrued sick leave, and other benefits customarily afforded to full-time and tenured faculty. Such efforts, which started in the second decade of the 21st century, were limited at first. For instance, Kezar (2012) found that only a handful of higher learning institutions had implemented MYTAs before 2012.

Over the past eight years, several thousands of colleges and universities have instituted MYTAs (Elliott-Negri, 2018; Gilmore, 2018; Samuels, 2017; Tolley, 2018; Tolley & Edwards, 2018; University of Michigan, 2020). The number of adjunct faculty with MYTCs has been gradually increasing over the past decade at degree-granting four and two-year public, private, for-profit, and nonprofit institutions of higher learning in the United States. The Chronicle of Higher Education reported that in 2015, of 900,000 non-tenured contingent track faculty teaching at 4,584 degree-granting institutions, 156,996 (17.2%) had multi-year contracts. Full-timers were 107,903 (11.8%), and adjunct faculty were 49,093 or 5.4% (Contract Length, 2017).

In 2016, of 911,290 non-tenured contingent track faculty teaching at 4,367 degree-granting institutions, there were 187,339 (20.6%) with multi-year appointments; full-timers were 121,704 (13.4%), and adjunct faculty were 65,635 or 7.2% (Contract Length, 2017). In 2018, of
907,181 non-tenure contingent track faculty teaching at 4,008 degree-granting institutions, there were 201,864 (22.3%) with multi-year contracts; full-timers were 126,061 (13.9%), and part-timers were 75,803 or 8.4% (Contract Length, 2020). Adjunct faculty with multi-year contracts rose from 5.4% in 2015 to 8.4% in 2018. A review of pertinent literature did not yield specific research studies about this population’s perception of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments.

There are many relevant studies on the adjunct faculty’s plight, perception of employment standing, and job satisfaction (Bakley & Bordersen, 2018; Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Baron-Nixon, 2007; Bickerstaff et al., 2021; Brennan & Magness, 2018; Boliltzer, 2019; Danaei, 2018; Eagan et al., 2016; Ferencz, 2017; Witt et al., 2021). However, many researchers who have conducted studies on adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction have primarily used quantitative methods (Barnett, 2018; Becher, 2019; Curtis, 2013; Eagan Jr. et al., 2016; Karpf, 2015; Page, 2017; Pugh, 2017). Researchers use data and information provided by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), which since its founding in 1915, has issued annual survey reports on the status of the profession and its membership.

Besides, AAUP has customarily commissioned targeted research on full-time and part-time faculty to different scholars and consultants (Curtis, 2013; Monks, 2009; Tuckman, 1978). They have shed light on the historical, social, and theoretical contexts of the topic of adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction in HEIs over the past nine decades. Another prominent source providing data about faculty’s job satisfaction is the Harvard Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education, known as COACHE (COACHE, 2007, 2010, 2018, & 2020). Researchers such as Crick et al. (2020) and Webber et al. (2018) rely on this authoritative source to conduct research focused on faculty’s job satisfaction with employment contracts and their
teaching experience. Most of the attention has been put on research about adjunct benefits such as salary, professional development, and amenities. However, none of these studies focused on adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction with multi-year contracts.

Social Context

A social context is a milieu of multiple historical, political, legal, procedural, organizational, institutional, individual, and personal socio-cultural trajectorial forces, directly and indirectly contouring people’s realities, experiences, behavior, and prospects (Schenkewitz, 2019). The academic milieu in which adjunct faculty have strived over the past century has limited their institutional standing, mobility, and aspirations in the U.S. higher education establishment. In late 1970, Howard Tuckman, one of the first scholars focusing on how part-time faculty have socialized and integrated into higher education echelons, documented the specific social context they have joined academe (Tuckman, 1978). Said study was entitled, *Who is Part-time in Academe?* With this widely cited seminal work commissioned by AAUP, AAUP set the trend in adjunct faculty scholarship and research agenda that has remained to the present time.

A salient contribution Howard Tuckman (1978) made to the body of knowledge and the social context of adjunct faculty was pioneering the creation of a peculiar adjunct faculty taxonomy which included seven distinct categories: the semiretired or “Hopeful Full-Timers”; the “Full-Mooners” about those with a full-time job outside academia; the “Homeworkers,” those with household responsibilities; the “Part-Mooners,” those who teach part-time while also work part-time outside of academia; and the “Unkowners,” who are other kinds of instructors who teach part-time, while dedicating themselves to a variety of other affairs outside of higher
education (pp. 307-309). This adjunct faculty taxonomy has served as a frame of reference for many subsequent studies conducted over the past 42 years.

As a follow-up to his initial research, Howard Tuckman co-authored a book with his wife Barbara Tuckman in 1981; its title was *Who are the part-timers and what are colleges doing for them?* (Tuckman & Tuckman, 1981). The question “Who are the part-timers?” has occupied the higher education establishment’s attention since the 1980s. AAUP broadened the adjunct faculty agenda to include whether part-time instruction adversely impacts teaching quality with this follow-up study. As Danaei (2019) investigated via a seven-year literature review on adjunct faculty, this kind of deficiency and focus have dominated adjunct faculty research inquiry since the early 1980s (Banachowski, 1996; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kezar & Bernstein-Sierra, 2016; Leslie et al., 1982; Wicks, 2020).

Tuckman’s 1978 seminal study’s significance lies in its findings that in social contextual terms, most adjunct faculty in the 1970s were happy or satisfied with their part-time positions and were not interested in full-time work. They were satisfied even when they had limited opportunities for being promoted to full-time positions and had unstable employment. In contrast, Tolley and Edwards (2018) found that most adjunct instructors preferred full-time positions. Yakoboski (2016) and Pons et al. (2017) found that adjuncts have low satisfaction with their part-time jobs.

Besides, the significance of Tuckman’s (1978) findings encompassed that some disadvantages of part-time teaching included a limited connection to the institution. These findings were also related to other faculty and students; overall, findings meant that adjunct faculty were disloyal, isolated, marginalized, and excluded from making academic decisions.
Most lacked fair wages or salaries commensurate with their teaching experience and academic qualifications.

Subsequent studies AAUP has published revolve around Tuckman’s findings (AAUP, 2019 & 2020; Monks, 2009). Emerging studies building the body of knowledge on adjunct faculty scholarship have also revolved around focusing on deficiencies or revisiting Tuckman’s initial findings (Crick, 2019; Ferencz, 2017). It plays like a broken record. For instance, in its publication titled *The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 2019-20*, AAUP limits its findings to financial considerations, part-time faculty inequitable salaries, lack of benefits and health insurance, and the potential impact of COVID-19 on the ability of HEIs to ensure enough funding for tenure-track full-time faculty positions (AAUP, 2020). AAUP’s annual reports do not offer in-depth information on adjunct faculty with multi-year teaching appointments of more than one year (AAUP, 2003, 2017, 2019, 2020, 2021). The reports are limited to teaching contracts between nine and twelve months and sharing complex data.

For instance, in its 2020-2021 *Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession*, AAUP revealed that “an ugly secret in higher education” is that “colleges and universities are not required to report detailed employment data on contingent faculty members” (AAUP, 2021, p. 12). Further, AAUP hinted at having no information about adjunct’s working conditions and contract length: “the fact remains that basic questions about the makeup, compensation, and working conditions of adjunct faculty members are difficult or impossible to answer” (p. 12). This AAUP’s statement means that colleges and universities have already spent a decade offering MYTCs without understanding how adjunct appointees experience such employment modalities.
In comparison to AAUP’s findings, most reviewed studies indicate that marginalization, disconnect, and lack of job stability are themes contingent faculty and, particularly, part-time faculty, experience within the social and academic contexts in which they have taught since the Great Depression (Banachowski, 1996; Danaei, 2018; Ferencz, 2017; Kezar & Bernstein-Sierra, 2016; Leslie et al., 1982; Tuckman, 1978). Although they have been part of a social and academic context in which tenured faculty enjoy academic freedom and benefits, part-time instructors have an inferior ranking status without having job stability, benefits, protections, and mobility within academia. With this study, the existing body of knowledge on adjunct faculty scholarship has grown with new knowledge beneficial for advocacy institutions such as AAUP, colleges and universities, faculty in general, students, education practitioners, administrators, and policymakers. The new knowledge about adjuncts’ perceptions of multi-year teaching appointments adds to the existing literature and positively affects higher education.

Theoretical Context

Theoretical frameworks play critical roles in qualitative inquiry. Considering that my utmost concern was how adjunct faculty perceive job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments, I conducted the study based on Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory (Herzberg et al., 1959) grounded in the reviewed literature. Herzberg posited that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are motivators and hygiene factors driving workers’ behavior and expectations. The first factor, job satisfaction, is linked to employees’ job responsibilities, input, productivity, growth, the role played, advancement, and talent. The second factor, dissatisfaction, is linked to hygiene factors such as the perception of job security, salaries, benefits, and overall working conditions. According to Herzberg, to motivate and satisfy employees, employers must meet both factors. Researchers have applied Herzberg’s theory to investigate adjunct faculty
perceptions of teaching employment (Ferencz, 2016; Gullickson, 2011; Kim, 2010; Millner-Harlee, 2010; Nelson, 2020; Page, 2018; Samora, 2013; Walton, 2018). This study was guided by this theory as well.

**Situation to Self**

The following section addresses my situation and motivation to conduct the study by applying a qualitative research method. As per convention, researchers apply qualitative research methods when they are interested in exploring and understanding participants' lived experiences with a particular phenomenon. "In a phenomenological investigation the researcher has a personal interest in whatever she or he seeks to know; the researcher is intimately connected with the phenomenon" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 59). Typically, researchers apply qualitative research methods when researching marginalized, disenfranchised, and misunderstood populations such as adjunct faculty to allow their voices to be heard (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

Furthermore, qualitative methods permit researchers to understand participants' experiences; both collaborate and interact closely during the research process. Customarily, qualitative research methods are chosen based on the researchers' ontological, epistemological and axiological philosophical assumptions (2018). Following, I outline the philosophical assumptions I brought to the study and social constructivism as the interpretive paradigm that guided it.

**Interpretive Framework**

Social constructivism guided the study. The concept of social constructivism is an interpretative framework through which researchers claim that knowledge-formation and conceptualization of self-identity result from people’s interactions with one another (Creswell & Poth, 2018; McKinley, 2015). This paradigm addresses how people understand their
surroundings (Creswell & Poth, 2018). In phenomenology, via this paradigm, researchers have the opportunity to convey their worldview of lived experiences (Husserl, 1931, 1973).

I embraced the social constructivism philosophy because I planned to interact with the study’s participants. Interacting with them during multiple in-depth interviews and the research process allowed knowledge-formation to flow freely based on their conceptualization of self, realities, and perceptions of lived experiences with a phenomenon. As found in relevant studies framed by social constructivism (Bakley, 2016; McKinley, 2015), as a research instrument, I bracketed my bias to ask participants to express their views of the phenomenon based on the interpretation of their subjective meaning and perception of lived experiences (Creswell & Poth, 2018). As indicated, Moustakas (1994) described the bracketing process outlined in Husserl’s theory of phenomenological reduction.

The study is relevant to my academic and professional interests, as, over the past two decades, I have worked in different capacities in higher education administration at an urban public university system in the Northeastern United States; I currently serve the University as a tenured higher education officer with a functional title of manager of adjunct affairs. My responsibilities include the coordination of multi-year teaching appointments. This practical experience, added to my axiological philosophical assumptions, has stressed my interest in researching adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with their employment.

**Philosophical Assumptions**

As I conducted this study, the three philosophical assumptions that guided me were *ontological, epistemological, and axiological*. My values and beliefs shape the three assumptions as my character and behavior influence the way I perceive lived experiences emanating from the environment in my surroundings. Following, I articulate such values and beliefs to denote the
different lenses through which I view the world, perceive phenomena, and this research study.

**Ontological Assumption**

Ontology permits researchers to view reality in a certain way. Some view reality as one that is tangible and practicable. Those who hold such a view tend to embrace positivism, a paradigm ascribed to quantitative research methods that focus on data and knowledge verification via empiricism (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Others, however, view reality as a byproduct of multiple realities germane and exclusive of their particular lived experiences with a phenomenon (2018). Researchers who embrace this view tend to conduct their studies by applying qualitative methods based on constructivist/interpretivist paradigms. I conducted this study through the lens of my ontological assumption.

**Epistemological Assumption**

Epistemology concerns knowledge, which derives from the interaction between and among individuals; the methodical interaction and relationship between researchers and study participants produce dialogue, which results in knowledge formation (Creswell & Poth, 2018). In this study, I used open-ended semi-structured interviews to produce a dialogue with each participant. The epistemological assumption aligns with the constructivist-interpretivism paradigm. It allowed me, as a researcher, to establish a relationship with participants and interact with them, which is contrary to the independent and presumed objective role researchers play when applying positivist paradigms and quantitative research methods.

**Axiological Assumption**

I am driven by axiological philosophical assumptions, meaning philosophical values and ethical principles that characterize me. According to Drob (2016), axiology refers to ethics and values, which influence the perception of life experiences. A standard practice in qualitative
research is that researchers disclose their values to the studies (Creswell & Poth, 2018). In other words, researchers’ values are shaped by gender, origin, upbringing, socio-economic and political status, culture, beliefs, and among other traits, experiences. My philosophical axiological point of view includes integrity, honesty, and interest in higher education and adjunct faculty research. I have high regard for teachers as I grew up witnessing how my mother devoted her life to teaching. These philosophical assumptions served me as a “heuristic” (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 18) to make decisions while understanding the complexity of the studied phenomenon. I disclosed the values and biases I brought to the study to ensure objective and impartial data analysis. Other assumptions of mine derive from my experience working in higher education administration over the past two decades. More specifically, I believe multi-year teaching appointments contribute to adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction.

**Problem Statement**

The problem is adjunct faculty’s perceived lack of job satisfaction with their part-time teaching positions (American Federation of Teachers, 2020; Kezar & Scott, 2019; Nelson et al., 2020; Reeder, 2020). To address this problem, researchers have recommended that HEIs offer adjunct faculty multi-year teaching appointments with a package of benefits, including job security, health insurance, a minimum teaching workload, office and professional hours, and annual leave (Kezar, 2012). In 2018, of 907,181 non-tenure contingent track faculty actively teaching, there were 201,864 (22.3%) with multi-year contracts; full-timers were 126,061 (13.9%), and part-timers were 75,803 or 8.4% (Contract Length, 2020).

Researchers have not conducted targeted qualitative research on adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction with such employment prototype (Page, 2017; Pons et al., 2017; Yakoboski, 2016). Exploring this phenomenon narrowed the existing literature gap and produced
new knowledge regarding whether adjunct faculty perceive multi-year employment as a job satisfaction factor. It was essential to investigate this phenomenon to generate new valuable knowledge for higher education administrators to make informed hiring decisions. Therefore, there was a need for a qualitative phenomenological study to explore this population and its perception of lived experience and job satisfaction with the phenomenon of teaching under multi-year contracts.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this transcendental phenomenological study was to explore the perception of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments of twelve adjunct faculty who taught from fall 2017 to fall 2020 at two public colleges in the Northeastern United States. Job satisfaction is a state of mind or perception that results from a gratifying job experience imbued with intrinsic motivational factors (Herzberg et al., 1959; Judge et al., 2017; Noe et al., 2016). Multi-year teaching appointments are labor contracts encompassing teaching for more than one academic year and afford stable employment, contributing to adjunct faculty job satisfaction (AAUP, 2020; Kezar, 2012; NCES, 2019). The theoretical framework that guided the study was Herzberg et al.’s (1959) motivation-hygiene or two-factor theory.

**Significance of the Study**

The study's theoretical significance centered on its corroboration of Herzberg et al.'s (1959) two-factor theory. Herzberg and his co-authors found that workers are motivated by intrinsic and extrinsic factors that contribute to job satisfaction and exacerbate job dissatisfaction. As found in related literature, researchers have used this theory to investigate adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with their employment (Auxier & Larizza, 2018; Hoyt, 2012; Nelson et al., 2020). For instance, Vicente’s (2018) study closely relates to this
study using Herzberg et al.'s theory of motivation and Husserl's phenomenological conceptual framework (Moustakas, 1994). However, none of the previously cited researchers applied these frameworks to investigate adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year appointments. The theoretical significance derived from applying these frameworks to the study to address a topic barely discussed in the existing literature.

The study's empirical significance stemmed from relating to existing studies. Researchers who investigated adjunct faculty job satisfaction have recommended further research on similar topics (Bakley & Bodersen, 2018; Ferencz, 2017; Nelson et al., 2020; Page, 2017; Smith, 2019; Walton, 2018). For instance, Ferencz (2017) recommended that future studies on adjunct faculty should not emphasize negative perspectives; instead, the focus should be on initiatives that work and improve adjuncts' job satisfaction. Following this type of recommendation, the study focused on twelve adjunct faculty who experienced teaching under multi-year contracts; the expectation was that teaching under multi-year contracts would improve their perception of job satisfaction. I explored this topic by conducting a novel phenomenological study, which narrowed the gap in the empirical, peer-reviewed literature.

The qualitative research has practical significance in that new knowledge was methodically developed. The resulting knowledge is helpful to effect change on a larger scale in the academic establishment. The study offers significant findings of much value for adjunct faculty and stakeholders. For instance, having new knowledge about their peers' perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year contracts provides adjunct faculty valuable insight for accepting or rejecting offers of multi-year positions.

New knowledge can serve as the basis for offering adjunct faculty multi-year contracts instead of the semester-to-semester option for higher education practitioners. Multi-year
appointments include a package of benefits and employment terms geared toward affording adjunct faculty job security. Researchers have found that employment terms and contract renewal are themes associated with work satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Ott & Cisneros, 2015; Larson et al., 2017; Nelson et al., 2020). Generating knowledge about this topic, ascertained the study’s practical significance as resulting findings can help higher education leaders address institutional deficiencies impacting adjunct faculty satisfaction with their teaching positions.

**Research Questions**

I formulated a central research question (RQ) and two sub-questions (SQs) to explore the phenomenon. The central RQ aligned with the study’s problem and purpose statements. The SQs focused on specific aspects of the RQ and drew from Herzberg et al.’s (1959) two-factor theory, which postulates that workers’ perception of job satisfaction with their teaching employment gravitates between two main factors — job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. SQ one addressed the satisfaction factor and related subordinate constructs Herzberg listed as intrinsic in the theory of motivation. Similarly, SQ two addressed the dissatisfaction or hygiene factor and its conceptual elements, as Herzberg listed in the theory of motivation.

**Central Research Question**

What are adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments? This central research question met the qualitative inquiry convention recommending that research questions be broader in scope (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The question, derived from the problem and purpose statements, was fully supported by the study’s theoretical and conceptual frameworks – Herzberg’s two-factor theory (Herzberg et al., 1959) and Husserl’s phenomenological conceptual framework and his theory of phenomenological
reduction (Moustakas, 1994). Its focus was on the study participants’ perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching contracts.

Based on Moustakas’ recommendation, when conducting phenomenological studies, researchers should formulate at least a general question phrased as what has study’s participants’ experience been in terms of the phenomenon they lived. Smith (2019) found that working conditions, rewards, and professional development promote the perception of job satisfaction among instructors with part-time employment. However, COACHE’s researchers conducted the first nationwide multi-institutional survey on faculty retention and exit. They found that 57% of responders indicated satisfaction with their salary (COACHE, 2018). In Herzberg’s two-factor theory, salary is a hygiene factor ascribed to job dissatisfaction.

**Sub-Question One**

How do adjunct faculty perceive motivating factors (i.e., achievement, recognition, work, responsibility, advancement, and growth) concerning job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments? In this sub-question, I detailed different aspects of the central research question. Researching what motivated engineers, accountants, and workers, Herzberg et al. (1959) found that the factors leading to job satisfaction are distinct from those leading to job dissatisfaction. Herzberg et al. labeled those factors intrinsic, meaning inherent to the work itself. Such factors include achievement, recognition, work, responsibility, advancement, and growth. Other researchers have corroborated these findings (Kezar, 2013; Marasi et al., 2020; Page, 2017; Pugh, 2017; Rich, 2017). For instance, Kezar found that multi-year teaching appointment was a factor in adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction. However, Pugh found that Herzberg's job satisfaction findings did not apply to the adjunct faculty population due to the influence of extrinsic factors. Marasi et al. used a similar question to investigate faculty satisfaction with
online teaching in a quantitative study. These authors applied Herzberg's two-factor theory and found that motivating factors drive faculty satisfaction with online teaching.

Despite these conflicting accounts, answering sub-question one yielded critical information about adjunct faculty teaching under multi-year contracts perceived as job satisfaction motivators. For instance, Rich (2017) found that adjuncts were satisfied with their part-time teaching positions due to intrinsic factors such as professional development and opportunities to interact and coalesce with students freely. In addition to these benefits, Page (2017) found that adjunct faculty perceived job satisfaction when teaching contracts included supplemental benefits such as institutional recognition of faculty seniority, meaningful performance evaluation, improved communications, professional development, and amenities. Harvard University researchers of the COACHE (2018) survey reported that their colleagues' quality and not salary, mattered most to the professoriate. Of all surveyed faculty, 67% ranked their colleagues' quality as the main factor in their overall job satisfaction.

**Sub-Question Two**

How do adjunct faculty perceive hygiene factors (i.e., institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, and job security) concerning job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments? Similar to the focus of sub-question one, this sub-question purpose was to compile an inventory of hygiene factors, also referred to as job dissatisfaction factors, about adjunct faculty with multi-year appointments. Herzberg et al. (1959) found that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are distinct, separate factors. Job dissatisfaction factors are extrinsic, meaning not necessarily part of the job's essential nature. Such factors include institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, and job security. Scholars who have
corroborated these findings include Crick (2020); Kezar, (2013), Marasi et al. (2020); Maxey and Kezar (2015), Neale-McFall (2020); Page (2016); Stickney et al. (2019).

Neale-McFall (2020), who framed a similar research question to examine factors that influence faculty mothers' level of satisfaction, found that institutional policy was a job dissatisfaction factor as faculty mothers did not get maternity leave. Marasi et al. (2020), who also used a similar question to study dissatisfaction factors impacting faculty satisfaction with online teaching, found that salary ranked as a first-tier hygiene factor impacting job satisfaction. Besides, entities that have validated similar findings include Harvard University (COACHE, 2007, 2010, 2017, 2018, 2020), and advocacy organizations such as the American Federation of Teachers/AFT (AFT Higher Education, 2010), and the American Association of University Professors/AAUP (AAUP, 2003, 2020). For instance, COACHE's researchers found that 43% of faculty who responded to a survey in 2016 indicated they were dissatisfied with their salary (COACHE, 2018). Answering sub-question two yielded critical information about demotivating aspects adjunct faculty teaching under multi-year contracts perceived as job dissatisfaction factors.

**Definitions**

The following constructs are common in the literature on adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction with teaching employment:

1. *Adjunct Faculty* – This title has traditionally been affixed to instructors who teach part-time or per course basis (AAUP, 2020).
2. *Contingent Faculty* – This concept refers to non-tenure-track part-time and full-time faculty hired by higher learning institutions and compensated on a per-semester-course-per-hour or salary basis (AAUP, 2020).
3. **Full-Time Faculty (FTF)** – Full-time faculty refers to instructors who teach at least 12 credit hours in a semester or the equivalent of 24 credit hours in an academic year (NCES, 2019).

4. **Job Dissatisfaction** – This construct is a state of mind or perception that results from lack of job stability and other factors such as job security, salaries, benefits, and overall working conditions (Herzberg et al., 1959; Judge et al., 2017; Noe et al., 2016).

5. **Job Satisfaction** – This construct is a state of mind or perception that results from a gratifying job experience or employment statuses such as job responsibilities, input, productivity, growth, the role played, advancement, and talent (Herzberg et al., 1959; Judge et al., 2017; Noe et al., 2016).

6. **Job Security** – Herzberg et al. (1959) described the lack of tenure or job security as causing job dissatisfaction among workers.

7. **Job Stability** – Hollenshead et al. (2007) defined *job stability* as continuity of employment for a while via fair multi-year teaching contracts.

8. **Lived experience** – Max van Manen (1997 & 2014) defines this concept as temporal past episodes individuals experienced life or a phenomenon that manifest itself via subsequent self or methodically induced reflections or perceptions that can be constructed and interpreted texturally via a research method such as phenomenology.

9. **Multi-year Teaching Appointment** – A type of employment contract encompassing teaching for more than one academic year (AAUP, 2020; NCES, 2019; University of Michigan, 2020).
10. **Part-Time Faculty (PTF)** – Part-time faculty are referred to as adjunct faculty who are “part-time, temporary, partially affiliated instructors,” and also as “non-full-time, non-tenure-track instructors” (Winters, 2015, pp. 1-2).

11. **Perception** – Deemed as “the primary source of knowledge, the source that cannot be doubted” (Mustakas, 1994, p. 52), the concept of perception is a manifestation of consciousness that humans express based on their learned knowledge and experiences (Husserl, 1931; Pitcher, 1971).

12. **Phenomena** – According to Moustakas (1994), “Phenomena are the building blocks of human science and the basis for all knowledge” (p. 26).

13. **Phenomenology** – According to Husserl (1931), phenomenology can be defined as a science-based on consciousness and carried out by researchers who reduce or bracket their knowledge and bias to accept reality or phenomena as they are, naturally and subjectively manifested without preconceptions, theoretical underpinnings and distortion of any kind.

14. **Phenomenological Research** – For van Manen (1977), via phenomenological research, the researcher transforms the study’s participants’ perceptions of their lived experience of a phenomenon into text, which conveys to the reader the essence of manifested lived experience.

15. **Social Constructivism** – is an interpretive qualitative theoretical framework via which researchers construct knowledge of “the world in which they live and work” by relying on participants’ perception of the phenomenon they have experienced (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 327).
16. Themes – Themes, also referred to as categories, are qualitative research components that result from a process of coding based on the perception participants share during interviews about their particular lived experiences with a particular phenomenon (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

Summary

This Chapter provided a framework for exploratory phenomenological research on adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments. As found in the literature, the lack of job satisfaction remains a problem impacting them. The specific plight afflicting adjuncts along the past nine decades has been the perception of job instability and dissatisfaction due to part-time employment status. Higher education institutions have established multi-year teaching appointments to tackle the problem. The number of appointees has steadily increased, while there has been a lack of specific qualitative studies on the topic. Countervailing this void, I conducted this transcendental phenomenological study to explore the perception of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments of twelve adjunct faculty who taught from fall 2017 to fall 2020 at two public colleges in the Northeastern United States. The study’s findings shed light on whether adjunct faculty perceive the multi-year appointment as an employment prototype contributing to more stable employment and job satisfaction. Consequently, the study narrowed the theoretical and empirical gap in the literature and provided higher education practitioners and stakeholders with new knowledge to make more informed hiring decisions and improve adjunct faculty working conditions concerning job security and stability.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

This Chapter is about the literature review of adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments. Over the past decade, higher education institutions (HEIs) in the United States have incrementally granted multi-year teaching contracts (MYTCs) to adjunct faculty. From 49,093 (4.4%) in 2015, the number of adjunct faculty with MYTCs in 2018 doubled, reaching 75,893, equivalent to 8.4% of the U.S. professoriate. However, researchers have not yet investigated this population. In this Chapter, I identify the literature gap and explain how the study narrows it. In addition to this Overview, the Chapter includes a Conceptual and Theoretical Framework section, a Related Literature section with several sub-sections, and a Summary.

Theoretical Framework

By convention, researchers outline pertinent conceptual and theoretical frameworks driving their inquiries (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Husserl’s transcendental phenomenology conceptual framework guided this study. The framework includes the theory of phenomenological reduction (Moustakas, 1994). Its theoretical framework was based on Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory (Herzberg et al., 1959). Both conceptual and theoretical frameworks helped explain the relationship between the theories and the focus of the study.

Husserl’s Transcendental Phenomenological Conceptual Framework

The origin of phenomenology has been traced to 20th century German-Jewish philosopher and mathematician Edmund Husserl when he published, in German, his seminal work titled Ideas: Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy (Husserl, 1931). Subsequently, his manuscript Ideen II (Ideas II) expanded the concept of
phenomenology as a science. Husserl’s conceptual framework lies on theoretical underpinnings, which is key to phenomenological research. Its components include Epoqué, Phenomenological Reduction, Imaginative Variation, and Synthesis (Moustakas, 1994). These components, which form phenomenology research methods, were discussed at length in Chapter 3. Moustakas describes phenomenological reduction as both a theory and a method. Husserl’s suppositions of phenomenological reduction are addressed first as both a concept and a critical theory guiding the study.

**Theory of Phenomenological Reduction.**

As Husserl (1931) posited, when conducting transcendental phenomenological studies, researchers are to consciously apply Epoqué and bracketing, two concepts discussed in the Design section of Chapter 3. Since phenomenology is a research approach based on consciousness, researchers reduce or bracket their knowledge and bias to accept reality or phenomena as they are, naturally and subjectively manifested, without preconceptions, theoretical underpinnings, and or distortion of any kind. Husserl called this researchers’ conscious behavior phenomenological reductionism. As a theory, Moustakas (1994) asserted that phenomenological reductionism includes five suppositions: 1) the researchers adopt a nonjudgmental position and account for their own biases; 2) “self-evidence is apodictic”; 3) “apodictic knowledge exists”; 4) “what appears to be appearing is appearing”; and 5) “the appearing person is appearing” (p. 61). These theoretical assumptions are the basis of Husserl’s theory of phenomenological reduction.

Researchers guided by these theoretical assumptions apply Epoqué and bracketing to counter spurious bias or influences. They assume a tabula rasa mindset encrypted with the study’s participants’ perceptions of lived experiences of the phenomenon under investigation.
Heoties (2020) refers to this assumed researcher’s conscious posture as one resembling the way a poet creates written art. In Husserlian terms, after collecting data, researchers conducting transcendental phenomenological studies describe the phenomenon as told by participants during interviews. Researchers identify emerging themes, reflect on said themes, and after applying conventional data analysis methods and techniques, piece themes and textural descriptions together as a cohesive movie script or a story or a poem. In the end, researchers extract the essence of participants’ perceptions of lived experiences. The resulting narrative is a piece of art constructed systematically by following rigorous qualitative methods. As done by previous researchers (Bakley & Bordersen, 2018; Ferencz, 2017; Smith, 2019), Husserl’s transcendental phenomenology conceptual framework and particularly his theory of phenomenological reduction guided this study; via this conceptual framework and the theory, I bracketed out preconceived assumptions and biases.

**Motivation-Hygiene Theory**

The motivation-hygiene theory, also known as the two-factor theory, originated in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, in the late 1950s (Herzberg et al., 1959). The proponents of this theory, Frederick Herzberg, Bernard Mausner, and Barbara Bloch Snyderman, had one goal in mind when they formulated it; the goal was to answer the following question: “What do workers want from their jobs” (p. xiii). They posited that workers’ satisfaction and dissatisfaction have to do with intrinsic and extrinsic factors inherent to the job setting. Those factors act as contaminants of workers’ mental or psychological standing, which disrupt their mood and genuine aspiration to achieve fulfillment. The masterminds of this theory refer to those factors as hygiene factors. The theory is known, interchangeably, like the two-factor theory and Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory, as Herzberg was the principal author of the study. Using the concept of hygiene
was to convey the idea that psychological clog is detrimental to the quest for satisfaction and motivation to work.

Workers want to satisfy or suffice psychological needs, such as the perception of being acknowledged by bosses or supervisors. In addition, workers aspire to be assigned challenging responsibilities, perceived as uplifting and commensurate with self-sense of worth, and a meaningful chance to advance through the ladder of authority. With this theory, Herzberg et al. stressed the role of motivators and hygiene factors. Motivators refer to aspects that workers want, such as recognition for efficiency and hard work, level of responsibility, and opportunities to partake in decision-making. Hygiene factors are those aspects that have to do with remuneration, perks and benefits, job stability, tenure, titles, and working conditions. Based on this premise, I explored whether the study’s participants perceived multi-year teaching appointments as a job satisfaction factor.

Altogether, both Husserl’s transcendental phenomenological conceptual framework and the study’s theoretical framework based on Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory (Herzberg et al., 1959) helped establish the significance of the study. Researchers who have applied these frameworks include Gagné and Deci (2005), Gullickson (2011), Ferencz (2016), Kezar and Bernstein-Sierra (2016), Kim (2010), Nelson et al. (2020), Ott and Dippold (2018), Page (2018), Pons et al. (2017), Samora (2013), Walton (2018). Although these researchers focused their studies on adjunct faculty perceptions of teaching experiences, none used Husserl’s and Herzberg et al.’s conceptual and theoretical frameworks to explore adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction with multi-year contracts.

The focus of the study was directly related to Husserl’s phenomenological theoretical underpinnings and Herzberg et al.’s two-factor theory (1959). Husserl’s phenomenology
encompasses the systematic study of individuals’ perceptions of their lived experience of a phenomenon, and Herzberg’s theory focuses on individuals’ perceptions of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. These frameworks align with the study’s problem, and purpose statements, the research question, and sub-questions. Consequently, with the study, the utility of these frameworks was advanced concerning the topic I explored — adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments.

**Related Literature**

This section introduces syntheses of relevant texts, arguments on the study’s significance, and known information about the phenomenon. It also includes omitted aspects yet to be discussed. Relevant seminal scholarly articles older than five years, and particularly those published between 2015 and 2020, are included in this study to ascertain study context and background information on the topic. This section includes the following subsections: Emergent Issues Revolving Around Adjunct Faculty and Job Satisfaction, Adjunct Faculty Perception of Job Satisfaction, The Need for a Uniform Definition of Adjunct Faculty, Emergent Related Themes Distilled from Extant Literature, Utility and Applicability of the Concept of Perception, and a Summary.

**Emergent Issues Revolving Around Adjunct Faculty**

Each of the sources cited in this manuscript represents critical aspects of the adjunct faculty plight and the body of knowledge about adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction and teaching experiences in the U.S. academe. These studies encompass broad areas of research about adjunct faculty scholarship. Researchers found diverse emergent issues such as taxonomy, job status, lack of job security, job satisfaction, job dissatisfaction, lack of interest in full-time teaching jobs, interest in teaching full-time, interest in prestige, low wages, lack of benefits, lack
of inclusion in shared governance, exclusion from college life, lack of institutional support, lack of professional development, lack of mentorship, lack of respect and lack of recognition. They also found the following themes: unequal treatment compared to counterparts, teaching perception, deficiencies, advantages, disadvantages, impact on student learning, association with adverse student outcomes, low student persistence, connectedness, disconnectedness, and lived teaching experiences in academe. These areas revolve around adjunct faculty perceptions of employment experiences and overall plight. However, researchers have not examined the topic of adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments yet. Considering that the study was exploratory and that no specific literature existed about the topic per se, Creswell and Creswell (2018) advised researchers who conduct studies under such circumstances to picture the literature review as an upside-down triangle. As shown in Figure 2, this study appears at the bottom of the triangle and, on top, in chronological order are relevant texts.

The study is narrow and specific. The purpose was to explore adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching contracts. Looking upward at the inversed triangle, it displays a select group of authors’ last names in alphabetical order; it also displays years of publication in chronological order from 2021 back to 1978. Based on reviewed texts, the related literature on adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction and teaching experiences includes a narrative of commonalities, deficiencies, and contradictions. Despite such incongruent stances, the chronology reflects relevant studies from the search criteria, including concepts forming the study’s research topic, problem and purpose statements, research question, and sub-questions. There was a need to examine the relevancy and extent of these constructs concerning the study. In the next sub-section, I examine the following constructs as they appear in the topic: problem
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statement, purpose statement, and research questions, job satisfaction factors, job dissatisfaction factors, and multi-year teaching contracts.

**Multi-year Teaching Appointments or Contracts (MYTAs or MYTCs)**

With multi-year teaching appointments (MYTAs), higher education leaders attempt to address the lack of job satisfaction and stable employment afflicting adjunct faculty in academia. These employment contracts encompass teaching for more than one academic year (AAUP, 2020; NCES, 2019; University of Michigan, 2020). Higher education administrators and faculty union leaders have indicated that the primary purpose of MYTCs is to provide adjuncts job stability, the guaranteed workload of minimum contact teaching hours, professional and office hours, stable income, accrued sick leave, and other benefits customarily afforded to full-time and tenured faculty. Such efforts, which started in the second decade of the 21st century, were limited at first. For instance, Kezar (2012) concluded that only a handful of higher learning institutions had implemented MYTAs before 2012.

With the introduction of multi-year contracts, HEIs have established a wide range of eligibility criteria. Customarily, to be eligible for multi-year appointments, adjuncts must have taught some courses and classroom contact hours every semester, along with some consecutive semesters in the same academic department and higher learning institutions (Tolley, 2018; Tolley & Edwards, 2018). For instance, some institutions require adjuncts to teach at least two courses or the equivalent of six classroom contact hours per semester for the ten most recent consecutive semesters, excluding summer and winter terms. Others have established slightly similar requirements. Kezar et al. (2019) claim that granting multi-year contracts to adjuncts can be interpreted as a form of job security, which in Herzberg's theory of motivation is a hygiene factor that causes job dissatisfaction if unmet (Herzberg et al., 1959). Multi-year contracts seem
to be rewards bestowed on contingent faculty, particularly adjunct instructors, who remain loyal while teaching per course and semester at the same institution and academic department.

In addition to demonstrating continuous teaching, adjuncts must pass a comprehensive evaluation of teaching. The faculty labor union and concerning HEIS usually determine the evaluation criteria (Tolley, 2018). Typically, academic departments and school deans are the officers in charge of evaluating adjuncts following institutional policies and applicable labor union contractual agreements. For initial and subsequent multi-year appointments and reappointments, each candidate's evidence collection includes evaluating different courses' syllabi and peer observation instruction.

Besides, based on my experience dealing with multi-year contract implementation, HEIs require faculty's most recent student evaluations of teaching and learning (SETL), including the overall rating reflecting an instructors' teaching performance. Other required documentation includes grade sheets, grade distributions, curriculum vitae, and a written statement stating the candidate's teaching philosophy. This evidence collection, placed in adjuncts' personnel files, serves as the basis for academic departments, deans, provosts, and presidents to determine which candidates they recommend for multi-year appointments, reappointments, and non-appointments.

Based on this literature review, over the past decade, hundreds of colleges and universities have instituted MYTAs (Elliott-Negri, 2018; Gilmore, 2018; Samuels, 2017; Tolley, 2018; Tolley & Edwards, 2018; University of Michigan, 2020). During this time, the number of adjunct faculty with MYTCs has slowly increased at degree-granting four and 2-year public, private, for-profit, and nonprofit higher learning institutions in the United States. Figure 3 displays the increase in faculty with MYTAs. Based on data from the U.S. Department of Education, the Chronicle of Higher Education reported that in 2015, of 900,000 non-tenured
contingent track faculty teaching at 4,584 degree-granting institutions, 156,996 (17.2%) had multi-year contracts; full-timers were 107,903 (11.8%), and adjunct faculty were 49,093 or 5.4% (Contract Length, 2017).
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Number of Contingent Faculty and Part-Time Faculty with Multi-year Teaching Appointments, 2015 – 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contingent Faculty</th>
<th>Part-Time Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>156,996</td>
<td>49,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201,864</td>
<td>75,803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In 2016, of 911,290 non-tenured contingent track faculty teaching at 4,367 degree-granting institutions, there were 187,339 (20.6%) with multi-year appointments. Full-timers were 121,704 (13.4%), and part-timers were 65,635 or 7.2% (Contract Length, 2017). In 2018, of 907,181 non-tenure contingent track faculty teaching at 4,008 degree-granting institutions, there were 201,864 (22.3%) with multi-year contracts; full-timers were 126,061 (13.9%), and part-timers were 75,803 or 8.4% (Contract Length, 2020).
Overall, and as shown in Figure 3, the number of contingent faculty with multi-year appointments increased from 17.2% in 2015 to 22.3% in 2018. Similarly, albeit slowly, the number of adjunct faculty with multi-year contracts rose from 5.4% in 2015 to 8.4% in 2018. After reviewing pertinent literature, I did not find specific research studies about this population and much less about adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction with multi-year teaching contracts (MYTCs).

**Motivators and Hygiene Factors**

Herzberg et al. (1959) formulated the two-factor theory to investigate the following continua ascribed to workers' perception of employment: Job satisfaction, outlined under motivation factors, and job dissatisfaction under hygiene factors. As shown in Figure 4, Herzberg et al. labeled the former intrinsic factors and the latter extrinsic about how workers perceive job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction in their employment settings. In general, Herzberg et al. found that workers are motivated or demotivated by these intrinsic and extrinsic factors in the workplace.

Herzberg et al. (1959) posited that intrinsic factors include feeling valued, acknowledged, and respected by coworkers and employers. He and his colleagues also stated that extrinsic factors are job security, equitable compensation or salaries, health care, vacation, and retirement benefits. For Herzberg and his co-researchers, these factors apply to all workers. This literature review shows that researchers have applied this theory in their studies on full-time and part-time faculty working at public, private and non-profit colleges and universities in the United States (Gagné & Deci, 2005; Gullickson, 2011; Ferencz, 2016; Kezar & Bernstein-Sierra, 2016; Kim, 2010; Nelson et al., 2020). When employers do not meet these factors, workers perceive dissatisfaction with their employment.
Herzberg et al.'s Motivation-Hygiene Factor Model

Note: I constructed this figure based on Herzberg et al.'s (1959) two-factor theory.
**Job Dissatisfaction**

Job dissatisfaction is a construct defined as a state of mind or human perception that results from factors such as institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, and lack of job security (Herzberg et al., 1959; Judge et al., 2017; Noe et al., 2016). For Herzberg, workers’ perception of job dissatisfaction is a by-product of the lack of stable employment. Besides, to him, job security plays a significant role in a worker’s perception of job dissatisfaction. In other words, workers perceive a lack of permanent job status as a factor in job dissatisfaction.

Over the past nine decades, researchers have investigated the job dissatisfaction construct. For instance, how the professorate perceive job dissatisfaction with their teaching positions has been explored by Page (2017), Rich (2017), and by researchers at Harvard University via the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education, aka COACHE (2019). Page and Rich found that providing teaching contracts with benefits and fair employment terms to adjunct faculty contributes to shifting their perception of job dissatisfaction into job satisfaction.

Researchers at Harvard University have found institutional deficiencies impacting faculty perceptions of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction at higher learning institutions that voluntarily participate in the COACHE surveys administered periodically. In the 2016 COACHE’s nationwide multi-institutional survey on faculty retention and exit (COACHE, 2018), researchers found that 43% of responders indicated they were dissatisfied with their salary, a hygiene factor ascribed to job dissatisfaction in Herzberg’s two-factor theory. Surprisingly, only 35% of the surveyed faculty expressed interest in renegotiating employment terms, typically including a fair salary. Other researchers such as Bakley and Bordersen (2018), Hutto (2017), Page (2017),
Wicks et al. (2020), Witt et al. (2021) found as well that adjunct faculty perception of unhappiness with their part-time teaching positions is associated with extrinsic factors as previously outlined.

**Job Satisfaction**

Researchers have investigated how workers perceive their employment and job satisfaction (Andrews, 2016; Herzberg et al., 1959; Rich, 2017; The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education, 2019). Job satisfaction is a state of mind or perception that results from a gratifying job experience or employment statuses such as job responsibilities, input, recognition, productivity, growth, the role played, advancement, and talent (Azevedo et al., 2020; Judge et al., 2017; Noe et al., 2016). Researchers have consistently found that employment status and working conditions play a significant role in adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Azevedo et al., 2020; Larson et al., 2017; Perry, 2013; Seipel & Larson, 2018). Researchers have validated these findings (Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education, 2017). These deficiencies weigh how faculty form their perception of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction based on their lived teaching experiences and interactions with the institutions they work with and the students they teach. For instance, Rich (2017) found that adjuncts were satisfied with their part-time teaching positions due to intrinsic factors such as professional development and opportunities to freely interact and coalesce with students.

As Rich and other researchers (Crick, 2020; Neale-McFall, 2020) have done, over the years, COACHE’s researchers have surveyed thousands of professors and instructors to ascertain their degree of job satisfaction regarding tenure, working conditions, job status, nature of the work, faculty retention and exit, terms of employment, and benefits. For the most part, COACHE’s surveys’ findings suggest that, in general, most of the U.S. professoriate seems to be
pretty and consistently satisfied with their teaching experiences and employment positions (COACHE, 2007, 2010, 2017, 2018, 2020). Although COACHE’s surveyed themes include retention and negotiation of employment terms, COACHE’s researchers have yet to survey adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching contracts (MYTCs).

In the 2016 COACHE survey, respondents indicated that their colleagues’ quality and not salary mattered most to the professoriate. Of all surveyed faculty, 67% ranked their colleagues’ quality as the main factor in their overall job satisfaction and decision to stay or leave the institution where they were teaching. Salary ranked 57%. Those faculty members interested in renegotiating the terms of their employment ranked 35%. Although the insights listed above offer a broad perspective about faculty’s job satisfaction standing, little data exists regarding adjunct faculty perception of overall job satisfaction with multi-year contracts. As introduced in Chapter 1 of this dissertation, the U.S. academe heavily relies on adjuncts and non-tenured faculty to train human capital in the United States of America. Neglecting to shed light on this particular population’s plight and job satisfaction counters higher education administrators’ ability to make hiring decisions in an informed fashion.

Furthermore, overlooking the standing and perception of job satisfaction of adjunct faculty teaching under multi-year appointments shortchanges the first remedy ever implemented in U.S. academia to address the perennial issue of their lack of stable employment – multi-year teaching contracts. Higher education institutions’ leaders have introduced multi-year teaching appointments to ameliorate the lack of job stability and job satisfaction adjunct faculty perceive of their part-time teaching employment (Eagan et al., 2016; Kezar, 2012).

However, COACHE and AAUP, two of the most prominent and highly regarded entities advancing research about the U.S. professorate standing, have overlooked or neglected to
conduct or commission research on a faculty population that is critical in the training of a capable labor force upon whose shoulders rests the nation’s ability to remain competitive in the world economy. Perhaps the oversight has to do with the fact that higher education administrators and faculty union leaders begun implementing multi-year teaching appointments tentatively as pilot programs in the 2010-2020 decade. Multi-year contracts are ways to stimulate adjunct faculty job security, stability, and satisfaction in academia (Eagan et al., 2015; Kezar et al., 2019).

**Adjunct Faculty Perceptions of Job Satisfaction**

As introduced in Chapter 1, Tuckman et al. (1978) published one of the first studies on adjunct instructors’ perception of job status and satisfaction. He conducted the study forty-three years ago and titled it, *Who is part-time in academe?* The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) sponsored the study; in publication, AAUP added a disclaimer stating that the content and opinions or judgments made in the article were “solely the author’s” (p. 305). It is noteworthy that AAUP added such a disclaimer to this study, as subsequent AAUP’s reports and studies have continued to validate Tuckman’s findings (AAUP, 2020; Curtis, 2013; Monks, 2009). I took into consideration Tuckman’s article’s seminal significance to conduct this literature review and construct the syntheses outlined below. Tuckman (1978) pioneered the creation of a particular adjunct faculty “taxonomy” (pp. 307-309) he described as: The “semiretired, students, those wishing to become full-time” (Hopeful Full-Timers), those with a full-time job (Full-Mooners), those with responsibilities in the home (Homeworkers), those with another part-time job (Part-Mooners), and all others (Part-Unknowners) (p. 307).

Previous to this taxonomy, in the early 1900s, leaders of institutions of higher learning had established academic ranks placing full professors at the top of the hierarchical system
They ranked other positions in the following descending order: associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors (2006). Some institutions, such as the University of Chicago, established a more detailed taxonomy by prioritizing those with tenure: head professors, professors, and associate professors (2006). Those with part-time or temporary positions were separately classified as follows: “Readers, lecturers, docents, assistants, associates, instructors and assistant professors” (p. 186). In contrast to these and Tuckman’s adjunct classifications, AAUP officers have noted the usage of different taxonomy terms to refer to part-time and contingent faculty as follows: “lecturers, senior lecturers, adjuncts, instructors, non-tenure-track faculty, non-senate faculty, unranked faculty, postdocs, visiting faculty, professors of practice, research assistants, teaching assistants, co-adjuntants, affiliates, specialists, clinical faculty, and so on” (The Inclusion in Governance of Faculty Members Holding Contingent Appointments, 2013, p. 77).

Certainly, Tuckman’s classifications have had profound implications for adjunct faculty, academe, and students for forty-three years, considering that AAUP sponsored this study. AAUP is a non-profit organization, which has, since its founding in 1915, advocated for the rights and advancement of academics. Some of the profound implications include that most of the part-timers in Tuckman’s 1978 study’s survey sample were not interested in full-time teaching. Thirty-one years later, in July-August of 2009, to be exact, a study conducted by James Monks (2009), also commissioned by AAUP, revealed that the majority of adjunct faculty were not interested in full-time teaching. With this corroboration of findings, AAUP seems to have set the tone and direction of adjunct and contingent faculty scholarship.

However, 40 years after Tuckman published his AAUP study, Tolley and Edwards (2018) found that most adjunct faculty want full-time employment. These authors based their
claim on two surveys conducted in 2010 and 2015 by the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), which found that approximately 60% of adjunct faculty below 50 years of age were interested in working full-time, and 40% indicated they were happy with their part-time jobs (American Federation of Teachers, 2010; Eagan et al., 2016). It is crucial not to digress from Tuckman et al.’s 1978 study’s findings, as such findings have given context to subsequent related research studies such as Kezar and Gehrke (2013), Ott and Dippold (2018). It is necessary to underline that Tuckman et al.’s conclusion was that, although they had no opportunity for promotion and their job was unstable, most adjunct faculty were satisfied with their teaching jobs. Besides, Tuckman found some disadvantages in adjunct part-time teaching:

- limited connection to the institution, other faculty, and students
- lack of loyalty to the institution
- isolation and marginalization
- exclusion from governance
- lack of fair wages or salaries commensurate with adjunct faculty’s teaching experience and academic qualifications

Although these disadvantages pertain to the realities of adjuncts in the 1970s, many of the studies I reviewed included similar findings attributed to adjunct faculty lived teaching experiences (Culver et al., 2020; Drob, 2016; Eagan et al., 2016; Ferencz, 2017; Flaherty, 2015; Seipel & Larson, 2018; Smith, 2019; Sotirin, 2019; Yu et al., 2015; Wicks et al., 2020).

A salient Tuckman’s finding was that instructors in academe in the 1970s had different motivations to teach as part-time faculty. Their perception of job satisfaction went hand in hand with their personal and professional motivations. Therefore, researchers must be cautious about lumping all part-time faculty together when researching them. Tuckman’s findings, framed under
the taxonomy described above, denote that the group more likely to be dissatisfied was the Hopeful Full-Timers who earned reduced wages, taught larger workloads, and tended to work at different institutions of higher learning. This type of adjuncts tends to work without health insurance, retirement, annual leave, sick leave, and other benefits afforded to tenured and full-time faculty. Those who earned reduced wages were more likely to be older than 49 years of age, as Tuckman and Tuckman (1976) had found two years before Howard Tuckman et al.’s 1978 seminal research on adjunct faculty.

In their study to debunk the claim that adjunct faculty are exploited and dissatisfied in academe, Brennan and Magness (2018) attested to the inquiry line Tuckman and AAUP established in the 1970s. As AAUP commissioned, Tuckman set the research agenda that has dominated adjunct faculty scholarship publication over the past four decades. Generalizing that adjuncts are exploited or dissatisfied with their job status and teaching experiences, as Bakley and Bordersen (2018) and other researchers such as Merrit (2016) found are claims Brennan and Magness attempted to debunk in their study. Sorting out these conflicting arguments could help clarify a concept inadequately addressed in academia and the pertinent existing literature. There is the need for a standard definition of adjunct faculty as researchers have established this concept as part of contingent faculty, including non-tenured full-time faculty.

**Definitions of Adjunct Faculty**

There are several definitions of adjunct faculty (Levin & Hernandez, 2014; Molly, 2018). For instance, an arbitrary selection of several authors included in the chronological triangle (see Figure 2), let us say Brennan and Magness (2018) or Danaei (2018) or Gappa and Leslie (1993) or Lima (2018), or Molly (2018) or Wicks et al. (2020) or Winters (2015), would show different definitions of the adjunct faculty title. Lima (2018) and Danaei (2018) refer to the concept of
adjunct faculty as part-time and contingent faculty. Wicks et al. (2020) defined *contingent faculty* as a term that also means adjuncts and full-time non-tenure-track faculty. Contingent faculty refers to part-time and full-time off-tenure-track faculty hired by higher learning institutions (AAUP, 2013). Specifically, the term includes adjuncts paid on a per-course or hourly basis and full-time non-tenure-track faculty who receive a salary (AAUP, 2013, 2020). Winters (2015) described adjunct faculty as part-time instructors, non-full-timers, non-tenure-track instructors who work temporarily at one or two higher learning institutions. In her phenomenological study on adjunct faculty, Molly (2018) found that taxonomies of part-time faculty vary; her preferred kind were those whose actual profession was different from being teaching as adjunct faculty.

For AAUP, the adjunct faculty title has traditionally referred to instructors who teach part-time on a semester basis and per course section (AAUP, 2020). For this study's purpose, adjunct faculty are those who teach under multi-year contracts. Under multi-year teaching contracts, adjunct faculty receive benefits equivalent to full-time faculty, such as longer contract terms, health insurance, and office and professional hours. Instead of teaching on a semester basis or per-course section, MYTC adjunct faculty teach a guaranteed workload of two or more courses. This discrepancy happens because the taxonomies early institutions of higher learning and Tuckman introduced have not been reconciled in the pertinent literature. Along its 103 years of existence, AAUP, as an authoritative entity advocating to formulate policy and standards to benefit its members, has failed to establish a uniform definition of adjunct faculty.

This deficiency adds to Tuckman's findings and implications, which have caught other scholars' attention, as shown in the chronological triangle (see Figure 2). As Tuckman, the authors listed in the triangle have focused on different topics about the adjunct faculty's teaching
experiences, realities, and plight. The literature's deficiency has been that many authors lumped together their studies' sample participants without establishing, with certainty, the extent of pertinent taxonomy, conceptual definition, and intrinsic variations. As found in this literature review (Monks, 2009), not all adjuncts are the same; not all of them have the same motivation to teach (Culver et al., 2020) or are ineffective or have negatively impacted student learning. Faltering in acknowledging taxonomy variations as a deficiency in the literature compromises the validity of any study's findings and conclusions.

In a sense, such deficiency seems an ecological fallacy, which occurs in quantitative research when researchers draw conclusions on individual participants in a study based only on the group's data (Gall et al., 2007). In other words, borrowing such a concept from quantitative research, the lack of conceptualization could lead to incorrect assumptions and conclusions in qualitative inquiry. For this reason, this study used a purposive sample of adjunct faculty who have lived similar experiences with the central phenomenon. The selection criteria included teaching under similar conditions, ranks, and multi-year teaching contracts at two public higher learning institutions in the Northeastern United States. Ensuring the sample's homogeneity and nomenclature allowed the opportunity to systematically explore the topic under examination – adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching contracts.

**Emergent Related Themes Distilled from Extant Literature**

As indicated in Chapter 1, themes refer to categories representing specific ideas (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The rationale to discriminate from the abundance of the related themes found in the literature circumscribed the focus on three: Adjunct faculty perceived lack of job stability (Danei, 2019; Ferencz, 2017; Mech, 2017; Vicente, 2017); adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction (Nelson et al., 2020; Page, 2018; Pons, 2017; Vicente, 2018; Yakoboski,
2016); and adjunct faculty's job dissatisfaction (Bakley & Bordersen, 2018; Eagan, Jr. et al., 2016; Merrit, 2016). These are the themes most relevant to the study's topic, the problem statement, the purpose statement, central research question, and sub-questions. A salient aspect I identified in the literature is that the multi-year teaching appointment is a factor in adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction (Kezar 2013; Page, 2017, 2018).

Focusing on these themes, particularly job satisfaction, does not prescribe considering that the list of emergent themes from the extant literature is exhausting, albeit redundant. Some themes related to the study include: adjunct faculty's disconnect with students and institutions has to do with isolation (Ferencz, 2017); lack of mentoring (Danaei, 2019); disinterest in becoming full-time faculty (Bakley & Bordersen, 2018); lack of recognition and support (Mech, 2017); confusion about the meaning of being part-time faculty (Smith, 2019); disconnection from institutions and students due to lack of competitive wages and stable employment (Danaei, 2018; Ferencz, 2017); exploitation (Mazurek, 2011); lack of respect from full-time colleagues as well as institutions of higher learning (Eagan et al., 2016); job status, lack of job stability, and interest in teaching full-time (Nelson et al., 2020).

In broad terms, although these themes encompass different areas of research about the adjunct faculty experience in U.S. academia, they revolve around adjuncts' perceptions of job satisfaction and or job dissatisfaction. The texts from which these themes derive show that the related literature on adjunct faculty includes a narrative of conflicting accounts of deficiency, adversities, and claims of success, failures, and eclectic findings of adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction. As previously mentioned, the theme of adjunct faculty perceiving themselves as exploited (Mazurek, 2011; Shulman, 2017) is an excellent example of what scholars have examined in their studies on the adjunct faculty perceptions of teaching
experiences and job satisfaction. In juxtaposition to Mazurek et al. (2018), Brennan and Maness (2018) concluded their study with skepticism about the finding that many part-timers have felt exploited. This conclusion mirrors Tuckman et al.'s (1978) findings indicating that most adjuncts were satisfied with their jobs in the late 1970s.

Other research studies found that lack of job stability adversely impacts instructors teaching effectiveness and experience (Colby, 2020; Mech, 2017; Ott & Dippold, 2018; Ott & Cisneros, 2015; Pons et al., 2017). Some researchers addressed faculty's connectedness and disconnectedness to academic institutions and students and lack of job satisfaction due to their part-time employment (Bakley & Bordersen, 2018; Hutto, 2017; Wicks et al., 2020). Again, via the lens of Herzberg et al.'s (1959) two-factor theory, these themes can be categorized as intrinsic and extrinsic factors and listed under themes labeled job satisfaction and or job dissatisfaction.

There is an additional relevant study authored by Vicente (2018), in which the author illustrated how exploring adjunct faculty perceptions of teaching experiences could shed light on their plight. A salient finding of Vicente's study was that adjunct faculty expressed unique concerns about job status. Based on Herzberg's theory, workers' concerns and perceptions of their lack of job security are labeled hygiene factors and lead to dissatisfaction (Herzberg et al., 1959).

Vicente (2018) recommended additional research to explore adjunct faculty perceptions of teaching experiences. Tuckman's study's salient conclusion was that instructors who teach voluntarily were more satisfied and engaged than those who earned additional income. These findings align with Tuckman et al.'s (1978) findings that adjuncts have different motivations to teach part-time and that not all adjunct types are alike.
These studies' researchers also revealed that those adjuncts who perceived receiving institutional support tended to be more satisfied, as they considered nurturing relationships a vital motivational factor to teach. Similarly, Tuckman as well as Culver et al. (2020) found that connectedness to the college, other faculty, and students happened as a result of developing the perception of being professionally and socially connected to stakeholders and the academic milieu. Culver et al. did not mention whether the studies' participants perceive job status and job satisfaction as motivational factors in teaching and connecting. However, Hutto (2017) cited pertinent literature to ascertain that lack of stable employment leads to job dissatisfaction among adjunct faculty.

Using an interpretative phenomenological qualitative approach, Vicente (2018) conducted a study on contingent faculty experiences at a private liberal arts college. The author noted that contingent faculty's perceptions of job satisfaction and connectedness to the institution affected their perceived institutional support system and employment status. A salient theme extracted from participants' interviews included remuneration and employment dependability. I noted other themes listed such as job security, uncertainty regarding being rehired, and lack of equitable remuneration.

Similarly, in a phenomenological exploration, Smith (2019) found the following five related themes drawn from adjuncts' teaching lived experiences: "enjoyment," "alignment," "significance," "connection," and "commitment" (p. 39). These themes pertained to contingent faculty lived teaching experiences, particularly part-time instructors' perceptions of their unique employment situation. Although participants expressed willingness to meet with students voluntarily in Smith’s study, they did not feel connected to the institution. They expressed disconcert over the lack of institutional attention to their plight. Smith found that participants
indicated they were satisfied being part-time as they received institutional support and connected to the institution and students.

While participants in Smith’s study expressed a perception of satisfaction with their adjunct teaching experience, Vicente (2018) found that contingent faculty participants perceived their counterparts, full-timers, and tenured faculty, as being treated more fairly. Vicente did not specifically address job status or job satisfaction as key motivational factors as Smith did. I developed Table 1 following recommendations from Creswell and Poth (2028), who suggested developing a literature review map or innovative ways to visualize statements, themes, and data via generating visual representations such as tables, diagrams, images, or spreadsheets. Table 1 displays select authors' last names, years of the relevant publication of their studies, and respective emergent themes. What transpires from reviewed studies and visual representation, particularly from those studies focusing on adjunct faculty's job standing in academe, is precisely the adjuncts' perceptions of that which has contributed to their job satisfaction and dissatisfaction with their employment status. Furthermore, as previously indicated, job dissatisfaction has been associated with part-time job status (Kezar & Gehrke, 2013; Nelson et al., 2020).

Other themes I identified in the review of the extant literature seemed repetitious, including lack of job security, lack of interest in a full-time teaching job, interest in teaching full-time, interest in prestige, low wages, lack of benefits, inequalities, job satisfaction, job dissatisfaction, lack of institutional support, lack of professional development, lack of mentorship, and adverse teaching experiences in academe. Overall, I describe the extant

Table 1

Select Extant Literature Review Emergent Themes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakley and Bordersen</td>
<td>Themes: “Accidental academics,” “I do not feel I am treated like a professional,” “Insider yet outsider with full-time faculty,” “undercurrent of ambiguity with administration,” “place-bound by family,” “interviewing for full-time faculty: Trying to get a foot in the door,” “Reevaluating my careers aspirations: Why am I still working as an adjunct faculty member?” “Thank you for listening,” and “We are the Wal-Martification of higher education” (p. 153).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolitzer (2019)</td>
<td>Themes: The extant literature shows there are five salient research areas in the extant literature about adjunct faculty scholarship: “Qualifications to teach,” “motivations to teach,” “institutional support,” “job satisfaction,” and “teaching effectiveness” (p.118). Of these, the primary source of job satisfaction for adjunct faculty is teaching. The primary source of job dissatisfaction derives from institutional treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crick et al. (2020)</td>
<td>Non-tenured track faculty job satisfaction is motivated by “upper-level administration, the department chair, the institution, as well as clarity regarding contract renewal and promotion, recognition from peers, and support for personal and family need” (pp. 441-442).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danaei (2019)</td>
<td>Based on a review of the literature on adjunct faculty, the following themes stand out: “understanding adjunct faculty, including the background of adjunct faculty and the impacts of adjuncts; adjunct faculty development, and the need and benefits of mentoring adjuncts” (p. 19).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferencz (2017)</td>
<td>Themes: “Supported, safe; ask questions and seek help; engage with others; loyalty and price; student success; understanding expectations and technology; busyness, collaboration and dialogue, communication, intentional leadership, and opportunity to connect” (p. 19).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrit (2016)</td>
<td>Themes: “Socialization as support, trust, and acceptance; it’s like being a second class citizen; the workhorse carries a heavy load, but it’s worth it; what’s your niche? To make myself needed; and (e) moving forward with an unclear path” (pp. 89-90).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson et al. (2020)</td>
<td>Nelson et al. found that although adjunct faculty who participated in their study lacked job security and were impacted by the lack of hygiene factors such as competitive compensation, they seemed to be satisfied with motivator factors such as “recognition, growth and advancement” (p. 18). Overall, Nelson et al. concluded that adjuncts seemed to be “like independent gig workers” (p. 18) and were satisfied with their employment to the level tenure-track and tenured faculty were.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicente (2017)</td>
<td>Defining contingent faculty by contingent faculty, contingent faculty perceptions of differences between full-time and contingent faculty, contingent faculty’s assessment of the institutional community’s lens, institutional investment in contingent faculty, the institutional culture surrounding contingent faculty relationships and belongingness, evaluation/feedback, reliability of employment, contingent faculty definition of job satisfaction and perception of job reward, and predicting the future and institutional recommendations by contingent faculty” (p. 5).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
literature as having five salient research areas or themes about adjunct faculty scholarship: "Qualifications to teach," "motivations to teach," "institutional support," "job satisfaction," and "teaching effectiveness" (Bolitzer, 2019, p. 118). Of these, Bolitzer concluded that the primary source of job satisfaction for adjunct faculty is teaching, and the primary source of job dissatisfaction derives from institutional treatment.

A commonality of outlined themes is that researchers used standard qualitative questions based on Moustakas' (1994). Moustakas recommends that researchers ask, what have participants experienced about the central phenomenon? He also suggests asking the following question: what circumstances have customarily influenced their lived experience of the phenomenon in a study? Based on these modeling questions, the themes cited, and Herzberg's seminal question about what workers want, I formulated the study's problem, purpose statements, and central research question and sub-questions.

I hesitantly outlined job stability, job satisfaction, and job dissatisfaction as relevant themes to this study. I was hesitant after experiencing a philosophical sense of wonder about possible findings; I felt such wonder the way Plato (ca. 370 B.C.E./2015) and Husserl (1973) posited, and as others have explored and experienced regarding what triggers conducting qualitative research (Motroshilova, 2014; Schinkel, 2020). A researcher's wonder for an unknown phenomenon triggers researching, as Plato postulated thousands of years ago. He posited that wonder is what initiates philosophical inquiry (ca. 370 B.C.E./2015). Wonder caused this research. Wonder kept me curious about the potential themes which ultimately transpired from the study's participants' perceptions. Cherry-picking from the listed themes found in the literature corroborated my wonder that the study's participants' perceptions of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction teaching under multi-year contracts reflected the themes listed in Table 1.
Utility and Applicability of the Concept of Perception

After lengthy rumination on the findings and reviewing sources, I concluded that authors broadly applied the concept of perception instead of systematically or contextually defining it as a concept that characterizes qualitative research. It was justified to delve into how researchers applied perception in the most relevant examined studies to configure this literature review. I wondered whether such oversight or intended omission of the conceptualization of perception was an acceptable practice in phenomenological inquiry and qualitative research in general. In my opinion, based on Husserl (1931) and Moustakas (1994), this concept seemed ambiguous in its application to philosophical investigation. In this sub-section, I paused to reflect on his curiosity.

While numbers are the raw materials in quantitative inquiry to establish centerereresearch significance, study participants' perceptions are the raw materials in qualitative research. As defined in Chapter 1 of this manuscript, for the study, perception is "the primary source of knowledge, the source that cannot be doubted" (Mustakas, 2014, p. 52). For Mosunova (2017), perception is "understanding experience in the form of reflecting the objective reality around us in the image of the world and its fragments" (p. 176). Perception derives from prior knowledge or experience resulting from a learning process. Bem (1972), Skinner (1953), and Pitcher (1971) argued that for individuals to form a perception of their realities and surroundings, they need experience, which determines beliefs. None of the studies reviewed explained the concept of perception and its applicability in toto. As water is vital for human existence, perception is vital to qualitative inquiry. Without perception, qualitative inquiry is not possible.

Indeed, the concept of perception has been widely used in adjunct faculty scholarship, and particularly in phenomenological inquiry. As mentioned above, many researchers have
applied this concept to qualitative research and phenomenological inquiry (Bakley & Bordersen, 2018; Ferencz, 2017; Smith, 2019). For instance, Smith (2019) conducted a qualitative hermeneutic phenomenological study and engaged in an "interpretive" process of participants' perceptions (van Manen, 1997, p. 180). The purpose of Smith's phenomenological study was to explore the essence of what it means to be an adjunct faculty member who heeds a call to teach. To investigate what it meant to be an adjunct, Smith collected participants' perceptions. The study depicted hermeneutical phenomenology's utility, which is relevant when the researcher gets involved in the meaning-making process to gather participant's perceptions.

The study conducted by Bakley and Bordersen (2018) via descriptive phenomenology is another example of how perception applies in qualitative inquiry. The study's researchers used a purposive sample of seven participants. Their overall conclusion was that part-time faculty who teach in two-year colleges are relinquishing the desire to become full-time faculty. The main reasons for such a decision have to do with inequality, lack of communication, and lack of support from colleagues and college administration. They reported that an involved process took place to arrive at this conclusion. Through the process, Bakley and Bordersen aimed at exploring participants' perceptions of lived experiences. They applied several steps to analyze the data collected: a reflection on faculty perceptions of lived experiences, journaling, listening to interviews several times, hiring a professional transcription service to transcribe interviews, and highlighting salient statements via following the process of horizontalization (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Moustakas, 1994).

As shown in Table 1, Bakley and Bordersen (2018) analyzed the data. They identified the following major themes: "Accidental academics"; "I do not feel I am treated like a professional"; "Insider yet outsider with full-time faculty"; "Undercurrent of ambiguity with administration";
These themes, as well as the themes distilled from other similar studies previously cited (Bakley & Bordersen, 2018; Smith, 2019; Vicente, 2018), informed this study and its statement that the problem impacting U.S. academia today is the lack of job satisfaction adjunct faculty perceive of their part-time teaching jobs.

The other significant study previously cited and listed in Table 2 was by Ferencz (2017). It was a transcendental phenomenological research design study "to provide a positive perspective of how some online adjunct faculty are overcoming isolation and creating a community despite the remote environment" (p. 16). To substantiate the study, Ferencz asked the following central research question: "What are the experiences of online adjunct faculty who have a high sense of community within their respective universities?" (p. 4). In comparison, in this study, I asked a similar central research question: "What are adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments?" It is all about perception. Each of these questions implies perception, which, as indicated in the Theoretical Framework section, is born out of lived experiences and resulting learned knowledge (Cross et al., 2016; Mosunova, 2017; Skinner, 1953; Bem, 1972; Pitcher, 1971).

Ferencz (2017) mentioned using a convenience sample of 14 faculty who met the study's sample selection criteria. As per criteria, the author selected only those with a sense of community. Participants were described as coresearchers, meaning those who were both contributors and investigators in the project. Data analysis results showed that adjunct participants with a high sense of community tended to engage and collaborate with other
colleagues to support students. As indicated, participants' sense of a phenomenon denotes perception. Via transcendental phenomenology, Ferencz analyzed themes to understand the phenomenon under investigation better. Ferencz identified the following themes: "Supported and safe"; "ask questions and seek help"; "engage with others"; "loyalty and pride"; "student success"; "understanding expectation and technology"; "intentional leadership and opportunity to connect" (p. 19).

Ferencz's (2017) study mentioned perception three times: in its title, in the abstract, and one time in the paper's body. Other researchers have included perception in their studies identified similar themes (Bakley & Bordersen, 2018; Crick et al., 2020; Culver et al., 2020; Hutto, 2017; Vicente, 2018; Wicks et al., 2020). It was evident that Ferencz followed the phenomenological method convention. However, it was noticeable that although considered, the concept of perception was mentioned but not adequately defined, as other authors have also failed to do in their studies (Vicente, 2018; Wicks et al., 2020).

Similarly, in his phenomenological study, Vicente (2018) used the terms "perception," "self-perception," and "perceptions" twenty-one times without defining these concepts. Vicente's study aimed at exploring "contingent faculty's experience and perceptions of institutional support" (p. 13). When researchers such as Ferencz (2017), Vicente (2018), and others (Baron-Nixon, 2007; Culver et al., 2020; Dhilla, 2017; Hutto, 2017; Kezar & Maxey, 2016; Kezar, 2012; Seipel & Larson, 2018; Smith, 2019; Wicks et al., 2020) construct themes and make conclusions from participants' perceptions without adequately defining this concept, which is an integral component of the phenomenon under investigation, the overall validity and reliability of such studies would seem compromised. As shown in Table 2, in addition to the above studies illustrating the applicability and utility of perception in qualitative phenomenological research,
Table 2

Most Relevant Extant Literature Emergent Themes for the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Auxier and Larizza (2018); Bickerstaff et al., 2021; COACHE (2007); Eagan et al. (2016); Neale-McFall (2020); Tuckman et al. (1978); Webber et al. (2018); Witt et al., 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stability</td>
<td>Colby (2020); Dhilla (2017); Danaei (2018); Ferencz (2017); Mech (2017); Ott &amp; Dippold (2018); Ott &amp; Cisneros (2015); Pons et al. (2017); Vicente (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path to Full-Time Employment</td>
<td>Bakley and Bordersen (2018); Danesi’s (2019); Merrit (2016); Tolley and Edwards (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to Students</td>
<td>Bakley and Bordersen (2018); Culver, et al. (2020); Ferencz (2017); Hutto (2017); Wicks et al (2020); Potter (2020); Tuckman et al. (1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconnection to Students</td>
<td>Baron-Nixon (2007); Culver, et al. (2020); Dhilla (2017); Ferencz (2017); Hutto (2017); Kezar and Maxey (2016); Kezar (2012); Seipel and Larson (2018); Smith (2019); Tuckman et al. (1978); Wicks (2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to Institution</td>
<td>Bakley and Bordersen (2018); Crick et al. (2020); Culver, et al. (2020); Ferencz (2017); Hutto (2017); Vicente (2017); Wicks et al. (2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconnection to Institution</td>
<td>Bakley and Bordersen (2018); Baron-Nixon (2007); Crick et al. (2020); Culver, et al. (2020); Dhilla (2017); Ferencz (2017); Kezar and Maxey (2016); Seipel and Larson (2018); Smith (2019); Tuckman et al. (1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>Bakley and Bordersen (2018); Dhilla (2017); Ferencz (2017); Mech (2017); Merrit (2016); Vicente (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Participation in Campus Extracurricular Activities</td>
<td>Culver, et al. (2020); Vicente (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion in Shared Governance</td>
<td>Bakley and Bordersen (2018); Merrit (2016); Vicente (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Benefits</td>
<td>Shulman (2017); Vicente (2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
there have been other research studies conducted on adjunct faculty perceptions of teaching experience (Gagné & Deci, 2005; Kezar & Bernstein-Sierra, 2016; Ott & Dippold, 2018; Pons et al., 2017).

However, none of these authors focused on conceptualizing perception as a critical construct delimiting the extent of their intended research (Husserl, 1931, 1965 & 1973; Pitcher, 1971; Skinner, 1953). They did not focus on adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching contracts, per se. Lack of research on this topic has prevented higher education professionals, advocates of the American Association of University Professors, union leaders, policymakers, and other stakeholders from learning how this population perceives job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

In Table 2, I listed findings distilled from the extant literature. The purpose was to pair up some emergent themes with relevant researchers to give positionality to this study. This table displays the emergent themes derived from studies via which researchers investigated similar topics and used similar central research questions. The reviewed literature, the theoretical framework outlined, and the emergent themes listed played pivotal roles in situating and focusing this study. I consolidated the study's significance via the use of a transcendental phenomenological approach, which central tenets are the concepts of human lived experience, the phenomenon of perception, and the theory of phenomenological reduction via which researchers apply Epoque and bracketing to account for preconceived notions and bias (Giorgi, 2018; Heidergger, 1962; Husserl, 1931; Merleau-Ponty, 1962; Moustakas, 1994; Pitcher, 1971; Sartre, 1956; Skinner, 1953; van Manen, 1997).
Summary

This Chapter offered an Overview, a Conceptual and Theoretical Framework section, a Related Literature section with several sub-sections, and this Summary. As Moustakas recommended, I described that the study's conceptual framework was Husserl's transcendental phenomenological method. The theoretical framework consisted of Herzberg's two-factor theory, as it suited the research design and the research questions seeking to address factors attributed to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The Related Literature section includes relevant recent studies and themes about adjunct faculty's plight in academia. Researchers investigated that a persisting problem afflicting adjunct faculty was lack of stable employment. They also investigated that adjunct faculty perceived their job satisfaction and dissatisfaction as ascribed to their part-time teaching positions. I noted that none of these researchers investigated adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments, which meant a gap existed in the extant literature. In this Chapter, I grounded this study's problem and purpose statements and supported its central research question and sub-questions.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

Overview

In this qualitative phenomenological study, I explored adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments (MYTAs). The research sites were a 2-year college and a 4-year college of a public urban university system in the Northeastern United States, where study participants taught from Fall 2017 to Spring 2020. Via open-ended semi-structured interviews, a purposive sample of 12 adjunct faculty described in their voices the factors they perceived contributed to their job satisfaction and dissatisfaction with multi-year teaching employment. This Chapter contains several subsections: Design, Research Question and Sub-questions, Setting, Participants, Procedures, the Researcher's Role, Data Collection, Data Analysis, Trustworthiness, Ethical Considerations, and a Summary.

Design

Considering that I planned to explore adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments, I selected qualitative research instead of quantitative. The former focuses on deductive reasoning, numbers, objectivity, and generalization (Gall et al., 2007). The latter focuses on inductive reasoning, texts, and in-depth exploration of how participants experience and perceive a phenomenon (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Yin, 2014). Qualitative research is practical when the researcher's expectations of findings are unclear and when the purpose of the inquiry is to explore perceptions and lived experiences (Giorgi, 2018; Husserl, 1931; Merleau-Ponty, 1962; Moustakas, 1994; van Manen, 1990). I applied a qualitative phenomenological design because quantitative research does not work well when seeking to understand participants' perceptions of the phenomenon to be studied.
According to Max van Manen (1997), phenomenological research investigates the experiences study's participants lived with a particular phenomenon. Similarly, according to Creswell and Creswell (2018), as shown in Figure 5, it is an approach via which the researcher becomes a research instrument to describe the study's participants' perceptions of their lived experiences.

**Figure 5**

*Depiction of the Researcher as a Research Instrument to Conduct the Study*

experiences with a phenomenon. To van Manen (1997), the researcher becomes the center of
inquiry via phenomenological research by transforming the study's participants' perceptions of a
phenomenon into text. Readers learn about the essence of participants' individual and collective
lived experiences.

Phenomenology originated with 20th-century German-Jewish philosopher and
mathematician Edmund Husserl. His seminal work was entitled *Ideas: A Pure Phenomenology
and Phenomenological Philosophy* (Husserl, 1931). Subsequently, Husserl wrote a manuscript
titled *Ideen II (Ideas II)* to expand phenomenology as a science. In these works, Husserl posited
that an accurate description of a lived phenomenon, meaning one devoid of bias, spurs scientific
knowledge. To Husserl, phenomenology is a science that originates in consciousness.

Via such science, researchers reduce or bracket their knowledge and bias to accept reality
or phenomena as they are, naturally and subjectively manifested without preconceptions,
thetical underpinnings, and or distortions of any kind. Husserl's phenomenological
reductionism counters any researcher's spurious bias or influence. Through Epoqué and
bracketing, Husserl (1931) argued, researchers could accomplish both — appreciating reality as
manifested and holding in check their preconceived notions of the phenomenon in the study and
study's participants' perceptions of lived experiences. In addition to Epoqué and bracketing,
Husserl introduced what he termed a three-stage "eidetic reduction" or "Imaginative Variation"
(Moustakas, 1994, pp. 97-98), which in his philosophical parlance is a process to deconstruct the
phenomenon in the study. First, I identified one or more similar participants who have
experienced the phenomenon under study. The first selected subject and new subjects formed a
homogeneous group characterized by having lived a similar experience.
In the second stage, called "imaginative repetition" (Moustakas, 1994, pp. 97-98), each additional subject allowed me an opportunity to explore a repetition of the phenomenon under study. A pertinent example is this study to explore adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments. Each of the adjunct faculty selected had lived a similar working experience. In exploring their perception of job satisfaction with MYTCs, I attempted to understand all possible perceived variations of the relayed phenomenon until accounts of participants' lived experiences were exhausted. Since the aim was to understand the essence of adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction with MYTCs, as Husserl indicated, I did not change course or deviate from exploring other aspects of the intended phenomenon nor stopped until saturation occurred.

After data saturation, the final stage, which Husserl labeled "synthesis" (Moustakas, 1994, pp. 97-98), ensued. At this stage, I integrated the subjects' perceptions of the phenomenon into a construct. The aim was to depict the essence of lived experiences of the phenomenon under investigation. This final reporting stage concludes a phenomenological study. A salient aspect of Husserl's phenomenological construct introduces the concept of research/data saturation, which has been attributed primarily to grounded theory (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Hennink & Kaiser, 2020).

Some of Husserl's followers and students have rebuked his phenomenological concepts. For instance, Hiedegger (1931) thought it impossible for researchers to set aside their knowledge of a phenomenon under study. Others have furthered Husserl's contribution to suggest more contemporaneous phenomenological research methods and indicated that hermeneutical phenomenology focuses on text interpretation (Giorgi, 1985, 2018; Hiedegger, 1931; Moustakas,
van Manen, 1990). For instance, van Manen (1990) thought that the interpretation is of the subjects' lived experiences with the phenomenon in exploration.

However, Moustakas (1994) extrapolated on such suggestion and advanced what Husserl termed transcendental phenomenology, which centers on the researcher's description of the study's participants' lived experiences. Although it sounds innovative, it can be traced to Husserl's philosophizing that transcendental denotes accepting subjects' perceptions of lived experience. Subjects' perceptions of a phenomenon do not constitute absolute reality, Husserl postulated. His rationalization on this stance is that the researcher is by convention a spectator, who, on the one hand, is to know the intended phenomenon by appreciating reality as manifested. On the other hand, he suspends preconception of the phenomenon under investigation. There are different phenomenological approaches, including hermeneutic, transcendental, ethical, existential, and linguistic (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Moustakas, 1994; van Manen, 1990).

I chose transcendental phenomenology because I wanted to understand how a group of adjunct instructors experienced and perceived job satisfaction with multi-year teaching contracts. This design type is pragmatic and flexible for researchers to explain and describe the essence of lived experiences based on reductionism (Giorgi, 1985; Husserl, 1931, 1965; Moustakas, 1994). With this concept, Husserl referred to the attitude researchers adopt respecting limiting interpretations and descriptions to how they perceive phenomena in their consciousness. Via transcendental phenomenology, researchers can investigate how knowledge emerges from participants' perceptions of their realities (Meriam, 2009). Without a doubt, of all available qualitative approaches, transcendental phenomenology was the most appropriate research design
to distill such knowledge because it was congruent with the study's problem and purpose statements and the research question and sub-questions.

**Research Questions**

**Central Research Question**

What are adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments at public colleges in the Northeastern United States?

**Sub-Question One**

How do adjunct faculty perceive motivating factors (i.e., achievement, recognition, work, responsibility, advancement, and growth) concerning job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments?

**Sub-Question Two**

How do adjunct faculty perceive hygiene factors (i.e., institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, and job security) concerning job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments?

**Setting**

Out of 4,008 degree-granting institutions of higher learning offering multi-year teaching appointments in the United States (Contract Lengths, 2020), I recruited participants for the study from King College (KC) and New Millennial College (NMC), a four-year college and a community college listed as two campuses of a public urban university system in the Northeastern United States. The university system was High Kingdom University (HKU). I selected these sites as I felt personally and professionally connected to HKU as an alumnus and tenured employee. KC and NMC serve the educational needs of the people residing in a large metropolis and densely populated region in the Northeastern United States.
In Fall 2019, KC and NMC had 15,000 and 12,000 students, respectively. Besides personal and professional connections, the rationale for site selection included the following leadership and organizational structural features of KC, NMC, and HKU, deemed to have a significant bearing on understanding the study's context. Considering that KC and NMC are part of HKU, their chain of command trickles down from HKU Board of Trustees and chancellery. At the campus level, the president presides over a cabinet conformed by senior executive higher education officers. The presidential cabinet includes provost and senior vice president for academic affairs and student success; vice president for budget and finance and chief financial officer; vice president for institutional advancement; vice president for student affairs; vice president for enrollment management; vice president for information technology and chief information officer; counsel to the president and labor designee; and vice president for diversity and human resources.

In both colleges, the president embodies formal authority; however, the president serves at the pleasure of the HKU Board of Trustees and chancellery. These administrative and policy-making levels have fiduciary responsibility for constitutive colleges. Besides, these levels uphold legal, contractual, and collegial authority over KC and NMC. A caveat ensuring transparency is that ultimate oversight lies with the state government apparatus, particularly with the State Inspector General's Office, which conducts periodic auditing of the university system and each college individually.

The span of control in both institutions extends to several divisions. As shown in Table 3, in the 2019-2020 academic year, King College (KC) had over 1,445 employees, including 381 full-time faculty, 639 part-time faculty, and 425 non-instructional employees. New Millennial College (NMC) had 1,300 employees, including 290 full-time faculty, 700 part-time instructors,
and 310 non-instructional employees. Job levels include faculty, executive, managerial, professional, support staff, information technology, and classified civil service. The span of campus control starts at the President's Office with executive and support staff, followed by the Provost's Office manned by higher education administrators. Under the provost's oversight, faculty report to academic department chairs, who report to deans, who respectively preside over School of Arts and Humanities, School of Education, School of Natural and Social Sciences, School of Health Sciences, Human Services and Nursing, and School of Continuing and Professional Studies.

**Table 3**

*Select Demographic Characteristics of HKU, KC and NMC 2019-2020*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Student Population</th>
<th>Full-Time Faculty</th>
<th>Part-Time Faculty</th>
<th>Non-Instructional Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HKU</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KC</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMC</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data compiled from King College and New Millennial College.

**Participants**

According to the U.S. Department of Education, in the fall of 2018, there were over 201,864 non-tenure-track faculty teaching under multi-year teaching contracts at 4,008 degree-granting four and two-year public, private non-profit, and for-profit institutions of higher learning in the United States (Contract Lengths, 2020). As shown in Table 4, 75,803 or 8.4% were part-time faculty, and 126,061 or 13.9% were full-time non-tenured faculty. Overall, in 2018, contingent faculty, including part-timers with multi-year appointments, accounted for 22.3% of the U.S professorate.
Any adjunct of this population could have participated in the study. However, the study used a purposive sample of twelve (N12) selected from the first cohort of 1,500 part-time instructors who experienced multi-year teaching appointments from 2017 to 2020 at High Kingdom University (HKU), which includes King College (KC) and New Millennial College (NMC). The recommended sample size in phenomenological is between 5 and 25 participants (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Polkinghorne, 1989).

Table 4

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members with Multi-year Teaching Contracts, Fall 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Full-Time Faculty</th>
<th>Part-Time Faculty</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Year Public</td>
<td>55,458 (15.6%)</td>
<td>23,675 (6.6%)</td>
<td>79,133 (22.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Year Private Non-profit</td>
<td>49,618 (18.5%)</td>
<td>17,773 (6.6%)</td>
<td>67,391 (25.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Year for Profit</td>
<td>8,711 (16.4%)</td>
<td>19,180 (36.2%)</td>
<td>27,891 (52.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Year Public</td>
<td>7,911 (3.6%)</td>
<td>11,497 (5.3%)</td>
<td>19,408 (8.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Year Private Non-Profit</td>
<td>608 (31.7%)</td>
<td>346 (18.%)</td>
<td>954 (49.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Year for Profit</td>
<td>3,755 (40.2%)</td>
<td>3,332 (35.7%)</td>
<td>7,087 (75.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>126,061 (13.9%)</td>
<td>75,803 (8.4%)</td>
<td>201,864 (22.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table was constructed based on data from the Chronicle of Higher Education’s Analysis of U.S. Department of Education data (Contract Lengths, 2018).

As shown in Table 5, of 1,500 adjunct faculty with multi-year teaching contracts in HKU, 45 were from KC and 43 from NMC. These appointees became eligible for a multi-year contract after teaching ten consecutive semesters at one of the colleges and in the same academic department. Only fall and spring semesters were considered to determine eligibility in compliance with the labor contract agreement signed between the university system and the
faculties, labor unions. Besides, each eligible appointee was required to undergo a comprehensive teaching performance evaluation. I used a demographic questionnaire exclusively designed for this study to select participants. In the following Procedures and Piloting sections, I address the questionnaire’s face and content validity and describe piloting procedures.

**Table 5**

*First Cohort (2017-2020) of Adjunct Faculty with Multi-year Teaching Appointments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Full-Time Faculty</th>
<th>Part-Time Faculty</th>
<th>Adjunct Faculty with Multi-Year Appointments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HKU</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KC</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMC</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data compiled from High Kingdom University

Legend: HKU = High Kingdom University. KC = King College. NMC = New Millennial College

As displayed in Table 6, the demographic characteristics of selected participants included six males, five females, and one self-identified as non-binary, meaning that this participant did not identify based on the sex assigned at birth. There were six between 18 and 65 years of age and six of 65 years of age or older. Three were African Americans or Black, three were Latino or Hispanic, and six were Non-Hispanic White. Seven taught at a public four-year college, and five at a two-year college in the Northeastern United States. Five earned PhDs as their highest academic achievement, six master’s degrees, and another an unspecified graduate degree. Regarding longevity at teaching, four have taught more than ten years as adjunct faculty, three twenty years or more, and the five remaining thirty years or more. The twelve participants underwent a comprehensive teaching evaluation to qualify for multi-year appointments.
**Procedures**

After obtaining the CITI Research Certification (see Appendix E) and completing the proposal defense, I requested the Dissertation Committee Chair approve the IRB application. Upon approval, I submitted the IRB application with supporting documentation. Upon receiving IRB approval, I began to execute the research (see IRB approval letter in Appendix D). I recruited a purposive sample of twenty-two participants from the first cohort of part-time instructors who experienced multi-year teaching appointments at King College (KC) and New Millennial College (NMC) from Fall 2017 to Spring 2020. I determined the final sample to be twelve (N12). Participants were chosen based on selection criteria, which requirements included that they had the title of adjunct or part-time faculty as referred to in the literature review and that they had experienced teaching under multi-year contract at the selected institutions of higher learning in the Northeastern United States from 2017 to 2020.

I selected a purposive sample from the first cohort of 88 adjunct faculty granted multi-year teaching contracts at KC and NMC. These colleges’ respective academic departments

---

### Table 6

**Demographics of Study’s Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Years of Teaching</th>
<th>Public HEI Type*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Aisha</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4-Year College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alyssa</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>30+</td>
<td>4-Year College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Amy</td>
<td>18-65</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>2-Year College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Barbara</td>
<td>18-65</td>
<td>Non-binary</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4-Year College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Jessica</td>
<td>18-65</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2-Year College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Jorge</td>
<td>18-65</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4-Year College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Joseph</td>
<td>18-65</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4-Year College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Kevin</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>30+</td>
<td>4-Year College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Maria</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>30+</td>
<td>2-Year College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Peter</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2-Year College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Rodrigo</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>30+</td>
<td>4-Year College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Roscoe</td>
<td>18-65</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2-Year College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Demographic questionnaire (Appendix F)

*HEI Type means Higher Education Institution Type
facilitated recruitment. Participants were selected based on their ability to provide information about their lived experiences with multi-year teaching appointments. They were outreached and recruited after the KC's and NMC's Offices of Research Compliance and Integrity granted permission to research.

Academic department chairs collaborated by forwarding potential participants an invitation letter via e-mail (Appendix A) and a flyer (Appendix B) outlining the purpose of the study. In the letter and flyer, adjunct faculty interested in participating in the study received instructions to contact me by phone, e-mail, or text. Upon receiving responses from those who accepted to participate, I arranged further communication to provide an overview of the study, confirm their availability, and set up interviews. As discussed in the following section, I tested the demographic questionnaire and interview questions with the first three eligible participants. As not enough responses resulted, I applied the snowball sampling technique to request that identified participants recommend colleagues who fit the study's sampling selection criteria or forward an invitation letter and flyer to them.

Pilot Study

At first, I tested the data collection and analysis procedures via piloting a small sample of three eligible participants who were not part of the study sample. I conducted the pilot study between May and June of 2021. The purpose of completing a pilot study was to test the demographic questionnaire and the open-ended, semi-structured interview questions. A targeted purpose was to ensure the questions were clear and adequately worded, that participants could respond usefully to answer the study's research question and sub-questions.

Besides, conducting this test allowed checking of the audio and video devices' functionality. Out of precaution, three different audio and video recording devices were used: a
4K SONY digital video camera, a two-track Zoom H1 handy audio recorder, and the Webex platform audio video digital recording. The pilot study's data collection procedures consisted of collecting data and demographic information from participants by electronically administering them a descriptive questionnaire (Appendix F); second, upon receiving completed questionnaires, I scheduled in-depth 60-minute, open-ended, semi-structured online interviews with each one of the three pilot study participants. Upon transcribing each interview, which on average lasted approximately 55 minutes and gathering thick data descriptions, the data analysis procedures were executed based on Moustakas' modified van Kaam's method of analysis of transcendental phenomenological data (Moustakas, 1994) as discussed in this Chapter three.

Based on the three participants' pilot study results and feedback, I dropped a question and a few sub-questions; then, I made ad hoc minor modifications and reordered the questionnaire and interview questions to ensure clarity and proper wording. There was no need to request an IRB modification as there were no new questions or sub-questions added. The modifications consisted, primarily, in dropping some sub-questions deemed repetitive or modifying questions wording without changing the original structural configuration. After completing the pilot study and receiving assurances from the three participants regarding the reasonableness of the questionnaire and interview questions, I conducted twelve open-ended semi-structured 60-minute interviews. The primary data collection sources were the demographic questionnaire and video and audiotaped online interviews. Other means of data collection included document analysis and a focus group of five participants. Relying on multiple data collection sources facilitated triangulation, adding validity and reliability to the study (Creswell & Poth, 2018).
The Researcher's Role

A key aspect to consider was my role as an instrument to collect data for the study. I am a higher education administrator whose current functional title is the manager of adjunct affairs at an urban public university system in the Northeastern United States. My duties are primarily administrative/executive. Before this position, I worked in different administrative capacities in the university system. Higher education administration has been my lifetime field of work. I have not had any supervisory authority over adjunct or full-time or tenured faculty along my higher education career. Before explicating my relationship to the study's participants, the research sites, personal assumptions that may impact data collection, data analysis, and the overall way I conducted the study, I elaborated on how my role as a human research instrument fit within transcendental phenomenology. Besides, I explained the reason why I chose this type of research design for the study.

Phenomenology focuses on consciousness. Husserl (1931) posited that when conducting transcendental phenomenological studies, researchers consciously apply Epoqué and bracketing, two concepts discussed in the Design section of this chapter. When applying phenomenology, researchers reduce or bracket their knowledge and bias to accept reality or phenomena as they are, naturally and subjectively manifested. Researchers suspend preconceptions, theoretical underpinnings, and or distortion of any kind. Husserl called this researchers' conscious behavior phenomenological reductionism. By applying Epoqué and bracketing, researchers can counter spurious bias or influences and position themselves as assumed tabula rasas. Heotis (2020) refers to this assumed researcher's conscious posture as when poets use words and language to depict their imagination of phenomena as formulated in their consciousness.
After collecting data, researchers conducting transcendental phenomenological studies describe the phenomenon in Husserlian terms — as told by participants during interviews. Researchers identify emerging themes, reflect on said themes, and apply conventional data analysis methods and techniques, piece themes, and textural descriptions together as a cohesive movie script, story, or poem. In the end, researchers extract the essence of participants' perceptions of lived experience. The resulting narrative resembles a piece of art constructed systematically by following rigorous qualitative methods. I observed the above as I brought my reality, professional academic experience, assumptions, and biases to the study.

As previously indicated, I currently work as a tenured higher education officer with a functional title of manager of adjunct affairs at an urban public university system comprising several campuses in the Northeastern United States. The nature of my position is primarily administrative/clerical. I do not have any authority over adjunct faculty members, although my job responsibilities include coordinating the implementation of multi-year teaching appointments in the campus where I work. I ensure adherence to the signed labor contract's conditions and stipulations as agreed to between the faculty labor union and the university system. I collaborate with deans, academic department chairs, human resources staff, the college's legal counsel and labor designee, and other higher education officers to ensure adherence to the labor contract. In Chapter One, I outlined the description of the university system where I work. My position hints at levels of authority in the chain of structural command. However, I have no authority over faculty members.

Since the pilot program's inception instituting multi-year teaching contracts in 2017, I have been the main coordinative point of contact for the campus where I work. Each of the campuses comprising the public university system has a designated coordinator who implements
multi-year teaching contracts (MYTCs). From 2017 to the present, I have coordinated the processing of multi-year contracts for four cohorts of 150 eligible adjunct faculty. As a result, I have gained practical knowledge of the labor contract, pertinent university policies, and program implementation. In the performance of my duties, I do not interact with eligible instructors or those who have been granted MYTCs or make hiring, non-hiring, or termination decisions.

Eligibility criteria, employment terms, rights, and duties of instructors are part of the labor contract. For instance, the annual list of eligible candidates for MYTCs is initiated and vetted by the Office of Human Resources and the Legal Counsel. Each academic department receives a list of eligible candidates. The academic department chairs and the department's Personnel and Budget Committee evaluate each candidate and, after voting, make a written recommendation to the provost, or the college president's designee, to enforce the labor union contract.

I ensure that appropriate administrative actions, deadlines, and evidence collection are followed and uploaded to Digital Measures, an online tool to organize the faculty's scholarship, service information, and employment supporting documentation. The provost signs the MYTC letter. Eligible candidates receive the appointment letter printed on Provost's Office's letterhead by regular mail and email. Candidates sign the letter and return it to the Office of Human Resources, indicating acceptance or rejection of the multi-year contract offer. Overall, this practical experience has stressed my interest in faculty affairs and motivation for conducting qualitative research on adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments.

Considering a researcher is a human research instrument, I was aware of bringing to the study's described higher education administrative experiences. Specifically, I brought an
administrative-executive standpoint perspective. Such a stance had a bearing on how data collection and analysis unfolded. When conducting a phenomenological study or qualitative studies in general, researchers' assumptions are the norm (Giorgi, 2018; Heidergger, 1962; Husserl, 1977; Merleau-Ponty, 1962; Moustakas, 1994; Sartre, 1956; van Manen, 1997). I have acquired detailed knowledge of multi-year teaching contract implementation and pertinent policies. After four years dedicated to implementing MYTCs, I have become an expert in this area. However, I lacked understanding from the perspective of those teaching under said contract. My assumption from an administrative-executive perspective was that multi-year teaching appointments alleviated adjunct faculty job insecurity and stability. To keep such preconceived notion in check, I followed Husserl's and Moustakas' recommendations to apply Epoqué and bracketing as previously described.

Data Collection

Before submitting the Liberty University IRB application, I attempted to obtain permission from the intended research sites. However, I was advised of the need for the IRB approval letter. After obtaining approval from Liberty University's IRB, and individual administrative permissions from the research sites to recruit subjects, I began data collection in May and concluded in July of 2021. As per qualitative convention, the data were from a demographic questionnaire, open-ended-semi-structured in-depth interviews, document analysis, and a focus group (Lincoln, 2009; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1988; Merriam, 2009; Merriam, 2015; Merriam & Tisdell, 2015; Patton, 2002 & 2015; Yin, 2014). Multiple data collection sources are to be used to facilitate triangulation, which adds validity and reliability to a study (Creswell & Poth, 2018). In this fashion, researchers can obtain an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon in exploration.
Besides the demographic questionnaire, I conducted twelve online audio-video-recorded interviews and a focus group discussion to answer the study’s research question and sub-questions (see interview questions, Appendix G). Out of an abundance of caution, I used three different devices to audio and video record each interview: A 4K SONY video camera, a two-track Zoom H1n handy audio recorder, and the Webex platform digital recording. Each interview was transcribed (see Appendix H for a sample transcript of the interviews) and timecoded from beginning to end, denoting hours, minutes, seconds (i.e., 01:15:02 equal to 1 hour, 15 minutes, and 2 seconds). Participants had equal opportunity to respond at will and uncoerced the fourteen open-ended, semi-structured interview questions and respective sub-questions. I did not have any reason to assume that participants' answers to the questions were compromised. I treated responses equally without judgment nor distortion.

Questions and answers were assigned timecodes displayed in the transcripts at the beginning of each paragraph. Timecoding permitted to precisely identify the location of every statement in the audio and video file to quickly and conveniently verify transcript accuracy. Besides, I removed identifiers from the transcripts, codified each transcript with a number ranging from 1 to 12, and added the corresponding pseudonyms (i.e., Interview 1 Transcript Aisha, Interview 2 Transcript Alyssa). Next, I coded every question and respective sub-questions thematically. For instance, I coded question number 2 as "Q.2. Description of Multi-Year Teaching Appointments." "Definition of Job Satisfaction." Sub-question 6.a was coded, "Q.6.a Perception of Job Satisfaction with Multi-Year Appointments" (see Appendix H). Similarly, I coded question number 6 as Q.6. With this coding system, I manually placed over a table printed transcript pages outlining the questions and respective responses. I then reviewed the transcripts
several times to compare, cross-check and correlate statements and notes, identifying patterns and keywords.

Creswell and Creswell (2018) recommend that researchers develop a preliminary codebook outlining "predetermined codes based on the theory being examined" (p. 196). In addition, as these researchers recommended, I developed a preliminary qualitative codebook and a codebook list (see Table 7 and Appendix I) to code the data emerging directly from participants. The table includes the identified codes, "in vivo codes" (p. 193), meaning those extracted from what participants said, and "preexisting codes" (p. 193), derived from Herzberg et al.'s (1959) two-factor theory, the theoretical framework guiding the study. The postulates of the two-factor theory indicate that workers perceive job satisfaction or dissatisfaction when employers improve on the following factors: "institutional policy and administration," "supervision," "working conditions," "interpersonal relations," "salary," "status," and "job security." When employers improve these factors, workers perceive less job dissatisfaction. The motivation or satisfier factors were "achievement," "recognition," "work," "responsibility," "advancement," and "growth."

As Creswell and Creswell (2018) recommend, I provided brief and complete definitions of codes, long and shortened code labels, explanations of utility, and pertinent quotes distilled from interview transcripts in the codebook and code list. I wrote the aforementioned predetermined codes and those that emerged during data analysis on the margin of each transcript page. Following this process and ad hoc reviews, I inductively identified codes and, subsequently, core themes and sub-themes.

As stated before, the study's primary data collection sources were the demographic questionnaire, open-ended, semi-structured interviews, a focus group discussion, and document
Table 7

Codebook for Themes A, B & C and Sub-Themes A.1., A.2., A.3.; B.1. and B.2.; and C.1., and C.2. (part 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CodeBook for Theme A. Partial Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Example of text from transcripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme A: Partial job satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Code Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Definition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction (Satisfaction)</td>
<td>When expectations are met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-themes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1. Temporary job security (Security)</td>
<td>A tenured employment status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2. Temporary job stability (Stability)</td>
<td>Continuity of employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3. Lessened anxiety (Anxiety)</td>
<td>Feeling apprehension due uncertainty and expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CodeBook for Theme B. Institutional Recognition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme B: Institutional recognition (Recognition)</th>
<th>Example of text from transcripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Code Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Definition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional recognition (Recognition)</td>
<td>Employment in the form of MYTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-themes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1. Longevity (Seniority)</td>
<td>Time spent teaching as adjunct faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2. Teaching performance evaluation (Performance)</td>
<td>Assessment of adjuncts professional performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks: The usage of () denotes shortened code name. MYTC means multi-year teaching contract.
Table 7

Codebook for Themes A, B & C and Sub-Themes A.1., A.2., A.3.; B.1. and B.2.; and C.1., and C.2.(part 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme C: Bells and whistles</th>
<th>Code Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>When to use</th>
<th>When not to use</th>
<th>Example of text from transcripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disappointment with MYTC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment contract with meaningless provisions</td>
<td>Use when co-researchers express disappointment with MYTC</td>
<td>In reference to instances when participants perceive MYTC as granting them job security, job stability, less anxiety and institutional recognition</td>
<td>Rodrigo: “They are giving us a lot of bells and whistles, but nothing attached to those bells and whistles. They’re trying to keep us distracted by giving us a bright shiny object.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-themes**

| C.1. Insult | MYTC as perceive as institutional disrespect |            | Use when study participants express sentiments of being deceived or taken advantage of | Do not use when referring to MYTC provisions adjuncts perceive as effective | Jessica: “There were times when I really felt taken advantage of, or where I felt like people did not understand that some adjuncts really wanted to teach more.” She added, “I think a lot of these colleges are relying on their adjuncts, instead of giving them full-time positions, and that hurts.” |

| C.2. Adjunct faculty complacency | Adjunct faculty complacency | Co-researchers define MYTC as a contract that creates psychological comfort in perceiving they are valued by institution | Use when co-researchers perceive MYTC as a tool to keep them complacent with the reality of their plight for meaningful employment | Do not use in reference to adjuncts who perceive MYTC as an employment prototype delivering tangible benefits | Joseph: MYTC “is keeping me complacent.” “They keep us complacent, when it’s not really adding anything for us. And we’re all people with a lot of experience.” |

Remarks: The usage of () denotes shorted code name.
MYTC means multi-year teaching contract.
analysis. As a human research instrument, I used these sources to distill pertinent codes, themes, identify patterns, determine the meaning of words, expressions, thoughts, intonation, gestures, silence, and participants' very essences of the lived experiences with the phenomenon under exploration. As shown in Figure 5, titled Depiction of the Researcher as a Research Instrument to Conduct the Study, I applied bracketing or Epoquée to interact and interview participants to allow knowledge-formation to flow freely based on their conceptualization of self, their realities, and perceptions of lived experiences of the phenomenon under exploration.

As found in relevant studies framed by social constructivism (Bakley, 2016; McKinley, 2015), as human research instruments, researchers bracket their bias to ask participants to express their views of the phenomenon solely based on the interpretation of their subjective meaning and perception of lived experiences (Creswell & Poth, 2018). As established in this Chapter Three, I followed the process of bracketing or Epoquée, which is part of Husserl's theory of phenomenological reduction (Moustakas, 1994). Through this process, then I became a vessel to describe participants' lived experience with the phenomenon and transform it into text (van Manen, 1997).

**Interviews**

The heart of phenomenology is in-depth, open-ended interviews to collect information about how participants communicate their perceptions of lived experiences (Creswell and Poth, 2018). The study required extensive interviewing. I followed Moustakas' (1994) and Patton's (2002) recommendations to conduct qualitative interviews. Moustakas suggests the researcher asks open-ended questions to elicit that participants convey their experiences with the phenomenon. Patton recommends that researchers consider at least three interview approaches. The first is informal or unstructured without predetermined questions. According to Paton and
Chadwick et al. (2008), this approach allows in-depth interviewing but lacks direction and can be time-consuming.

The second approach, used by Hamblin et al. (2020) and Smith (2019), was intended to understand part-time faculty job satisfaction at the community college level. This approach is guided or semi-structured. The third approach, used by Vicente (2018) in a phenomenological study about adjunct faculty job satisfaction, consisted of open-ended or structured questions. I have experience utilizing audio-visual equipment and interviewing subjects for television production, documentaries, and research studies and felt comfortable with the three approaches Patton recommended. I selected open-ended semi-structured 60-minute interviews and quickly developed a rapport with interviewees via being proactive, keeping eye contact, pronouncing interviewees’ names correctly, being respectful, and poised to create an atmosphere of trust. I relied on these skills when conducting the intended semi-structured interviews for the pilot and the actual research.

I drafted interview protocols and a set of open-ended questions (Appendix G). The protocols included advice regarding procedures and expectations for participants as well as for me as the researcher. The description of any foreseeable risks to participants was included in the informed consent and explained to participants (see Appendix C). I requested that scholars, experts in qualitative research review interview protocols and questions. Upon receiving authorization from Liberty University's IRB, I reached out to adjunct faculty who expressed interest in participating in the study. As researchers have done (Hartman et al., 2019; Page, 2017), the demographic questionnaire was administered via e-mail to ensure participants met sample selection criteria.
Then, with the list of those who met the criteria, online 60-minute interviews were scheduled to pilot protocols and interview questions with a representative sample of participants (Anderson, 2016; Ferencz, 2016). The piloting sample size was limited to three participants; in Anderson's (2016) pilot study, two adjunct faculty participated, while in Ferencz, four not included in the study were selected. Upon completing the pilot, I made ad hoc modifications to the questionnaire and interview questions and repeated the procedures to select the purposive sample and conduct intended semi-structured 60-minute interviews.

The interviews included fourteen open-ended questions and probing sets of sub-questions. Based on the literature review introduced in Chapter Two of this dissertation, and with the interview questions, I intended to distill raw information and data from adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with their lived experiences teaching under multi-year contracts. The intent was that these questions and probing sub-questions would lead participants to speak candidly about the phenomenon they experienced. The interview questions were related to the study's problem and purpose statements and central question and sub-questions. I supported the content of each question and sub-question with scholarly references distilled from the empirical literature. The aim was to ensure adequacy in generating intended raw data and information. Following are the interview questions:

1. Thank you for volunteering to participate in this study. Please, introduce yourself and tell me about you.
2. Based on your perception, how would you describe multi-year teaching appointments?
3. What did you like about teaching under multi-year appointments?
   a. Please, respond to the following question as you see fit: Regarding students, how did you connect with them while you were teaching under a multi-year contract?
b. How did you connect with full-time faculty?

c. How did you connect with the institution and its leadership, including the academic department chair, deans, and the Provost's Office?

4. What did you dislike about teaching under multi-year appointments?
   a. What are some instances of what you disliked about teaching under a multi-year appointment?

5. How do you describe job satisfaction?
   a. How does your perception of multi-year teaching appointments depict your job satisfaction?
   b. What kind of institutional support was afforded to you during your experience teaching under multi-year appointments contributing to your job satisfaction?

6. How would you describe job dissatisfaction?
   a. How does your perception of a multi-year teaching appointment depict your job dissatisfaction?

7. What does a multi-year teaching appointment mean to you as an adjunct faculty?

8. What were the advantages of having multi-year teaching appointments?
   a. If the interviewee mentions any, I will ask them to describe.

9. Overall, what were the disadvantages of having multi-year teaching appointments?
   a. If the interviewee mentions any, I will ask: why?

10. What are your perceptions of being a part-time faculty with multi-year teaching appointments?
    a. What are your perceptions of being a part-time faculty without multi-year teaching appointments?
b. How does teaching under multi-year appointments make you feel?

c. After the multi-year teaching appointment ends, what are your plans in terms of continuing to teach on a per-semester basis or teach full-time?

d. How do you describe your career goals regarding getting tenure or continuing to teach under multi-year appointments?

11. What is your perception of each of the following motivating factors regarding job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments? (I will ask participants to address each factor separately):

   a. What is your perception of “achievement” concerning job satisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

   b. What is your perception of “recognition” concerning job satisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

   c. What is your perception of “work” concerning job satisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

   d. What is your perception of “responsibility” concerning job satisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

   e. What is your perception of “advancement” concerning job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments?

   f. What is your perception of “growth” concerning job satisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

12. As you did in question 11, please describe your perception of each of the following factors concerning job dissatisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments (I will ask participants to address each factor separately):
a. What is your perception of “institutional policy and administration” concerning a sense of job dissatisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

b. What is your perception of “supervision” concerning job dissatisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

c. What is your perception of “working conditions” concerning job dissatisfaction with multi-year appointments?

d. What is your perception of “interpersonal relations” concerning job dissatisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

e. What is your perception of “salary” concerning job dissatisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

f. What is your perception of “status” concerning job dissatisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

g. What is your perception of “job security” concerning job dissatisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

13. What factors of multi-year appointments do you perceive have contributed to a sense of job stability?

a. What factors of multi-year appointments do you perceive have contributed to a sense of job instability?

14. Please allow me to ask a final question: what else should I know regarding your overall perception of job satisfaction with the three-year appointment?

Parting from Patton (2002, 2015), questions are to follow a logical order. For instance, Patton suggests that the first questions are to elicit opinion and feelings, followed by knowledge and background questions. Each question should be open-ended, singular, and devoid of
sophisticated language. In contrast, Bevan (2014) posited that interview questions derive from themes of participants' experiences with phenomena. Moustakas (1994) recommends that researchers ask participants at least two fundamental questions. The first is, what have they experienced about the study's phenomenon? The second is, what circumstances have customarily influenced their lived experience of the phenomenon in the study? These questions derive from Husserl's rationalization of the concepts of noema and noesis (Husserl, 1931). The former refers to the appearance of the perceived phenomenon and how one knows that one is experiencing what one is experiencing. He posited that in phenomenology, the driven question is "what is the perceived as such" (p. 260). The latter, noesis, embodies the essence of the lived experience.

I developed the interview questions to reflect these philosophical concepts and Herzberg's (1959) two-factor theory, which fundamental tenet is in the research question: “What workers want” (p. ii). In general, with slight variations, subtleties, and research peculiarities, similar questions have been used in studies found in the literature review. Below, I address both, how the study's interview questions, and sub-questions align with what Herzberg, Husserl, Moustakas, and Patton posited; and how pertinent extant literature provided support for the content of the fourteen interview questions and sub-questions. The focus and content derived from several researchers including, Bakley and Bordersen (2018); Baldwin and Chronister (2001); Brennan and Magness (2018); Crick et al. (2019); Dalgıç (2014); Danaei (2018); Dhilla (2017); Eagan et al. (2016); Ferencz (2017); Hartman et al. (2019); Kezar and Bernstein-Sierra (2016); Marasi et al. (2020); Maxey and Kezar (2015); Mech (2017); Neale-McFall (2020); Ott and Dippold (2018); Ott and Cisneros (2015); Pons et al. (2017); Rogers (2015); Seipel and Larson (2018); Smith (2019); Stickney et al. (2019); Valdez and Zambrana (2019); Vicente (2018); Walters et al. (2019); and Yu et al. (2015).
The first and last questions are standard and derive from James P. Spradley (1979). The purpose of these two questions was to put participants at ease and allow uncoerced responses. People can candidly speak when questions are open-ended and about themselves, their lives, and their experiences. All the studies cited in the previous paragraph used similar content questions (Bakley, 2016; Williams-Munger, 2018).

The second and third questions are knowledge-based, as Moustakas (1994) posited. I phrased the study's question based on Moustakas' recommendation. Moustakas recommended that researchers are to ask participants at least two general questions when using phenomenological research methods. The first is, "What has your experience been in terms of the phenomenon?" The second is, "What situations have typically influenced or affected your experience of the phenomenon?" (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 79). To frame these questions and sub-questions, I reviewed the phenomenological studies conducted by Ferencz (2017), Mech (2017), and Vicente (2018). The probing sub-questions aimed at expanding the scope of the study's main research question. For specific content, I relied on insights from the studies of Ferencz, Mech, and Vicente, who asked about adjunct faculty perception of their part-time job experiences. These researchers asked participants the type of questions Moustakas and Husserl recommended. In each of these studies, the content of knowledge-based questions was framed based on participants' lived experiences.

Questions and sub-questions 3, and 4 are particular about eliciting responses that require participants to express juxtaposed feelings (Patton, 2002, 2015) about what they liked and disliked of the experienced phenomenon. These questions evoked judgment. I phrased these questions based on Patton (2015). However, for content, I drew from Williams-Munger (2018), who concluded that adjunct faculty liked the idea of different employment positions such as
teaching full-time. Williams-Munger indicated that these adjuncts were unsure whether teaching full-time would fit them.

Questions and sub-questions 5 and 6 elicited participants' perceptions of the phenomenon in the study. I drew from Smith (2019) to write these questions to elicit participants to describe their perceptions of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction with various factors such as institutional support (Page, 2017). Brennan and Magness (2018) used similar questions and found that certain adjuncts sense satisfaction based on their interest in getting institutional support and being connected to HEIs. Maxey and Kezar's (2015) and Page (2016) found that institutional support and other intrinsic factors contribute to adjunct faculty satisfaction and dissatisfaction. In tandem with Herzberg et al.'s (1959) two-factor theory, these researchers corroborated that intrinsic and extrinsic factors play different roles in influencing adjunct faculty to consciously share their perception of employment experiences.

Question 7 was to elicit the study's participants to explain the meaning of teaching under multi-year contracts. Dhilla (2016) found conflicting meanings expressed by the study's participants regarding their perceived teaching experience under part-time contracts. For instance, Dhilla found that online teaching impacts faculty in different ways ranging from feeling vulnerable to being confused with the meaning they ascribe to such a cyber teaching experience.

Questions 8 and 9 focused on the advantages and disadvantages of teaching under multi-year appointments. In an essay about the advantages and challenges of being contingent faculty, Harrell (2019) pointed out that an advantage of his role as an adjunct instructor is the credibility that he gets from students for teaching part-time while having a full-time day job somewhere else. Harrell indicated that students see him as a successful, experienced role model whose dual vocation inspires their future careers. In a study based on 1,034 online adjunct faculty teaching at
faith-based and nonprofit higher learning institutions, Starcher (2017) found that 40% of responders indicated their role as adjunct instructors was an advantage that made them feel satisfied. In another essay about adjunct instructors, Burroughs (2019) revealed that disadvantages of being part-time faculty are feeling disenfranchised to exert any significant influence in higher education institutions, and little incentives demotivate them to teach rigorously. In a study about adjunct faculty experiences at multi-campus community colleges, Bakley and Brodersen (2018) found that a disadvantage of being adjunct faculty is the feeling that the institution takes advantage of them.

Question 10 and sub-questions elicited participants' perceptions of being part-time faculty with and without multi-year teaching appointments. Considering this topic had not been explored, I could not identify any specific study in pertinent literature that has used this question and sub-questions. However, I drew from Kezar et al. (2019) and Nelson et al. (2020), who denoted multi-year teaching contracts as adjunct motivation. I also drew from Page (2018), who asked about adjuncts' feelings about their part-time jobs.

Questions 11 and 12 elicited an explanation of factors participants perceived of multi-year contracts, job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Herzberg et al. (1959) found that both job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are not antonyms. For instance, he posited that employers could motivate employees and increase their satisfaction by offering them recognition, additional responsibility, advancement, and growth. However, he warned that when employers improve working conditions, execute institutional policies to improve employees' working experience, improve relationships with peers, supervisors, and subordinates, and offer good competitive salaries, job security, and benefits, employees tend to be less dissatisfied. Researchers have corroborated Herzberg's postulate via researching job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among
contingent faculty (Crick, 2020; Kezar, 2013; Marasi et al., 2020; Neale-McFall, 2020; Page, 2016; Stickney et al., 2019). For instance, Neale-McFall found that institutional policy was a job dissatisfaction factor impacting faculty mothers who did not get maternity leave as part of their employment package. Marasi et al. found that salary ranked as a primary hygiene factor impacting adjunct faculty’s job satisfaction.

Question 13 referred to factors of multi-year appointments that adjunct faculty perceived as affording them job stability. Researchers suggest that workers without job stability perceive it as a job dissatisfaction factor (Gullickson, 2011; Herzberg et al., 1959). Herzberg suggested that as a motivating factor for workers, job stability is an extrinsic factor of equal importance to institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, and status.

Question 13 also included a sub-question about job instability. In a study about how Herzberg’s theory of motivation applied to full-time and adjunct faculty, Gullickson found that Herzberg’s theoretical assumptions of job stability and instability were useful regarding validating factors motivating job satisfaction. Researchers found that adjunct faculty perceive their teaching employment as dissatisfaction due to the lack of job stability (Eagan et al., 2016; Kezar & Scott, 2019; Page, 2017; Pons et al., 2017; Yakoboski, 2016).

Question 14 was constructed to allow participants an opportunity to volunteer any information they deem appropriate about the experience. This question elicited important aspects the researcher may have overlooked (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Spradley, 1979). The focus and content for this question derived from Brennan and Magness (2018); Danaei (2028); Dhila (2017); Eagan et al. (2016); Ferencz (2017); Hartman et al. (2019); Mech (2017); Ott and Cisneros (2015); Smith (2019); Vicente (2018).
**Questionnaire**

Instead of using surveys, after obtaining IRB approval, I collected data and demographic information from participants by administering a descriptive questionnaire (Appendix F) before scheduling the interviews. The link to the questionnaire was sent by email to adjunct faculty who expressed interest in participating in the study. The questionnaire helped answer the research question and sub-questions. The questionnaire also yielded background information on participants, including race and ethnicity, employment status, and critical background information about teaching experience, job satisfaction, job dissatisfaction, and perception of job stability. As Creswell and Poth (2018) indicated, demographic questionnaires provide general information about co-researchers, similar to information collected in information triage.

Upon receiving the completed demographic questionnaire in the Appendix section of this manuscript (Appendix F), I scheduled open-ended semi-structured online interviews via the Webex communication platform. The information collected helped the researcher ascertain whether co-researchers met sampling selection criteria. Using completed questionnaires, I developed a spreadsheet to keep an inventory of contact information and track interaction with participants, including particularities, notes, and observations. The questionnaire was piloted with a small sample of three adjunct faculty with multi-year teaching appointments at either King College or New Millennial College to ensure content validity. It was critical to determine whether the questionnaire and interview questions were effective to explore co-researchers experience with the phenomenon under study. Piloting a representative sample of three co-researchers not only helped ensure that the questions were clear and compelling but also to troubleshoot potential issues. In addition, piloting served to ascertain whether Husserl’s
phenomenological conceptual framework was suitable to conduct the study on adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments.

**Document Analysis**

Documents are reliable sources of information. In addition to interviews and observations, documents include insightful descriptive narratives about phenomena (Sanders, 1982). In this study, document analysis included:

- a dossier of labor contract agreement signed by the faculty labor union and the university system,
- implementation and evaluation memoranda,
- and other publicly accessible related documents developed for the implementation of multi-year teaching appointments.

Following, I identified and briefly described the nature of documents collected and explained the criteria for document selection. An important observation is that I meticulously analyzed documents and used pseudonyms ad hoc fashion to protect the study's participants' identity and the research sites' names.

**Labor Contract Agreement**

This public legal document was available for public use. It states the terms, eligibility criteria, and procedures for implementing adjunct faculty multi-year teaching contracts at the university system and the two institutions of higher learning from where study participants were recruited. The rationale for selecting this document was predicated upon the need to get acquainted with relevant contract stipulations, including benefits, teaching workload, professional development hours, office hours, and a comprehensive evaluation of adjunct teaching performance.
Implementation and Evaluation Memoranda

A set of memoranda about implementing and evaluating multi-year teaching appointments provided the researcher with specific details of such processes. These were public documents accessible via the websites of research sites and the faculty union. Considering the Labor Contract Agreement described above includes general information, I was able to find specificities detailing all stakeholders' expectations, including those of adjunct faculty granted a multi-year contract.

Other Related Internal Organizational Documents and Materials

Other documents I considered applicable included appointment and nonappointment letters requested from participants, as such letters included vital information about institutional expectations and contractual terms. I advised study participants to mask such letters before sharing them to protect their identity and the names of research sites. Besides, I reviewed the minutes of the University's Board of Trustees' proceedings regarding the implementation and the different issues ascribed to multi-year appointments. Additional materials I used included publicly available documents labeled as frequently asked questions or FAQs published by the faculty labor union and colleges and universities implementing multi-year teaching contracts. I also listened to audio-visual materials containing comments, discussions, presentations, and interviews of the faculty union and higher education officers about implementing multi-year appointments.

Focus Group

As Ferencz (2017) and other scholars such as Sotirin and Goltz (2019) have done, I relied on hosting an online focus group with some participants of this transcendental phenomenological study. As stipulated in the signed informed consent, I invited them to partake in an online semi-
structured focus group discussion. The focus group consisted of the first five co-researchers who agreed to participate in a 60-minute session. This form of data collection yielded additional information about participants' feelings and reactions. The session also served to reconcile themes that resulted from the open-ended, in-depth multiple interviews.

The rationale driving this modus of data collection was to elicit insights from participants regarding their perception of job satisfaction with multi-year contracts. Researchers widely use focus groups in qualitative research (Creswell & Poth, 2018). It has become trendy to hold synchronous focus groups on the Internet (Gill & Baillie, 2018). At present, researchers have to their disposal innovative technology via Zoom, TEAMS, and WebEx applications to realize their investigations. In a transcendental phenomenological study, Ferencz (2017) used focus groups via Adobe Connect video conferencing.

A list of relevant themes that emerged from pertinent literature, and the theory of motivation, was made available to study participants. The focus group questions were similar in format to the open-ended, semi-structured interview questions introduced in this manuscript. The following are the four focus-group questions (Appendix J) that guided the focus group discussion:

1. As adjunct faculty, what are your perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments?
2. How do you perceive the following motivating factors concerning job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments?
   a. Achievement
   b. Recognition
   c. Work
d. Responsibility  
e. Advancement  
f. Growth  
g. Other

2.1 From 1 to 7, number the following categories based on importance regarding how you perceive each category concerning job satisfaction with multi-year appointments (1 denotes the most important and 7 the least important):

_____ Achievement
_____ Recognition
_____ Work
_____ Responsibility
_____ Advancement
_____ Growth
_____ Other

3. How do you perceive hygiene factors concerning job dissatisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments?

a. Institutional policy and administration  
b. Supervision  
c. Working conditions  
d. Interpersonal relations  
e. Salary  
f. Status  
g. Job security
h. Other

3.1. From 1 to 8, number the following categories based on importance regarding how you perceive each category concerning your job dissatisfaction with multi-year appointments (1 denotes the most important and 8 the least important):

_____ Institutional policy and administration
_____ Supervision
_____ Working conditions
_____ Interpersonal relations
_____ Salary
_____ Status
_____ Job security
_____ Other

4. Are there any other aspects of your experience and perception of job satisfaction teaching under multi-year contracts that you would like to discuss? If yes. Please discuss.

Data Analysis

There are several ways data can be processed and analyzed in qualitative research. Researchers customarily use content analysis, discourse analysis, framework analysis, and grounded theory analysis (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Miles et al., 2014). In this study, data analysis approaches were limited to the ones yielded by the literature review about transcendental phenomenological research (Moustakas, 1994). In other words, analysis procedures aligned with Moustakas' phenomenological research methods.

Researchers conventionally use transcendental phenomenology to describe the essence of participants' lived experiences. They focus on describing participants' perceptions of a
phenomenon via transcendental phenomenology. Studying Moustakas' seminal work on phenomenological research methods facilitated the learning of two salient data analysis methods used in phenomenological inquiry: Stevick-Colaizzi-Keen Method (Colaizzi, 1973; Keen 1975; Stevick, 1971) and van Kaam Method (Moustakas, 1994). On the one hand, Moustakas modified the Stevick-Colaizzi-Keen Method to use it in a deconstructive way by focusing on finding the meaning of lived experiences. Researchers arrange such units into thematic references or themes, conceiving an encompassing central description of subjects' lived experience of the phenomenon in exploration. On the other hand, Moustakas modified the van Kaam Method to establish seven steps beginning with researchers applying Husserl's tripartite process consisting of (a) Phenomenological Reduction, (b) Imaginative Variation, and (c) Synthesis. When this method is applied, researchers neutralize any preconceptions about the phenomenon under investigation; in other words, researchers step out of themselves.

The resulting thirteen transcripts, twelve from the interviews and one from the focus group, were printed, read, explored, and reviewed numerous times. Creswell and Creswell (2018) recommend that in addition to utilizing predetermined codes, researchers consider identifying additional codes from the data to reflect co-researchers’ views better. Consequently, the list of manually identified additional codes and sub-codes included satisfaction, dissatisfaction, security, stability, anxiety, recognition, longevity, performance, disappointment, insult, and complacency. The process included identifying recurring themes manually and conducting a thorough review of the transcripts, paying close attention to each word and sentence structure. A review, categorization, and combination of resulting themes followed.

Aside from manual hand-coding, I used NVivo, a qualitative data analysis software (QDAS) (Creswell & Poth, 2018) praised as a tool to transcribe, codify, classify texts and
perform an array of functions in the context of data analyses. After uploading the thirteen transcripts into NVivo, verification of codes and themes from participant's responses to interview questions ensued. The next step consisted in ascertaining similarities and differences in theme development with the initial themes manually identified and generated via NVivo. Following this step entailed clustering themes inductively and organizing them based on commonality and differences. Out of the two data analysis methods, the selected one was Moustakas' modified "van Kaam's Method of Analysis of Phenomenological Data" (Moustakas, 1994, pp. 120-121). The main reason for this decision was that the van Kaam's method embodies Husserl's transcendental phenomenological philosophy. Researchers distill a rich, in-depth understanding of participants' perceptions of a phenomenon's lived experience with this method.

The study's design data analysis procedures are based on Moustakas' modified van Kaam's data analysis method. Moustakas' method includes seven steps: (1) "Listing and Preliminary Grouping" also referred to as "Horizinalization," (2) "Reduction and Elimination," (3) "Clustering and Thematizing the Invariant Constituents," (4) "Final Identification of the Invariant Constituents and Themes by Application: Variation," (5) "Individual Textural Description of the experience," (6) "Individual Structural Description of the experience," and (7) "Textural-Structural Description" (pp. 120-121). Adhering to these steps in providing the study's participants' narratives of the essence of their lived experience teaching under a multi-year contract in a bona fide unaltered manner was critical to ensure research validity. It was critical to apply these steps to each participant's interview transcript. Consequently, the outcome was a lengthy report as the sample size consisted of twelve participants (N12).
1. The first step was *horizontalization* to treat the data with equality and list, group, and code quotes relevant to the adjunct faculty perception of lived experience with multi-year contracts.

2. In the second step, reducing and eliminating quotes based on utility took place. Through this process, quote analysis included asking two questions based on Moustakas' (1994) recommendation: Was this quote important to adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments? The second question was, can the researcher reduce this quote to its actual meaning? A negative answer to these questions meant elimination of vague, redundant, or repeated quotes. The objective of this step was to obtain relevant expressions of participants' lived experiences.

3. With the remaining relevant quotes, the third step explored meanings and created clusters of themes denoting participants' lived experiences.

4. In the fourth step, checking themes against the data ascertained that such themes represented the adjunct faculty perceptions of lived experiences.

5. In the fifth step, constructing a textural description for each participant permitted listing and maintaining their vernacular expressions intact.

6. The sixth step consisted of applying Husserl's Imaginative Variation concept to create individual structural descriptions of their lived experiences. This step included interpreting data; and paying particular attention to what adjunct faculty participants said about their sociocultural standing and how they felt about their lived experience teaching under multi-year contracts.
7. In the final step, the process included constructing composite structural descriptions to identify similarities and differences among participants. This step was crucial to conceptualize specific characteristics that participants indicated they experienced with the phenomenon. This step concluded with constructing a composite textural-structural description to depict the meanings and essences of the entire group's perception of lived experience with the phenomenon under investigation.

**Trustworthiness**

Trustworthiness refers to validity, researcher's honesty, trustfulness, reliability, dependability, and accuracy of findings (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Researchers use different procedures and sources to ensure trustworthiness; one is the triangulation of data, which refers to collecting data from multiple sources (2018). Using multiple sets of data is critical to triangulate research findings. Triangulation aims at ascertaining the validity and reliability of the study's results. The data collection for this study originated from several primary sources: a demographic questionnaire, semi-structured interviews, document analysis, and a focus group. The following criteria ensured overall trustworthiness: member checks (Appendix K), audit trail, and thick descriptive data (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). These strategies addressed what Lincoln and Guba (1985) termed credibility, dependability, transferability, or confirmability. The following are pertinent definitions and descriptions applied to this study.

**Credibility**

Credibility refers to trustworthiness, which conveys believability and defensibility (Creswell, 2009; Creswell & Poth, 2018). The study included data distilled from multiple sources and rendered accurate accounts of participants' lived experiences to ensure credibility. As
Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Whittemore et al. (2001) postulated, drawing data from multiple interviews, document analysis, and other sources add credibility to the research. As an instrument, my analytical abilities and research experience ensured the study was conducted according to qualitative research conventions and IRB requirements. Participants reviewed and approved interview and focus group transcripts for accuracy in descriptions and accounts of their lived experiences. Besides, after data analysis, identified findings were relayed to participants for their input, verification, and authentication. These were critical, rigorous steps taken in this study to ensure credibility. Before signing the informed consent, each participant received advice about these steps.

**Dependability and Confirmability**

This study included an audit trail and relied on member checks (Appendix K) as techniques to account for dependability and confirmability. Dependability refers to researchers' technique to ensure consistency, accountability, and research repeatability (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Confirmability denotes certification or assurance or truthfulness of other researchers' pertinent findings (2018). Both techniques were accounted for in this study's research process via an audit. Creswell and Poth recommend creating a document using "memoing" or writing memoranda to create a retrievable document along the research process to trace resulting findings.

Relying on an audit trail permits researchers to get rich details needed to do postmortem analyses. The study’s data collection sources yielded consistent findings that researchers can replicate. As Lincoln and Guba (1985) recommend, having an inventory of details and steps taken not only validates the study but can also help take corrective action should the researcher stray from conventional qualitative research practices. Following these authors’
recommendations, I ensured dependability and confirmability by using memoing, an audit trail, and member checking via which co-researchers corroborated study findings to account for accuracy.

**Transferability**

Creswell and Poth (2018) define transferability as generalizability, meaning that the study's findings are relevant to other similar situations or populations. Via transferability, researchers ascertain external validity (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1988; Yin, 2009). As pointed out throughout this manuscript, this study yielded thick, rich descriptive data and findings. Creswell and Poth posited that developing thick descriptions helps transferability between the researcher and participants.

To further ensure transferability, I emphasized the maximum variation of the sample and setting. The sample represented the target population in terms of age, rank as adjunct faculty, and type of teaching contracts. The twelve co-researchers had three-year teaching contracts. In terms of setting, a community college and a four-year college in the Northeastern United States were the sites to draw the purposive sample. Although researchers emphasize the role of transferability, it is noteworthy that when conducting qualitative research, they do not aim to achieve generalizability; the focus is on the particular (Greene & Caracelli, 1997; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). These expectations ensured transferability in this study, according to Lincoln and Guba's established qualitative research criteria.

**Ethical Considerations**

Ensuring that the study was ethical was of utmost importance to me. Researchers typically disclose their values and assumptions in their studies (Creswell & Poth, 2018). As indicated in Chapter One and Chapter Two, I was driven by axiological assumptions, meaning
that values have influenced my perceptions of life experiences, such as social status, gender, beliefs, and Christian worldview. My philosophical axiological point of view is characterized by integrity and honesty. Telling the truth and following ethical principles are idiosyncratic to my habits and behavior. I adhered to widely accepted qualitative inquiry conventions and IRB requirements. I also adhered to Liberty University School of Education's conceptual framework labeled the "SCRIP" philosophy, which stands for S = "Social Responsibility," C = "Commitment/Work Ethic," R = "Reflection," I = "Integrity," and P = "Professionalism" (Liberty University, 2019, p. 5). As a tenured higher education administration practitioner who has lived by these principles, I informed participants of the purpose, protocols, benefits, potential risks of harm, and extent of the study. To participate in the study, they were required to sign an informed consent (see Appendix C). They were also advised of their rights to withdraw from participation at any time during the research process.

I used pseudonyms to protect the identity of co-researchers and the names of the research sites. Furthermore, data and information deemed to identify participants potentially were not collected. I secured collected data in a password-protected computer. According to section §46.115 of federal 45 CFR 46 regulations (National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research, 1979), pertinent paper files must be kept in a locked cabinet. Retention and destruction of data will be executed based on the policy established by Liberty University's RIB. After three years, I will delete the data. The purpose of retaining data for such a period will be to address any potential inquiry into potential research misconduct and other related matters. Additionally, participants had access to research findings and respective analyses to review for accuracy in data distilled from interviews and focus group discussion.
Summary

This chapter outlined the study's research design, its research central question and sub-questions, settings, co-researchers, procedures, researcher's role, data collection, data analysis, trustworthiness, and ethical considerations. I explained the rationale for conducting a transcendental phenomenological by substantiating that qualitative methods are practical when the researcher's expectations are unclear. The purpose of the inquiry was to explore how individuals experience a phenomenon and understand the essence of their collective lived experience with said phenomenon. By selecting transcendental phenomenology, I investigated how knowledge emerged and described my philosophical assumptions and the essence of participants' lived experiences. I laid out the preeminent need to conduct this transcendental phenomenological study on adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction with multi-year contracts.
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

Overview

The purpose of this transcendental phenomenological study was to explore the perception of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments (MYTAs) of twelve adjunct faculty who taught from 2017 to 2020 at public colleges in the Northeastern United States. The study's participant recruitment and data collection took place from May to July 2021. The data collection sources were a demographic questionnaire, open-ended, semi-structured online interviews, a focus group discussion, and document analysis. I took notes during the interviews and focus group discussions to ensure data analysis validity. I also applied member checking to reaffirm the accuracy of participants' responses (Appendix K). The length of the interviews ranged from 50 to 70 minutes, and the focus group lasted about one hour.

Following this Overview, this Chapter includes a section about Participants and a Results section organized with two main subsections. Subsection Theme Development reflects the seven data analysis steps I took to process and extract themes and sub-themes. Subsection Research Question Responses encompass answers to the study's central research question: "What are adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with MYTAs?" This subsection also includes answers to the study's two sub-questions: "How do adjunct faculty perceive motivating factors (i.e., achievement, recognition, work, responsibility, advancement, and growth) concerning job satisfaction with MYTAs?" And "How do adjunct faculty perceive hygiene factors (i.e., institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, and job security) concerning job dissatisfaction with MYTAs?" The Chapter concludes with a Summary.
Participants

I selected participants or co-researchers for this study by applying purposive and snowball sampling techniques. The sample consisted of twelve adjunct faculty 18 years of age or older who had multi-year teaching contracts (MYTCs). From fall 2017 to spring 2020, they taught at two public colleges in the Northeastern United States – New Millennial College (NMC) and King College (KC). Co-researchers were initially contacted via email by academic department chairs of the two colleges. Chairs or their designees forwarded the invitation strictly to those adjuncts with MYTCs. I did not know the total number of potential participants who received the invitation from chairs. A population of twenty-two accepted the invitation. They clicked on the link included in the invitation and read the consent to participate. As Creswell (2009) recommends, the consent form included advice on their protected rights (see Appendix C). They were made aware that they agreed to participate in the study by clicking on the demographic questionnaire link at the end of the consent form. The twenty-two potential participants completed and submitted the demographic questionnaire, therefore consenting to participate. I followed up by selecting the first three who met the study's sampling selection criteria to conduct the pilot study. I selected twelve (N12) who met the sampling selection criteria upon completing the pilot study.

I concluded that the remaining seven did not meet the sampling selection criteria. Three indicated in the questionnaire that they had taught under an MYTC from fall 2017 to spring 2020; however, they clarified that their first three-year contract started in fall 2020. One participant expressed confusion during the interview and was unsure whether she had an MYTC. An eligible adjunct withdrew, indicating discomfort sharing information about his lived experience teaching under a multi-year contract. Furthermore, two adjuncts indicated they met
the sampling eligibility criteria when in reality, they were granted an MYTC effective in the fall of 2021.

I contacted the remaining twelve eligible participants via emails and phone numbers they provided in the questionnaire. They were requested to submit signed and dated consent forms before the interviews; they had the opportunity to select a date and convenient timeslot for the online interview. Upon receiving the preferred date and timeslot confirmation from each participant, I scheduled online Webex interviews. Participants received a Webex automatic invitation for the interview and a researcher's email confirmation note with the link and additional information. I conducted the twelve interviews online in the privacy of my residence, used pseudonyms for each participant, and did not report information that revealed their identity nor the names of the research sites.

As outlined in Chapter Three and shown in Table 6, the demographic characteristics of the purposively chosen sample of participants included five females, six males, and one non-binary. Six were between 18 and 65 years of age, and six were 65 or older. Six were Non-Hispanic White, three Black or African American, and three Hispanic or Latino. I did not ascertain whether participants were representative of the general population of adjunct faculty with MYTCs at the research sites. Five had earned Ph.D. as their highest academic achievement, six master's degree, and another an unspecified type of graduate degree. Seven taught at a public 4-year college, and five at a two-year college. In terms of longevity, four taught more than ten years as adjunct faculty, three, twenty years or more, and five, thirty years or more. Based on information distilled from the demographic questionnaire, the interviews, the focus group, document analysis, email, and phone exchanges with participants, I constructed the following individual portraits using pseudonyms:
Aisha

In the study's demographic questionnaire, this participant self-identified as a Black or African American female of 65 years of age or older. Her higher academic credential is a Ph.D. Over the past 25 years, she has taught at public colleges in the Northeastern United States. At the interview for this study in June 2021, she was a three-year appointed adjunct faculty. Her passion is to share knowledge about the African American experience and preserve the African people's cultural legacy. She teaches undergraduate and graduate courses on race relations. Aisha is actively involved in the African American community and has a record of advocacy and community empowerment accomplishments. She accepted a three-year teaching appointment in the fall of 2017 and an additional three-year teaching contract in 2020.

Alyssa

With a master's degree and over thirty years of teaching experience, Alyssa, 65 years of age or older, has taught African American study courses at public colleges in the Northeastern United States over the past two decades. She is of African American/Black ancestry. Her community commitment includes involvement in several grassroots community-based organizations in the Tri-state area of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. She also engages in documentary production focused on civil rights, diversity, and inclusion. In addition, she works in television and theater. Her television credits include accolades from local, state, and national constituents.

Moreover, college officials acknowledged her accomplishments. After teaching along more than ten consecutive semesters at the same institution and academic department, Alyssa accepted her first three-year teaching appointment in 2017 and her reappointment effective from
fall 2020 to spring 2023. At the time of the interview in July 2021, she was a three-year appointed adjunct faculty.

**Amy**

Amy is an over 60 years of age non-Hispanic White female. Her highest academic credential is a Ph.D. After teaching as an adjunct for several years, she accepted a one-year teaching contract and a two-year contract. Eventually, after teaching for ten consecutive semesters at the same college and academic department and passing comprehensive teaching performance evaluation, she was granted a three-year contract at a public community college. However, when her three-year reappointment came, she was given a one-year contract with guidance instead. She is still bewildered by the decision as no one in the department sat down with her to explain the reasons for her demotion. Amy has lost all hope of getting a full-time position because she is already over 60 years of age.

**Barbara**

Barbara is over 60 years of age and self-identified in the study's questionnaire as a non-binary and non-Hispanic White who teaches at a public four-year college as an adjunct assistant professor of English, American, and Media studies. Barbara's higher degree is a Ph.D. She has taught at public colleges in the Northeastern United States since 2010. Her first three-year appointment was granted in the fall of 2017 and ended in spring 2020. Subsequently, she accepted a three-year reappointment effective from fall 2020 to spring 2023. At the interview for this study in June 2021, she was still teaching as a three-year appointed adjunct faculty.

**Jessica**

As an adjunct faculty teaching at a public community college in the Northeastern United States, Jessica prides herself on having a master's degree and professional experience in the arts.
She is a female, over 60 years of age, who self-identified in the questionnaire as non-Hispanic White. Her plans include getting a full-time teaching position. Over the past six years, she has been teaching a course workload equivalent to a full-time position. However, she still does not have a full-time rank. Her job satisfaction comes from knowing that students are learning and preparing for the rigors of getting a college education. In 2017, she accepted a three-year teaching contract and another three years in 2020. At the interview in June 2021, Jessica indicated she was teaching under a multi-year contract at a public four-year college in the Northeastern United States.

**Jorge**

Over the past two decades, Jorge has taught undergraduate students at public and private colleges and universities in the Northeastern United States. His passion is to teach and help students succeed. He self-identified as a Latino/Hispanic male over 60 years of age. He taught at an elitist university for several years. The institutional support and resources devoted to student learning at such an institution opened his eyes to the kind of support and resources offered to students who attend public colleges across the United States. This experience enlightened him regarding the inequalities in higher education and reinforced his resolve to teach undergraduate students to excel. He is confident that the stigma associated with being an adjunct faculty does not affect him as he is financially stable. He has always been satisfied with his adjunct teaching rank and is happy with the institutional support he has received from the 4-year college where he was working during the interview in July 2021. Jorge earned a three-year teaching appointment due to his seniority and demonstrated teaching performance working at the same higher education institution and academic department over the past decades. Jorge was also granted a three-year contract reappointment after passing a comprehensive teaching evaluation.
Joseph

After 20 years as a practicing lawyer, Joseph, a non-Hispanic White over 60 years of age, revealed the need for new challenges to fulfill his life. To this end, he embraced teaching as a second career. "As exciting and interesting as law is, I thought it was becoming 'same old, same old' and I'd always, you know, really enjoyed the times that I've mentored and taught younger attorneys," he noted at the beginning of the interview for this study. In addition to his law degree, Joseph earned an English as a second language certificate and completed a master's degree in applied linguistics. With these credentials, he began teaching legal writing to foreign undergraduate and graduate students. His passion is to teach students who are bound or hoping to have careers in law. Joseph received his first three-year appointment in fall 2017. As of the interview for this study in June 2021, Joseph indicated he was teaching under a multi-year contract at a public four-year college in the Northeastern United States.

Kevin

Kevin is a non-Hispanic White of over 65 years of age who has been teaching for a very long time, dating back to the mid-1980s. He has always taught as an adjunct, mainly at an urban public university system in the Northeastern United States. Kevin had a full-time teaching position for two or three years. He is proud to have raised a family on a teaching salary earned at several public and private colleges. He earned his Ph.D. in the late 90s. His forte is teaching communication, public speaking, theater, film, and research writing. Approaching his 70th birthday, he still hopes to get a full-time teaching position. His first three-year teaching contract started in fall 2017. Unlike other adjuncts, he is pleased to have a key to an office granted to him for teaching and student service purposes. He considers access to an office a privilege rarely granted to adjunct faculty. As of the interview for this study in June 2021, Kevin indicated he
was teaching under a multi-year contract at a public four-year college in the Northeastern United States.

Maria

Maria is over 65 years of age. After earning a master's degree in Spanish literature, she started working in higher education in different administrative capacities in the mid-1980s. From working in career services, continuing education, enrollment management, student affairs, and diversity training, and after retiring, Maria started teaching as an adjunct faculty in 2010 at different public and private institutions of higher learning in the Northeastern United States. She attempted, in vain, to complete her Ph.D.; family contingencies thwarted her efforts. While teaching undergraduate students, Maria remained actively involved in the faculty union and other community-based organizations. She taught on a semester basis as a regular adjunct at an urban two-year college. Eventually, Maria accepted a one-year teaching contract. Subsequently, she became eligible for a three-year appointment after teaching for more than ten consecutive fall and spring semesters at the same institution and academic department and undergoing comprehensive teaching performance evaluation; being the only adjunct faculty with a multi-year contract in her academic department afforded Maria a sense of pride and professional fulfillment. Maria accepted and began teaching under this type of contract in fall 2017. As of the interview for this study in June 2021, Maria indicated she was teaching under a multi-year contract at a public four-year college in the Northeastern United States.

Peter

Peter is an over 65-years of age male who retired from a government position. As a Ph.D. holder, he has taught as an adjunct faculty for more than three decades at a community college in the Northeastern United States. Peter remembers being laid off from work twice as adjunct
faculty in the 1990s. Although he is secured financially due to receiving a lifetime pension for working as a public employee of a large municipality in the Northeastern United States, he appreciates getting teaching contracts for more than one semester or a year. After teaching for several decades at the same public college and academic department, his multi-year contract resulted from a labor agreement signed between the faculty union and the university system. He accepted a multi-year teaching contract in 2017 and an additional three-year contract in 2020. He views exchanging knowledge with students and helping them graduate from college, his most valuable contribution to academia. As of the interview for this study in June 2021, Peter indicated he was teaching under a multi-year contract at a public four-year college in the Northeastern United States.

Rodrigo

A Ph.D. holder, Rodrigo is over 65 years of age. He self-identified as a Hispanic/Latino male of Jewish descent. Over the past two decades, Rodrigo has taught music courses at the same public college in the Northeastern United States. In fall 2017, he accepted to teach under a three-year teaching contract and, in 2020, was reappointed to another three-year contract.

Approaching his 70th birthday, Rodrigo hopes to get a full-time teaching appointment in academia, commensurate with his three-decade teaching experience and contributions to students, the university system, and society. Rodrigo is writing a book to strengthen his academic credentials as he plans to pursue a full-time teaching position. He is politically active with the faculty union and the state legislature regarding his quest to address the adjunct faculty plight for respect, job stability, and better salaries. Rodrigo is proud of his many academic accomplishments and expressed satisfaction having the opportunity to teach students and work for a public college affording educational opportunities to underrepresented communities.
Roscoe

Over the past 20 years, Roscoe has taught undergraduate students at different community colleges in the Northeastern United States. He self-identified as an African American/Black man who is over 60 years of age. His highest academic degree is a master’s. His job satisfaction derives from sharing knowledge with students. His primary career was in the private sector; however, he lost his full-time job due to the COVID pandemic. After over ten consecutive semesters, Roscoe accepted his multi-year teaching appointment at a community college, excluding Summer and Winter terms. Unfortunately, during the COVID pandemic, thousands of adjuncts were laid off, even some of those with multi-year contracts, like Roscoe. At the interview in July 2021, he was uncertain about whether his contract would allow him to get his job back. After passing a comprehensive evaluation, he received his initial three-year teaching appointment, including a chair's annual evaluation, a 50-minute peer observation, and student evaluations.

Results

Theme Development

In this section, I report the study’s results drawn from the demographic questionnaire, interviews, focus group discussion, document analysis, and answers to the central research question and sub-questions. Considering there is no standardized method to write the results section of a phenomenological qualitative research study (Creswell & Poth, 2018), I report the results in narrative form based on the seven steps of Moustaka’s modified van Kaam method of analysis of phenomenological data as I described in Chapter Three. Guided by predetermined codes and in vivo codes (see Table 7 and Appendix I), I introduce each step with corresponding findings in narrative and tabular form. I include listing and preliminary groupings, invariant
constituents, individual textural descriptions, individual structural descriptions, individual
textural/structural descriptions, resulting themes and sub-themes, and a composite description of
the group lived experience with multi-year teaching contracts. As outlined below, theme
development for this study included narrative and data from the results extracted from the
demographic questionnaire, interviews, focus groups, and document analysis.

**Demographic Questionnaire Results**

The process of theme development started to unfold during the data analysis. The twelve
participants completed the demographic questionnaire (see Appendix F), which yielded initial
data regarding job satisfaction and dissatisfaction with multi-year contracts. The questionnaire
was designed based on Herzberg et al.’s (1959) theory of motivation and the study’s research
question and sub-questions. As shown in Table 8, participants responded to a question asking
them to single out which of the following factors they deemed as contributors to job satisfaction
in the workplace: achievement, recognition, work, responsibility, advancement, and growth.

**Table 8**

*Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction Factors Contributing to Adjuncts’ Perceptions of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Multi-Year Teaching Contracts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Satisfaction Factors Perceived as Contributing to Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Dissatisfaction Factors Perceived Contributing to Job Dissatisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Aisha</td>
<td>work; recognition; achievement</td>
<td>salary; status; job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alyssa</td>
<td>achievement; responsibility</td>
<td>salary; other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Amy</td>
<td>achievement; recognition; other</td>
<td>job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Barbara</td>
<td>work; other</td>
<td>job security; salary; other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Jessica</td>
<td>recognition</td>
<td>job security; status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Jorge</td>
<td>responsibility; work; recognition</td>
<td>salary; job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Joseph</td>
<td>achievement, recognition; work; responsibility</td>
<td>institutional policy and administration;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>working conditions; salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Kevin</td>
<td>work; growth</td>
<td>job security; supervision; salary; status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Maria</td>
<td>work; recognition</td>
<td>job security; other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Peter</td>
<td>recognition; work; responsibility</td>
<td>institutional policy and administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Rodrigo</td>
<td>recognition; work; growth</td>
<td>supervision; job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Roscoe</td>
<td>responsibility; work; other</td>
<td>job security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Demographic questionnaire (Appendix F)*
They also responded to a question asking them to point out which factors they deemed to contribute to job dissatisfaction in the workplace: institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, and job security.

As illustrated in Table 8, participants listed all of the satisfaction factors they perceived contributed to their job satisfaction with multi-year contracts: Ten of the twelve participants listed “work” and nine “recognition,” as main factors contributing to their perception of job satisfaction. Similarly, they listed all of the factors they perceived contributed to their job dissatisfaction with multi-year contracts. Of the twelve participants, nine listed “job security,” and six “salary,” as main factors contributing to their perception of job dissatisfaction.

As shown in Table 9, regarding the main factor contributing to co-researchers’ perception of job dissatisfaction with a multi-year contract, six selected “job security,” two singled out “institutional policy and administration,” one responded “salary,” other “status,” another “working conditions,” and one selected “interpersonal relations.” Herzberg et al. (1959)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Are you satisfied with your Multi-Year Contract?</th>
<th>Main Factor Contributing to Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Main Factor Contributing to Job Dissatisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Aisha</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alyssa</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>achievement</td>
<td>salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Amy</td>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>recognition</td>
<td>job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Barbara</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Jessica</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Jorge</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Joseph</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Kevin</td>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Maria</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>institutional policy and administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Peter</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td>institutional policy and administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Rodrigo</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>recognition</td>
<td>job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Roscoe</td>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>job security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Demographic questionnaire (Appendix F)
concluded that when workers have assured job security, working conditions, reasonable salary, and ranks, they tend to perceive no dissatisfaction with their employment. Job security, which denotes longevity or tenure, was the most prevalent factor co-researchers singled out as reflecting their perception of job dissatisfaction with multi-year contracts.

Out of nine intrinsic motivating factors, eight co-researchers selected “work” as the primary factor contributing to job satisfaction with multi-year contracts. Two singled out “recognition,” one selected “responsibility,” and one selected “other”. Herzberg et al. (1959) concluded that workers perceive these factors as motivators increasing job satisfaction.

During the interviews, I asked participants in different ways to clarify their perception regarding job satisfaction with a multi-year contract. The co-researchers also responded to the question, are you satisfied with the multi-year contract? Nine responded “yes,” while three were “not sure.” In the following section about theme development, which includes the interview results, I report their answers in this respect.

**Interviews Results**

Aside from the results of the demographic questionnaire rendered above, in this section, I present the study's themes or findings emerging from the twelve participants' responses to fourteen open-ended, semi-structured interview questions and sub-questions, and five participants' responses to four open-ended, semi-structured focus group questions. In addition, I asked the five focus group participants to rank factors they considered contributed to their perception of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction with MYTCs; their responses yielded similar results obtained from the demographic questionnaire. As described in Chapter Three, I extracted the study's themes or findings following the seven steps based on Moustakas Modified van Kaam Method of Phenomenological Data Analysis (Moustakas, 1994):
First: Horizonalization

Second: Invariant Constituents

Third: Clustering and Thematizing the Invariant Constituents

Fourth: Concluding Identification of the Invariant Constituents and Themes by Application: Validation

Fifth: Individual Textural Description of the Experience

Sixth: Individual Structural Description of the Experience

Seventh: Textural-Structural Description of the Meanings and Essences of the Experience

First: Horizonalization Results. Following the above outline of Moustakas' Modified van Kaam Method of Analysis of Phenomenological Data, I read each transcript several times to extract expressions relevant to the adjuncts' experience and perception of job satisfaction teaching under a multi-year contract. I gave equal value to every word, phrase, expression, or statement and outlined them in a list titled Horizonalization - Listing (see a select list in Appendix L). I listed three hundred and ninety expressions describing the adjuncts' lived experience with multi-year contracts. The first expression listed was distilled from Barbara's interview transcript when asked to define multi-year contracts: "A little bit of job stability and job security." The last expression listed was from Jorge's interview transcript: "It gives me a sense of recognition." I noted that the number of possible horizons could have been more extensive than the total listed. However, I extracted only those that seemed relevant to the lived experience of adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction with multi-year contracts.

Second: Invariant Constituents Results. The second step consisted in identifying the invariant constituents, meaning the core themes and sub-themes of the adjunct faculty's experience teaching under a multi-year contract. Several were reduced, kept, or eliminated based
on the utility of the three hundred and ninety invariant constituent expressions. Each of the
selected horizons was analyzed through this step, asking the following two questions
recommended by Moustakas (1994): Was this quote important to adjunct faculty perception of
job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments? The second question was, can this quote
be reduced to its actual meaning? A negative answer to these questions meant quote elimination.
Besides, I eliminated vague, redundant, or repeated quotes. I took the three hundred and ninety
horizons (see a select list in Appendix L) denoting the initial listing of relevant expressions and
created preliminary groupings as reflected in Appendix M. In this step, I compiled all the vetted
expressions and subsumed them under twelve invariant constituents listed in Table 10. The goal
of selecting the invariant constituents was only to obtain relevant expressions of participants'
lived experiences.

Table 10

Invariant Constituents

- a. I am partially satisfied having this contract
- b. A multi-year contract is job security and job stability albeit temporary
- c. Multi-year teaching appointments lessen job anxiety
- d. No additional compensation under multi-year contract
- e. Multi-year contracts are a recognition of seniority and teaching performance
- f. It is a piece of paper
- g. Multi-year contracts are bells and whistles, a carrot and a stick, an insult
- h. Even with multi-year contracts, we are still adjuncts
- i. No additional institutional support
- j. There is life after multi-year contracts
k. No change in working conditions

l. They keep us complacent, when it is not really adding anything for us

Third: Results from Clustering and Thematizing the Invariant Constituents. In the third step, I clustered the twelve invariant constituents into core themes and sub-themes. I noted how common themes formed clear patterns across the interview transcripts. I identified each core theme and sub-theme with different colors on the printed transcript copies; each was then explored and deemed to represent participants' lived experience and perception of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments. The broad core themes that emerged from the invariant constituents were the following three and respective sub-themes:

Theme A: Partial Job Satisfaction.


A.2. Lessened Job Anxiety.

Theme B: Institutional Recognition.

B.1. Teaching Longevity.

B.2. Teaching Performance.

Theme C: Bells and Whistles.

C.1. Insult.

C.2. Adjunct Faculty Complacency.

These themes and sub-themes are in correspondence with the study's research question and sub-questions. In the following pages, each theme is outlined and supported with narratives, quotes, and data from the collection methods used and the twelve invariant constituents. Similarly, each sub-theme is described as each represents a relevant specific aspect of the adjuncts' lived
experience with multi-year teaching contracts and the resulting perception of job satisfaction with the said labor contract.

**Theme A: Partial Job Satisfaction.** This core theme includes three sub-themes A.1. Temporary Job Security, A.2. Temporary Job Stability, and A.3. Lessened Job Anxiety. To adequately address these concepts, I considered study participants' descriptions of job security, job stability, and job anxiety. They described job security as entailing assurance of maintaining a job; job stability as the actual duration [emphasis added] of employment; and job anxiety as stress-inducing feelings associated with employment uncertainties.

Theme A Partial Job Satisfaction denotes that overall, participants perceived and experienced satisfaction with some aspects of multi-year teaching contracts such as temporary job security, temporary job stability, and less anxiety. Except for the three who were not sure, participants indicated they were satisfied with multi-year contracts. Alyssa said she was partially satisfied with her multi-year contract because it was a temporary fixture to the perennial adjunct faculty's plight for job security.

**Sub-Theme A.1. Temporary Job Security.** This sub-theme denotes that participants acknowledged being satisfied with experiencing job security regardless of COVID and other contingencies impacting enrollment. In this respect, Barbara said: "Job security is the biggest area of change with the contract and the one that provides the most significant difference in my perception; job security is what the contract affords." Jessica indicated she was frustrated and had low satisfaction because she felt taken advantage of as a regular adjunct. However, after being granted a multi-year contract, her perception was that she was satisfied as having this type of contract has allowed her stable employment for three consecutive years. "There's security; there's some job security. So, I really like that."
Joseph admitted that when he accepted the three-year appointment, he thought, "Wow, this is fabulous because they are telling me that for three years, I will have employment, even if it should turn out that [there were not] enough students enrolled in certain classes for me." Jorge said: "I have a degree of job security until the contract is up." Barbara indicated that "Three-year appointment is designed to give the adjunct some kind of job security, and feeling of confidence; it does that, and that gives you satisfaction, much more satisfaction." In his theory of motivation, Herzberg et al. (1959) postulated that when workers lack job security, they perceive job dissatisfaction with their employment.

**Sub-Theme A.2. Temporary Job Stability.** Job security entails assurance of not losing a job, which translates into job stability for all participants. They expressed concerns that their three-year appointment eventually and resolutely would end as there was, or there is no guarantee of reappointment for an additional three-year contract or a permanent contract, said Alyssa. She realized that her three-year reappointment seemed unsure at the moment of the interview with her in July 2021.

In this respect, Barbara said, "The multi-year contract itself provides as much job stability as one can have for the length of the contract." Peter said, "I just like that you have job stability." A commonality among participants was to refer to job security and job stability interchangeably as if both terms had the same meaning. The references to these terms were about their perception of partial job satisfaction with MYTCs. Hollenshead et al. (2017) defined *job stability* as continuity of employment, whereas Herzberg et al. (1959) described *job security* as tenure.

**Sub-Theme A.3. Lessened Job Anxiety.** In this study's review of pertinent literature, I noted that anxiety had been a fixture in the adjunct faculty plight stemming from the lack of better working conditions. In a study on adjunct faculty job satisfaction, Nelson et al. (2020)
found that although adjuncts lack job security and stability, they still perceive some degree of job satisfaction with their part-time positions. In contrast, Bakley and Bordersen (2018) and Crick et al. (2020) found that adjuncts tend to be dissatisfied with their part-time teaching positions, which causes heightened awareness of anxiety. In contraposition to this finding, I noted that adjuncts with a multi-year teaching part-time position expressed a sense of job satisfaction and less anxiety.

For instance, when asked whether he was satisfied with his multi-year teaching contract, Kevin revealed that job anxiety is another way to talk about adjunct faculty. When teaching as a regular adjunct, Kevin worried about whether he would have a job the following semester. After being granted a multi-year appointment, he remained less worried: "It [multi-year contract] kind of lessens that job anxiety. So, the three-year appointment in a nutshell feels a little better, but the anxiety is still there."

Jessica corroborated Kevin's statement that regular adjuncts continuously wonder whether they would teach next semester and that teaching under a multi-year contract causes "a little less anxiety." Like Jessica, other participants also corroborated Kevin's assertion. For instance, Maria said, "It is less stressful than being on a semester-to-semester contract." Peter indicated, "I don't have to worry every semester or every year if I am going to pay my bills."

Rodrigo explained, "It is more restful and allows me to make long-range plans. Beyond that, we're just a higher class of dirt." Barbara stressed, "I like it because of continuity and less stress." Moreover, Aisha said, "It is less stressful than being on a semester-to-semester contract."

All study participants acknowledged experiencing lessened anxiety with their multi-year contracts. However, for two participants, Roscoe and Amy, anxiety increased towards the end of their first three-year appointment. Roscoe lost his job during the COVID pandemic, and Amy got
a one-year appointment with guidance instead of a three-year reappointment. Irrespective of their employment standing at the interview in July 2021, both acknowledged that MYTCs lessened their anxiety. In this respect, Amy said: "I am partially satisfied because I have less anxiety." Roscoe admitted: "I was partially satisfied and job security was temporary. There was less anxiety."

Theme B: Institutional Recognition. This theme denotes that participants perceived the granting of a multi-year appointment as recognition of seniority. However, the contract did not include a salary raise, additional institutional support, better working conditions, or status changes. Joseph, for instance, said, "Because I've been around so long, I've consistently been given the three-year contracts." Claiming he was also granted a multi-year contract due to his longevity, Rodrigo said, "Multi-year contracts make one feel a little bit more recognized, a little bit more valued, but not valued enough for the higher education establishment to take qualified adjunct faculty over tenured track [faculty]." Although Rodrigo acknowledged a multi-year contract as recognition that affords security, he asked: "What's job security if you're not paid enough? How is that secure?" Moreover, he added, "That's not secure. So, they stopped beating us with a large stick, instead they beat us with ropes; they're still beating us!"

Barbara said, "When I first got the three-year contract, I was gratified by the idea that my chair had thought of me to offer the contract. I perceived it as a vote of confidence." Rodrigo shared that when he passed the comprehensive evaluation for his three-year contract, he received excellent marks from colleagues and students: "I had fantastic peer reviews and fantastic reviews from the students." Similarly, Jessica said she felt acknowledged by the contract. "I definitely feel well recognized. I feel that it is an acknowledgement of the satisfaction that my department has towards my work."
**Sub-Theme B.1. Teaching Longevity.** The college grants MYTC to adjunct faculty who have worked ten consecutive semesters. Most study participants perceived this eligibility criterion as fair and a form of institutional recognition that psychologically reflects positively in their records and employment prospects. Herzberg et al. (1959) list recognition as one of the factors contributing to job satisfaction. Out of the twelve participants, six were of 18-65 years of age. Each of these six was over 50 years of age.

Similarly, there were six over 65 years of age. Five of these six were over seventy years of age or older. "I don't know what the deciding factor was in general; longevity was a component of it," said Jorge about his multi-year appointment. The other co-researchers acknowledged that longevity was a qualifying factor to grant them a three-year contract.

**Sub-Theme B.2. Teaching Performance.** This sub-theme encompasses the recognition of adjunct faculty seniority and teaching performance. Co-researchers perceived multi-year teaching positions as institutional recognition of either longevity and or performance. In the following statement, Jorge corroborated Herzberg et al.’s (1959) theory, that psychologically, workers who perceived recognition for their performance tend to be more satisfied with their job:

By offering the multi-year contract, the institution recognizes the educator as an important and valued component of the institution because it says, 'we know that you can teach; we know that you do things properly.' Moreover, offering a multi-year contract, it aids in economic stability and psychological stability. In a sense, that active recognition that the multi-year contract offers also improves the educator psychologically.

Regardless of whether they responded to the study questionnaire saying they were satisfied with the multi-year contract or not, all participants perceived institutional recognition as a job
satisfier. Herzberg et al. (1959) found that recognition motivates workers to perform better. For instance, Maria said:

The multi-year appointment is a recognition that I am well thought of as a professional, as a faculty member, and what I do with the students. That they can count on me because I do a lot of last-minute subbing for a lot of faculty. And they know they can count on me. They can give me a call at 10:00 PM the night before, and I'll be fine. So, I think that it made me feel very well recognized.

Maria summarized her thoughts about this in the following way: "I guess being given a multi-year contract is an achievement in itself. That's it!"

**Theme C: Bells and Whistles.** As mentioned in the previous two themes and sub-themes, adjunct participants acknowledged they accepted a multi-year appointment to ensure job security and stability and as recognition of their longevity in teaching in the same academic department and institution of higher learning. However, their perception was that the multi-year contract did not include permanent job security per se. Nor did it include assurance of salary increase, better working conditions, or the promise of additional institutional support. They expressed such sentiments in different ways. To Rodrigo, the multi-year contracts are "bells and whistles," meaning a type of "shiny object" to keep adjuncts distracted. "They're trying to keep us distracted by giving us a bright shiny object." In addition, he said, the contract is "an insult" perceived as disrespect towards adjunct commitment and contributions. To Kevin, the three-year, two-year, or one-year contract type would not matter unless there is a well-intended change in the culture of higher education institutions towards adjuncts. The type of contract does not change anything, he clarified:

It is just kind of a carrot and a stick. It does not change the institution's attitudes and
feelings about what an adjunct is, what it was, and still is; and what it is now. We are hard-working teachers who are dedicated to our students.

**Sub-themes C.1. Insult and C.2. Adjunct Faculty Complacency.** Theme C embodies sub-themes C1. and C.2. based on co-researchers' perception that multi-year contracts are an insult that promote adjuncts complacency with their employment situation. Complacency derived from participants' perceptions of what a multi-year teaching appointment meant to them. As this theme and sub-themes reflect, Amy felt that "adjuncts don't want to rock the boat" even when experiencing hardship. "I will never have the job security that a full-timer has."

Regarding how a multi-year contract has changed his teaching experience, Kevin said, "I haven't seen anything. I mean, you got an email from the chair saying, 'you got this appointment,' but I haven't gotten anything else." He added, "Why can't you just…tell me that I have a position, some kind of position; something more permanent, which is what adjuncts want." Aisha labeled her multi-year contract simply as "a piece of paper." In this respect, Joseph said during the focus group discussion:

> I do think we need to be concerned that it might be, as Professor Rodrigo was saying, all *bells and whistles*, and they keep us complacent when it is not really adding anything for us. And we're all people with a lot of experience, and we've been around; so, that may be a negative.

Rodrigo was convinced that the university system and faculty union agreed to that type of multi-year contract to keep adjunct faculty "complacent," without adding anything new. To him, Multi-year contracts are an attempt to throw a few crumbs to make you feel better about the fact that we're not being paid anywhere near what we should be, especially if they recognize that we have proven ourselves to be effective teachers.
He added, "They're throwing me a bone, and this dog is getting a little tired of bones and would like some meat."

In a similar undercurrent of thought, Alyssa asserted, "I have always been amazed at how people who speak so highly of the value of education but yet, they don't think their teachers deserve pay; [they are of the opinion] that we should be donating our time." Expanding on her position on this issue, she noted: "If I had to survive based upon what I was being paid on the multi-year contract, I could not survive in New York." She concluded by saying: "They need to pay the adjuncts more."

Acknowledging that being granted a multi-year appointment did not include additional remuneration, more institutional support, and improved working conditions, Maria pointed out, "The salary had nothing to do with the multi-year appointments. Salary goes by how many semesters you have taught, and it is very much negotiated between the union and the university." Then, she asserted, "I don't see new support because of the multi-year contracts. I see the same support that I have always received." Maria concluded, "We are disposable faculty." Rodrigo validated Maria's statement during the focus group discussion:

Multi-year contracts are an insult. They don't have the integrity to take us on as full-time, even when the lines had existed. They let them vanish by attrition. So, no, they're an insult. They should have hired me and a few of my colleagues to fill in the full-timers' lines that have been lost.

Despite perceiving a multi-year contract as bells and whistles, or a bone, or a carrot, or a piece of paper, or an insult, or an appointment letter, or a way to keep them complacent, participants expressed partial job satisfaction with certain aspects of it, such as temporary job
security, temporary job stability, lessened anxiety, and institutional recognition of longevity and teaching performance.

**Fourth: Results of Concluding Identification of the Invariant Constituents and Themes by Application: Validation.** As shown in Table 11, I checked the invariant constituents and respective core themes against the data in step four. This step aimed to ascertain that the resulting themes represented the adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year contracts. I checked the invariant constituents and pertinent themes against each participant's evidence collection, including the demographic questionnaire results, interview, and focus group transcripts. I noted that the invariant constituent framed as "There is life after multi-year contracts" was not relevant to the co-researchers experience as the focus of the study was on the lived experience and perception of job satisfaction with multi-year contracts. I deleted this expression.

Table 11

**Final Identification of the Invariant Constituents and Themes by Application: Validation**

**Theme A: Partial Job Satisfaction.**

*Sub-Theme A.1. Temporary Job Security.*

*Sub-Theme A.2. Temporary Job Stability.*

*Sub-Theme A.3. Lessened Job Anxiety.*

- I am partially satisfied because I have less anxiety
- I am satisfied having this contract
- Job security is what the contract affords
- A multi-year contract is job stability, albeit temporary
- Multi-year teaching appointments lessen job anxiety
Theme B: Institutional Recognition.

Sub-Theme B.1. Teaching Longevity.

Sub-Theme B.2. Teaching Performance

- Multi-year contracts are a recognition of seniority
- Multi-year contracts are a recognition of adjuncts’ teaching performance
- Feeling appreciated

Theme C: Bells and Whistles.

Sub-Theme C.1. Insult.

Sub-Theme C.2. Adjunct Faculty Complacency.

- A multi-year contract is a piece of paper
- Even with multi-year contracts, we are still adjuncts
- They keep us complacent, when it's not really adding anything for us
- They’re throwing me a bone, and this dog is getting a little tired of bones and would like some meat

Some invariant constituents were rearranged and listed correctly under the core themes that emerged. I verified several times that all the invariant constituents appeared in respective transcripts and were explicit and compatible with the three core themes and respective sub-themes. Therefore, they were relevant to the lived experiences of co-researchers.

Fifth: Individual Textural Descriptions of the Experience. In this fifth step, textural descriptions were constructed of each participant's perception of job satisfaction and lived experience with MYTCs. I used the twelve validated invariant constituents, the three core themes, sub-themes, and relevant participants’ vernacular expressions to construct individual textural descriptions. Common characteristics of each of the twelve participants were the shared
experiences teaching as regular adjuncts at public colleges in the Northeastern United States before and after being granted a multi-year contract. They were considered long-serving adjunct faculty who lived a similar teaching experience under three-year appointments from 2017 to 2020. To effectively construct a textural description of their experiences, it was critical to consider their background information.

Co-researchers' individual experiences converged in that they have been subjected to the same multi-year contract working terms as agreed to by the faculty union and the university system where they taught. All were eligible for a multi-year appointment for having taught a minimum of ten consecutive fall and spring semesters at the same institution and academic department. They were required to pass a comprehensive teaching performance evaluation, including their academic department chair’s annual evaluation, a 50-minute peer classroom observation, the last three-year student evaluations of faculty, official approval by the department of personnel and budget committee, and the college president or designee. As part of the contractual labor agreement, these adjuncts taught at least two courses or a minimum of six contact hours per semester, which guaranteed them healthcare and other benefits.

Besides, they were entitled to the office and professional hours, and among other benefits, sick leave, vacation time leave, and holidays time off. They were also entitled to a three-year teaching reappointment under the same contractual terms as regular adjuncts. The reappointment was contingent upon passing a comprehensive teaching performance evaluation as described.

Co-researchers voluntarily participated in this study, completed the demographic questionnaire, and were asked the same fourteen semi-structured-open-ended interview questions and sub-questions regarding their job satisfaction and lived experience with MYTCs. Based on
their answers to the questionnaire, interview questions, and focus group discussion, I constructed
textural descriptions for Aisha, Alyssa, Amy, Barbara, Jessica, Jorge, Joseph, Kevin, Maria,
Peter, Rodrigo and Roscoe. As shown in Tables 10 and 11, I constructed each textural
description with participants' vernacular expressions as reflected in the interview transcripts. I
also considered the validated invariant constituents and the three core themes and sub-themes
that emerged and depicted their job satisfaction experience and perception of with MYTCs.

_Aisha’s Individual Textural Description of the Experience._ Aisha indicated that before
accepting the MYTC, she taught without job assurance as a regular adjunct. "My job satisfaction
has not changed since I have received the multi-year contract—I love teaching and taught quite
happily without the contract," she said in response to the research question, what is your
perception of job satisfaction with the multi-year contract? "The difference is that with the
contract, I have a bit more security about where I'll be teaching next semester," Aisha said.

In the questionnaire, she indicated being satisfied with her multi-year contract (see Table
8). In the interview, she reiterated being partially satisfied (see item #6 in Appendix N). "Every
semester you don't have to worry because you already have a guarantee for three years, and
another three years; so, you're going to be concentrating on students."

Although Aisha was optimistic about getting her second three-year appointment, I
verified that she had accepted her reappointment but seem to have forgotten. She expressed
optimism regarding reappointment: "I wouldn't want to be so egotistical or so overconfident…at
the end I hope that everything will work out?" Her answers validated Theme A that a multi-year
teaching contract provides partial job satisfaction as it offers temporary job security, temporary
stability, and lessened job anxiety.
In terms of Theme B, she clarified that a multi-year appointment did not grant her any recognition, additional pay, institutional support, or improved working conditions. Aisha asserted, "I know it's my department that recognizes me, not the multi-year contract." "I just feel they need to pay us more whether it's a multi-contract or not." She indicated feeling supported but clarified, "I don't know if this is because the multi-year thing or not."

Respecting Theme C, participants perceived multi-year contracts as *bells and whistles*. In this respect, Aisha's vernacular expression was: "It really is just like another piece of paper." "In fact, it is no different to me; the only difference is on paper." Overall, Aisha's textural description of the experience with a multi-year appointment and her perception of job satisfaction demonstrates an adjunct faculty partially satisfied by the assurance of job security and stability, albeit temporary.

*Alyssa’s Individual Textural Description of the Experience.* Since the fall of 2017, Alyssa has been teaching under an MYTC. She answered "yes" to the question, are you satisfied with your multi-year contract? (Table 8). "I would say that the union fought for this and I'm very proud they did that, because before the multi-year contract, we had no guarantees of anything and that's already like a major improvement," she said, adding, "I am very happy to have gotten an MYTA" (see item #6 in Appendix O). The main reason for Alyssa to feel this way had to do with job security and stability. However, she feels there are uncertainties with this type of contract. Even after being granted a multi-year contract, adjuncts are unsure whether they will get reappointed. As Theme A Partial Job Satisfaction states, MYTCs afford co-researchers limited employment terms. Sub-Themes Temporary Job Security, Temporary Job Stability, and Lessened Job Anxiety derived from Theme A, as they are interrelated. In a sense, for Alyssa, multi-year contracts result in less anxiety than one-semester or one-year contracts.
Similarly, Theme B Institutional Recognition is denoted as a factor that workers perceive as a job satisfier; such a factor recognizes seniority and teaching performance. Alyssa felt respected and acknowledged by the institution, which granted her an MYTC due to her seniority, teaching performance, and contributions to the benefit of students.

Well, I think that the chairperson gives you a little more respect because the appointment comes directly from the provost. I called my chairperson up recently, and I said, 'I want to thank you for the additional three-year appointment, which I received that letter.' She said, 'Oh, I had nothing to do with that; it came directly from the provost.'

Alyssa acknowledged that the academic department chair is the one who makes the three-year appointment recommendation to the provost. "The fact that they give it, is appreciated. It says, 'yes, we respect you'; 'I'm only able to offer you three years but I will offer that.' It's a respect thing, for me," Alyssa assertively conveyed. Such display of institutional support was indicative of her perception of job satisfaction with multi-year contracts.

However, Alyssa expressed concerns regarding the extent of multi-year contracts; after all, she did not get additional benefits such as a salary increase resulting from the contract. "The missing link is there was no increase in salary, there was no bonuses for being selected." She did not get additional institutional resources nor improved working conditions. "I have to still say they should pay more to the adjuncts; they should at least pay the same hourly rate they pay the full-time teacher," she indicated, stating that her rank did not change, neither how she interacted with students, colleagues, and higher education administrators, including her academic department chair. Alyssa's perception of these aspects fits in Theme C, which denotes multi-year contracts as an insult and bells and whistles to keep adjunct faculty complacent.
Overall, she admitted the extent of the MYTC and her job satisfaction. In acquiescence, she said regarding her college employer: "They didn't say they wanted me there for life, just for three years. Absolutely, it does give some stability. And you figure if you do a good job, they will do something else again. I'm partially satisfied."

**Amy's Individual Textural Description of the Experience.** Amy described her experience with MYTC as having a sense of job security and an opportunity to focus on students. "I perceive it to be like more secure." "And so, having that made me kind of feel like I could focus on my teaching more and my students." Her contract description is attuned to Theme A Partial Job Satisfaction and sub-themes A.1., A.2., and A.3., which refer to temporary job security, temporary job stability, and lessened anxiety. However, in the demographic questionnaire, Amy responded to whether she was satisfied with her multi-year contract with two words: "not sure" (see Table 8). When during the interview, I asked about her perception of job security with MYTC, she said:

Oh, that's high, but it's temporary because it's only for three years. I don't know; maybe that makes me greedy. The job satisfaction is very high for the period of the contract. But the contract ends, and there is no guarantee that it will be renewed.

Amy feels the contract does not afford her permanent job stability. However, she acknowledged that it afforded her lessened anxiety. "My perception of multi-year appointment is that it creates less stress for me, and less stress opens up the opportunity for more creativity and flexibility in the way I teach." At some point in the interview, she said, "I'm partially satisfied because I have less anxiety."

Regarding Theme B. Institutional Recognition, Amy stated that the contract meant her "recognition and security" from the institution. She acknowledged that the granting of the
contract stemmed from her longevity teaching at the same college and the comprehensive
teaching performance evaluation results. However, she is convinced that adjuncts do not get
additional institutional support or more recognition because of the contract.

Respecting Theme C. *Bells and Whistles*, and sub-themes C.1. Insult and C.2. Adjunct
faculty complacency, Amy realized that except for the sense of temporary job security and
stability, the multi-year contract did not change anything respecting the administration and
employment terms: "Nothing changes with the administration as a result of granting the
contract." The contract affords a little bit of job security and stability and lessened anxiety.
Although she did not refer to the contract as an insult, she did mention that "Adjuncts don't want
to rock the boat" regarding their plight. Such stance concerns her, mainly because she
understands that multi-year contracts do not afford adjuncts the permanent job security afforded
to full-time and tenured faculty. "Would I ever be satisfied with the multi-year contract?
Probably not, because I'll never have the job security that a full-timer has. So, I don't know.
Maybe that's greedy of me but I will never have job security."

*Barbara's Individual Textural Description of the Experience.* Similar to Aisha, Barbara
has been teaching under a second three-year contract since fall 2017. The difference is that
Barbara knows it:

I am working in my second year of the first 3-year contract I have been assigned. So far,
it has been a relief to know that I will get at least two classes…though it is always
"pending enrollment." I am not yet sure how that works if enrollment is too low.
Hopefully, I will not need to experience it in the Fall 2021.

Although Barbara expressed concerns about enrollment, the labor contract provides that
those adjuncts with multi-year appointments who are not assigned at least two courses or a
minimum of six contact hours per semester are entitled to payment although assigned to tasks other than teaching. As Table 8 and item # 6 of Appendix Q show, Barbara said she was satisfied with her three-year contract. In her response to the interview question about her perception of job satisfaction with an MYTC, she said, "when I first got the contract, I was gratified by the idea that my Chair had thought of me to offer the contract. I perceived it as a vote of confidence."

Similarly, regarding the question about her feelings about the MYTC, she said, "A bit more secure." Answering an additional question about her overall perception of job satisfaction with MYTC, she said, "The contract offers some job stability in an unstable post-pandemic University setting. My job itself has not changed, nor has the way I execute my responsibilities or my course delivery." Her responses validate Theme A that MYTCs afford partial job satisfaction concerning job security and stability and lessened job anxiety. Regarding the lessened job anxiety MYTC provides, Barbara said:

   I never know when and/or where the next job will come from, if anywhere. Post-pandemic, this will become more crucial, as some of the schools for which I have taught for more than five years have not yet (in June [2021]) given me a fall schedule. Normally, I would know what I was doing at all the schools I work for by now.

She expressed anxiety in the following statement: "I hope that my contract will continue to be renewed; if not, I will go back to what I was doing before—teaching as many courses as are available."

Regarding Theme B indicating that a multi-year contract is a recognition of seniority devoid of additional remuneration, institutional support, and improved working conditions, Barbara said, "For me personally, being awarded the contract and then to be given a contract renewal" is a recognition. Regarding remuneration, she added: "The pay is the same; the job
security has changed." Her perception of institutional support centered in that multi-year contract has afforded her "Enhanced job security." She said that the three-year contract gave her "also, the opportunity to teach courses that I had not been able to teach before, such as composition." In terms of improved working conditions, she added, "No dissatisfaction. Working conditions, given the pandemic, the Zoom requirement, and other pandemic-related events, are as good as they can be, and better than at some of the other places where I teach."

Concerning Theme C that multi-year contracts are as bells and whistles, Barbara said the opposite: "On paper, and for the Human Resources office, my job appears to be more permanent than simply a 15-week stint in the Sociology Department. That helps with financial concerns that less permanent work does not afford." In sum, Barbara's textural description of the experience with multi-year appointments and her perception of job satisfaction demonstrate an adjunct faculty that is, for the most part, satisfied with her employment and poised to keep teaching under such contract as long as she is allowed. "If a full-time tenured track job comes to me, I will take it. If not, I will continue with the multi-year appointment as it is available or work as I was before the contract: semester to semester."

*Jessica’s Individual Textural Description of the Experience.* In the questionnaire (Table 8) and online interview, Jessica, who at the time of the interview in June 2021 was teaching at a community college in the Northeastern United States, indicated she was satisfied with her multi-year teaching contract (see item # 6 in Appendix R). "I am satisfied having this contract. I do feel satisfied," she said. Then, she reaffirmed her statement by saying, "I like knowing that yes, that I'm going to be paid a certain minimum amount, even if my class gets cancelled. There's security, there's some job security; so, I really like that." Her perception depicts Theme A, which indicates
that multi-year contracts afford partial job satisfaction concerning job security and stability and lessened job anxiety.

Although Jessica perceived job satisfaction, she was still somewhat anxious regarding certain aspects of her multi-year teaching contract. One aspect was her aspiration to get a full-time teaching position and her uncertainty about whether a multi-year contract prevented her from being hired as a full-timer. In this respect, she said:

The big upset is that…I guess there's a dissatisfaction because I have a three-year contract does that mean that they are going to keep me on as an adjunct instead of giving me a full-time position should one become available?

With these words and the following quote, Jessica expressed a sense of anxiety regarding her multi-year teaching appointment: "That's my fear, I mean, I want to be hired as a full-timer, and that's just not clear."

Regarding Theme B, which indicates that a multi-year contract recognizes seniority devoid of additional remuneration, institutional support, and improved working conditions, Jessica said that her multi-year appointment recognizes her work. "I definitely feel well recognized. I feel that it is an acknowledgement of the satisfaction that my department has towards my work," she said. However, in terms of compensation, she noted: "The salary is kind of the same for everybody."

Theme C reflects multi-year contracts perceived as bells and whistles. However, Jessica perceives her MYTC as a genuine employment opportunity the college granted her to indicate appreciation for her commitment to teaching and servicing students. In this respect, she reminisced when she was a regular adjunct and said, "It almost felt like they didn't care about
me, like the department didn't really care about me." Then, she acknowledged how her perception changed upon being granted a three-year contract:

When I got the three-year appointment, it was a way of saying they valued me. That was good. So, without the three-year appointment, I had no idea of what they thought of me. I mean, I know they thought I was teaching because I was observed and my students wrote, you know, good evaluations…. But I always kind of felt, like, I just wish I knew; I wish it was more clear, right?

In sum, Jessica's textural description of the experience with multi-year appointments showed that, up to the moment when the interview occurred in June 2021, she was satisfied with her job. It has provided her with an assurance of job security and stability. Most importantly, she perceived having an MYTC as a recognition that made her feel like a valuable part of the academic department.

**Jorge’s Individual Textural Description of the Experience.** “I'm probably not the most ideal study for your project here,” said Jorge during the July 2021 interview. “Why do you say that professor? I asked. He replied:

Why do I say that? Well, because I don't have the kind of anxiety that other part-time faculty have… I never felt connected to that… In a sense, I'm not the ideal study because I have other means to sort of support myself.

On this premise, Jorge shared his lived experience with MYTC as adjunct teaching at a public four-year college. In the demographic questionnaire, he replied “yes” to whether he was satisfied with the contract. However, as Theme A Partial Job Satisfaction denotes, Jorge indicated the contract was limited to three years, and therefore, it did not offer permanent job security and stability, although it made adjuncts feel less anxious. “I'm not either satisfied or dissatisfied. If
there are a series of questions that I can answer in a multiple choice, that will be it.” (Appendix S). His stance reflected Theme A and sub-themes and further illustrated overall adjunct faculty perception of multi-year contracts. “It is not only job stability, because it also had a positive psychological effect as a serious motivation kicks in. By having job security, it makes one a better employee and it makes one a better teacher, a better pedagogue.” To Jorge, the experience can be synthesized as affording adjuncts psychological equilibrium stability, which transcends the limitation of merely judging MYTCs as having to do with economics and salary increase. “While you are being offered a multi-year contract, you're being considered a valued member of the institution which again adds to the stability that’s not just economics….”

To Jorge, contrary to what Theme C Bells and Whistles and its sub-themes purport, adjuncts should not look at the whole experience, questioning multi-year contracts with pessimism and focusing on job dissatisfaction.

It's not a question of dissatisfaction; it is a question I would probably phrase based on the focus of the research on the multi-level contract. What can be improved? It might be a better way of phrasing it, rather than as a glass half empty or rather than seeing it as a glass half full.

Jorge acknowledged that it would be great to have a salary increase as a result of MYTC. However, he did not judge the contract based on what could be improved. Instead, he appreciated the institutional recognition for his longevity and teaching performance, and all of the positive aspects of the contract, as Theme B and its sub-themes denote. “So, by giving me a three-year contract, [the institution] gives me a sense of recognition on their part as to the value that I have for the department and what I can bring to the department.”
In sum, Jorge looked at his multi-year experience as a broader picture of what it entailed. “And again, whatever I am saying is not to either excuse as to why there has not been sufficiently increased salary, but there's a larger picture when one talks about a public university as opposed to a private university.” To him, better compensation for adjuncts is the only aspect of MYTC to be improved. “That would be the only thing that I would say, just needed to be improved.”

**Joseph’s Individual Textural Description of the Experience.** Joseph expressed job satisfaction with multi-year contracts from the outset: "It's very high. I feel very good. I know that I will be teaching what I'm teaching or something close to it, for the next three years." He was direct and transparent regarding how he viewed his current adjunct position when he indicated: "I chose to be an adjunct. I've always wanted to be an adjunct." Concerning his perception of MYTCs, he asserted, "I'm in a better position, having my three-year contract."

His perception reflected Theme A in that a multi-year contract provides partial job satisfaction as it offers job security and temporary stability, which lessen job anxiety (Appendix T). "This is fabulous because they are telling me that for three years, I will have employment, even if it should turn out that there isn't enough enrollment in certain classes for me." In terms of anxiety and stress, Joseph noted that anxiety about job security was not an issue for him, "I am accustomed to going from semester to semester and never knowing if I will be teaching the next semester."

Theme B addresses recognition due to seniority and teaching performance. Joseph felt that with MYTC, his professional experience, expertise in the field, and seniority were recognized. "I have the different niches in which I teach undergrads on the one hand, and foreign graduate students on the other; and no institution would allow me to do both together." He
pointed to his teaching longevity, asserting: "I'm very high in seniority, as I also teach two different types of populations; that's cool. So, I'm very much on demand; I never really thought I wouldn't have a job from semester to semester for the last 13 or 15 years."

Joseph considered himself fairly remunerated. "I get a raise every year, according to what has been negotiated." He felt supported by the institution, although he was not pleased with working conditions. "Working conditions, like space and things like that, are very, very poor." Nevertheless, he did attribute it to a multi-year contract, "They were not good before I was under multi-year contract."

Considering Theme C that multi-year contracts are bells and whistles, Joseph's perception was to the contrary. He asserted:

I have signed a contract, and I will continue to be offered two classes or the pay for them. So, that's a pretty major thing, right? To not be full-time, to be part-time, and to have those kinds of assurances, OK? It is kind of like being half full-time if you will, and I really appreciate that.

Joseph noted what, in his opinion, was multi-year contracts' main advantage: "The clear advantage is, at a time when enrollments are down, and a fair percentage of adjuncts are being laid off, I will never face that." He was pleased with the MYTC and his status as well: "I do have a little bit of a glow inside, knowing that my professional colleagues think highly enough of me to offer me that three-year. I do feel a little bit of warmth inside because of that." He summarized his experience saying, "I definitely feel more peace of mind and security knowing that, you know, I've just been renewed. So, for the next six semesters, I will definitely be paid, regardless of whether they have classes for me."
Kevin’s Individual Textural Description of the Experience. In completing the demographic questionnaire, Kevin said he was "not sure" whether he was satisfied with his multi-year contract (see Table 8). However, in the May 2021 interview, he noted the following about job satisfaction, "There is a little bit...because I don't have to worry for a few semesters by having to probe myself again... I mean, that feels good." As Theme A establishes, Kevin reiterated that his position offered him partial job satisfaction, security, stability, and less anxiety (Appendix U). However, he said, "My whole experience, in a nutshell at teaching as an adjunct, is anxiety." He added, "I have never been satisfied with the way I've been treated by the administration that I've worked under. My job satisfaction is entirely in my ability to engage with my students in the way that I want to."

Kevin seemed to corroborate the content of Theme B, which denotes that a multi-year contract is a recognition of seniority devoid of additional remuneration, institutional support, or improved working conditions. The fact that he accepted a multi-year contract made Kevin feel recognized by the academic department. "They see me as someone who's better than the other adjuncts," he said, pointing out that his department assigns classes to him before assigning them to other adjuncts. Such treatment has to do with seniority. However, he noted that payment was low and that a three-year contract "doesn't change anything; it is just kind of a carrot and a stick; it doesn't actually change the institutions attitudes and feelings about what an adjunct is, what it was, and still, what it is." In other words, he stressed that multi-year contracts did not include additional institutional support and that working conditions were the same as when he was teaching as a regular adjunct.

In Theme C multi-year contracts are depicted as bells and whistles. Kevin's posture on MYTC seemed to be congruent with this expression. During the interview, he was assertive in
expressing his perception of multi-year contract. His immediate reaction was to ask why the college did not give him a more permanent position, "which is what adjuncts want." His final thoughts on aspects of the experience coincided with Rodrigo in describing his lived experience with MYTC in the following manner:

We have been there for so many years. Why don't you just bite the bullet and give us a permanent position? And, so, yeah, my immediate thing is, 'there's a little bit of respect you give me by giving the three-year thing, but, yeah, you know, I'm still…I'm still an adjunct.

**Maria's Individual Textural Description of the Experience.** Maria answered "yes" to the questionnaire question about job satisfaction with a multi-year contract (see Table 8 and Appendix V). However, during the June 2021 interview, she minimized the impact of job security and stability. Her stance on MYTC was to establish a difference regarding her experience as a regular adjunct and that of a MYTC appointee:

The only difference having multi-year and not having it, is that you at least, have a job for three years. Because it's always pending enrollment. So, even if you have a multi-year contract, there's a little line saying, 'pending enrollment'. I know there's security because it means that being an adjunct, I'll be the first one to get the classes, but it is still pending.

When pressed to mention a benefit of a three-year contract, Maria said, "Security. That is the only thing." She repeated the statement when asked about what she liked about teaching under multi-year appointment: "Security. That's the only reason." She described job satisfaction in terms of working conditions such as:

Being part of a department where I feel that we're colleagues, that you are part of the
department, that you have a camaraderie with your colleagues. That you have people to
talk about what you're doing in class and what worked or didn't work. That you have a
place to sit with the computer, and a printer and drawers to put your stuff in, and a place
to meet with students. And that's important.

She noted, however, that this support is not due to the multi-year contract.

Because there's been a relationship formed between the department and I for all these
Years, I don't see new support because of the contract. I see the same support that I have
always received. We're like a mini-many family in a way.

Regarding anxiety about job uncertainty, she indicated that a multi-year contract means: "Not
having to worry 'will I have a class?'" Overall, in congruence with Theme A Partial Job
Satisfaction and sub-themes temporary job security, temporary job stability and less anxiety, she
noted that her MYTC afforded her a sense of satisfaction.

On Theme B, the perception of multi-year contract as recognition of seniority devoid of
additional remuneration, institutional support, or improved working conditions, Maria considered
herself recognized: "That means that I am well considered and well thought of, as a professional
in the department, and that makes me feel good." She also described multi-year contracts as an
achievement. "I guess being given a multi-year contract is an achievement in itself. I see the
contract as recognition by my chair and by my management." She highlighted her seniority and
rapport with colleagues as an asset: "I have been there so long that every tenured and full-time
faculty has observed me. They know how I teach; they know what I do." Maria vented about the
lack of status for adjuncts, stating:

You still don't get invited to meetings. We are not invited to even give feedback about the
textbooks or as to the syllabi. And I just think that adjuncts are teaching 50% of the
courses, and we have been with the students just as much as full-time.

Maria agreed with Theme C that multi-year contracts are *bells and whistles*: "We are discardable. We are disposable"; "It doesn't make me feel equal to full-timers at all. I don't have any advantage. I am still an adjunct. Nothing has changed in that matter." However, she acknowledged a significant advantage: "I think the advantage is that multi-year contracts allow the instructor to mature or to improve without having to worry, ‘will I come back next semester after I did all this work in this course?’"

Maria expressed her experience teaching under a multi-year contract the following way: "Because I have a contract, they're going to look to fill my classes first. I think it gives me a sense of continuity in terms of what I do in the classroom, and an opportunity to improve on it."

To Maria, her multi-year contract has allowed her to teach students, which she likes to do. To do that, she has had to take two subways and drive about an hour. In her own words, Maria described her reasons to teach under a multi-year contract:

> Of all the possible gigs, that is the one you want, that you feel most useful in. We are there because we care about changing the lessons, so that it fits the student body. We care about the student who wants to sit with you for about an hour.

**Peter’s Individual Textural Description of the Experience.** Theme A stating that a multi-year contract provides partial job satisfaction as it offers temporary job security and temporary stability, which lessen job anxiety, mirrored Peter's perception of employment. "I think I perceive that the job security is better under a multi-year appointment. And so, you know, that provides stability, and not only for the instructor, but also to the students as well." In the questionnaire and interview, Peter was assertive in indicating he was satisfied with his multi-year appointment and reappointment (see Table 8 and Appendix W). In terms of anxiety and stress, he
said, "It's nice to see that they don't have to renew you every single year, you know. You can get a few years without having to worry about the, you know, job cuts and layoffs, you know, less of a bother."

Reminiscing about being a regular adjunct in the late 1980s and 1990s, he said he lost his job for two semesters due to the fiscal crises. However, he did not during the COVID pandemic because he had protection under a multi-year contract. "You don't have to worry about the administration laying off this person."

Theme B reflects recognition due to seniority performance. Peter felt recognized, fairly remunerated, supported by the institution, and pleased with his working conditions. He was thankful for having been granted a multi-year contract as recognition of his seniority. "I think it shows at least some appreciation for length of service and the number of classes that you can teach." He clarified that whether adjunct faculty are under the multi-year contract or a one-year appointment, their salary will be whatever is in the union contract. "I'm on the top step of the salary schedule based on, you know, the number of years that I've been there. For me that's a pretty good salary and I have no complaints about it."

Considering Theme C that multi-year contracts are bells and whistles, Peter's perception was the contrary. For him, such contracts were real with tangible benefits and advantages. In his experience, he has gotten the resources he needed to teach. He also reflected that with the multi-year appointment he felt acknowledged: "You are elevated a little bit."

He was happy with the MYTC and his status: "Well, I think it's good; I feel good that we have achieved multi-year appointments and yeah, sure, yeah, you know, I feel recognized a little bit." He believes that "The advantages are that you're pretty much guaranteed you're going to be working as an adjunct in the following semester." He summarized his experience by saying, "I
don't have any dissatisfaction with it." Nodding his head with his eyesight lost to an unidentified point on the left corner of the computer screen, he resolutely said to himself, "I think it's a plus for all the instructors. It's a plus for the department, and it is a plus for the students…Yeah, that… that's basically what it is. It is basically what it is."

Rodrigo’s Individual Textural Description of the Experience. When completing the questionnaire, Rodrigo said "yes" to whether he was satisfied with his multi-year contract. However, in the June 2021 interview, he directly stated he was partially satisfied with his MYTC (Appendix X). His first reaction to the question about his perception of MYTC was, "How sarcastic do you want me to be?" I prompted him to be as truthful as possible, and Rodrigo said, at different points during the interview:

- It is less stressful than being on a semester-to-semester contract. I don't feel as pressured.
- Some of it is the security of the three-year contract. I have enough institutional security via the multi-year contract to feel like I am not less than a person who has been fortunate enough to have a tenure track position.

These statements represent Theme A indicating that a multi-year contract provides partial job satisfaction as it offers temporary job security, temporary job stability, and lessened anxiety.

To Rodrigo, his partial satisfaction came from longevity, which his academic department considered to grant him a multi-year contract in the fall of 2017 and a multi-year reappointment in 2020. The appointment recognized his longevity and contributions to students, the college, and the university system. Theme B talks about that MYTC recognizes seniority and teaching performance; however, to Rodrigo, it is devoid of additional remuneration, institutional support, or improved working conditions. He is not necessarily satisfied with being recognized with a multi-year appointment and having job security, stability, and less anxiety. In this respect, he
asked: "What's job security if you're not paid enough? How is that secure? That's not secure. So, they stopped beating us with a large stick, instead they beat us with ropes. They're still beating us."

Theme C denotes multi-year contracts as *bells and whistles*. Rodrigo offered this phrase during the focus group discussion to denote that the multi-year contract has been an insulting delay tactic and a distraction, and a way to keep adjunct faculty complacent. In his view, the university system and the faculty labor union offer MYTCs to adjunct faculty as a vague sense of appreciation. About the faculty union and the university system, he specifically said, "They're giving us a lot of *bells and whistles*, but nothing attached to those bells and whistles. They're trying to keep us distracted by giving us a bright shiny object." In a relaxed manner, he looked straight into his computer camera, paused for a moment, and, raising his right hand to the level of his chest, said: "I'm not fooled. Yes, it has afforded me some brief lessening of stress, but, basically, I'm not fooled. And I don't think killing me is going to escape the reckoning." Overall, Rodrigo recapitulated his stance by saying:

I view the multi-year contract as an insult. As an attempt to throw a few crumbs to make you feel better about the fact that we are not being paid anywhere near what we should be, especially if they recognize that we have proven ourselves to be effective teachers.

In conclusion, Rodrigo made bold statements about his lived experience as an adjunct faculty and insisted that his multi-year contract was a deliberate insult from the faculty union and the university system.

They do not have the integrity to take us on as full-time, even when the lines had existed. They let them vanish by attrition. So, no, they are an insult. They should have hired a few
of my colleagues and me to fill in the full-timers' lines that have been lost.

**Roscoe’s Individual Textural Description of the Experience.** After the COVID pandemic hit, colleges and universities experienced financial challenges and laid off hundreds of adjuncts. He was one of those dismissed from their teaching jobs at public institutions of higher learning in the Northeastern United States. "To me this is probably a breach of contract," he said. What makes his case different was that he had the guarantee of a three-year teaching contract up to the moment of the lay-off. Under such a frame of mind, the academic department chair recommended that Roscoe participates in this study. Roscoe completed the demographic questionnaire and indicated he was "not sure" whether he was satisfied with his multi-year contract. He also said that the basis of his job satisfaction was "work," which he thought he did not have at the moment of the interview in July 2021, and "job security," which is considered a job dissatisfaction factor.

As Theme A Partial Job Satisfaction and sub-themes temporary job security, temporary job stability, and less anxiety denote, he perceived some satisfaction with his employment during his first years teaching under MYTC (Appendix Y). In this respect, he said, "I was very satisfied." Although teaching under a multi-year contract was different from when he was teaching as a regular adjunct, he said he appreciated its job security. "I said there was no difference beyond the fact that you know, that come the next three years, you have something in the bank." His stance changed as a result of the job dismissal. Contrary to Theme A's sub-themes temporary job security, stability, and lessened anxiety, Roscoe experienced job instability and increased anxiety due to his termination of employment. Without knowing what was going to happen with his multi-year position, he faced uncertainty about his teaching job: "I was still doing training classes in preparation for the fall even though there is no confirmation."
Despite his situation, Roscoe acknowledged that the multi-year appointment granted him institutional recognition for longevity and teaching performance, which are sub-themes of Theme B Institutional Recognition: "It gave you the feel at least that your efforts were being recognized… for making positive change and adding value to an institution." He felt satisfied regarding this aspect of MYTCs and the increased responsibility he experienced when the chair hastily assigned him to teach additional courses. However, as Theme C Bells and Whistles and sub-themes C.1. Insult and C.2. Adjunct Faculty Complacency reflects, Roscoe perceived the contract as lacking specific employment guarantees to ensure adjuncts' overall sense of job satisfaction.

The fact that I am not in the classroom right now is an element of dissatisfaction. I think that has to do with policies that are being enacted behind the scenes, but they are not clearly communicated. That certainly is an element of dissatisfaction.

He expressed frustration for being granted an unfulfilled contract that came with the assurance of at least three years of employment. "I am probably very dissatisfied that even though there was a contract in place, they could have just easily disregarded the contract and moved on." In other words, as Theme C Bells and Whistles hints, this multi-year contract appointee accepted the contract for its attractive promise of job security, job stability, and other employment features; having the contract at first made him quite satisfied: "I was quite satisfied with the contract, at least for the next three years, and at that point, I was very satisfied."

However, after experiencing the contract, he found out that the college did not honor the contract's provision regarding job security. The contract's clauses stating guaranteed employment
for at least three consecutive years and the right to an additional three-year term were ignored. In his own words, his termination was a breach of contract yet to be remedied.

**Sixth: Individual Structural Descriptions of the Experience.** In the sixth step, I took into account the previous individual textural descriptions in conjunction with the concept of *Imaginative Variation* (Husserl, 1936/1970) to construct individual structural descriptions of the lived experience of the twelve co-researchers. Considering that a structural description encompasses all of the constitutive parts of an object or phenomenon, I constructed a template table (see Table 12). For illustration purposes, Table 12 depicts relevant satisfaction and dissatisfaction factors and their interrelation regarding participants' perception of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments. Next, I jotted down pertinent information on each table per co-researcher, based on the pertinent individual textural description and summary responses to the interview topical questions used to answer the study's research question and sub-questions. I then included each table in the appendix section for reference purposes (see Appendix N through Y).

With ad hoc reviews of interview transcripts, individual textural descriptions, and tables, I engaged in the process of Epoqué and applied Husserl's *Imaginative Variation* technique to fabricate and explain the structure of each experience. I paid close attention to what each adjunct faculty participant said and how they felt their lived experiences and perception of job satisfaction with multi-year contracts. Keeping bias and preconceived notions in check, I aimed to understand or elucidate how participants manifested their consciousness and perception of the phenomena under exploration. As Husserl postulated (Moustakas, 1994), I engaged in a mental exercise, imagined the phenomenon as it appeared in my consciousness, and looked at it from
different perspectives, including those who perceived their particular lived experiences differ from that of their colleagues.

**Table 12**

*Sample of Co-Researcher’s Individual Structural Description of the experience with MYTCs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Questions/Topics</th>
<th>Summary Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Description of multi-year teaching appointments</td>
<td>1. It is less stressful than being on a semester to semester contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience teaching under multi-year appointments</td>
<td>a. Connecting with students, full-time faculty, chairs, deans, provost, and president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disliking multi-year appointments</td>
<td>a. Same as when teaching as a regular adjunct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Institutional support</td>
<td>“If I was going to make a very crass analogy to African American slavery, I am the lucky guy working in the kitchen instead of in the fields.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Advantages of multi-year appointments</td>
<td>7. It didn’t change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Disadvantages of multi-year appointments</td>
<td>8. They don’t pay me what I’m worth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Supervision</td>
<td>a. Teaching longevity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Working Conditions</td>
<td>b. The multi-year position itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>c. Recognized by the administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Salary</td>
<td>d. Developing instructional materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Status</td>
<td>e. None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Job Security</td>
<td>f. Unrelated to MYTC*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Job Instability</td>
<td>g. Yes, but not enough</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MYTC means Multi-year Teaching Contract*
Following this process, I retained only those aspects or features that were consistent and
did not change from my consciousness. Those aspects were the invariants (Moustakas, 1994). In
this fashion, I constructed pertinent vivid narratives for each structural description while the
individual essences of the experience remained intact.

The pertinent, *Imaginative Variation* elements of the lived experience of adjuncts' perception of job satisfaction with multi-year contracts were: contract description, experience, connection with students, colleagues, and higher education administrators, liking or disliking the contract, the definition of job satisfaction, and job dissatisfaction, perception of the contract, institutional support, perceived meaning of the contract, advantages, and disadvantages, motivating job satisfaction factors and hygiene job dissatisfaction factors, and, additional perceptual thoughts of the experience. Following are structural descriptions for Aisha, Alyssa, Amy, Barbara, Jessica, Jorge, Joseph, Kevin, Maria, Peter, Rodrigo, and Roscoe.

*Aisha’s Individual Structural Description of the Experience with Multi-Year Contract.*

As shown in Appendix N, Aisha’s structural description of the experience with multi-year appointments and her perception of job satisfaction include all the elements outlined above. Overall, at the time of the interview in June 2021, she was partially satisfied with her multi-year contract. She described it as “a piece of paper” that did not change anything of significance in her lived teaching experience, except that it gave her a temporary sense of job security and stability and, therefore, less anxiety. She asserted that connection with students, colleagues, and higher education administrators did not change under her multi-year contract experience. Institutional support also did not change. Her perceived meaning of the contract was reduced to a piece of paper. Although she did not find any disadvantages, she admitted it was advantageous to have a multi-year contract because of the job security and stability it provided.
She listed recognition as a factor she perceived as a contributor to her job satisfaction with a multi-year teaching contract. The other motivating factors such as achievement, work, responsibility, advancement, and growth did not have a weight in her perception of job satisfaction. She considered being granted a multi-year contract a sign of respect and acknowledgment from the academic department chair.

Respecting her perception of job satisfaction with MYTCs in relation to hygiene or job dissatisfaction factors, institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, and job security, she expressed that job stability helps ameliorate her anxiety. No changes happened regarding the other factors. The lessening of anxiety came from not having to be hired on a semester basis, as she was previously, as a regular adjunct. Aisha offered thoughts indicating that anxiety loomed when she went through the process of getting the first three-year reappointment, which contractually required a meticulous and demanding comprehensive evaluation of her teaching performance. She felt she qualified for a three-year contract based on her seniority and dedication to students.

However, the caveat was to pass the comprehensive evaluation. This process made Aisha feel restless. She was concerned about those in a position of authority approving her three-year contract. “I have a kind of a distrust of academia,” she said, wary and cautiously as if denoting she did not have anything else to say. I reacted: “I think you summarized your experience very well, and I appreciate the time you took doing it. Any question, anything that you would like to add or discuss further? She replied: “Just that I am really happy here…and would not want to change that.” The thought that Aisha is partially satisfied with her contract as it provides her a sense of temporary job security and stability, and less stress, remained in my consciousness as I exercised my role as a human research instrument to describe co-researchers’ lived experience.
Alyssa’s Individual Structural Description of the Experience with Multi-Year Contract.

Alyssa was clear in her perception about all of the elements of her experience with a multi-year contract. From a structural standpoint, as shown in Appendix O, Alyssa perceived partial satisfaction because MYTC did not include a salary increase as a shortcoming she disliked very much. To her, MYTC meant less stress and a job for at least three-years. Although her interpersonal relations with students, colleagues, and higher education administrators did not change after being granted the MYTC, she liked the contract because she perceived the chair gave her a little more respect due to the appointment being extended by the Provost. A contract advantage was a guaranteed workload; however, it did not come with additional benefits.

Overall, of all job satisfaction factors such as achievement, recognition, work, responsibility, development, and growth, work and recognition were the most relevant to Alyssa’s job satisfaction. In her view, both were interrelated as granting her a multi-year contract meant institutional recognition of her long-term teaching service to the college and her excellent work performance. Regarding job dissatisfaction factors such as institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, job security, and job instability, Alyssa felt that MYTC increased her pride by affording some job security, stability, and lessened anxiety. Therefore, she perceived partial job satisfaction with a multi-year contract.

Amy’s Individual Structural Description of the Experience with Multi-Year Contract.

As shown in Appendix P, Amy shared mixed feelings about her lived experience with MYTC. When asked to describe the contract, she said it was a more secure job that elevated her status, although she was still an adjunct faculty. She experienced less stress over three consecutive years
teaching under MYTC. She reported no change in interaction with colleagues and higher education administrators.

Regarding interaction with students, her experience was that MYTC allowed her to work more cooperatively with them; she liked experiencing less anxiety and focusing on the actual development and success of her students. Amy stressed that with the MYTC she was recognized to her for excellent teaching performance and longevity, teaching at the same two-year public college. Except for “work” and “recognition,” she did not perceive responsibility, advancement, and growth as relevant to her job satisfaction with MYTC. Initially, she thought the contract was an achievement in itself, but it was taken away from her, and the contract was not renewed.

Regarding dissatisfaction factors such as institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, job security, and job instability, she perceived supervision as faulty. In addition, she deemed job security as high but temporary. Her perception of job instability was apparent as she was going through increased anxiety because of the lack of a guaranteed job.

Overall, from a structural standpoint, Amy judged the implementation of MYTC as deficient regarding establishing benchmarks and instituting monitoring mechanisms to track teaching performance and take ad hoc corrective measures instead of waiting for a comprehensive evaluation at the end of the contract. She was not granted a multi-year reappointment because she did not pass the comprehensive teaching performance evaluation at the end of the three years. She was granted a one-year reappointment with guidance instead.

I was kind of surprised that I didn't get the renewal, and the department chair agreed that it was probably because I didn't have those check-ins after the one-year observations…
this was happening under COVID and remote learning, and none of us were really prepared for that. Maybe there should have been some small check-ins during the multi-year contract because I was kind of surprised that I didn’t get it.

Engulfed by anxiety about her immediate future, she said MYTC should have had check-ins to account for teaching performance progress and for effective evaluations. At the end of the interview, she expressed uncertainty about sustaining her initial perception of job satisfaction because of the lack of MYTC renewal. Her uncertainty was initially reflected in her responses to the study’s demographic questionnaire about whether she was satisfied with MYTC; her answer to this question was “not sure.” To Amy, “recognition” was a primary factor in her perception of job satisfaction. Similarly, lacking job security was the most salient factor ascribed to her perception of job dissatisfaction. Although she first perceived both of these factors as the bedrock of her appreciation of MYTC, not being reappointed impacted her plight for job stability.

**Barbara’s Individual Structural Description of the Experience with Multi-Year Contract.** At the interview in June 2021, Barbara was partially satisfied with her multi-year contract. As shown in Appendix Q, Barbara's structural description of the experience with multi-year appointments and her perception of job satisfaction included all the elements outlined in Aisha’s case. She described it in the following way:

I am working in my second year of the first three-year contract I have been assigned. So far, it has been a relief to know that I will get at least two classes…, though it is always "pending enrollment." I am not yet sure how that works if enrollment is too low. Hopefully, I will not need to experience it in the Fall 2021.
She asserted that connection with students, colleagues, and higher education administrators remained the same under MYTC. Regarding what she likes and dislikes about the contract, she noted: “Nothing so far.” About job satisfaction, her statement was resolute: “My job satisfaction has not changed since I received the contract.” Regarding institutional support, she perceived she was assured of “enhanced job security.” She added, “Also, the opportunity to teach courses that I had not been able to teach before, such as Composition.” Her answer to the question about job dissatisfaction with a multi-year contract was confident, “I am not dissatisfied with my job—particularly during the pandemic, I was glad to be working and interacting with students.” This answer was in agreement with her response regarding the meaning of a multi-year contract: “It affords a bit of job security, even if only for a few years.”

Barbara said that that to her, a multi-year contract was advantageous because, “On paper, and for the Human Resources office, my job appears to be more permanent than simply a fifteen-week stint in the English Department. That helps with financial concerns that less permanent work does not afford.” To illustrate her asseveration, she said that her multi-year contract status can serve to, “For example: obtaining credit for a car loan, or a lower mortgage interest rate.”

Concerning her perception of job satisfaction concerning the following motivating factors, achievement, recognition, work, responsibility, advancement, and growth, Barbara said regarding achievement and recognition:

The achievement was to get the contract offer; the next would be to get a renewal. An achievement in terms of student engagement and success is what I perceive my job to be. That is a daily source of satisfaction and challenge. And satisfaction again.

Regarding work, responsibility, advancement, and growth, she said those aspects are the same as when she was a regular adjunct faculty. When asked about the perception of job
satisfaction with multi-year contracts concerning the following hygiene or job dissatisfaction factors, institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, and job security, she said in the same thought order:

I do not have any dissatisfactions that I am aware of at this time— No dissatisfaction— working conditions, given the pandemic, the Zoom requirement, and other pandemic-related events are as good as they can be and better than at some of the other places where I teach. I am glad that this institution had a three-year contract policy and that I was able to benefit from it.

Then, about her satisfaction with the multi-year appointment, Barbara said, “It has not changed pre-or during the contract.” “The pay is the same; the job security has changed.” “Job security is the biggest area of change with the contract and the one that provides the most significant difference in my perception: job security is what the contract affords.” In sum, Barbara summarized the factors she perceived had to do with her perception of job satisfaction by saying:

The multi-year contract itself provides as much job stability as one can have without it for the length of the contract. “The contract offers some job stability in an unstable post-pandemic University setting. My job itself has not changed, nor has the way I execute my responsibilities or my course delivery.

Overall, what remains in my consciousness is that Barbara is partially satisfied with her multi-year contract as it has provided her a sense of less anxiety due to her perceived assurance of temporary job security and stability.

Jessica’s Individual Structural Description of the Experience with Multi-Year Contract. As shown in Appendix R, Jessica is partially satisfied with the contract as it has caused
her less anxiety and given her a sense of job security and stability for three years and three more after reappointment. As a regular adjunct, she was always pretty nervous about not knowing whether she would have a job next semester. "I was frustrated and felt really bad and had very low satisfaction because I felt taken advantage of, as an adjunct."

However, when she accepted the three-year contract, she felt it recognized her longevity and commitment to students. To her, being granted an MYTC was an achievement in itself. She felt she belonged in her academic department. "I'm a valuable part of the department. They want me there. I have office hours that go with the number of hours that I teach, which is nice and would seem fair."

Jessica is appreciative of the contract. Although nothing changed regarding institutional support, supervision, work, advancement, growth, responsibility, salary, institutional policy and administration, and connecting with students, colleagues, and higher education administrators, I sensed Jessica was partially satisfied with the MYTC. Her satisfaction, she said, is because "there is some job security" in multi-year contracts.

**Jorge’s Individual Structural Description of the Experience with Multi-Year Contract.**

In Appendix S, I summarized Jorge's structural description of his experience with MYTC. When completing the study's demographic questionnaire, he indicated he was satisfied with MYTC and that the most critical job satisfaction factor to him was work, followed by recognition and responsibility. His dissatisfaction factors were salary and job security. He was ambivalent regarding salary: "I'm not either satisfied or dissatisfied." During the interview, Jorge was consistent with his perception and referred to some job dissatisfaction factors that higher education administrators could improve regarding MYTC. Instead of looking at what is lacking regarding MYTC, he suggested looking at it with optimism. In this respect, he said:
It is not a question of dissatisfaction; it is a question I would probably phrase based on the focus of the research on the multi-level contract. ‘What can be improved?’ It might be a better way of phrasing it, rather than as a glass half empty, seeing it as a glass half full. But I would say that probably, just generally, that it would be great to have an increase in salary now and then and maybe easier access to health insurance.

To him, the only aspect of MYTC in need of improvement is better compensation for adjunct faculty. Except for responsibility, and advancement, Jorge perceived job satisfaction factors such as achievement, recognition, work, and growth as part of his teaching experience, contributing to his overall sense of job satisfaction with MYTC. Respecting the extent of job dissatisfaction factors in his perception of job satisfaction with MYTC, he said that his dissatisfaction with institutional policy and administration stemmed from the institution not offering MYTCs to every eligible adjunct. He is satisfied with supervision. To him, dissatisfaction with working conditions, interpersonal relations, and salary did not change due to having MYTC. However, he perceived a slight change in his status as "an elevated rank," although the title of adjunct faculty remained intact for human resources and academic personnel. He emphasized that "ranking does not entail a salary increase"; however, he insisted that the university improve remuneration for faculty across the board, particularly adjunct faculty. In terms of job security as a factor associated with job dissatisfaction, Jorge said:

Well, like I said, even though it might be illusory, the idea of job security, by virtue of having a multi-year contract, is very satisfying. But is it like job security and the extent of exactly what that word means? … So, the multi-year contract does not really change job security in the abstract, but it does give security much more in the immediacy because you do not have to worry about applying for a job in consecutive years.
Furthermore, Jorge was assertive in conveying his perception that MYTC is a good start to alleviate adjunct faculty's plight for job security and job stability.

It is not only job stability but also a positive psychological effect as serious motivation kicks in. Having job security makes one a better employee, and it makes one a better teacher, a better pedagogue. I mean, that goes without saying so to speak. But even the multi-year contract, by the very nature of an adjunct, whether multi-year contract or not, is temporary.

Jorge was adamant in his claim that colleges, universities, and faculty unions had bona fide reasons for offering multi-year contracts, even under financial hardship. He summarized his stance by saying that MYTC should be granted with prudence:

I think that the multi-year contract should be offered more sensibly because (a) it fundamentally makes a better educator, nor that the educator is any worst without that. But it improves the educator for a number of reasons: One is because of less anxiety in terms of finding employment in consecutive semesters; (b) the institution by offering the multi-year contract recognizes the educator as an important and valued component of the institution because it says, ‘we know that you can teach’; ‘we know that you do things properly.’ And that by offering a multi-year contract so that aids in economic stability, but also psychological stability in the sense that active recognition that the multi-year contract offer also improves the educator psychology...This improves the overall function of the institution. And basically, I would say that fundamentally, a multi-year contract alleviates anxiety.

Overall, Jorge's indicated he is partially satisfied with MYTC as he understands that the job security and stability it offers are temporary and tied to the duration of the contract. Most
significantly, he stressed that MYTCs indeed lessen job anxiety. Moreover, when job anxiety lessens, workers tend to benefit psychologically, which translates into better performance and perception of job satisfaction.

**Joseph’s Individual Structural Description of the Experience with Multi-Year Contract.** Joseph's structural description of the experience with multi-year appointments and his perception of job satisfaction include the following elements: contract description, experience, liking or disliking the contract, institutional support, advantages and disadvantages, motivating job satisfaction factors, and hygiene job dissatisfaction factors (see Appendix T). At the time of the interview in June 2021, he was satisfied with a multi-year contract. He indicated: "This is fabulous because they are telling me that for three years, I will have employment," and reiterated that, although he perceives himself to be "very high in seniority, and very much on demand" as a teacher; having a multi-year contract, "I definitely feel more peace of mind and security knowing that I've just been renewed."

Joseph reported no change regarding institutional support, connection with students, colleagues, higher education administrators, work, responsibility, or achievement in his multi-year contract experience. He found no disadvantages but listed job security and higher salary as advantages of multi-year contracts. Regarding his perception of job satisfaction with MYTCs concerning recognition, Joseph indicated he felt recognized and respected, "I do have a little bit of a glow inside, knowing that my professional colleagues think highly enough of me to offer me that three-year. I do feel a little bit of warmth inside because of that." He felt that being granted a multi-year contract was a sign of respect and acknowledgment from the academic department chair.
Regarding his job satisfaction with multi-year contracts concerning job dissatisfaction factors such as institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, and interpersonal relations, he said no changes occurred under the multi-year contract. Joseph summarized his satisfaction with MYTC in terms of his seniority, expertise, and marketability as a teacher: "I have the different niches in which I teach undergrads on the one hand, and foreign graduate students on the other… I also teach two different types of populations, that that's cool. So, I'm very much on demand." To me, Joseph was partially satisfied with his job because it afforded him temporary job security and stability and less anxiety.

**Kevin’s Individual Structural Description of the Experience with Multi-Year Contract.**

As shown in Appendix U, Kevin’s structural description of the experience and his perception of job satisfaction revealed he was not satisfied with his three-year contract. The only change in his perception of job satisfaction with his adjunct faculty position was that multi-year contracts afforded him a limited sense of job security and stability and lessened his anxiety. The other aspects of the lived experience teaching under MYTC remained unchanged.

Based on his perception, no change occurred regarding institutional support, connecting with students, colleagues, and higher education administrators due to having an MYTC. He did not conclude that motivating factors such as achievement, recognition, work, responsibility, advancement, and growth influenced his job satisfaction with the multi-year contract. He could not think of any specific achievement or recognition that happened due to having an MYTC. The nature of his work and responsibilities remained the same. He did not perceive any advancement or growth while teaching under a three-year contract.

Similarly, he did not see any significant changes in job dissatisfaction concerning institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations,
salary, and status. The exception was his perception that multi-year contracts afforded some job stability. I summarized Kevin’s experience and perception of MYTC as partially satisfied. The essence of his experience rests on his ambivalence about whether he was satisfied or not with his MYTC. Therefore, what prevails in my consciousness is that Kevin was not sure if he was satisfied with his job, although he acknowledged experiencing less anxiety and temporary stability.

*Maria’s Individual Structural Description of the Experience with Multi-Year Contract.*

Maria's structural description of the experience with a multi-year appointment and her perception of job satisfaction included the following elements: lived experience, connection with students, liking or disliking the contract, the definition of job satisfaction, institutional support, perceived meaning of the contract, advantages, and disadvantages, motivating job satisfaction factors, hygiene job dissatisfaction factors, and additional perceptual thoughts of the experience (see Appendix V).

Overall, at the interview in June 2021, she was minimally satisfied with her multi-year contract. She described it as a quasi-guarantee that "Because I have this contract, they're going to look to fill my classes first," which did not change much of significance in her teaching lived experience. She mentioned more than twice, however, that multi-year contracts provided her job security. Also, she perceived it as recognition of her teaching abilities and the high regard she enjoys among her colleagues and superiors, "Multi-year appointment is a recognition that I am well-thought of as a professional, as a faculty member."

She asserted that her excellent connection with students, colleagues, higher education administrators, working conditions, or salary did not change under her multi-year contract experience. Institutional support and other factors contributing to her job satisfaction, such as
interpersonal relations and professional camaraderie, were attributed to the department's atmosphere rather than the contract. Although she did not find any disadvantages, she reported that the continuity provided by the multi-year contract enabled her to grow and develop as a teacher thus benefiting the contract.

She considered recognition, work, and responsibility, motivating factors that were inheritably part of teaching, regardless of contract. Regarding dissatisfiers such as supervision, salary, status, and job security affecting job satisfaction, Maria indicated that, except for job stability, no changes took place under the MYTC. When extended to add any thoughts to the interview, she expressed the desire that administration would enable adjuncts to further contribute to students' education experience.

**Peter’s Individual Structural Description of the Experience with Multi-Year Contract.**

As shown in Appendix W, Peter indicated he was satisfied with the contract because it gave him “a lot more of a sense of job security.” In addition, he liked the job stability and the fact that the college does not have to renew his contract every semester or every year. Instead, it happens every three years. “You can get a few years without having to worry about the, you know, job cuts and layoffs, you know, less of a bother,” he said. Furthermore, job satisfaction means that he is successful with students and that the academic department chair supported him when he needed assistance.

Looking at Peter’s story from different perspectives, he seemed content with the position, although he indicated that many aspects of his over 35 years of teaching experience as an adjunct have not changed. For instance, regarding connecting with students, colleagues, chairs, deans, the provost, and the president, Peter said nothing changed due to his multi-year contract. Similarly, he reported no changes regarding institutional support, supervision, work,
advancement, growth, responsibility, salary, institutional policy and administration, working
conditions, or supervision. He clarified that although his salary has not changed, he is pleased
with it.

From my perspective, Peter had a fulfilling experience as an adjunct faculty. He was
partially satisfied as MYTC gave him some job security and stability and has reduced anxiety
cause by fear of losing his job. His overall experience with multi-year contracts was feeling
vindicated with a multi-year position, which added to his perception of job stability. “And that’s
basically what it is,” he said.

_**Rodrigo’s Individual Structural Description of the Experience with Multi-Year**_

*Contract.* As shown in Appendix X, although Rodrigo admitted that multi-year contracts
provided some job security and stability, lessened stress, and allowed him the opportunity to do
what he loves doing, teaching, they were an insult to adjunct faculty. Although MYTCs were
forms of recognition, appreciation, and accomplishment, he noted that these contracts did not
include additional monetary compensation and were tantamount to a bone thrown to a dog in that
it provided the semblance of food but was not food.

According to Rodrigo, although multi-year contracts enabled him to "plan curriculum"
and "develop teaching skills," as well as allowed him to "pursue his left-wing, anti-colonialism
and anti-racist agenda," they were nothing more than "bells and whistles to keep adjuncts
complacent." Rodrigo reported no change in supervision, working conditions, or interpersonal
relations under a multi-year contract. Rodrigo's thoughts in response to the opportunity to offer
any, regarding his lived experience with a multi-year contract, captured the essence of his
experience:

They just pushed the problem back by six years, and I am not satisfied with that. The
multi-year contract has been an insulting delay tactic. I am not fooled. Yes, it has afforded me some brief, lessening of stress, but, basically, I am not fooled. And I do not think killing me is going to escape the reckoning.

Roscoe’s Individual Structural Description of the Experience with Multi-Year Contract. When granted the three-year teaching appointment at the community college where he used to work, Roscoe felt happy that his awarded job was deemed secure. It was "a relief to know I will get at least two classes per semester," he asserted when describing MYTC. However, after experiencing the contract for three consecutive years, Roscoe realized the perception of job satisfaction had withered away. "I was quite satisfied with the contract, at least for the next three years and at that point I was very satisfied," he said. Coming from the private sector, Roscoe viewed teaching as an adjunct, not his primary job, although it turned out to be that way. He was always available for teaching assignments; from teaching one class, he ended up teaching four. "I have been called in at the last minute to say, can you take over this class?" He dedicated himself to teaching, hoping to carve out an employment niche in higher education. Unfortunately, at the time of the interview in July 2021, he was experiencing job instability:

I wasn't looking for anything long-term; I have a tenure contract. It was good enough for me to say, 'hey, we want to make sure that the next three years we have you secure in a position.' I was partially satisfied, and job security was temporary. There was less anxiety.

As shown in Appendix Y, Roscoe experienced job security and stability over three consecutive years, which lessened anxiety. His multi-year contract meant more stable employment and less uncertainty. When asked specifically about each satisfaction and dissatisfaction factor contouring his perception of job satisfaction, he answered with certainty.
For instance, he experienced no change in achievement, recognition, work, responsibility, 
advancement, or growth. However, he was satisfied with the contract because he thought the 
position would give him "adjunct faculty tenure." The contract granted him recognition for his 
seniority and teaching performance. Therefore, he perceived achievement, recognition, and work 
as factors ascribed to his job satisfaction.

Regarding dissatisfaction factors such as institutional policy and administration, 
supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, and job security, he 
perceived that institutional policy and administration were meaningful dissatisfiers, causing him 
unhappiness. "The fact that I'm not in the classroom right now is an element of dissatisfaction. I 
think that has to do with policies enacted behind the scenes, but they're not clearly 
communicated. That certainly is an element of dissatisfaction." With this statement, he referred 
to the termination of the MYTC due to institutional financial constraints resulting from the 
COVID pandemic.

He did not perceive any significant change in the other dissatisfaction factors, except job 
security. In this respect, he said: "It was certainly a factor of satisfaction to know that for the next 
three years you have the perception that you have you locked-in something in the bank."

However, Roscoe wrapped up his experience by acknowledging the way he felt when notified of 
the termination: "I am probably very dissatisfied that even though there was a contract in place, 
they could have just easily disregarded the contract and moved on."

**Seventh: Individual Textural-Structural Descriptions of the Experience.** As 
Moustakas (1994) recommended, in this final step of his Modified van Kaam Method of 
Analysis of Phenomenological Data, I constructed an individual textural-structural description 
for the twelve co-researchers: Aisha, Alyssa, Amy, Barbara, Jessica, Jorge, Joseph, Kevin,
Maria, Peter, Rodrigo, and Roscoe. This step also included a composite description of the experience of all co-researchers. The focus was on outlining the meanings and essences of their lived individual experiences. In this stage of the process, I tactfully reconstructed the "noema" and the "noesis" (1994, p. 69) the participants experienced and described. Husserl described both concepts as correlated critical elements of consciousness via which "meanings" and "essences" (p. 70) emerge.

Moustakas said that the process of noema embodies the meanings of what the researcher and co-researchers see or feel or judge of the phenomenon they experience. He also indicated that the process of noesis embodies the essence of the experience. The ultimate essence is what the researcher and co-researchers reflect upon and perceive regarding their lived experience. Therefore, I incorporated the invariant constituents listed under the three core themes and sub-themes to construct the participants' textural-structural descriptions.

Finally, I used the resulting individual textural-structural descriptions and the meanings and essences of the adjunct faculty with multi-year contract experience to construct a composite narrative to tell the story of the entire group. I noted similarities and differences among participants. This step was crucial to conceptualize specific characteristics that participants indicated they experienced with the phenomenon. In summary, the composite structural-textural description depicted the essence of the entire group's perception of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching contracts.

_Aisha's Textural-Structural Description of the Meaning and Essence of the Experience._ For Aisha, the noema or meaning of a multi-year contract is a piece of paper or letter given to her and filed away in a cabinet. The letter stated that Aisha was assigned at least two courses or the equivalent of six contact hours, but no more than nine per semester. Upon
answering the study interview questions and reflecting on her life experience's noesis or essence, she perceived that having a multi-year contract afforded her temporary job security, stability, and less anxiety.

Her lived experience is illustrated in Theme A, stating that a multi-year teaching contract provides partial job satisfaction as it offers temporary job security and temporary stability, which lessened her job anxiety. Constituting this theme are the following expressions drawn from the invariant constituents: "I am satisfied having this contract. I do feel satisfied." "Job security is what the contract affords." "A multi-year contract is job stability, albeit temporary"; and "Multi-year teaching appointments lessen job anxiety."

As Theme B states, a multi-year contract recognizes seniority albeit devoid of additional remuneration, institutional support, or improved working conditions. The invariant constituents forming this theme illustrate Aisha's perception that the contract recognized her seniority. She did not receive a salary increase or additional institutional support, and the working conditions did not change. The only difference between teaching under a multi-year contract and teaching as a regular adjunct is on paper.

Theme C, which states that multi-year contracts are bells and whistles, depicted her perception of the phenomenon in this respect. Theme C's invariant constituents are: "It's a piece of paper"; "Even with multi-year contracts, we are still adjuncts"; "They keep us complacent when it's not really adding anything for us"; and "They're throwing me a bone, and this dog is getting a little tired of bones and would like some meat."

Overall, her three-year appointment was a letter she received from the college. Upon receiving the appointment letter, she went into oblivion. She did not have to think about it for the remainder of the contract, realizing that she was still an adjunct faculty who now has a three-year
teaching contract. The three themes, sub-themes, and respective invariant constituents represent the meaning and essence of Aisha's perception of job satisfaction with her three-year teaching appointment.

Alyssa’s Textural-Structural Description of the Meaning and Essence of the Experience. As outlined in Themes A, B, and C and respective sub-themes, Alyssa summarized the meaning and essence of her experience with MYTC as having a job for three years. She centered her perception of MYTC on the institutional recognition of her teaching performance and longevity. By experiencing job stability, and less anxiety, Alyssa felt more respect from the chair and colleagues. Although the contract did not include a salary increase, she experienced psychological comfort, increased pride, and an overall perception of job satisfaction. This description illustrates her noematic experience. All study participants described their MYTC experience in similar terms. The demographic questionnaire results reflected that the main factor of her perceived job satisfaction with the multi-year contract was "achievement." The main dissatisfaction factor was "salary." Her sense of achievement comes from enforcing high graduate teaching standards regardless of the nature of the contract.

However, the noesis of her experience sparked feelings about getting an MYTC without a salary increase or other benefits granted to full-timers and tenured faculty. She believed that the lack of fair compensation denoted a lack of appreciation from the institution. As Theme C and sub-themes C1 and C2 illustrate, study participants depicted the contract as a bluff regarding compensation and other aspects. Rodrigo and Joseph referred to it as bells and whistles, an insult, and bones without meat were thrown at adjuncts in an attempt to keep them complacent. Like most study participants, Alyssa has been teaching as an adjunct for decades. Getting a multi-year contract did not make any difference in her teaching career. After the multi-year contract expires,
her plans to continue teaching remain unchanged – teaching on a semester basis. She reasoned that approaching 80 years of age means she was no longer interested in teaching full-time, and therefore she was ok teaching as an adjunct. Therefore, the noesis of her experience translated into perceiving partial job satisfaction with MYTC as it is moot, for only offering her and her colleagues a psychological sense of temporary job security, provisional job stability, and lessened anxiety.

Amy’s Textural-Structural Description of the Meaning and Essence of the Experience.

Amy expressed overall satisfaction with her MYTC because it afforded her temporary job security and lessened anxiety, as I stated in Theme A and sub-themes A1 and A2. Noematically speaking, she perceived the contract to be more secure versus teaching on a semester basis contract. As a result, feeling invested in having an MYTC allowed her to focus on teaching and students without worrying about employment the following semester. In a sense, she experienced the contract holistically and synergistically as she felt that the more she enjoyed her teaching, the more students could get out of it. In her view, the MYTC did not change her day-to-day functioning as an adjunct professor or give her more institutional support or additional recognition. All study participants expressed similar views.

Theme B and sub-themes B1 and B2 reflect that MYTC meant security and professional recognition for her accomplishments and teaching longevity. She just knew she did not have to worry about a job or workload assignments, even if enrollment was low and the department chair canceled classes; the contract stipulated that the college was required to assign her other tasks, such as administrative duties, equivalent to six credits hours. In other words, under MYTC, her salary was guaranteed regardless of registration sufficiency.
Upon experiencing MYTC for three consecutive years, Amy received a letter stating that the provost offered her a one-year contract with guidance instead of a three-year reappointment. Amy’s perception of MYTC changed. Her noesis of the lived experience with MYTC shifted to sentiments of frustration, disappointment, and anxiety. Her direct knowledge or noesis of MYTC was that she did not get a reappointment because the contract had deficiencies in its implementation. As shown in Appendix O, in her opinion, there is the need to include benchmarks and check-ins in MYTC to track teaching performance, detect deficiencies and apply timely corrective measures. She taught for three consecutive years without anyone checking her performance. When the time came for MYTC reappointment and submitted to the required comprehensive evaluation, some deficiencies in her teaching were used as grounds not to grant her a multi-year reappointment. She claimed that if check-ins had been in place, she would not have failed the comprehensive evaluation.

Reflecting on the experience, she realized that she should have raised her voice on this issue and other issues ascribed to the contract but did not. Instead, as Theme C and sub-themes C1 and C2 signify, she remained complacent, as do many adjuncts for fear of retaliation. For this reason, and as shown in Table 7, she responded to the question of whether she was satisfied with her MYTC as “not sure.”

Overall, she noted apathy among adjuncts regarding raising their voices against adverse working conditions. “Adjuncts don’t want to rock the boat...they don’t want to say anything,” she said, respecting the lack of benchmarks in the MYTC. “As I’ve gotten older, I’ve gotten more concerned about that. Job security has been such an important thing for me.”

Barbara’s Textural-Structural Description of the Meaning and Essence of the Experience. Like Aisha, to Barbara, the noema or meaning of a multi-year contract was also a
piece of paper describing her job. For her, the position seemed to be more permanent than simply a fifteen-week stint in the academic department for the Human Resources office. Barbara described the appointment as an assignment of at least two classes per semester or the equivalent to at least six, but no more than nine, contact hours per semester. It was a sort of relief for her. However, the course assignments depended on enrollment; she was unsure how it worked when enrollment was too low. Considering Themes, A, B, and C, and the pertinent invariant constituents altogether (see Table 11), the noesis or essence of Barbara’s experience with MYTC translated into partial satisfaction due to the perception of temporary job security and stability and feeling less anxious.

**Jessica’s Textural-Structural Description of the Meaning and Essence of the Experience.** As for Themes A, B, and C and respective invariant constituents convey, Jessica's noema or meaning of teaching under a multi-year contract is the perception of what the contract means to her. She has several courses or credits to teach every three years and expects reappointment for three additional years. The contract stipulates that adjuncts with multi-year appointments are assigned an equivalent of six contact hours but no more than nine per semester. Jessica experienced the phenomenon similar to how Aisha, Barbara, and Kevin did.

The noesis or essence of the experience hinged on her perception that the MYTC afforded partial satisfaction, temporary job security, stability, and less stress or anxiety regarding her job. To Jessica, teaching under an MYTC made her feel valued for her work. She accepted the three-year appointment as a gesture from the administration. To her, it was an indication that their supervisors would instead keep her than letting her go to teach somewhere else.

**Jorge’s Textural-Structural Description of the Meaning and Essence of the Experience.** Jorge's noema of the experience with MYTC resembled that of his colleagues
Aisha, Alyssa, Amy, Barbara, Jessica, Joseph, Kevin, Maria, Peter, Rodrigo, and Roscoe. His outlook was that MYTC afforded him partial job satisfaction derived from perceived temporary job security, temporary job stability, and a sense of lessened anxiety. These outcomes were reflected in Theme A and sub-themes A1 and A2. His views on recognition were embodied in Theme B and sub-themes B1 and B2 and were coresearchers' views. Like him, their overall feeling was that MYTCs granted them gratifying recognition of longevity and teaching performance.

Aside from a sense of temporary job security and being treated as a valuable member of the institution, Jorge's noesis of the experience centered on perceiving MYTCs as promising ways to address the adjunct faculty perennial unemployment plight. Contrary to the perception that MYTCs were bells and whistles or insults or strategies fostering adjunct complacency, as Theme C and sub-themes C1 and C 2 reflect, these contracts were pragmatic as colleges and universities used them to offer psychological support equilibrium to appointees. Instead of looking at MYTCs as deficient in addressing the adjunct faculty plight, Jorge suggested that critics appreciate the actual value of such an employment prototype.

Undoubtedly, in his view, MYTCs needed improvement regarding employment terms such as salaries commensurate with experience and academic credentials. However, appreciating MYTCs in their just dimension would reveal that these types of contracts are part-time and temporary. In his opinion, MYTCs are effective alternatives to retain experienced adjunct faculty while giving them a guaranteed teaching workload, stable salary, security, stability, less anxiety, and psychological equilibrium. Jorge believes that all adjuncts who qualify deserve some job security regardless of the temporal nature of multi-year teaching contracts.
**Joseph’s Textural-Structural Description of the Meaning and Essence of the Experience.** To Joseph, the noema or meaning of the experience with the phenomenon centered on how he described the three-year appointment. Much the way Aisha, Barbara, Kevin, and Jessica did, the contract meaning for Joseph was steady employment for three consecutive years, and if reappointed, three additional years. Regarding similarities and differences regarding how other co-researchers perceived MYTC required comprehensive teaching evaluation, he thought such requirement was burdensome. Even when his supervisor had promised his evaluation was random, the evaluation was required to approve his three-year appointment and reappointment every four or five years. The MYTC evaluation requirement was slightly stressful, similar to what it caused other co-researchers like Kevin and Roscoe.

Regardless of feeling anxiety about the evaluation, Joseph perceived his three-year contract as job security even if enrollment was low. Nonetheless, he felt more peace of mind and security knowing he had secure employment. Aisha and Jessica had similar experiences in this respect. However, Barbara, Kevin, and Maria were anxious because they believed their multi-year contracts depended on sufficient enrollment. Despite this difference in meaning to Joseph, his perception of multi-year appointments manifested in Themes A, B, and C and respective invariant constituents. Like his colleagues, the noesis or essence of his lived experience laid in that the MYTC afforded him partial satisfaction, temporary job security, stability, and less stress.

**Kevin’s Textural-Structural Description of the Meaning and Essence of the Experience.** Equivalent to the experiences lived by Aisha and Barbara, Kevin’s noema or meaning of his multi-year contract translated into being assigned at least two classes equivalent to six but no more than nine contact hours per semester. To him, having a multi-year contract was not a guarantee of being assigned classes as full-timers always get theirs first. There was
uncertainty and anxiety if enrollment was down as he might not get assigned classes, particularly during contingencies such as COVID. Having an MYTC made him feel a little better, although the anxiety was still there. Considering Themes, A, B and C, and the pertinent invariant constituents together (see Table 11), the noesis or essence of Kevin’s experience with an MYTC made him feel unsure whether he is satisfied with it or not. However, based on the invariant constituents and the themes, I extracted Kevin’s essence of the experience as partial job satisfaction due to the temporary job security, stability, and lessened sense of anxiety.

**Maria’s Textural-Structural Description of the Meaning and Essence of the Experience.** The meaning or noema of the experience for Maria was similar to that of Aisha, Barbara, Kevin, Jessica, and Joseph. The multi-year contract meant to her that she had a somewhat stable job for three consecutive years. Her anxiety came with the uncertainty that the contract depended on student enrollment. If sufficient enrollment, the contract meant she would get two classes assigned to her. Customarily, adjunct faculty with a multi-year teaching contract are assigned courses before other regular adjuncts.

The academic department chair assigned Maria an equivalent of six but no more than nine contact hours per semester. The noema or meaning of her experience resembled Themes A, B, and C and the relevant invariant constituents. The noema was intertwined with the noesis or essence in that having an MYTC meant teaching at least two courses per semester. Being assured of this contractual arrangement contributed to making Maria less anxious about her teaching workload. Therefore, she perceived partial job satisfaction with her MYTC.

**Peter’s Textural-Structural Description of the Meaning and Essence of the Experience.** Except for providing a sense of temporary job security and stability and, therefore, less anxiety and partial satisfaction, Peter's multi-year contract did not change any other aspects
of his adjunct teaching experience. He interacted with students, colleagues, and administrators the way he did before being appointed to a three-year teaching position. Although his salary did not change, his job satisfaction stemmed from teaching students. This description was similar to the perceptions of co-researchers Aisha, Alyssa, Amy, Barbara, Jessica, Jorge, Joseph, Kevin, Maria, Rodrigo, and Roscoe.

Themes A, B, and C embodied the meaning and essence of Peter's multi-year contract experience. His noema or meaning of the experience was a job that consisted of teaching at least two classes or the equivalent of six, but no more than nine contact hours per semester. The job did not include getting additional remuneration, institutional support, improved working conditions, additional responsibilities, opportunity to grow and develop, change in rank. The noesio or essence of his lived experience centered on the perception that a multi-year contract afforded him a sense of partial satisfaction, temporary job security, and stability. His multi-year contract experience resulted in less anxiety due to the predictability of having a permanent job.

Rodrigo’s Textural-Structural Description of the Meaning and Essence of the Experience. Themes A, B, and C depict multi-year contracts as means that afford adjuncts temporary job security, temporary job stability, less stress, partial job satisfaction, and disenchantment for purported employment terms and benefits. Furthermore, the themes denote the contracts mean rewards, without additional monetary compensation and institutional support or improved working conditions. Besides, the themes also depict three-year contracts as bells and whistles, meaning empty guarantees of a job with benefits. To Rodrigo, the meaning of his three-year contract was that of bells and whistles. As Theme A signifies, he perceived the contract to provide partial job satisfaction, job security, stability, and less anxiety. The MYTC
meant a simple job to teach at least two classes or the equivalent of six, but no more than nine contact hours per semester, without getting paid additional compensation.

To Rodrigo, no significant changes occurred in his adjunct teaching experience due to being granted an MYTC. The noema or meaning of the experience to him was in tandem with the meanings perceived by Aisha, Alyssa, Amy, Barbara, Jessica, Jorge, Joseph, Kevin, Maria, Peter, and Roscoe. As they experienced, Rodrigo’s noesis or essence of the experience was reduced to his perception that a multi-year contract afforded him a sense of partial satisfaction, temporary job security and stability, and less anxiety because he could have continuity in teaching the same course along with the duration of the contract. However, regardless of the temporary job security MYTC affords him, his longevity determines his employment as an educator.

**Roscoe’s Textural-Structural Description of the Meaning and Essence of the Experience.** Roscoe perceived MYTC as an assurance to teach at least two classes per semester over three consecutive years. As Theme A and sub-themes A1 and A2 signify, MYTC meant more stable employment giving him a sense of job security, stability, and lessened anxiety. He understood it as a promise that he would be in the classroom teaching students for three consecutive years. Roscoe knew his MYTC depended on passing a comprehensive evaluation from the department chair, peer review observation, and student evaluation. Feeling similarly as his colleagues Aisha, Alyssa, Amy, Barbara, Jessica, Jorge, Joseph, Kevin, Maria, Peter, and Rodrigo, Roscoe stated that MYTC gave him “a sense of comfort” and institutional recognition for longevity and effective teaching performance as I established in Theme B and sub-themes B1 and B2.
The contracted employment and protection extent were not clear to him. Although he felt MYTC gave him job security for three years, which was the noema of his experience, he realized it did not because the college terminated his employment. The noesis of his lived experience with MYTC turned into job dissatisfaction and the realization that the contract did not protect him. As other participants like Rodrigo, Joseph and Kevin perceived, Roscoe felt the contract was noncommittal to ensure his job. Like his colleagues, Roscoe’s sentiments about MYTCs embodied in Theme C and sub-themes C1 and C2, which refer to the contract as *bells and whistles*, an insult contributing to adjunct faculty complacency. His lived experience with MYTC translated into the contract was not what it appeared to be at first—job security for adjunct faculty.

*Composite Description of the Meanings and Essences of the Group Experience.* After constructing twelve individual textural-structural descriptions of the meanings and essences of each participant's experience with a multi-year contract, I developed a composite narrative. The emphasis with this concluding part of the final step was to list and describe the meanings and essences of the lived experience of the twelve co-researchers as a group. The results of the Modified van Kaam Method of Analysis of Phenomenological Data revealed a compounded meaning of different expressions or terms distilled from the invariants constituting the individual textural-structural descriptions. The revealed purpose is that co-researchers perceived MYTC as an institutional acknowledgment of seniority and teaching performance.

The contract guaranteed temporary part-time employment to teach at least six but no more than nine contact hours per semester. Besides, it did not alter regular adjunct teaching employment terms and practices, neither granted assurance of additional benefits, institutional support, and improved working conditions. The results also include three essences representative

The meaning depicted how adjunct faculty understood their lived experience with MYTC and their perception of job satisfaction with said contract. The essences addressed the study research questions. Essence 1 addressed the central research question, "What are adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments?" Essence 2 addressed sub-question one, "How do adjunct faculty perceive motivating factors (i.e., achievement, recognition, work, responsibility, advancement, and growth) concerning job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments?" Moreover, Essence 3 addressed sub-question two, "How adjunct faculty perceive hygiene factors (i.e., institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, and job security) concerning job dissatisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments?"

**Essence 1: Adjunct Faculty Realization that a Multi-year Contract Only Afforded Partial Job Satisfaction Due to Perception of Temporary Job Security, and Job Stability, Which Resulted in Lessened Anxiety.** In responding to the study's fourteen interview questions and sub-questions, participants realized the extent of multi-year contracts regarding terms of employment and benefits. As they wrestled with articulating their thoughts to answer questions, it became apparent that MYTCs afforded them temporary employment. A participant said, "A multi-year contract is job stability, albeit temporary." Upon further reflection, others concluded that the contract did not include additional compensation or improved working conditions or
additional institutional support, or the opportunity to develop and grow personally or professionally. It merely provided a guarantee of employment for three years. Therefore, the group experience was subsumed in their perception that the contract afforded partial job security and partial stability. As a result, they perceived MYTCs caused less anxiety than teaching as regular adjuncts.

Besides, participants perceived the contract to represent institutional recognition of longevity and service to students and the college. These aspects of the multi-year contract experience led them to conclude they were satisfied. Although they concluded having job satisfaction, they acknowledged that the contract did not improve their status. Maria summarized this realization by saying, "It does not make me equal to full-timers. I was still an adjunct. Nothing has changed in that matter."

**Essence 2: Feeling Appreciated.** During the interview and the focus group discussion, some participants indicated they felt appreciated by being granted a multi-year teaching contract because of their longevity and teaching performance. In this respect, Kevin said, "I do feel that!" "I mean, I do feel recognized a little bit." He added, "My three-year contract has a lot to do with my tenure," meaning the time he spent teaching as a regular adjunct. Rodrigo also indicated that his longevity as an adjunct assistant professor led the college to grant him an MYTC. He said, "The contract, per se, has been rather moot," in determining his standing at the college.

Rodrigo felt well regarded by various chairs and colleagues and recognized as a quality teacher. In this respect, he stated, "the department has wanted to keep me around, and the colleges have wanted to keep me around." When explicitly asked about the meaning of the three-year contract to him, he replied:

"It means I am a little more recognized and valued but not valued enough for them to take
me over the tenured track. They are throwing me a bone, and this dog is getting a little
tired of bones and would like some meat.

When asked to illustrate how they felt appreciated having an MYTC, Maria said, "A multi-year
appointment is a recognition that I am well-thought-of as a professional, as a faculty member." Other participants mentioned receiving business cards from their academic departments. Maria reacted by saying, "I am impressed that you have a card. Do you have business cards? You know, I'm going to suggest that to my department," she concluded. Joseph said to Maria, "I am going to grab one before we get off and show it to you…you do not pay a thing; your director just approves it."

All participants perceived being granted an MYTC as recognition from the chair or the college administration, or the faculty union. Maria said, "I see the contract as recognition by my chair and by my management." Peter saw it as determined by a labor contract between the faculty union and the university system. Rodrigo asserted, "It is compelled by the union," while Jessica guessed:

I guess it was the union that made this happen, and what a great idea because as an adjunct, I felt that. There were times when I really felt taken advantage of or when I felt like people did not understand that some adjuncts really wanted to teach more.

Overall, to Barbara and other participants, getting a multi-year appointment was an institutional recognition from the college that has contributed to their perception of being satisfied with some aspects of the contract. To Jorge, the contract made him feel acknowledged. Although students and most of his colleagues did not know he had a three-year appointment, he was resolute in affirming that the contract somehow made a psychological difference in him.
However, he acknowledged that his job satisfaction as an educator comes from teaching students.

**Essence 3: A Perception of Job Satisfaction with Multi-year Contracts Driven by Disappointment and Complacency.** All participants indicated they were partially satisfied with their multi-year contract, although three indicated they were unsure. However, in responding to the interview questions, they expressed frustration with the terms of employment. When asked to share their perception about the contract regarding achievement, recognition, work, growth, advancement, and responsibility, all responded that recognition and work were the only factors they perceived contributed to job satisfaction. On the one hand, they felt that granting them a multi-year contract was an acknowledgment from the institution. On the other hand, the contract meant they had a job.

Similarly, when asked to share their perception of the contract regarding institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, and job security, all responded that job security was a key factor. They perceived this factor contributed to the sense of partial job satisfaction. The remaining factors did not change their perception of the contract. All of them agreed they were partially satisfied with multi-year contracts.

In this respect, when specifically asked regarding satisfaction with the contract, Kevin responded to the questionnaire that he was unsure of being satisfied. When asked the same question during the interview, he replied, "Yes. There is a little bit. I mean, there is a little bit because I do not have to worry for a few semesters or having to prove myself again." He meant to say that he does not have to go through the hiring process every semester. Joseph pointed out
that the contract is a way to keep adjunct faculty complacent. In this respect, he said, "They keep us complacent when it is not really adding anything for us."

Other participants expressed similar sentiments. For instance, Rodrigo stated that adjuncts do not get paid enough. He stressed the lack of fair compensation, although they have proven themselves by passing rigorous, comprehensive teaching performance evaluations to be offered a multi-year position. Aisha said, "The only thing I could say is I just feel they need to pay us more, whether it's a multi-contract or not… I am just happy where I am at."

Overall, participants perceived they were partially satisfied with the contract. “I’m partially satisfied because I have less anxiety,” Amy said despite feeling disappointed by compensation, lack of additional institutional support, status, improved working conditions, and most aspects of their MYTC experience. Nevertheless, she and the other adjuncts opted to remain complacent regarding their disappointment with MYTCs.

**Research Question Responses**

**Central Research Question**

“What are adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments?” Except for three participants who in the demographic questionnaire responded "not sure" to the question of satisfaction with a multi-year contract, nine participants indicated they were. However, based on their responses to interview questions and the Modified van Kaam Data Analysis results, I concluded they perceived job satisfaction with some aspects of multi-year contracts. Their collective perception harmonized with Theme A, Partial Job Satisfaction, and sub-themes A.1, A.2., and A.3. Temporary Job Security, Temporary Job Stability, and Lessened Job Anxiety. Similarly, it attuned with Theme B and sub-themes B.1. and B.2. Recognition of Seniority and teaching performance, as well as it was in accord with Theme C
According to Herzberg's two-factor theory (Herzberg, 1959), workers tend to perceive job satisfaction when they can achieve it. They get satisfaction when recognized for their contribution or feel they have guaranteed work, are assigned additional meaningful responsibilities, or have opportunities for advancement and growth. The twelve participants responded to questions about each one of these factors. Overall, their responses indicated they perceived MYTCs provided job satisfaction respecting temporary job security and stability, which lessened job anxiety. For instance, Kevin acknowledged the little job security he got from having a multi-year contract regardless of its shortcomings. Barbara said that "Three-year appointment is designed to give the adjunct some kind of job security. It does that, and that gives you satisfaction, much more satisfaction." To Kevin, it is less stressful to teach under multi-year appointments. In this respect, he said, "It kind of lessens that job anxiety."

Most of the twelve participants listed "work" and "recognition" in the questionnaire as the main factors contributing to their perception of job satisfaction. In addition, they perceived “job satisfaction” in MYTCs as institutional recognition of seniority and teaching performance. However, they understood MYTCs were devoid of additional remuneration, institutional support, improved working conditions, or change in status. Rodrigo said, "Multi-year contracts make one
feels a little bit more recognized, a little bit more valued, but not valued enough for the higher education establishment to take qualified adjunct faculty over the tenured track."

**Answer to Sub-Question One.** How do adjunct faculty perceive motivating factors (i.e., achievement, recognition, work, responsibility, advancement, and growth) concerning job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments? In the two-factor theory of motivation, Herzberg et al. (1959) postulated that workers perceive job satisfaction from having met several factors such as achievement, recognition, work, responsibility, advancement, and growth. Sub-question one was, how do adjunct faculty perceive these motivating factors concerning job satisfaction with a multi-year appointment? Study participants responded that they did not experience any achievement, additional responsibility, advancement, or growth except recognition and work with MYTCs. They perceived the employer granted them a three-year appointment as institutional recognition of seniority and teaching contribution to the benefit of students, the college, and the university system. This answer emerged from Theme B Institutional Recognition. This theme denotes that adjunct faculty perceive multi-year teaching contracts as institutional recognition of longevity. Besides, they also saw the contracts as institutional recognition of excellence in teaching performance. Maria described this aspect of her multi-year teaching experience in the following way:

> The multi-year appointment is a recognition that I am well-thought-of as a professional, as a faculty member. What I do with the students; that they can count on me because I do a lot of last-minute subbing for a lot of students and faculty. And they know they can count on me. They can give me a call at 10:00 PM the night before, and I'll be fine. So, I think that it makes me feel very well recognized.
Aside from perceiving recognition, co-researchers also perceived their multi-year contract as guaranteed work for three years or six semesters and, if reappointed, three additional years of stable employment. In their view, the only difference between their three-year employment and their regular adjunct position was the guarantee to be assigned a workload of at least two courses per semester or the equivalent to six, but no more than nine contact hours per semester. The remaining employment terms, such as office hours and benefits, applied to all faculty teaching in regular adjunct titles and were based on the faculty union and the university contractual labor agreement.

In sum, as Theme C denotes, co-researchers perceived MYTCs as *bells and whistles*; except for the contract length, standard employment terms did not change. Study participants were disappointed with MYTCs as factors such as achievement, responsibility, advancement, and growth did not influence their perception of job satisfaction. Furthermore, despite their disappointment, adjuncts opted to remain complacent. In this respect, co-researcher Amy said, “Until I had the multi-year contract, I never felt like I could speak up about anything. Not that I really spoke up when I had the three-year contract. Adjuncts don’t want to rock the boat.”

**Answer to Sub-Question Two.** How do adjunct faculty perceive hygiene factors (i.e., institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, and job security) concerning job dissatisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments? In addition to motivating factors contributing to workers' job satisfaction, Herzberg (1959) postulated that workers tend to be dissatisfied with work due to hygiene factors. Sub-question two was, how do adjunct faculty perceive hygiene factors concerning job dissatisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments? They replied that, except for job security, study participants did not experience these factors as weighting on their perception of job
dissatisfaction as there was no apparent change resulting from transitioning from a regular adjunct faculty position to an MYTC. Participants reported they did not know of any institutional policy or requirement that shifted their perception of job satisfaction. Academic department supervision and working conditions did not change either. Interpersonal relations with students, colleagues, and higher education administrators did not change at all. Salary remained the same as per the contractual labor agreement between the faculty union and the university. Moreover, their status or rank remained the same, meaning they were still adjuncts with an MYTC. These statements originate from Theme C, indicating multi-year contracts are *bells and whistles*.

Study participants summarized the experience indicating that factors such as institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, and status did not influence their perception of job satisfaction with the multi-year contract. In this respect, Joseph and Rodrigo concluded that MYTCs kept adjunct faculty complacent. "They keep us complacent, when the contract is not really adding anything for us," said Joseph, while Rodrigo stated that multi-year contracts are *"bells and whistles."* He stressed:

> It means I'm a little more recognized. A little bit more valued, but not valued enough for them to take me over the tenured track. They are throwing me a bone, and this dog is getting a little tired of bones and would like some meat.

**Summary**

The data collected for this study came from an online demographic questionnaire, individual online interviews of twelve adjunct faculty who taught under multi-year contracts, document analysis, and a focus group discussion with five participants selected from the sample population. The Chapter began with a detailed description or portrait of each co-researcher. The Results section was organized thematically with two subsections: Theme Development and
Answers to the Research Questions. I included rich, thick summaries of each co-researcher. I also included individual textural, structural, and composite descriptions, which outlined participants' perspectives, experiences, and commonalities concerning their perception of job satisfaction with multi-year contracts. I traced the general themes in the Chapter's results section and incorporated pertinent quotes from each data collection method. The Chapter concluded with the following answers to the study's central research question and sub-questions: Participants perceived that multi-year teaching contracts provided partial job satisfaction, temporary job security and stability, and less anxiety. Aside from appreciating being recognized for their seniority and teaching performance, participants perceived multi-year contracts as guaranteed stable employment for three years or more. Except for job security, study participants indicated that institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, responsibility, growth, and development did not influence their perception of job satisfaction with multi-year contracts.
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

Overview

The purpose of this transcendental phenomenological study was to explore the perception of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments of twelve adjunct faculty who taught from fall 2017 to spring 2020 at public colleges in the Northeastern United States. Considering the study’s empirical, theoretical, and practical implications, in this Chapter Five, I present a summary of the findings, a discussion of the implications concerning the empirical and the theoretical literature centered on Herzberg et al.’s (1959) two-factor theory and Husserl’s (1959) conceptual and theoretical phenomenological methods. Besides, it includes my interpretation of the findings, discussions about limitations, ideas, and recommendations. The Chapter incorporates six sections: this Overview, a Summary of Findings, Discussion, Implications, Delimitations and Limitations, Recommendations for Future Research, and a Summary.

Summary of Findings

The twelve adjunct faculty who participated in this study completed a demographic questionnaire, answered fourteen open-ended, semi-structured interview questions and respective sub-questions, and validated the accuracy of the findings via member checking. In addition to the interview, five of them participated in a focus group discussion. They ranked factors they considered correlated with their perception of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction with multi-year teaching contracts (MYTCs). With their responses, I answered the study’s central research question: “What are adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments?” I also answered the study’s two sub-questions. Following is a summary of the study’s findings (See Appendix Z for a list of the general conclusions classified under themes and sub-themes):
1. Multi-year teaching contracts provide partial job satisfaction due to temporary security, and stability, which lessen anxiety.

2. Multi-year appointments afford adjunct faculty a horizon to plan for curriculum development and materials.

3. Adjunct faculty perceive multi-year teaching contracts as institutional recognition of longevity.

4. Adjunct faculty perceive multi-year teaching contracts as institutional recognition of excellence in teaching performance.

5. Multi-year contracts keep adjunct faculty complacent and disappointed as employment terms remain unchanged except for contract length.

6. Study participants feel that achievement, responsibility, advancement, and growth factors do not influence their job satisfaction with the multi-year contract.

7. Study participants feel that institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, and status do not influence their perception of job satisfaction with the multi-year contract.

**Brief Answers to the Research Questions**

Considering Husserl’s (1959) postulate that “phenomenology is rooted in questions that give meaning, and in themes that sustain inquiry…with whatever is experienced” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 59), in the following summary, I briefly answer the central research question. In addition, I also briefly answer the two sub-questions that guided this transcendental phenomenological study. After an exhausting coding process, theme analysis, and intense study of data sources, I constructed the answers inductively. Answers were based on data from the
demographic questionnaire, interview transcripts, focus group discussion, and document analysis.

*Answer to the Central Research Question*

The question guiding this study was, “What are adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments?” Adjunct faculty perceived multi-year appointments as guaranteed employment granted to them as institutional recognition of seniority. They perceived a sense of job stability, albeit temporary, which lessened job anxiety and made them feel partially satisfied with their multi-year teaching job. Aside from sensing it as an institutional recognition of seniority and stable employment, participants perceived their regular adjunct employment terms did not change due to being granted a multi-year position. For Maria and Rodrigo, Joseph, Aisha, Kevin, and most participants, except for the previously mentioned factors, the perception of job satisfaction remained the same as when they were regular adjuncts.

*Brief Answer to Research Sub-Question One.* The first sub-question guiding the study was, how do adjunct faculty perceive motivating factors such as achievement, recognition, work, responsibility, advancement, and growth concerning job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments? The brief answer to this sub-question is: Except for recognition and work, most study participants indicated they did not experience any achievement, additional responsibility, advancement, and or growth as a result of having a multi-year contract. The study’s participants perceived the multi-year appointment as an institutional recognition of seniority and excellence in teaching performance. For them, MYTCs benefit students, the college, and the university system because the employer took into account adjunct faculty’s years of service and the comprehensive teaching performance evaluation results to grant them a three-year appointment. Each adjunct eligible for a multi-year contract experienced a process of uncertainty before
receiving the appointment letter ascertaining terms of employment. Such a momentous occasion was a significant cause for celebration.

However, as they began teaching under MYTC, they realized the unfolding lived experience differed from training on a semester basis as regular adjuncts. During online interviews and focus group discussions, I asked them to reflect on each motivating factor listed in the sub-question in the demographic questionnaire. Their individual textural, structural, and composite answers denoted their lived experience with achievement, responsibility, advancement, and growth had little or no relevance to their perception of job satisfaction with a multi-year contract. In other words, while teaching under a multi-year contract, most of them said they did not achieve anything of consequence or were assigned additional responsibilities, or had meaningful opportunities to personally, professionally, or academically advance and grow.

**Brief Answer to Research Sub-Question Two.** The second sub-question, which also served to guide the study, resembled the response to the first sub-question but focused on hygiene factors associated with job dissatisfaction. The sub-question was, how do adjunct faculty perceive hygiene factors such as institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, and job security, concerning job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments? The brief answer to this sub-question is: Except for job security, participants did not experience any change regarding the other factors resulting from an MYTC. Nothing changed regarding institutional policy and administration, meaning whether the college implemented additional protocols or rules that exacerbated job dissatisfaction of adjuncts with three-year appointments. They reported no change in the way academic department chairs and deans or the provost supervised them. Working conditions were the same as when teaching on a semester-to-semester basis. Interaction with students, colleagues, and higher education
officers remained the same. Most said salary remained the same as established by the labor contract between the faculty union and university system; therefore, the multi-year labor agreement did not include a salary increase. Finally, respecting status, they remained adjunct faculty or part-time faculty, teaching under the same employment terms. In other words, except for temporary job security, they experienced multi-year contracts with the same sense of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction as when teaching as regular adjuncts.

**Discussion**

This section includes discussions and interpretations of the study's findings concerning the empirical and theoretical literature to reflect the related literature review outlined in Chapter Two (see Appendix Z for a list of general conclusions under themes and sub-themes). In the empirical literature section, I articulate how this study has corroborated and extended previous research findings, and how it has brought the research questions and findings together. Besides, discussions of this study's novel knowledge contributions to the literature follow, drawing attention to agreements and disagreements regarding the study's data with the data and findings of other pertinent research studies. In the theoretical literature section, there is a discussion about how this study has shed light on the applicability of Herzberg et al.'s (1959) two-factor theory, which served as the theoretical framework informing the topic. Besides, there is a discussion reflecting on how researchers applied the concept of perception. Following these two sections, the focus is on individually discussing and interpreting this research's seven most salient findings concerning the literature review, encompassing both its empirical and theoretical literatures.

**Empirical Literature**

As discussed in Chapter Two, the reviewed empirical literature unveiled several themes or findings relevant to the topic of adjunct faculty's perception of job satisfaction with part-time
employment (Bolitzer, 2019; Nelson et al., 2020; Tuckman et al., 1978). The themes most relevant to the study's topic, the problem statement, the purpose statement, central research question, and sub-questions were three: Adjunct faculty perceived lack of job security and stability (Danei, 2019; Ferencz, 2017; Mech, 2017; Vicente, 2017); adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction (Nelson et al., 2020; Page, 2018; Pons, 2017; Tuckman et al., 1978; Vicente, 2018; Yakoboski, 2016); and adjunct faculty's job dissatisfaction (Bakley & Bordersen, 2018; Eagan, Jr. et al., 2016; Merrit, 2016). A critical finding identified in the literature was that the multi-year teaching appointment is a factor in adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction (Kezar 2013; Page, 2017 & 2018). With their responses, this study's participants validated these findings as they perceived job satisfaction for having MYTCs. "The job satisfaction is very high for the period of the contract," said co-researcher Amy when asked to describe her perception of job satisfaction with MYTC. Overall, I concluded that the study's results fit well with such an existing body of work focused on adjunct faculty scholarship. This section offers in-depth discussions of the study's findings with agreements, disagreements, strengths, and weaknesses extracted from other studies' findings I reviewed to conduct the empirical literature review.

As shown in Figure 2, a triangle depicting significant studies conducted over the past forty-three years about the adjunct faculty teaching experience, this study has connected with Tuckman et al. 's (1978) Who is part-time in academe? Tuckman's was a seminal work published over forty years ago about the taxonomy, status, and perception of job satisfaction of part-time professors. This study, listed at the bottom of the triangle, has also connected with salient research published after Tuckman's study (see Azevedo et al., 2020; Bakley & Bordersen, 2018; Bickerstaff et al., 2021; Bolitzer, 2019; Danei, 2019; Ferencz, 2017; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kezar et al., 2019; Nelson et al., 2020; Rich, 2017; Page, 2016; Pons, 2017; Smith, 2019;
Vicente, 2018; Witt et al., 2021; Yakoboski, 2016). These and other researchers produced knowledge about adjunct faculty taxonomy, job status, lack of job security, job satisfaction, job dissatisfaction, lack of interest in full-time teaching jobs, interest in teaching full-time, interest in prestige, low wages, lack of benefits, lack of inclusion in shared governance, exclusion from college life, lack of institutional support, lack of professional development, lack of mentorship, lack of respect, lack of recognition, unequal treatment compared to counterparts, perception of lived teaching experience, deficiencies, advantages, disadvantages, adjuncts' impact on student learning, association with adverse student outcomes, low student persistence, and connectedness, and disconnectedness.

For instance, a critical Tuckman et al. finding was that in the 1970s, most adjunct faculty were satisfied with their teaching jobs and had different motivations to teach; in those days, they perceived job satisfaction based on their expectations and educator roles. This study's data show that adjuncts with MYTAs perceived partial [emphasis added] job satisfaction with their part-time positions. Although this finding seems to concur with Tuckman et al., it includes the term "partial" to denote that co-researchers were not completely satisfied with all aspects constituting MYTCs. Therefore, partial job satisfaction is a novel finding absent in relevant literature until I conducted his study.

Although co-researchers expressed unhappiness with salaries and working conditions, they perceived partial satisfaction with guaranteed employment for at least three consecutive years. Similar to what Tuckman et al. found in 1978 and other researchers (Brennan and Magness, 2018; Smith, 2019) also found along the past four decades, this study's co-researchers perceived partial job satisfaction as linked to personal and professional motivations and the way they self-identified their ranks. "Even with a multi-year contract, I am still an adjunct," said
Maria, one of this study's twelve participants. She clarified that having an MYTC had nothing to do with her commitment to teaching and her perception of job satisfaction, as her job satisfaction came from teaching and serving students.

When conducting studies on contingent faculty, researchers must be cautious about lumping all part-timers together and drawing conclusions to purport generalizability without considering adjunct's taxonomy. Tuckman et al.'s (1978) finding regarding the adjunct faculty taxonomy denoted that the group more likely to be dissatisfied was the "Hopeful Full-Timers" (pp. 307-309), who earned reduced wages, taught larger workloads, and worked at different higher learning institutions. This type of adjunct tends to work without health insurance, retirement benefits, annual leave, sick leave, and other benefits afforded to tenured and full-time faculty. Those who earned reduced wages were more likely to be older than 49 years of age, as Tuckman and Tuckman (1976) had found two years before Tuckman et al.'s 1978 seminal research on adjunct faculty.

In corroboration with Tuckman et al.'s finding, this description seems to fit this study's participants' characteristics as they were sixty years of age or older, expressed unhappiness regarding salary and teaching workloads, expressed interest in getting a full-time teaching position, and had the need to work at different institutions to make ends meet. A plus of this study was that the purposive sample was limited to particular adjuncts who had multi-year contracts and taught at public higher learning institutions in the Northeastern United States from 2017 to 2020. This study's findings and conclusions regarding partially satisfied adjuncts with MYTCs, contribute to modifying Tuckman et al.'s taxonomy findings as multi-year teaching appointments did not exist in the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s.
The lack of a uniform adjunct faculty definition is a deficiency in the empirical literature that has led many researchers to offer concluding findings from samples lacking homogeneity (Levin & Hernandez, 2014; Molly, 2018; Winters, 2015). For instance, in contrast to this study, Winters described adjunct faculty as part-time instructors, non-full-timers, non-tenure-track instructors who work temporarily at different higher learning institutions. In her phenomenological study on adjunct faculty, Molly described part-timers as those whose actual profession differed from teaching as adjunct faculty. Further, for AAUP, the most prominent advocacy organization representing the interests of the U.S. professoriate, the adjunct faculty title refers to instructors who teach part-time on a semester basis and a per course section (AAUP, 2020). As found in the empirical literature (Monks, 2009), not all adjuncts are the same and have similar motivations to teach (Culver et al., 2020). Researchers who falter in acknowledging the role of existing adjunct faculty taxonomy variations risk compromising the validity of their studies' findings and conclusions. This study used a well-defined homogenous purposive sample of adjunct faculty who taught under multi-year contracts at two specific public institutions of higher learning in the Northeastern United States to avoid such empirical literature deficiency.

Aside from Tuckman et al. (1978), other researchers found that adjunct faculty perceived job satisfaction and dissatisfaction as correlates derived from their part-time employment status, institutional treatment, and teaching experience (Bolitzer, 2019; Kezar & Gehrke, 2013; Nelson et al., 2020). For instance, Bolitzer concluded that the primary source of job dissatisfaction for adjunct faculty derives from the institutional treatment and job satisfaction from teaching students. This study corroborates these findings, as co-researchers indicated their perceptions of job satisfaction derives from teaching students and their dissatisfaction from their close adjunct
ranks and the lack of institutional support. For instance, co-researcher Kevin said, "The whole idea of satisfaction to me, is my students. Are the students satisfied with what I am giving them? Are they challenged and do they appreciate the challenges that I give them in the class?" Co-researcher Alyssa derives satisfaction from teaching students as well; however, she perceived job dissatisfaction regarding uncompensated labor. Co-researcher Rodrigo corroborated Kevin’s and Alyssa’s position that satisfaction comes from students and dissatisfaction from institutional treatment. In this respect, Rodrigo said:

Our pay is terrible, given the amount of work that we are expected to do. There is so much uncompensated labor. So, if I was going to make a very crass analogy to African American slavery, I am the lucky guy working in the kitchen instead of in the fields.

Other researchers found that adjuncts perceive part-time positions as job insecurity and job instability and, therefore, anxiety-inducing (Danei, 2019; Ferencz, 2017; Mech, 2017; Vicente, 2017). Furthermore, Yakoboski (2016) and Pons et al. (2017) found that regular adjuncts have low satisfaction with their part-time jobs. This study departs from these findings as its co-researchers concluded their multi-year part-time teaching positions guaranteed them temporary secure jobs, resulting in job stability and less anxiety. Co-researcher Barbara indicated that when she was teaching as a regular adjunct, she was satisfied: "My job satisfaction has not changed since I have received the contract. I love teaching and taught quite happily without the contract." Although her perception of satisfaction did not change, she felt assured being granted a multi-year teaching position: "There is some relief in knowing that, at least for three years, I will have some idea of where some of my next jobs will be."
Similarly, co-researcher Rodrigo pointed out, "Having the multi-year contract makes me feel more confident." Joseph was adamant in expressing his position regarding how he perceived his part-time position: "It is a pain in the butt to have to continue to, you know, to have the insecurity when you are not under a multi-year contract." Having a multi-year appointment, albeit part-time, made him feel safe in his teaching position. He said, "I am more secure" than when teaching as a regular adjunct. In his interview answers, as he corroborated his member checking feedback, Kevin concluded that his multi-year part-time position had lessened his job anxiety. As a regular adjunct, he was insecure with the part-time position. "I had jobs given to me and then pulled out in the last week, and then I had to kind of scramble to find something. So, job anxiety is a big thing." Upon getting a multi-year appointment, his stress and insecurity diminished. “The three-year appointments, in a nutshell, feels a little better, but still the anxiety is still there,” he concluded.

Furthermore, researchers found that the lack of institutional recognition leads to adjunct faculty job dissatisfaction (Bakley & Bordersen, 2018; Smith, 2019; Vicente, 2018). In agreement with this finding, this study contributed new knowledge indicating that co-researchers granted a multi-year teaching contract felt recognized by the institution as they perceived such type of employment as a recognition of their teaching performance and longevity. One of the study’s participants, Roscoe, refers to MYTC as a form of "adjunct tenure." The extant literature did not yield specific studies about the MYTC as institutional recognition or as a tenured leading position. On the contrary, reviewing studies such as Tuckman et al. (1978) resulted in findings denoting challenges regular adjuncts experience when interested in being promoted to full-time positions. For instance, Tuckman et al. found that adjuncts were satisfied even when they knew
they had limited opportunities for being promoted to full-time positions and had unstable employment.

In contrast, Tolley and Edwards (2018) found that most adjunct instructors preferred full-time positions. In this respect, one of this study's co-researchers, Barbara, said, "If a full-time tenured track job comes to me, I will take it. If not, I will continue with the multi-year appointment as it is available or work as I was before the contract, semester to semester." Another co-researcher, Rodrigo, indicated the following: "Multi-year contracts make one feel a little bit more recognized, a little bit more valued, but not valued enough for the higher education establishment to take qualified adjunct faculty over tenured track [faculty]." He acknowledged that a multi-year contract is a form of institutional recognition. Rodrigo, Jessica, Aisha, Amy, and most of this study's participants expressed interest in full-time positions. However, they understand adjuncts do not usually get offered full-time positions once they are hired as part-timers, regardless of their academic qualifications.

Another significant finding of this study to compare and contrast against findings extracted from the empirical literature is that adjuncts perceive their multi-year teaching contracts as *bells and whistles* [emphasis added], meaning devoid of added benefits. Some of the researchers (see Bakley & Bordersen, 2018; Merrit, 2016) I reviewed found that adjuncts were exploited and offered employment with uncertain and unfair contracts with undesirable employment terms. In their study debunking the claim that adjunct faculty are exploited and dissatisfied, Brennan and Magness (2018) attested to the inquiry line Tuckman et al. (1978), and AAUP established in the 1970s. As AAUP commissioned, Tuckman et al. set the research agenda that has dominated adjunct faculty scholarship publication over the past four decades. For Tuckman et al., adjuncts were satisfied with their teaching positions and employment terms.
However, subsequent studies conducted by Bakley & Bordersen (2018) and Merrit (2016) concluded that adjuncts were exploited or dissatisfied with their job status, teaching experiences, and contractual benefits. This study found that adjuncts with multi-year appointments perceive such contracts as moot, meaning inconsequential to improve their plight for secure and fairly remunerated stable employment. Co-researcher Rodrigo sustained his position regarding multi-year part-time teaching employment. "The multi-year contract has been an insulting delay tactic. I am not fooled. Yes, it has afforded me some brief lessening of stress, but, basically, I am not fooled." His contempt for his job centered on perceiving it as devoid of tangible benefits and as a tactic engineered to secure “uncompensated labor.” "What is job security if you are not paid enough? How is that secure? That is not secure. So, they stopped beating us with a large stick; instead, they beat us with ropes; they are still beating us."

Joseph, Aisha, Alyssa, Amy, Kevin, Maria, and other co-researchers manifested similar apprehension regarding the extent of multi-year contracts. They labeled these contracts bells and whistles, an insult, a piece of paper or a carrot on a stick, a tactic to ensure adjuncts become worker bees to do all necessary work without being adequately compensated, or simply an appointment letter, or a way to keep adjuncts complacent, or bright shiny objects to keep adjunct faculty distracted, or a meatless bone. These statements contradict Tuckman et al.'s (1978) and Brennan and Magness' (2018) findings and corroborate the conclusions of Bakley and Bordersen (2018) and Merrit (2016) that adjuncts feel exploited and denied fair contractual benefits.

Through the above discussion, I articulated how this study has corroborated and extended previous research findings. The discussion included relevant direct quotes from co-researchers to illustrate commonalities and differences I found in the empirical literature. Having discussed how the study's results fit with other research work, I address the following section focused on
the theoretical literature and how the concept of perception has been used by researchers exploring adjunct faculty job satisfaction. After this section, I further elaborate on how the seven findings drawn from this study fit previous work on adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction.

**Theoretical Literature**

As drawn from the reviewed empirical literature in Chapter Two, Husserl's theoretical and conceptual transcendental phenomenological framework, particularly the theory of phenomenological reduction, and Herzberg et al.'s (1959) two-factor theory guided this study. Researchers have applied these conceptual and theoretical frameworks to explore adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction (Auxier & Larizza, 2018; Bakley & Bordersen, 2018; Crick et al., 2020; Culver et al., 2020; Ferencz, 2017; Page, 2018; Hutto, 2017; Hoyt, 2012; Nelson et al., 2020; Smith, 2019; Vicente, 2018; Wicks et al., 2020). Following, I discuss the applicability of the concept of perception as the most critical construct of phenomenological research and then delve into discussing Herzberg et al.'s two-factor theory, as drawn from the theoretical and empirical literature.

**Husserl's Conceptual and Theoretical Framework: Theory of Phenomenological Reduction**

The theoretical literature revealed that researchers have widely used Husserl's conceptual and theoretical framework to explore the perceptions of adjunct faculty regarding their part-time employment (Bakley & Bordersen, 2018; Ferencz, 2017; Smith, 2019; Vicente, 2018). However, I noticed that all the reviewed studies lacked in-depth descriptions and sufficient conceptualization of perception and its applicability in qualitative research. Defined as "the primary source of knowledge, the source that cannot be doubted" (Mustakas, 2014, p. 52), perception is critical to executing phenomenological research. The execution of this study
centered on both the theory of phenomenological reduction and the two-factor theory. The former permits researchers to counter their preconceived bias via Epoqué and accept participants’ perceptions of phenomena as such, based on what they have experienced; and the latter pinpoints the factors ascribed to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Bem, 1972; Husserl, 1931; Moustakas, 1994; Skinner, 1953; Pitcher, 1971). This study was conceptualized based on these premises. The research, questionnaire, interview, and focus group questions were based on the concept of perception and the theory of phenomenological reduction. Strictly following these precepts by articulating the extent of Husserl's conceptual and theoretical phenomenological framework resulted in reliable findings of the adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching contracts.

Surprisingly, none of the studies I reviewed in the theoretical and empirical literature included sufficient conceptualization of perception as a critical element delimiting the extent and results of the intended research studies (See Bakley & Bordersen, 2018; Ferencz, 2017; Smith, 2019; Vicente, 2018). For instance, Bakley and Bordersen conducted a phenomenological study with a purposive sample of adjunct faculty. Similarly, Ferencz applied a transcendental phenomenology design to conduct a study on adjunct faculty online experience. Smith executed a hermeneutic phenomenological study to determine what it meant to be an adjunct faculty. Vicente conducted a phenomenological study as well, but on contingent faculty, meaning full-time and part-time faculty together. The surprising fact was that none of these researchers sufficiently conceptualized the concept of perception in their studies. This fact differs from my study, which centered on strictly following Husserl's phenomenological framework and his theory of phenomenological reduction, recommending that researchers center on perception as a germane source of knowledge, bracket themselves and accept participants' perceptions as such.
Conceptually and theoretically speaking, this research stands out in setting a precedent regarding the utility of the concept of perception in qualitative research, and particularly in phenomenological research methods. A take-away from my research is that any phenomenological or qualitative study must conceptualize perception as guiding such study methodological design, data gathering, and analysis methods and findings. I consolidated this study's significance via the use of a transcendental phenomenological approach, which central tenets are the concepts of human lived experience, and the phenomenon of perception as scholars have advanced (Giorgi, 2018; Heidergger, 1962; Husserl, 1931; Merleau-Ponty, 1962; Moustakas, 1994; Pitcher, 1971; Sartre, 1956; Skinner, 1953; van Manen, 1997).

**Herzberg et al.'s Two-Factor Theory or Theory of Motivation**

The empirical literature revealed that researchers had used Herzberg's two-factor theory or theory of motivation to investigate the following thirteen factors concerning adjunct faculty job satisfaction with their part-time employment: achievement, recognition, work, responsibility, advancement, and growth, institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, and job security. The reviewed literature yielded findings denoting that lower salaries, insufficient institutional support, undesirable working conditions, lack of job security, job instability, anxiety, and other aspects exacerbate job dissatisfaction among regular adjuncts. Based on this theory, this study yielded findings correlated to adjunct's perception of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Considering that the reviewed empirical texts constituted the foundation for this study's theoretical framework, the following are discussions of this study's main seven findings concerning the empirical and theoretical literature.
Finding 1. Multi-year teaching contracts provide partial job satisfaction due to temporary security, and stability, which lessen anxiety. In the empirical literature review, contingent faculty, particularly adjunct faculty who teach on a per-semester basis, perceive job satisfaction and dissatisfaction as correlates derived from their part-time employment status (Bolitzer, 2019; Kezar & Gehrke, 2013; Nelson et al., 2020). Bolitzer concluded that the primary source of job dissatisfaction for adjunct faculty comes from the institutional treatment and the primary source of job satisfaction from teaching. Kezar and Gehrke found that job dissatisfaction is associated with contingent faculty. Other researchers found that adjuncts equate part-time employment to job insecurity and job instability and, therefore, anxiety-inducing (Danei, 2019; Ferencz, 2017; Mech, 2017; Vicente, 2017).

Nelson et al. (2020) found that although contingent lack job stability and many are "paid by the course" (p. 5), they are satisfied with their part-time jobs. As a result of perceiving job satisfaction from their unstable part-time work, Nelson et al. concluded that adjuncts were satisfied and experienced lessened stress. As many other studies have found, this is a crucial finding denoting that adjuncts tend to be dissatisfied with their part-time teaching positions (Bakley & Bordersen, 2018; Crick et al., 2020).

In contrast, applying Herzberg et al.’s (1959) theory of motivation, I found that adjunct faculty with multi-year appointments perceive partial job satisfaction. They are partially satisfied because MYTCs do not include a salary raise, improved working conditions, additional institutional support, and other benefits. However, they experience less anxiety than regular adjuncts for job security and stability, guaranteed course assignments, payment for teaching at least two courses per semester, and three years or more of continuous employment.
This study corroborates Nelson et al.'s (2020) finding that adjunct faculty can perceive job satisfaction with their part-time teaching positions. However, I broadened this finding to denote, as previously indicated, that partial job satisfaction results when other factors are unmet. The theory of motivation postulates that having an assurance of work is a factor that contributes to job satisfaction. Therefore, in Nelson et al.'s finding and this study's finding, this postulate is met.

The theory of motivation also postulates that the lack of job security and stability results in job dissatisfaction. In Nelson et al.'s (2020) study, participants perceived having job satisfaction with their part-time employment. Bickerstaff et al. (2021) also found that adjuncts are satisfied with their jobs. These authors did not specify the degree of job satisfaction as they presented findings in absolute terms. However, by its very nature, teaching on a per-semester basis translates into a lack of job security and stability. For instance, Jorge, a participant of this study, reasoned that by the very nature of being an adjunct, whether with a multi-year contract or not, the position is temporary. "If one goes into *adjuncting* thinking that it is full-time, well you have the wrong idea of what an adjunct is. By its very nature it is temporary," he clarified. In Herzberg et al.'s (1959) theoretical terms, lack of job security and stability are hygiene factors correlated to job dissatisfaction. Corroborating and diverging from Nelson et al.'s finding that adjunct participants were satisfied with their part-time position, this study's participants perceived partial job satisfaction instead. They sensed MYTCs as offering them temporary job security and stability, which resulted in less anxiety for the length of the contract only. This finding is a novel contribution to the field of adjunct faculty job satisfaction scholarship. Therefore, the study sheds new light on the applicability of Herzberg et al.'s theory of motivation
and produces new knowledge on adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments.

**Finding 2. Multi-year appointments afford adjunct faculty a horizon to plan for curriculum development and materials.** This study’s finding is unique as I could not identify any study shedding light on this conclusion in the literature review. For the most part, this study's participants indicated they did not have the opportunity to plan for curriculum development and prepare materials when they taught as regular adjuncts. As found in reviewed literature (Street et al., 2012), adjuncts lack time to plan as they work in different colleges to make ends meet. Street et al. found that customarily, adjuncts are hired a couple of weeks or days before starting classes. They have no time to prepare. In this respect, Roscoe, one of the twelve participants of this study, said:

I have been called at the last minute to say, can you take over this class? or can you teach this class? So, from an organizational perspective, you want to make sure that you have that sense of stability within the environment, such that there is no disruption in your day-to-day functionality.

Roscoe's testimonial corroborates the findings of Street et al.'s (2012) study that higher learning institutions do not afford adjunct faculty enough time to prepare to teach. Other co-researchers acknowledged the utility of MYTCs in this respect. Upon being granted a multi-year contract, most study participants expressed a sense of encouragement for having the opportunity to further their horizons along with the duration of the job agreement, which included a first three-year appointment and a subsequent three-year reappointment. This finding diverges from previous research (West & Curtis, 2006; Street et al., 2012; Walton, 2018), which, for the most
part, explored the lack of time and challenges preventing adjunct faculty from engaging in curriculum development and preparation of course-related materials.

**Finding 3. Adjunct faculty perceive multi-year teaching contracts as institutional recognition of longevity.** Contrary to what I found in the reviewed literature, adjuncts with multi-year contracts perceived work as institutional recognition of years of service benefiting students and the college. As Herzberg et al.'s (1959) postulated, institutional recognition is one of the motivating factors contributing to workers' job satisfaction. All study participants agreed on perceiving multi-year employment as high regard and support by the institution. Sensing such institutional recognition contributed to their job satisfaction.

However, reviewed studies found that job stability adversely impacts instructors' teaching effectiveness and experience (Colby, 2020; Mech, 2017; Ott & Dippold, 2018; Ott & Cisneros, 2015; Pons et al., 2017). Lack of job stability also impacts connectedness and disconnectedness to academic institutions and students and results in job dissatisfaction with part-time employment (Bakley & Bordersen, 2018; Hutto, 2017; Wicks et al., 2020). With finding three, this study diverges from previous studies while making a novel contribution to how recognition of adjunct longevity in service adds to the perception of job satisfaction. Besides, with this finding, the study sheds new light on the theory of motivation. It informs this study's topic about adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction with multi-year contracts.

**Finding 4. Adjunct faculty perceive multi-year teaching contracts as institutional recognition of excellence in teaching performance.** Similar to finding three, the study makes an additional contribution to the field regarding how the granting of multi-year contracts based on the outcomes of a comprehensive teaching evaluation makes adjuncts feel recognized and partially satisfied with their part-time teaching positions. Contrary to what I found in the
literature review, this finding illustrates the applicability of the two-factor theory in that recognition is a critical factor in making workers feel valued, acknowledged, and respected (Herzberg et al., 1959). For instance, study participant Alyssa indicated feeling respected and acknowledged by her academic department when it granted her a multi-year contract due to her seniority and educational contributions. Such display of institutional acknowledgment was indicative of her perception of job satisfaction with MYTCs. This finding expands on previous research concluding that adjunct faculty's problem is lack of job satisfaction due to lack of recognition (Bakley & Bordersen, 2018; Smith, 2019; Vicente, 2018). Theoretically speaking, perceiving work as institutional recognition granted on merit transcends other types of acknowledgment such as a certificate, award, grant, or promotion. In a sense, with this finding, the study adds to the field. It sheds new light on the utility of the theory of motivation in exploring adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction with multi-year appointments.

**Finding 5. Multi-year contracts keep adjunct faculty complacent and disappointed as, employment terms remain the same, except for contract length.** Contrary to what I found in the reviewed literature, this finding denotes that co-researchers adopted a complacent attitude towards expressing themselves regarding the merit of multi-year contracts. All participants expressed concerns regarding the actual benefits of MYTCs. They acknowledged that an MYTC is very limited in the benefits it offers. In their view, they get institutional recognition in the form of a three-year appointment, which translates into temporary job security and stability along with the life of the contract, and less anxiety regarding workload assignments and temporary job continuity.

Rather than speaking out, most interviewees confessed their attitude has been to remain silent or complacent. In her member-checking feedback, co-researcher Amy expressed
disagreement with this finding. She said, "In item 5, I disagree with the use of the words complacent and disappointed. Perhaps you mean that despite the recognition, there is no room for advancement." However, during the interview, she explained why she did not speak up about an adverse issue regarding her multi-year appointment. "I did not say anything, and this sort of came back to bite me" (see p. 276 in Appendix H displaying her interview transcript). She said about not getting a multi-year reappointment due to failing to pass the required comprehensive teaching performance evaluation. In her opinion, the decision not to reappoint her was arbitrary. The implementation of multi-year contracts "should have been more organized and lacked performance benchmarks or "check-ins" to assess how adjuncts experience the multi-year contract. Her attitude was to ask herself, "am I going to rock the boat? I did not want to get him in trouble." She made a similar comment about adjuncts in general: "Adjuncts do not want to rock the boat."

Like Amy, co-researchers adopted a similar attitude and preferred to enjoy being partially satisfied due to the sense of temporary security MYTC grants them, rather than being vocal in acknowledging the contract's actual extent and potentially adverse effects. However, they also realized what the multi-year agreements do not include – i.e., increased salary, improved working conditions, additional institutional support, promotion, change in status, additional responsibilities, opportunities to develop and grow, and permanent employment. In other words, study participants were clear that having a multi-year contract kept them complacent as it did not change their adjunct faculty employment terms, except for the contract length. Witt et al. (2021) found that HEIs have failed to provide adjuncts sufficient support and resources to fulfill student needs.
Nevertheless, adjuncts perceive partial job satisfaction with MYTC, regardless of what it offers or does not offer, and preferred to do nothing about it. This finding is novel in adjunct faculty job satisfaction scholarship and diverges from previous research. I noted in the literature review that many qualitative studies on adjunct faculty job satisfaction concluded with various findings. Such findings denote a myriad of themes ascribed to the adjunct faculty's lived experience with their part-time position and their perception of job dissatisfaction (Maxey, & Kezar, 2015; Page, 2017; Rich, 2017). For instance, Page, Rich, and researchers at Harvard University (COACHE, 2019) found that providing teaching contracts with benefits and fair employment terms to adjunct faculty contributed to shifting their perception of job dissatisfaction to job satisfaction. Based on these authors and Bakley and Bordersen (2018), Hutto (2017), and Wicks et al. (2020), adjunct faculty perception of unhappiness with their part-time teaching positions was associated with extrinsic factors. In Herzberg et al.'s (1959) theory of motivation, such factors are institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, and job security.

**Finding 6. Study participants feel that factors such as achievement, responsibility, advancement, and growth factors do not influence their job satisfaction with multi-year contracts.** The study’s researcher relied on the two-factor theory (Herzberg et al., 1959) to explore if participants perceive intrinsic motivational factors as having to do with their sense of job satisfaction with a multi-year contract. Participants rendered the working agreement moot or impractical regarding achievement, responsibility, advancement, and growth. Based on the conducted literature review, I realized that authors such as Bakley and Bordersen (2018); Eagan, Jr. et al. (2016); Nelson et al. (2020), and Merrit (2016) found that adjunct faculty perceive intrinsic factors as ascribed to their sense of job satisfaction with their part-time employment.
For instance, Nelson et al. (2020) concluded that although adjunct faculty who participated in their study lacked job security and did not have competitive compensation nor enjoyed improved working conditions, they expressed satisfaction with factors such as recognition and advancement. According to Herzberg et al. (1959), adjuncts perceived these factors as dissatisfiers (Page, 2018; Pons, 2017; Vicente, 2018; Yakoboski, 2016). Out of all intrinsic factors outlined in the theory of motivation concerning this study, I corroborated that recognition in the form of multi-year employment led to the perception of job satisfaction, albeit partial.

**Finding 7.** Study participants feel that institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, and status do not influence their perception of job satisfaction with multi-year contracts. Based on the empirical literature and similar to finding number six, adjunct faculty mentioned the lack of job security and stability correlated to their job dissatisfaction. They also indicated that institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, and status are critical factors they perceived had to do with their lack of job dissatisfaction (Danei, 2019; Ferencz, 2017; Mech, 2017; Vicente, 2017). These are extrinsic, or hygiene job dissatisfaction factors Herzberg et al. (1959) postulated with the theory of motivation. Except for job security and job stability, this study participants perceived these factors as moot regarding their sense of job satisfaction. This finding partially corroborates previous research by Kezar (2013) and Page (2017), who found that multi-year teaching appointments seem to be considered factors in adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction. The saliency of finding six is that those study participants were assertive in indicating that except for job security and stability, they did not perceive these factors as intrinsic to their sense of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction with MYTCs. With this finding, the usefulness of the theory of motivation became evident.
Implications

In this section, I elaborate on this study's theoretical, empirical, and practical implications. The theoretical implications center on corroborating the two-factor theory (Herzberg et al., 1959). Empirically, its basis rests on previous research on adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction with part-time employment. The practical implications focus on the new knowledge the study generated. The section concludes with specific recommendations to stakeholders, including higher education administrators, union leaders, adjunct faculty, policymakers, and higher education advocates.

Theoretical Implications

The study's theoretical significance lies in its partial corroboration of Herzberg et al.'s (1959) postulate regarding the two-factor theory. Herzberg postulated that workers, in general, are motivated by intrinsic and extrinsic factors which contribute to their job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction. Six intrinsic factors are inherent to the nature of the work itself: achievement, recognition, employment, responsibility, advancement, and growth. Eight extrinsic factors are not inherent in work itself: institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, and job security. Researchers such as Auxier and Larizza (2018), Hoyt (2012), Nelson et al. (2020) have used Herzberg's theory of motivation to explore these factors concerning adjunct faculty job satisfaction with their part-time employment. The usual findings denote that lower salaries, lack of institutional support, undesirable working conditions, lack of job security, job instability, anxiety, and other aspects exacerbate job dissatisfaction among regular adjuncts.

Similarly, the study explored these factors with twelve adjunct faculty who have lived similar experiences teaching under multi-year teaching contracts at public colleges in the
Northeastern United States from the fall of 2017 through the spring of 2020. Based on participant’s interview responses, I corroborated three of the thirteen factors explored: work, recognition, and job security. Study participants revealed they perceived these three factors as sources of partial job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments. They concluded that the remaining eleven factors were inconsequential to determine whether they were fully satisfied or dissatisfied with multi-year contracts. Their justification for considering the remaining eleven factors moot hinged on that, except for work, recognition, and job security, nothing else changed due to being granted a multi-year contract.

Therefore, the theoretical implication derived from testing the theory of motivation (Herzberg et al., 1959) to address adjunct faculty job satisfaction with multi-year contracts, a topic barely discussed in the existing literature. Furthermore, applying Herzberg's theory fell short of ascertaining the relevancy of eleven factors to help determine adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction with MYTCs. Based on this reasoning, I conclude that the twelve adjunct faculty perceived they were partially satisfied with their multi-year appointments; eleven of thirteen factors were irrelevant to their lived MYTC teaching experience.

**Empirical Implications**

Ferencz (2017) made an excellent recommendation for researchers interested in studying the topic of adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction with employment. This author suggested not to emphasize adjuncts' adverse experiences. Instead, Ferencz recommended focusing on initiatives that work and improve adjuncts' job satisfaction. Researchers who investigated adjunct faculty job satisfaction with part-time employment suggested further research on similar topics (Bakley & Bordersen, 2018; Ferencz, 2017; Page, 2017; Smith, 2019; Walton, 2018).
This study focused on twelve adjunct faculty who experienced teaching under a multi-year contract. Its empirical significance stemmed from existing studies (see Auxier & Larizza, 2018; Hoyt, 2012; Nelson et al., 2020). Before engaging in bracketing and applying Epoké, I expected teaching under multi-year contracts would improve adjunct faculty's perception of job satisfaction. However, this study's findings reveal that the twelve adjuncts participants were far from perceiving MYTCs as panaceas of their plight for fairness, better treatment, and working conditions. One of them, Amy, said, "In some ways it's really brilliant; doing this phenomenological study makes a lot of sense because it's how it affects the person internally that makes the difference." The results of this phenomenological study are novel findings that fill a void by narrowing the empirical, peer-reviewed literature.

For instance, ascertaining that multi-year contracts improve adjunct faculty's perception of job satisfaction seems a step in the right direction to understand their employment concerns. Further, finding that adjunct faculty perceive partial job satisfaction with multi-year employment due to experiencing temporary job security, job stability, lessened anxiety, unchanged working conditions, no additional compensation, and institutional support adds value to the peer-reviewed literature. Therefore, I conclude that this study narrows the theoretical and empirical gap in the literature based on its findings. Narrowing the gap means producing new knowledge about adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction with MYTCs.

**Practical Implications**

There are scarce research studies on adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction with multi-year contracts; this is why this pioneering qualitative research study has practical implications. It generated new knowledge methodically developed via comprehensively applying Husserl's phenomenological conceptual framework (Moustakas, 1994). For instance, a salient
result is finding one: Multi-year teaching contracts provide partial job satisfaction due to temporary security and stability, which lessen anxiety. This finding denotes that job satisfaction is partial; it is a breakthrough in adjunct faculty scholarship on job satisfaction. Most reviewed studies referred to adjunct faculty job satisfaction in absolute terms. In reality, participants did not perceive complete satisfaction in each of the thirteen motivational and hygiene factors Herzberg postulated in his theory of human motivation.

As stated in Chapter One, the resulting knowledge is helpful to effect change in academia. The study offers significant findings of much value for adjunct faculty and stakeholders to inform the offering and acceptance of an employment prototype that addresses, albeit temporarily, adjunct faculty's dissatisfaction with job security and instability. The new knowledge about adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction provides valuable insight for part-time faculty who accept multi-year positions. To higher education professionals, the new knowledge this study generated may serve as a basis for offering adjunct faculty multi-year contracts with competitive benefits instead of the semester-to-semester option.

Researchers have found that employment terms and contract renewal are associated with job satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Ott & Cisneros, 2015; Larson et al., 2017; Nelson et al., 2020). However, based on the results of this study, multi-year appointments include a limited package of benefits and employment terms geared toward affording adjunct faculty temporary job security and stability. The problem is that adjuncts accepted an MYTC devoid of equivalent benefits for full-time and tenured faculty. Generating new knowledge about the phenomenon of adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction with MYTC ascertains the study's practical significance. I highly recommend the findings to inform higher education leaders in addressing
institutional hiring deficiencies impacting adjunct faculty job satisfaction with part-time teaching positions.

**Delimitations and Limitations**

**Delimitations**

This study was conducted based on a purposive sample of twelve adjunct faculty with multi-year teaching appointments. Participants met the sample selection eligibility criteria, which required they teach at public colleges in the Northeastern United States from fall 2017 to spring 2020 and be 18 years of age or older. The study's purpose was to explore the perception of these adjunct faculty participants regarding job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments. Considering this purpose, I opted to conduct a qualitative study instead of selecting a quantitative method by applying a transcendental phenomenological research design. Experts recommend qualitative research when the researcher is unclear regarding potential findings and when the purpose is to investigate participants' perceptions and lived experiences with a phenomenon (Giorgi, 2018; Husserl, 1931; Merleau-Ponty, 1962; Moustakas, 1994; van Manen, 1990). I chose a phenomenological design because its focus was on understanding participants' lived experiences.

The study had delimitation regarding its focus on the theory of motivation (Herzberg et al., 1959) to explore the twelve adjuncts' lived experiences and perceptions of job satisfaction. The theory of motivation centers on thirteen factors ascribed to workers' perceptions of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Therefore, the study was delimited to explore the thirteen factors from which participants perceived job satisfaction or dissatisfaction with multi-year appointments. Six were motivating factors, including achievement, recognition, work, responsibility, advancement, and growth. Seven demotivating factors include institutional policy
and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, and job security. Out of the thirteen, I found only three factors were relevant to adjunct faculty lived experience and perception of job satisfaction with multi-year contracts: work, recognition, and job security. These delimitations circumscribed the study's findings.

**Limitations**

The study had some limitations I could not control. Considering that the purposive sample was limited to adjunct faculty who taught under multi-year appointments from fall 2017 to spring 2020 at two public institutions of higher learning in the American Northeast, the eligible population was relatively small. Although I estimated the sample to be small, the recommended sample size for phenomenology research is between 5 and 25 participants (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Polkinghorne, 1989). The number of adjunct faculty who appeared to meet the study's sampling eligibility criteria at the two selected research sites was estimated to be less than ninety (see Table 5 in Chapter Three).

Another limitation of this study was that some participants did not fully understand the employment terms constituting their MYTCs. Some were unclear whether their adjunct faculty rank had changed or whether a recent salary raise was due to the MYTC or was a result of the faculty union and university system's general labor contractual agreement. Although multi-year contracts provided them job security, stability, less anxiety, and a sense of recognition, they could not comprehensively articulate whether they were completely satisfied. In their perception, nothing else had changed with their regular adjunct employment terms due to MYTCs.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Another recommendation is to conduct a hermeneutical phenomenological study in a particular academic department. The aim could be to determine whether the findings corroborate
this study's results. The recommendation is for researchers to get involved in the meaning-making process to gather participant's perceptions (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Moustakas, 1994; van Manen, 1990). The aim would be to interpret text, including the data and findings of this study, to corroborate or debunk them (van Manen, 1990). A possible topic would be Adjunct Faculty Perception of Job Satisfaction with Multi-Year Contract at the Academic Department Level. Exploring the lived experience of adjuncts in a particular academic department would provide more cohesive accounts of a lived experience individual to every potential participant and site.

Another recommendation is to conduct a phenomenological study on adjunct faculty with multi-year appointments considering their highest academic accomplishments. The study could be based on a transcendental phenomenological research design to permit researchers to apply bracketing and Epoqué to account for preconceived notions of the phenomenon (Husserl, 1931; Moustakas, 1994). Of the twelve participants of this study, five had earned a Ph.D. degree (see Table 6 in Chapter Three); four of them taught at a four-year college, and one at a community college. Of the twelve, six had earned master's degrees; two taught at a community college, and four at a four-year college. One had earned a law degree and taught at the four-year college. An appropriate topic for this suggested study would be: "Perception of Job Satisfaction of Adjunct Faculty with Doctorates and Multi-Year Teaching Appointments." Conducting targeted qualitative research by considering participants’ highest earned academic degrees may yield reliable experience findings. In this study, I realized that those with doctorate degrees seemed more knowledgeable of their multi-year contract employment terms than those with master's degrees.
Considering I conducted this study with participants from two public colleges in the Eastern United States, a final proposal would be to conduct a phenomenological study on adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction with multi-year contracts at colleges and universities in the Southern United States. As shown in Table 4, in 2018, four-year private non-profit institutions of higher learning granted 17,773 multi-year contracts to adjuncts compared to four-year public colleges and universities, which awarded 23,675 (Contract Lengths, 2018). Similarly, two-year private non-profit HEIs granted 346 multi-year contracts, while two-year public HEIs granted 11,497 (Contract Lengths, 2018).

The proposed research can corroborate this study's findings. The aim would be to apply Husserl's phenomenological conceptual framework and Herzberg's theory of motivation to explore the lived experience and perception of job satisfaction with multi-year contracts of adjuncts working at higher learning institutions. The study’s focus could also be four-year for-profit HEIs. The primary data collection would be open-ended semi-structured interviews and the data analysis based on Moustakas' Modified van Kaam Method of Phenomenological Data Analysis.

**Specific Recommendations to Stakeholders**

This study narrows the theoretical and empirical gap in the literature based on findings. Narrowing the gap meant producing new knowledge about adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction with MYTCs. Considering that the purpose of multi-year teaching contracts is to afford job security to contingent faculty, I recommend the following:

- That higher education administrators, faculty union leaders, and policymakers broaden the multi-year employment terms. The recommendation is to institute a special academic
multi-year teaching appointment rank, distinct from the regular adjunct faculty position and upgrades equivalent to the benefits granted to full-time and tenured faculty.

- Besides, higher education administrators and faculty union leaders are encouraged to expand the existing contractual benefits to afford adjunct faculty reasonably, competitive prorated compensation commensurate with experience, academic qualifications, and to the level of full-time and tenured faculty salaries.

- Furthermore, I recommend that stakeholders provide additional institutional support to assign dedicated and functional office space to each adjunct with a multi-year appointment.

- Another recommendation is to streamline job responsibilities via developing a flexible job description for the multi-year teaching position.

- Finally, higher education administrators are recommended to account and pay for uncompensated teaching labor adjunct faculty with multi-year contracts perform during the length of the contract.

**Summary**

Multi-year teaching contracts (MYTCs) are a reality of the first quarter of the twenty-first century. As higher education faces financial challenges, the need to innovate and identify additional economic sustenance and organizational strategies to manage the academic labor force has become a peremptory necessity. Although it requires a hefty financial commitment, colleges, universities, and faculty unions have joined efforts to implement a revolutionary employment strategy — multi-year teaching appointments exclusively directed to full-time and part-time faculty. Over the last one hundred years, adjunct faculty have struggled in their plight for better working conditions and more stable employment. The advent of MYTCs about a decade ago
came with the promise to address this plight. MYTCs emerged as panaceas to solve the lack of job security and job anxiety afflicting adjunct faculty, whose shoulders disproportionately carry the responsibility to train the labor force of the United States of America and an increasingly diverse student population hailing from around the world.

Colleges and universities have already spent a decade offering multi-year contracts without understanding how adjunct appointees experience such employment prototypes. At last, this study is the first to explore adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction with MYTAs. Its findings are a composite testament of the reality adjuncts with multi-year contracts have experienced along the past decade and recommendations for the higher education establishment to improve multi-year contractual employment terms. It behooves higher education officers, policymakers, and faculty union leaders to reconfigure MYTCs in ways that adjunct faculty do not perceive such contracts as adverse to their personal, professional, and academic interests. On the one hand, most of the adjuncts who participated in the study felt disappointed with multi-year teaching appointments. They labeled these contracts an insult, *bells and whistles*, a piece of paper or a carrot on a stick, or simply an appointment letter, or a way to keep adjuncts complacent, or bright shiny objects to keep adjunct faculty distracted, or a bone without meat. On the other hand, individually and as a group, they perceived the multi-year contract as an institutional recognition bestowed upon them as temporary employment.

As this exploratory study concludes, it is noteworthy to say that colleges and universities grant multi-year contracts to highly qualified individuals with high academic degrees and excellent teaching performance records. Instead of awarding contracts perceived as "*bells and whistles,*" or disappointments, stakeholders are encouraged to revamp such contracts and equate them to employment terms afforded to full-time and tenured faculty. Therefore, the most
important takeaway of this exploratory transcendental phenomenological research is that, at least, participants perceive multi-year contracts as bona fide institutional recognition. These contracts afford them a sense of partial job satisfaction derived from perceiving temporary job security and stability and lessened job anxiety.
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APPENDIX

Appendix A

Invitation to Participate in a Research Study Titled:
A Phenomenological Exploration of Adjunct Faculty Perceptions of Lived Experience with Multi-year Teaching Appointments

Dear [Recipient]:

As a doctoral candidate in the School of Education at Liberty University, I am conducting research as part of the requirements for a Ph.D. in Higher Education Administration. The purpose of my study is to explore adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments, and I am writing to invite eligible participants to join my study.

Participants must have taught at a public higher education institution in the Northeastern United States as adjunct faculty with multi-year contracts from fall 2017 to spring 2020. Also, participants will be selected based on their ability to provide information about their lived experiences with multi-year teaching appointments. If willing, participants will be asked to complete an online demographic questionnaire that may take up to 5 minutes. You may then be invited for an online 60-minute interview. You may also be asked to participate in an online 60-minute focus group session. In addition, because member checking improves the credibility of the study’s results, you will be asked to check for the accuracy of the results of the information and data you provide. The time estimate to complete this validation requirement may take about 30 minutes. Names and other identifying information will be requested as part of this study, but the information will remain confidential. Click on the following link to complete the questionnaire:

A consent form will be provided when you first open the questionnaire link. The consent form contains additional information about my research. After you have read the consent form, please proceed to the questionnaire. Doing so will indicate that you have read the consent information and would like to take part in the study.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at: [email protected] or via [email protected].

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Néstor Montilla
Doctoral Candidate
Did you teach at a public higher education institution in the Northeastern United States as an adjunct faculty with a multi-year contract from fall 2017 to spring 2020?

Would you like to share your experience and perception of job satisfaction teaching as an adjunct faculty with a multi-year teaching appointment?

If you answered yes to at these questions, you might be eligible to participate in a qualitative study.

The purpose of this study is to explore the perception of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments of adjunct faculty who taught from fall 2017 to spring 2020 at a public college in the Northeastern United States. Participants will be asked to fill out an electronic demographic questionnaire and participate in a 60-minute online interview. Some participants may also be asked to participate in a 60-minute focus group discussion. Participants will have the opportunity to check the accuracy of the results of the information and data they will provide.

**Interviews and focus group discussion will be held online via**
the Cisco Webex Meeting platform

The study is being conducted with adjunct faculty teaching under multi-year contracts at both

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King College (KC)</th>
<th>New Millennial College (NMC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>Bronx, NY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Néstor Montilla, a doctoral candidate in the School of Education at Liberty University, is conducting this study. Please contact Néstor Montilla at [email address redacted] or [email address redacted] for more information.
Appendix C

Consent

Title of the Project: A Phenomenological Exploration of Adjunct Faculty Perceptions of Job Satisfaction with Multi-Year Teaching Appointments

Principal Investigator: Néstor Montilla, Doctoral Candidate, School of Education, Liberty University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invitation to be Part of a Research Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You are invited to participate in a research study. To participate, you must be 18 years of age or older, an adjunct faculty teaching under multi-year contract, and have taught under multi-year contracts from fall 2017 to spring 2020 at a public higher education institution in the Northeastern United States. Participants will be selected based on their ability to provide information about their lived experiences with multi-year teaching appointments. Taking part in this research project is voluntary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please take time to read this entire form and ask questions before deciding whether to participate in this research project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the study about, and why is it being done?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The study is about adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments. The research will be conducted to produce new knowledge that can serve as the basis for hiring decisions and narrowing the literature gap.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What will happen if you take part in this study?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you agree to be in this study, I will ask you to do the following things:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. You will be asked to fill out an electronic demographic questionnaire, which may take up to 5 minutes to complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. You will be asked to participate in a 60-minute online interview, which will be audio and video recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. You may also be asked to participate in a 60-minute audio and video recorded online focus group discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Because member checking improves the credibility of the study’s results, you will be asked to check for the accuracy of the information and data you will provide (estimated time: may take up to 30 minutes).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How could you or others benefit from this study?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants should not expect to receive a direct benefit from taking part in this study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefits to society include the generation of new knowledge useful for higher education practitioners to make hiring decisions based on the tenability of multi-year teaching contracts in improving adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction. Because adjunct faculty are the largest group of the professoriate in charge of training the U.S. labor force, generating new knowledge about their experience and satisfaction with multi-year teaching contracts will benefit students and
society at large. Researchers have found that happy or satisfied employees are more productive and effective in performing their job responsibilities.

What risks might you experience from being in this study?
The risks involved in this study are minimal, which means they are equal to the risks you would encounter in everyday life.

How will personal information be protected?
The records of this study will be kept private. Published reports will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. Research records will be stored securely, and only the researcher will have access to the records.

- Participant responses will be kept confidential through the use of pseudonyms.
- Interviews will be conducted online, where others will not easily overhear the conversation.
- Data will be stored on a password-locked computer and may be used in future presentations. After three years, all electronic records will be deleted.
- Interviews and focus group sessions will be recorded and transcribed.
- Recordings will be stored on a password-locked computer for three years and then erased. Only the researcher will have access to these recordings.
- Confidentiality cannot be guaranteed in focus group settings. While discouraged, other members of the focus group may share what was discussed with persons outside of the group.

Is study participation voluntary?
Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Liberty University or the higher education institution where you work. If you decide to participate, you are free not to answer any question or withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.

What should you do if you decide to withdraw from the study?
If you choose to withdraw from the study, please contact the researcher at the email address/phone number included in the next paragraph. Should you decide to withdraw, data collected from you, apart from focus group data, will be destroyed immediately and will not be included in this study. Focus group data will not be destroyed, but your contributions to the focus group will not be included in the study if you choose to withdraw.

Whom do you contact if you have questions or concerns about the study?
The researcher conducting this study is Néstor Montilla. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you are encouraged to contact him at [email protected] or [phone number]. You may also contact the researcher’s faculty sponsor, Sarah Panzone, at [email address].
Your Consent

Before agreeing to be part of the research, please be sure that you understand what the study is about. You will be given a copy of this document for your records. If you have any questions about the study later, you can contact the researcher/study team using above information.

*I have read and understood the above information. I have asked questions and have received answers. I consent to participate in the study.*

☐ The researcher has my permission to [audio-record/video-record/photograph] me as part of my participation in this study.

Printed Subject Name __________________________  Signature & Date __________________________

**Click on this link to complete the questionnaire.**
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IRB Approval Letter

Liberty University
Institutional Review Board

April 22, 2021

Nestor Montilla
Sarah Pannone

Re: IRB Exemption - IRB-FY20-21-683 A Phenomenological Exploration of Adjunct Faculty Perceptions of Job Satisfaction with Multi-Year Teaching Appointments

Dear Nestor Montilla, Sarah Pannone:

The Liberty University Institutional Review Board (IRB) has reviewed your application in accordance with the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) and Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulations and finds your study to be exempt from further IRB review. This means you may begin your research with the data safeguarding methods mentioned in your approved application, and no further IRB oversight is required.

Your study falls under the following exemption category, which identifies specific situations in which human participants research is exempt from the policy set forth in 45 CFR 46.101(b):

Category 2.(iii). Research that only includes interactions involving educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior (including visual or auditory recording) if at least one of the following criteria is met:

The information obtained is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the identity of the human subjects can readily be ascertained, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects, and an IRB conducts a limited IRB review to make the determination required by §46.111(a)(7).

Your stamped consent form(s) and final versions of your study documents can be found under the Attachments tab within the Submission Details section of your study on Cayuse IRB. Your stamped consent form(s) should be copied and used to gain the consent of your research participants. If you plan to provide your consent information electronically, the contents of the attached consent document(s) should be made available without alteration.

Please note that this exemption only applies to your current research application, and any modifications to your protocol must be reported to the Liberty University IRB for verification of continued exemption status. You may report these changes by completing a modification submission through your Cayuse IRB account.

If you have any questions about this exemption or need assistance in determining whether possible modifications to your protocol would change your exemption status, please email us at irb@liberty.edu.

Sincerely,

G. Michele Baker, MA, CIP
Administrative Chair of Institutional Research
Research Ethics Office
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CITI Program Research Certification

This is to certify that:

Nestor Montilla

Has completed the following CITI Program course:

Social & Behavioral Research - Basic/Refresher (Curriculum Group)
Social & Behavioral Researchers (Course Learner Group)
1 - Basic Course (Stage)

Under requirements set by:

Liberty University

Verify at www.citiprogram.org/verify?weba8938c1-5d38-4f0c-b57c-158f90853b91-38299114
Appendix F

Demographic Questionnaire

Thank you for your interest in my study about adjunct faculty's perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments. Your responses to this questionnaire will be kept confidential and help determine your eligibility to participate in the study and answer the research question and sub-questions. Should you have any questions or concerns, please contact me: Nestor Montilla, Doctoral Candidate, School of Education, Liberty University, via my cellphone or e-mail: Thank you!

1. What is your age? 18-65 years of age _____ 65+ _____

2. Are you currently an adjunct or part-time faculty? Yes _____ No _____

3. As an adjunct faculty, did you teach under a multi-year contract at a public college in the Northeastern United States from fall 2017 to spring 2020? Yes______ No _____

4. If you answered "no" to any of these three questions, you do not meet the inclusion criteria to participate in the study. Thank you.

5. If you answered "yes" to these three questions, please proceed to complete the questionnaire.

6. Are you currently teaching at a public college in the Northeastern United States as an adjunct with a multi-year appointment? Yes _____ No _____

7. Gender: Male _____ Female _____ Non-binary _____ Prefer not to say ______

8. Race and Ethnicity:
   ______ Asian
   ______ Black or African American
   ______ Hispanic/Latino (of any race)
   ______ Native American or Alaska Native
   ______ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   ______ Non-Hispanic White
   ______ Other

9. What is your highest academic degree level?
   Bachelor’s _____ Master’s _____ Ph.D. _____ Other _____

10. Are you satisfied with your experience teaching under a multi-year contract?
   Yes _____ No _____ Not sure _____
11. Of the following factors, select the ones you perceive contributed to your job satisfaction with multi-year teaching contracts:

- Achievement
- Recognition
- Work
- Responsibilities
- Advancement
- Growth
- Other

12. Of the following factors, which one you perceive contributed the most to your job satisfaction with multi-year teaching contracts?

- Achievement
- Recognition
- Work
- Responsibilities
- Advancement
- Growth
- Other

13. Of the following factors, select the ones you perceive contributed to your job dissatisfaction with multi-year teaching contracts:

- Institutional policy and administration
- Supervision
- Working conditions
- Interpersonal relations
- Salary
- Status
- Job security
- Other

14. Of the following factors, which one you perceive contributed the most to your job dissatisfaction with multi-year contracts?

- Institutional policy and administration
- Supervision
- Working conditions
- Interpersonal relations
- Salary
- Status
- Job security
- Other

15. Would you agree to participate in an online interview about adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe
16. Would you agree to participate in a focus group session about adjunct faculty perception of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments?

   Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

17. Please write your first and last name _________________________________

18. Please provide your contact information so I can reach out to you and schedule the interview. Thank you! Sincerely, Nestor Montilla, Doctoral Candidate, School of Education, Liberty University (nmontilla@liberty.edu).
Appendix G

Interview Protocol

Adjunct Faculty with Multi-year Teaching Appointment Interview Questions

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this study about adjunct faculty perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments. The interview will be about an hour. I have prepared 15 questions and sub-questions regarding your lived experience as an adjunct faculty teaching under multi-year contract. Please feel free to convey your answers candidly and to your satisfaction. You may rephrase them, you may pause, ask me questions or express any concerns. You are not required to answer any question you feel uncomfortable answering. Your confidentiality will be preserved intact as your name and the name of the institution where you taught will not be revealed. I will use pseudonyms. Please note, this interview will be recorded for transcription purposes. Thank you for volunteering to be interviewed.

Interview Questions

1. Thank you for volunteering to participate in this study. Please, introduce yourself and tell me about you.

2. Based on your perception, how would you describe multi-year teaching appointments?
   a. Please provide specific examples of some relevant experiences teaching under multi-year contracts.
b. How did you handle those experiences you deem most significant?

3. What situations have typically influenced or affected your experience teaching under a multi-year contract?
   a. What are some instances of those situations you described?
   b. Thinking about a few of them, how did those situations influence or affect you?

4. What did you like about teaching under multi-year appointments?
   a. Please, respond to the following question as you see fit: Regarding students, how did you connect with them while you were teaching under a multi-year contract?
   b. How did you connect with full-time faculty?
   c. How did you connect with the institution and its leadership, including the academic department chair, deans, and the Provost's Office?

5. What did you dislike about teaching under multi-year appointments?
   a. What are some instances of what you disliked about teaching under multi-year appointment?
   b. Please describe how you disliked those instances.

6. How do you describe job satisfaction?
   a. How does your perception of multi-year teaching appointments depict your job satisfaction?
   b. What kind of institutional support was afforded to you during your experience teaching under multi-year appointments contributing to your job satisfaction?
   c. How would you describe the institutional support you received regarding whether it contributed to your job satisfaction teaching under a multi-year contract?

7. How would you describe job dissatisfaction?
a. How does your perception of a multi-year teaching appointment depict your job dissatisfaction?

b. What institutional support do you perceive contributed to your job dissatisfaction?

8. What does a multi-year teaching appointment mean to you as an adjunct faculty?

9. What were the advantages of having multi-year teaching appointments?
   a. What are some specific instances of advantages you deem necessary to you?
   b. What additional specific instances of advantages did you receive?
   c. If the interviewee mentions any, I will ask them to describe.

10. Overall, what were the disadvantages of having multi-year teaching appointments?
    a. What are some specific instances of disadvantages of being under multi-year teaching appointment do you deem of concern?
    b. What additional specific instances of disadvantages of teaching under multi-year appointments impacted your experience?
    c. If the interviewee mentions any, I will ask: why?

11. What are your perceptions of being a part-time faculty with multi-year teaching appointments?
    a. What are your perceptions of being a part-time faculty without multi-year teaching appointments?
    b. How does teaching under multi-year appointments make you feel?
    c. After the multi-year teaching appointment ends, what are your plans in terms of continuing to teach on a per-semester basis or teach full-time?
    d. How do you describe your career goals regarding getting tenure or continuing to teach under multi-year appointments?
12. What is your perception of each of the following motivating factors regarding job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments? (I will ask participants to address each factor separately):

a. What is your perception of “achievement” concerning job satisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

b. What is your perception of “recognition” concerning job satisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

c. What is your perception of “work” concerning job satisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

d. What is your perception of “responsibility” concerning job satisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

e. What is your perception of “advancement” concerning job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments?

f. What is your perception of “growth” concerning job satisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

13. As you did in question 12, please describe your perception of each of the following factors concerning job dissatisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments (I will ask participants to address each factor separately):

(a) What is your perception of “institutional policy and administration” concerning a sense of job dissatisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

(b) What is your perception of “supervision” concerning job satisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?
(c) What is your perception of “working conditions” concerning job dissatisfaction with multi-year appointments?

(d) What is your perception of “interpersonal relations” concerning job satisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

(e) What is your perception of “salary” concerning job satisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

(f) What is your perception of “status” concerning job satisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

(g) What is your perception of “job security” concerning job satisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

14. What factors of multi-year appointments do you perceive have contributed to a sense of job stability?
   a. What factors of multi-year appointments do you perceive have contributed to a sense of job instability?

15. Considering we have discussed many aspects of your experience teaching under a multi-year contract, please allow me to ask a final question: what else should I know regarding your overall perception of job satisfaction with the three-year appointment?

Thank you for participating in this interview. I would like to reiterate that confidentiality of your responses is guaranteed as your name and the name of the institution you worked for will not be revealed. I will use pseudonyms. I will contact you to schedule an additional interview if needed and also to schedule an online focus groups with other participants. Upon transcribing this interview, I might reach out to you for clarification purposes if needed and or to relay transcript content to you. Once again, thank you very much. Blessings.
Appendix H

Sample Transcript 3 Amy

Online interview with Amy on June 15, 2021. Amy earned her Ph.D. in the 1980s. She likes working with students and teaches at a public 4-year college in the Northeastern United States. Amy was granted a three-year teaching contract in 2017. After three year, instead of a multi-year reappointment, she was granted a one-year contract with guidance.

Q.1. Background Information and Connection to a Public College in the Northeastern United States

Nestor
00:02:02 Thank you for volunteering to participate in this study. Please, introduce yourself and tell me about you.

Amy
00:02:13 I did my doctoral research in the 1980s and I earned my doctorate in 1990. I did not initially go into teaching, which is part of how I ended up becoming an adjunct. I worked in business and consulting for 10 years. In 2002 I returned to academic life because it's my perception, I mean, no one told me this, I just understood this, because I wasn't flexible about where I went to geographically or… I didn’t go into academia right away, I kind of lost some of my cutting edge, that I might have had. I mean, there's no guarantee that I would have been the most competitive person out there in my academic area, which is geography. But if I had been more flexible to go to any rural area in any state, I probably would have had more opportunities. I chose to stay there, in the New York metropolitan area. Other people I know have gotten full- time positions doing that, but because of that time lapse made me less competitive because I didn't start, you know, becoming a publishing machine right away. I probably wasn't also the best at being a publishing machine. Those kinds of things contributed towards me… my options being in the adjunct area… education… I am sorry for the long introduction. I've been teaching as an adjunct since 2002 in different campuses. At the college I have been teaching since 2010 and I’ve had a multi-year contract since 2017; because it just came to an end in 2020. That's the part that has to do with your research. I’m trying to tell you a little bit about how I became an adjunct.

Q.2. Description of Multi-Year Teaching Appointments

Nestor
00:06:46 Based on your perception, how would you describe multi-year teaching appointments?

Amy
00:07:16 OK. I would say that… describe and perceive it would be sort of the same thing for me; which is that having a multi-year contract makes me feel… or I perceive it to be like more secure versus like, every year, if you thought it was, you know, perfunctory, going through… you know, that you're going to get another one-year contract. It was something that I just had to worry about for three years. I felt more secure for three years.

The biggest challenge for me is having like a sense of job security versus not knowing where you're going to be from semester to semester, year to year. And so, having that made me kind of feel like I could focus on my teaching more and my students. That I might actually enjoy teaching more because I wasn’t so stressed out about where I was going to be another six months or a year; and the more I can enjoy my teaching, the more my students get out of it. It was kind of a very holistic and synergistic that way.
Q.3. Experience Teaching Under Multi-Year Appointments

Nestor 00:10:55 What did you like about teaching under multi-year contract?

Amy 00:11:07 OK. So, there's going to be some repetition here. What I liked was that I could relax, that I could focus on what I'm hired to, which is teaching and being an educator and focus on the development and success of my students.

Q.3.a. Connecting with Student

Nestor 00:11:47 How did you connect with students while teaching under multi-year contract?

Amy 00:12:09 Let me pause and think for a moment. My first response is… I’m not sure, but… I think there's a difference. I think there is an opportunity to work more cooperatively together. I think… I'm not sure if it's appropriate to be stating all I see, all I feel. I’m sorry for the hesitation. I think working with students under a multi-year contract allows me to work more creatively with them. I’ve come up with more creative projects. I have found myself… I’m trying to think of the words for what I want to say. I don't feel… I haven't felt like… I was just going in, you know, punching a timecard in and punching a timecard out. I just felt more invested in the students and the place. For example, they may need help with something, that's not part of my toolkit… my tracking down … it’s hard to separate this from who I am, but I'm more relaxed to do this. If something is not part of my “job description” or toolkit and someone has a problem or needs help with something; it’s less stressful for me to track down, getting them the help they need with something. I feel more invested. I have felt more invested.

Q.3.b. Connecting with Colleagues and Higher Education Administrators

Nestor 00:16:15 How did you connect with full-time faculty, the department chai, deans, the provost and the president as a result of having a multi-year contract?

Amy 00:16:47 I don't know if there was really a change. Some departments at the college are more user friendly and respectful of adjuncts and others. My multi-year contract was through the department even though I’m a geographer and I teach geography and my degree is in geography. The department that's chaired by Dr. Smith is just a great department and incredibly collegial; except that when I was observed before my multi-year contract, I never had… the two years before, I'm just getting this in there whether you want it or not. But I just want you to have the data.

Nestor 00:17:49 Ok.

Amy 00:17:51 The two years before my multi-year contract, the same person; because it affected my multi-year contract, the same person did my observation and he never followed up with a post observation meeting, and my perception… I was so busy, this was on the one-year contract, was well known, no news was good news, and I didn’t worry about it, I didn’t have the time. I not only have a multi-year contract here, but I have other gigs then and now. So, I'm busier than a person that has a full-time job. And then,
when they did my review for my multi-year contract, either because it was in the online environment and there were some weaknesses in my organization because of that or because I never got that review, because that person was sort of in the limelight because of his research, and he was so busy, there were deficiencies and because of those deficiencies which I’m responsible for, I didn't get another multi-year contract. So, right now I’m on a one-year contract to correct those deficiencies with… and I've been told that after they are corrected, I have a mentor who's working with me, not that person who was in the limelight, somebody else, an assistant chair, that it goes without saying I'm going to get another multi-year contract.

00:20:45 But if this person who… different people who are tenured or are full-time. I think tenured, are responsible for reviewing all of the adjuncts, when they do their reviews. And this person never did a write up and sat down with me. The union demanded that, but he was so busy, and my attitude was, if there’s no problem, am I going to rock the boat? I didn’t want to get him in trouble. And that’s another thing about being an adjunct. If you feel like saying something is going to make you feel insecure, and this doesn’t only apply to three-year contracts, but certainly on a one-year contract, then you don’t say anything. I didn’t say anything and this, sort of came back to bite me. Because they said, wait, this should have been more organized and this should have been done, you know, more effectively and things like that. So, I spent a lot of time this summer trying to get those things corrected.

Nestor
00:22:13 I think it’s excellent to be given a sense about your interactions with faculty and also with administrators who were part of the Personnel and Budget Committee in the department in charge of conducting the evaluation and they were to vote on your reappointment.

Amy
00:22:39 The Personnel Budget Committee was extremely nice, and Dr. Smith did not know that this person had not done the observation report. This person is like, you know, getting pressed because he's doing work for the US Congress, what was I going to say? I felt like, you know, I'm just a peon and he’s a big shot; what could I say? Until I had the multi-year contract, I never felt like I could speak up about anything. Not that I really spoke up when I had the three-year contract. Adjuncts don’t want to rock the boat. As I’ve gotten older, I’ve gotten more concerned about that. Job security has been such an important thing for me.

Q.4. Disliking Multi-Year Appointments

Nestor
00:25:10 Moving along to the fourth question, which is, what do you dislike about teaching under three-year contract?

Amy
00:25:18 I don't think there’s anything I dislike about the multi-year contract. I mean, maybe the contract could be longer. I don't know. Would I ever be satisfied with the multi-year contract? probably no because I'll never have the job security that a full-timer has. So, I don't know. Maybe that's greedy of me but I will never have job security. I guess that's my answer. I will never have the job security that a full-timer has. There are people who had worked into their 90s in the sciences where, because of their declining effectiveness, need to have two teaching assistants or lab technicians in a class, to manage the class. Because there's no mandatory retirement age but, I will never have that job security. And I’m not sure what happens after the second three-year contract. Does that mean I can't have any more after the second one? I’m not sure.
Nestor
00:27:55 In the questionnaire you answer that you are not sure whether you are satisfied with multi-year appointments…

Amy
00:28:00 Oh, I’m partially satisfied. I’m partially satisfied because I have less anxiety; because I have security. I can postpone concern or worry about the renewal of my job or whether I have to look for another job or I have to take out of my retirement savings because I'm in my early 60s.

Q.5. Definition of Job Satisfaction

Nestor
00:28:37 That answer brings me to question #5, how do you describe job satisfaction?

Amy
00:29:10 Interesting. I think part of job satisfaction, for me, is feeling like I'm doing a good job. This means that I’m reaching the students, that I’m connecting with the students in some way, on the topics that I teach. That I can convey the meaningfulness of them. Although I did this positivistic hypothesis, data collection on my dissertation, my interest in geography is kind of like your interests or your methodology in higher education, and when I'm able to create some kind of content or education pedagogy… I don't know, maybe it's because of the feedback of students. When students tell me, unsolicited, I got a lot out of this unit, I really like this assignment, you know, that kind of unsolicited positive feedback versus frustration from students. It’s audience feedback, I guess.

00:32:29 What I did in the past year, in the past 18 months is that I changed my course, which is a world regional geography course, with the approval of my department chair, to a geographical analysis of the pandemic or understanding the pandemic through two graphical tools and analysis. I think that was really… I'm not trying to say, you know, I'm the bestest teacher out there, but I think it was wonderful for students to have tools through which they could understand what was going on around them. And it gave me job satisfaction that I could do that. If I was worrying more about the pressures of six months or a year ahead, usually it's like six months, I'd be worrying about the renewal. Then it becomes more stressful and more difficult to think and act creatively.

Q.5.a. Perception of Job Satisfaction with Multi-Year Appointment

Nestor
00:34:02 Now, question #5 has two sub-questions and the first sub-question is, considering the description that you gave about job satisfaction, how does your perception of multi-year teaching appointments depict your job satisfaction?

Amy
00:33:46 I'm not sure. Can you ask the question again? Have I answered the question and you just need to go through the motion of asking me again? Because it feels like I already answered that.

Nestor
00:33:59 You did. The question about how you describe job satisfaction has two sub-questions. The first one was, how does your perception of multi-year teaching appointments depict your job satisfaction? You said that you are partially satisfied. That's the answer. The second sub-question is, do you have anything else to add to that?
My perception of multi-year appointment is that it creates less stress for me, and less stress opens up the opportunity for more creativity and flexibility in the way I teach.

**Q.5.b Institutional Support Due to Multi-year Contract**

*Nestor*  
00:34:59 *What kind of institutional support was afforded to you, during your experience teaching under multi-year contract, that somehow contributed to your job satisfaction?*

*Amy*  
00:35:40 I think the answer is no and the reason is that I don't think there's... I have taken every possible workshop that an adjunct can get paid to take. That's offered by the college or the university. I don't think there was anything additional, that was unique to the multi-year contract, at least I'm not aware of it. I really can't distinguish what I've taken between 2011 and 2018 from what I took between 2018 and 2021. I probably took more in the first time period just because it was a longer time period. I really don't think there was additional support during the multi-year contract. It might be that there was even less because no one was really necessarily checking to see how it worked, there were no benchmarks to see how it's going or where it should be at the end. I was kind of surprised that I didn't get the renewal and the department chair agreed that not only was it probably that I didn't have those check-ins after those one-year observations by, you know, we're all... this was happening under COVID and remote learning and none of us were really prepared for that. Maybe there should have been some small check-ins during multi-year contract because I was kind of surprised that I didn't get it.

**Q.6. Definition of Job Dissatisfaction**

*Nestor*  
00:38:15 *How would you describe job dissatisfaction?*

*Amy*  
00:38:26 When you say job dissatisfaction you mean under the multi-year contract?

*Nestor*  
00:38:32 Yes, to some extent, that will be the next sub-question. With this question, I am asking you in a general way so that we could inform your response to the sub-question about multi-year contract.

*Amy*  
00:38:49 OK. I would say, in general, many parts of the college treat adjuncts as you know, as somehow substandard, even though they make up the majority of the teaching workforce. This is the exception in the department. The college has a lot of bureaucracy. I find the college insensitive to the difficult economic situation of adjuncts, in general. I find administrators quite apathetic, uncaring. If they had to wait an inordinate amount of time for a check from, let’s say, a professional development workshop, it would be intolerable to them. But they're quite indifferent when it comes to adjuncts.

**Q.6.a. Perception of Institutional Support Due to the Multi-Year Contract**

*Nestor*  
00:40:26 What institutional support do you perceive contributed to your job dissatisfaction?
Amy
00:41:00 I don't think there's anything specific to the multi-year contract. It doesn't mean you get more institutional support or more recognition or because you have your contract. You just know that you don't have to worry. I don't know how other people feel but I don't have to have that anxiety, you know, come March or April, about what's going to happen. Here's something that I can add, even if you have a multi-year contract...OK I forgot about something important, multi-year contract guarantees me 6 credits and with those six credits per semester for those six semesters and with that, it guarantees me health benefits, so I don't have anxiety about those things. Getting to the dissatisfaction side, there's nothing that changes in the day-to-day functioning as an adjunct professor because you have those multi-year contracts. If you've been assigned three courses and, once they fill up or one doesn't get a minimum registration and then it cancels, but it's the two that are tied to the multi-year contract; if they don't get sufficient registration, either the college runs them anyway or they have to give me something else to do, equivalent to the number of hours because you're guaranteed that. You're guaranteed that money. But nothing changes with the administration. I mean, long-term changes like you'll come up for renewal year to year, which is nerve wracking. That's what changes. Nothing changes on a day-to-day basis with the administration. It's neutral or negative with the administration. It’s neutral or positive with your colleagues. Colleagues in the department are very collegial so they don't really differentiate who's an adjunct versus who's a tenured faculty member. On a one-year contract I've also taught in the department because I taught a course there. It's very obvious that they treat their adjuncts differently than they treat their full-timers.

Q.7. Meaning of a Multi-Year Contract

Nestor
00:45:15 What does multi-year teaching contract mean to you as an adjunct faculty?

Amy
00:45:31 It’s recognition and security.

Nestor
00:45:38 What do you mean by recognition?

Amy
00:45:40 It’s professional recognition. I’m not going to get tenure. This is like another form of professional accomplishment.

Q.8. Advantages of Multi-Year Appointments

Nestor
00:46:55 What were the advantages if any, of having multi-year teaching contract?

Amy
00:47:00 I think I covered that already.

Q.9. Disadvantages of Multi-Year Appointments

Nestor
00:47:10 What were the disadvantages of having multi-year teaching contract?
Amy
00:47:19 I’ve answered that too, but I’ll underline it. Lack of regular feedback about doing things that I wasn’t doing, and I didn’t know. Certain expectations not all came up for the multiple year review.

Well, actually, phenomenologically, something else came to mind which is that getting the one-year with guidance, after getting the multi-year contract, feels like a demotion. Even though I recognize that the things they pointed out need to be corrected and that they’re valid points. It’s like, why didn’t this professor meet with me? Why am I discovering it now? After being given a multi-year contract, wasn't I doing something right? Why are they pointing out that I did something wrong now? It seems a little bit disorganized on their part and who suffers? Me.

Nestor
00:4:00 So, somehow that is a disadvantage in your view?

Amy
00:50:55 Right.

Q.10. Perceptions of Multi-Year Appointment as an Adjunct Faculty

Nestor
00:50:58 What are your perceptions of being a part-time faculty with a multi-year teaching contract?

Amy
00:51:25 It felt like I was being elevated even though I’m still an adjunct professor, and that's the function of publication. It felt like I had status. A more accomplished status.

Q.10.a. Perception as an Adjunct Without a Multi-Year Appointment

Nestor
00:51:59 What are your perceptions of being a part-time faculty without a multi-year contract?

Amy
00:52:15 It’s about job insecurity, anxiety, income, you know. I work at least three separate gigs. I teach at two different colleges plus I do tutor and sometimes, I'm at three different colleges. It’s exhausting!

Q.10.b. Feelings About the Multi-Year Appointment

Nestor
00:51:05 How did teaching under multi-year contract make you feel?

Amy
00:53:07 It made me feel more secure. It made me feel recognized for my accomplishments in some way if not for having sufficient scholarly publications, at least some form of professional recognition.

Q.10.c. Career Plans After the Multi-Year Appointment

Nestor
00:52:25 After the multi-year teaching contract ends, what are your plans in terms of continuing to teach on a per-semester basis or teach full-time?
Amy
00:53:40 Continuing to teach and hope that I receive another multi-year contract. I teach at another college and also teach one on one. I teach something in school districts called home and hospital tutoring. I’ll continue to do that.

Q.10.d. Describing Career Goals

Nestor
00:54:00 How do you describe your career goals regarding getting tenure or continuing to teach under multi-year appointments?

Amy
00:54:22 I’ll never get tenure. That's for sure. If I follow through on what I was told to follow through on and they follow through on what they said they’d follow through on in the department, I will get it. I will get another three-year contract. However, I am mistrustful of the administration. So, I don't know if that administration will throw a wrench into the plans. I’ll teach for another 10 years, if I can. But I don't know if that will be interrupted by things beyond my control.


Nestor
00:55:23 What is your perception of each of the following motivating factors regarding job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments achievement, recognition, work, responsibility, advancement and growth? (I will ask you to address each factor separately).

Q.11.a. Achievement

Nestor
00:56:38 What is your perception of achievement concerning your job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointment?

Amy
00:57:13 I felt that it achieved something but then, with it not being renewed it was like taken away. It’s transient. It’s temporary. Not permanent.

Nestor
00:57:30 So, you are looking at the granting of the contract as an achievement. Is that what you mean to say?

Amy
00:57:40 I felt that getting the contract was an achievement but it's not like you can put it on your resume if they take it away from you. You’re not going to put ‘had a three-year contract, now I have a one-year contract.’

Q.11.b. Recognition

Nestor
00:57:55 What is your perception of recognition concerning job satisfaction with a multi-year contract?
Amy 00:58:21 I did feel that there was recognition. There was recognition and there was respect. But it's ironic because who knew about it? If no one but the chair or the PMV committee knows about it, how much respect is there?

Q.11.c. Work

Nestor 00:58:42 What is your perception at work concerning job satisfaction with the fact that you were granted a multi-year teaching contract?

Amy 00:59:02 There was satisfaction with the fact that, you know, I just knew that I had work for three years. That in itself was an accomplishment. I know that I had work for three years and I could work. I didn’t have to be concerned that there was not going to be work.

Q.11.d. Responsibility

Nestor 00:59:24 How about responsibility? What is your perception of responsibility concerning job satisfaction with a multi-year contract?

Amy 00:59:48 Same, because adjuncts don’t serve on committees.

Q.11.e. Advancement

Amy 01:00:01 No advancement.

Q.11.f. Growth

Nestor 01:00:05 What is your perception of “growth” concerning job satisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

Amy 01:00:12 The growth that comes from attending workshops. The department has been very generous supporting whenever there's been an opportunity to send me to a workshop within the college. I don’t know if that has to do with the three-year contract.

Q.12. Perception of Job Dissatisfaction with Multi-Year Contract Concerning the Following Hygiene or Demotivating Factors: institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, and job security

Nestor 01:02:24 As you did with the previous questions, please describe your perception of each of the following factors concerning job dissatisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments: institutional policy and
administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, and job security (I will ask you to address each factor separately).

Q.12.a. Institutional Policy and Administration

Nestor 01:03:48 What is your perception of “institutional policy and administration” concerning your sense of job dissatisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

Amy 01:02:48 None

Q.12.b. Supervision

Nestor 01:02:50 What is your perception of “supervision” concerning job satisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

Amy 01:02:58 None. Maybe there should have been, not supervision but a little bit more preparation for the review given the magnitude of its significance.

Q.12.c. Working Conditions

Nestor 01:03:34 What is your perception of “working conditions” concerning job dissatisfaction with multi-year appointments?

Amy 01:03:40 None. I’m just a peon. Just another adjunct sharing the office with an ungodly number of people who come on different days.

Q.12.d. Interpersonal Relations

Nestor 01:03:54 What is your perception of “interpersonal relations” concerning job satisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

Amy 01:04:01 I have very nice relationships in our [academic] department with adjunct and full-time colleagues, administrators, support. My experience outside the multi-year contract in the chemistry department with the complete office, my experience with the administration is a bit spotty. It’s just…you sort of learn, but it doesn't have anything to do with the multi-year contract. You can get help with a problem in a particular department or office and who is best to avoid you know. Like I know who to contact at the library, a library professor when I need support for a class, and I know who’s a waste of time. I know how to troubleshoot, wherever I have to go but that comes from being there 11 years. That has nothing to do with the multi-year contract. No one says, [Amy] the professor is calling, she has a multi-year contract, you better listen to her. Nothing like that. For those purposes it’s meaningless.

01:05:33 In some ways it's really brilliant, doing this phenomenological study makes a lot of sense because it's how it affects the person internally that makes the difference. I mean if I had to predict what
you're going to find and take an educated guess, being one of your subjects but also haven't done studies like this, including on worker satisfaction in geography, I would say it is going to be something that makes a difference internally and doesn't make a difference externally. That's my prediction. I'd love to see your report when you're done.

Q.12.e. Salary

Nestor
01:07:16 What is your perception of “salary” concerning job satisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

Amy
01:07:40 I'm not sure that one is on a different salary because one has multi-year contract. I actually don't know. I really forgot. On the one hand, what I make on an hourly basis on an adjunct salary is satisfying. However, it's not full-time. If it was a full-time equivalent, I'd be like really doing well but it's not and so I piece things together as I said, I teach at a community. I teach at another college and then I do this other freelance thing that I do which is home and hospital tutoring instruction. And I make as much money from that as I do from some of my adjunct thing.

Q.12.f. Status

Nestor
01:08:47 What is your perception of “status” concerning job satisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

Amy
01:09:08 I have no status. There's no increased status.

Q.12.g. Job Security

Nestor
01:09:14 What is your perception of “job security” concerning job satisfaction with a multi-year teaching appointment?

Amy
01:09:39 Oh, that's high but it's temporary because it's only for three years. I don't know, maybe that makes me greedy. The job satisfaction is very high for the period of the contract. But the contract ends and there's no guarantee that it will be renewed.

Q.13. Job Instability

Nestor
01:10:11 What factors of multi-year appointments do you perceive have contributed to a sense of job stability?

Amy
01:10:23 None.

Q.14. Additional Comments about the Adjunct Faculty Multi-Year Experience
*Nestor*
01:11:30 *Please allow me to ask a final question: what else should I know regarding your overall perception of job satisfaction with the three-year appointment?*

*Amy*
01:12:10 I'm just trying to think… do I have anything to add? I think we've kind of covered it. It kind of motivates me to maybe sit down with my chairperson and give her some feedback on this process and the two years before and how it should have been handled differently. On the other hand, would I really want to do that? Will I feel sure enough to do that when I’m on one-year contract? I don't know. I guess the thing that sticks in mind is the way it was coming up and then there was like a rush to do it in the spring. Maybe if there had been not a review but, some kind of check-ins along the way. No having the one-year with guidance could have been avoided.

*Nestor*
01:15:15 *Anything else?*

*Amy*
01:15:31 I think most people who are actually in the administration give two, you know what, about adjuncts; easy come, easy go. We can find another one easily who are mediocre, who comes in first semester for a year and then goes out. And, so, it's just like indentured workers of academia.

I hope your study makes a difference because I really never felt that anyone in the administration really is concerned about the well-being or job satisfaction of adjuncts, who are like at the lowest possible level. That’s unheard of in the academia. Best of luck with everything.

*Nestor:*
01:17:04 Thank you!
Appendix I

**CodeBook for Theme A. Partial Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme A: Partial job satisfaction</th>
<th>Code Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>When to use</th>
<th>When no to use</th>
<th>Example of text from transcripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>When expectations are met</td>
<td>Use when co-researchers perceive it</td>
<td>When referring to dissatisfaction</td>
<td>Roscoe: “I was partially satisfied” with MYTC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Satisfaction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-themes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1. Temporary job security</td>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>A tenured employment status</td>
<td>Use when co-researchers express perception of it</td>
<td>In reference to recognition</td>
<td>Amy: MYTC “is recognition and security.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Security)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2. Temporary job stability</td>
<td>Job stability</td>
<td>Continuity of employment</td>
<td>Use when related to employment experience</td>
<td>When not related to MYTC experience</td>
<td>Jessica: “I know I’m going to make a minimum amount of money each semester.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Stability)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3. Lessened anxiety</td>
<td>Job anxiety</td>
<td>Feeling apprehension due uncertainty and expectations</td>
<td>Use when perceived as job related</td>
<td>When is not related to MYTC</td>
<td>Kevin: MYTC “kind of lessened that job anxiety.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Anxiety)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CodeBook for Theme B. Institutional Recognition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme B: Institutional recognition</th>
<th>Code Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>When to use</th>
<th>When no to use</th>
<th>Example of text from transcripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional recognition</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Employment in the form of MYTC</td>
<td>Use in reference to MYTC as work granted due to seniority and teaching performance</td>
<td>When it doesn’t apply to longevity and performance</td>
<td>Maria: “MYTC is a recognition that I am well-thought of as a professional.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Recognition)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-themes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1. Longevity</td>
<td>Seniority</td>
<td>Time spent teaching as adjunct faculty</td>
<td>In reference to MYTC employment</td>
<td>When it applies to personal commitments</td>
<td>Rodrigo: “I would say that the MYTC is an indication of my longevity within the department and college as a whole.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Seniority)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2. Teaching performance evaluation</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Assessment of adjuncts professional performance</td>
<td>Use in reference to adjunct teaching performance</td>
<td>In reference to personal accomplishments</td>
<td>Alyssa: “They have seen certain things that you have done.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks: The usage of () denotes shortened code name. MYTC means multi-year teaching contract.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme C: Bells and Whistles</th>
<th>Code Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>When to use</th>
<th>When not to use</th>
<th>Example of text from transcripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme C: Bells and Whistles</td>
<td>Disappointment with MYTC</td>
<td>Employment contract with meaningless provisions</td>
<td>Use when co-researchers express disappointment with MYTC</td>
<td>In reference to instances when participants perceive MYTC as granting them job security, job stability, less anxiety and institutional recognition</td>
<td>Rodrigo: “They are giving us a lot of bells and whistles, but nothing attached to those bells and whistles. They’re trying to keep us distracted by giving us a bright shiny object.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-themes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1. Insult</td>
<td>MYTC as disrespect</td>
<td>It is co-researchers’ perception that MYTC is a subtle institutional strategy devoid of tangible benefits improving the adjunct faculty plight for better working conditions</td>
<td>Use when study participants express sentiments of being deceived or taken advantage of</td>
<td>Do not use when referring to MYTC provisions adjuncts perceive as effective</td>
<td>Jessica: “There were times when I really felt taken advantage of, or where I felt like people did not understand that some adjuncts really wanted to teach more.” She added, “I think a lot of these colleges are relying on their adjuncts, instead of giving them full-time positions, and that hurts.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2. Adjunct faculty complacency</td>
<td>Adjunct faculty complacency</td>
<td>Co-researchers define MYTC as a contract that creates psychological comfort in perceiving they are valued by institution</td>
<td>Use when co-researchers perceive MYTC as a tool to keep them complacent with the reality of their plight for meaningful employment</td>
<td>Do not use in reference to adjuncts who perceive MYTC as an employment prototype delivering tangible benefits</td>
<td>Joseph: MYTC “is keeping me complacent.” “They keep us complacent, when it’s not really adding anything for us. And we’re all people with a lot of experience.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks: The usage of () denotes shortened code name.
MYTC means multi-year teaching contract.
Appendix J

Focus Group Questions

15. As adjunct faculty, what are your perceptions of job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments?

16. How do you perceive the following motivating factors concerning job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments?
   1. Achievement
   2. Recognition
   3. Work
   4. Responsibility
   5. Advancement
   6. Growth
   7. Other

2.2 From 1 to 7, number the following categories based on importance regarding how you perceive each category concerning job satisfaction with multi-year appointments (1 denotes the most important and 7 the least important):
   ____ Achievement
   ____ Recognition
   ____ Work
   ____ Responsibility
   ____ Advancement
   ____ Growth
   ____ Other

17. How do you perceive hygiene factors concerning job satisfaction with multi-year teaching appointments?
   i. institutional policy and administration
   j. Supervision
   k. Working conditions
   l. Interpersonal relations
   m. Salary
   n. Status
   o. Job security
   p. Other

3.1. From 1 to 8, number the following categories based on importance regarding how you perceive each category concerning job satisfaction with multi-year appointments (1 denotes the most important and 8 the least important):
   ____ Institutional policy and administration
   ____ Supervision
   ____ Working conditions
   ____ Interpersonal relations
18. Are there any other aspects of your experience and perception of job satisfaction teaching under multi-year contracts that you would like to discuss? If yes. Please discuss.
Appendix K

Member-Checking Solicitation E-Mail

From Nestor Montilla

Date:

Subject:

To:

Thank you for allowing me to interview you.

As promised, attached please find the transcript of your interview. Please note I have redacted any personal references or identifiable information about you and your institution.

As an acceptable practice in qualitative research, the purpose of member checking is to triangulate collected data. Study participants are given the opportunity to review interview transcripts to ascertain accuracy and reflect your narrative as you intended. Should you like to modify, expand or edit any of your responses to make them clearer, please use track changes in Microsoft Word.

Thank you very much for your participation and I look forward to receiving your feedback. In the meantime, should you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate in calling me. You may also contact the researcher’s faculty sponsor, Dissertation Committee Chair Sarah Pannone, at [spannone@liberty.edu].

Thank you again.

Sincerely,

Nestor Montilla
Appendix L

*Horizontalization - Listing of Relevant Expressions of the Adjunct Faculty Perceptions of Job Satisfaction with Multi-year Teaching Appointments*

1) A little bit of job stability and job security

2) Recognition

3) Respect

4) Anxiety

5) A little less anxiety

6) Multi-year teaching appointments lessen job anxiety

7) Lack of communication

8) Lack of support

9) Lack of inclusion

10) Unfair compensation

11) Even when adjuncts have multi-year contracts, full-timers get assigned their classes first.

12) In a nutshell a multi-year appointment feels a little better, but the anxiety is still there.

13) A multi-year teaching contract is as a guarantee work for a certain period of time.

14) I don’t have to worry every semester or every year if I am going to pay my bills.

15) A multi-year contract is a financial cushion for adjuncts.

16) It is job security even if it is only three years.

17) I’m not getting paid any extra because I am teaching under multi-year contract. That’s a problem.

18) I am being paid the same as when I was on a one-year contract or just teaching under a renewable by semester contract.

19) Well, for me a multi-year contract is having the security of not having to go through a reappointment process on a continuous basis; it is more restful and allows me to make long range plans.
20) Beyond that, we’re just a higher class of dirt.

21) It’s not a big deal to me.

22) For me, in terms of work, a multi-year contract means that I usually get the same courses every semester or at least I teach a variation of 1, 2, or 3 courses within the department; so, I’m able to improve on it. It gives me security that I’ll be able to teach it again next semester.

23) I don’t want to treat it in a too blasé of a manner. I appreciate it.

24) At the end of the three years, who knows what’s going to happen? I’m not losing sleep over it because I didn’t even know I had it.

25) It is quite a benefit.

26) It is assurance that you have a job.

27) It gives me a little more security. Because I have a three-year contract, my courses are assigned to me before those adjuncts who don’t have a multi-year appointment.

28) To be honest, the only difference between being a semester-by-semester adjunct and having a multi-year contract is that at least I have a job for three years.

29) My multi-year contract has been a relief to know that I will get to teach at least two classes every semester, though it is always “pending enrollment.” I am not yet sure how that works if enrollment is too low.

30) I like it because of continuity and less stress.

31) It gives a lot more of a sense of job security.

32) I am accustomed to teach as an adjunct on a semester basis, but when the three-year appointment came on, I am like, wow, this is fabulous because they are telling me that for three years, I will have stable employment even if enrollment is down.

33) It is less stressful than being on a semester-to-semester contract.

34) I see it as a plus.

35) To get a multi-year contract one has to earn it by teaching for ten consecutive fall and spring semesters at the same college and academic department.

36) The number of adjuncts eligible for a multi-year contract is rather narrow.
37) With a multi-year contract, I am guaranteed to teach a number of courses every semester for a period of three years.

38) Before I had a multi-year contract, I asked myself, “am I teaching next semester?”

39) As a regular adjunct I have a little bit of anxiety, meaning pretty nervous about whether or not I would get my job. Having now a multi-year contract has allowed me to know that I would have work at my college for three consecutive years.

40) Less stress.

41) Multi-year contracts are an insult.

42) A multi-year contracts is a piece of paper…that’s it.

43) Multi-year contracts are an attempt to throw a few crumbs to make you feel better about the fact that we’re not being paid anywhere near what we should be, especially if they recognize that we have proven ourselves to be effective teachers.

44) What’s job security if you’re not paid enough? How is that secure? That’s not secure. So, they stopped beating us with a large stick, instead they beat us with ropes; they’re still beating us!

45) A multi-year contract is job stability albeit temporary.

46) If multi-year teaching appointments end, if I’m given the opportunity, I’ll teach full time.

47) I am not interested in a full-time or tenured position. The burden of attending committee meetings and all that is too much!

48) Multi-year contracts are bells and whistles.

49) Multi-year contracts make one feels a little bit more recognized, a little bit more valued, but not valued enough for the higher education establishment to take qualified adjunct faculty over tenured track.

50) They’re throwing me a bone, and this dog is getting a little tired of bones and would like some meat.

51) I think that in some departments the three-year contract is used as a carrot, to dangle in front of your nose, that if you say yes to all the right questions, we make sure you get your three-year contract. Not those who are not in favor.

52) They keep us complacent, when it’s not really adding anything for us.
53) I have no delusions, even with a multi-year contract there’s no job security for an adjunct, ever.

54) Even with multi-year contracts, we are still adjuncts.

55) I felt more secure for three years.

56) The biggest challenge for me is having like a sense of job security versus not knowing where you're going to be from semester to semester, year to year.

57) What I liked was that I could relax, that I could focus on what I’m hired to, which is teaching and being an educator and focus on the development and success of my students.

58) I think there's a difference having a multi-year contract and connecting with students.

59) Job security has been such an important thing for me.

60) Would I ever be satisfied with the multi-year contract? probably no because I'll never have the job security that a full-timer has.

61) I’m partially satisfied. I’m partially satisfied because I have less anxiety. Because I have security. I can postpone concern or worry about the renewal of my job or whether I have to look for another job or I have to take out of my retirement savings because I'm in my early 60s.

62) My perception of multi-year appointment is that it creates less stress for me, and less stress opens up the opportunity for more creativity and flexibility in the way I teach.

63) I forgot about something important, a multi-year contract guarantees me 6 credits and with those six credits per semester for those six semesters and with that, it guarantees me health benefits. So I don't have anxiety about those things. Getting to the dissatisfaction side, there's nothing that changes in the day-to-day functioning as an adjunct professor because you have those multi-year contracts.

64) A multi-year contract it’s recognition and security.

65) It’s professional recognition. I’m not going to get tenure. This is like another form of professional accomplishment.

66) It felt like I was being elevated even though I’m still an adjunct professor, and that's the function of publication. It felt like I had status. A more accomplished status.

67) Maybe there should have been some small check-ins during multi-year contract because I was kind of surprised that I didn't get reappointed.
68) I’ve answered that too, but I’ll underline it. Lack of regular feedback about doing things that I wasn’t doing, and I didn’t know. Certain expectations not all came up for the multiple year review.

69) It made me feel more secure. It made me feel recognized for my accomplishments in some way if not for having sufficient scholarly publications, at least some form of professional recognition.


71) I felt that getting the contract was an achievement.

72) I did feel that there was recognition. There was recognition and there was respect. But it's ironic because who knew about it? If no one but the chair or the PMV committee knows about it, how much respect is there?

73) There was satisfaction with the fact that, you know, I just knew that I had work for three years.

74) I didn’t have to be concerned that there was not going to be work.

75) None. I’m just a peon; just another adjunct sharing the office with an ungodly number of people who come on different days.

76) I'm not sure that one is on a different salary because one has multi-year contract.

77) I have no status. There's no increased status.

78) Oh, that's high but it's temporary because it's only for three years. I don't know, maybe that makes me greedy. The job satisfaction is very high for the period of the contract. But the contract ends and there's no guarantee that it will be renewed.

79) Getting the one-year with guidance, after getting the multi-year contract, feels like a demotion.

80) Multi-year contracts are an insult to adjunct faculty.

81) Adjuncts are afraid of rocking the boat, even though we are getting very little.

82) I know I can be more relaxed and I'm not uptight about whether I'm going to work next semester.

83) Stigma being an adjunct.

84) I have always been amazed at how people who speak so highly of the value of education but yet, they don't think their teachers deserve pay, that we should be donating our time.
85) I’m partially satisfied.

86) I have to still say they should pay more to the adjunct; they should at least pay the same hourly that they pay the full-time teacher.

87) Absolutely, it does give some stability.

88) I think that it increases my pride in myself when people show some kind of respect for the amount of effort that you bring, that you pour into the institution.

89) The security that you know that you're going to be there. The fact that you will be assigned three classes so you know that you'll be making a certain amount of money.

90) It just means that the institution has respect for what you're doing. That's what it means to me.

91) It’s a respect thing, for me. They didn't say they wanted me there for life, just for three years.

92) I don’t know if the other faculty within the school have an awareness that you have a three-year contract.

93) Nothing has changed in salary.

94) You're getting temporary job security for three years.

95) I think it creates a psychological comfort knowing that somebody wants you around for three years.

96) By giving you the option of a three-year contract, at least says, I have no money but I’m going to support you for three years.

97) But if they reappoint you, you automatically get your health insurance.

98) This is a private arrangement.

99) Let’s say three years go by and they reduce you to one class, now you lose your health insurance.

100) You know you're working someplace for three years and you got the monies that you need, as long as you do a good job.

101) They need to pay the adjuncts more.

102) The only person that knows are the chairperson and the administrative assistant.
It’s a secret.

Status is the same as when you were a regular adjunct.

The only difference is you have a little more security.

Well, I think the work that I do with a multi-year contract and being an adjunct is not enough money for me to survive.

It shows they want to have me around.

I can plan ahead. I've already done my syllabus for the spring semester and I will go back over them, soon.

It stabilizes you.

Regarding working conditions, I don't think that the three-year commitment made any difference. I was just an adjunct that was thrown in the hallway.

A lot of anxiety without a multi-year contract.

They’re trying to show some appreciation.

Money will show an appreciation.

The only thing I dislike about multi-year contract is that the pay is not up to the amount of effort that the teacher is putting out.

So, what has changed for me is that the three-year contract simply says, yes, you have a job for three years. That in itself is satisfying. That makes you more comfortable but it hasn't changed my perspective on how I'm teaching.

I'm very happy to have gotten a multi-year contract.

And now I'm happy to be part-time because I've gotten older and I don't want any more responsibility.

I think there's a lot more respect for you but, respect is one thing and money is another.

Well, I think that the chairperson gives you a little more respect because the multi-year appointment comes directly from the provost.

Before the multi-year contract we had no guarantees of anything and that's already like a major improvement.
But the missing links is there was no increase in salary.

It’s a part-time position. So, the job security just means that you have a three-year contract. That’s all.

The advantages were actually as I had said it, it's job security. That's the only...the only difference between a multi-year contract and not having a multi-year contract I is that.

If you have a certain job security, you are much happier employee, in a sense because you don't have this specter of uncertainty that's hanging over your head.

The advantage was the job security which again, makes one’s life less anxious.

I see it as temporary until I am rehired again.

What it means to me is that I have a degree of job security until the contract is up. That’s all what that means to me.

Fundamentally, a multi-year contract alleviates anxiety.

I am seen as a valuable member of the department and to the institution by the multi-year contract.

I know this is an adjunct position.

I'm not really required to attend faculty meetings or other things of that sort that would in a one sense lessened the hourly rate that I would be paid.

I’m partially satisfied.

By offering you a multi-year contract, that is a gesture by the institution that you are a valued member, which then that translates psychologically as being recognized for being a contributing member.

There are various levels of stability involved here. One of course, deals with the question directly asks about economics stability. So, there is other subtle question regarding stability regarding your multi-year contract when it's offered to you as a gesture of recognition which creates psychological equilibrium stability.

And that also is a much more subtle element of stability because you have less to do with economics but its far more psychologically and emotional.

Adjuncting is unemployment.
I don’t need to worry about at a minimum applying for a job for the next three years or so. So that gives you a degree of stability. Absolutely! It is psychologically…it’s great. It is…it adds stability even though it is a three-year contract.

I'm not either satisfied or dissatisfied.

By having job security, it makes one a better employee and it makes one a better teacher, a better pedagogue.

Well, I think you know the salaries should be increased. Absolutely!

The multi-year contracts help adjunct faculty to plan ahead.

I feel different than the other adjuncts because I have a multi-year contract.

My job satisfaction comes with the results of a student learning.

With multi-year contract I have job security as an adjunct.

It gives stability and some job security although only for three years.

Multi-year contracts should be extended to five years.

Multi-year contract is temporary.

It is not only job stability, because it's also had a positive psychological effect.

I felt that getting the contract was an achievement.

The multi-year contract gives me a sense of recognition on their part as to the value that I have for the department and what I can bring to the department and the work that they see in terms of my work that I have with my students.

Multi-year contract gives me the ability to have the feeling of job security and being able to actually plan ahead.

It gives me more breathing room in one sense, just by virtue that I will be teaching in the following semesters because of the three-year contract.

What it has done is giving me, again, less anxiety whether I am going to be teaching the following semester.

It's job security; that's the only difference between a multi-year contract and not having a multi-year contract.

They recognize that we have proven ourselves to be effective teachers.
Well, my definition of job security as an adjunct I mean I know it's temporary; it just means that you're hired for three years.

It's not a job security in the sense that it's a full-time position but that's true partition so the job security just means you're doing a contract that's all.

I perceive it to be like more secure.

To me this is probably a breach of contract.

I was very satisfied.

I said there was no difference beyond the fact that you know that come the next three years you have something in the bank.

It gave you the feel at least that your efforts were being recognized… for making positive change and adding value to an institution.

The fact that I’m not in the classroom right now is an element of dissatisfaction. I think that has to do with policies that are being enacted behind the scenes, but they're not clearly communicated. That certainly is an element of dissatisfaction.

I am probably very dissatisfied that even though there was a contract in place, they could have just easily disregarded the contract and moved on.

I was quite satisfied with the contract. At least for the next three years and at that point, I was very satisfied.

And so, having that made me kind of feel like I could focus on my teaching more and my students.

Having a three-year contract makes me a better employee.

“If I was going to make a very crass analogy to African American slavery, I am the lucky guy working in the kitchen instead of in the fields.”

It gives me a sense of recognition.
Appendix M

Preliminary Grouping of Relevant Expressions of the Adjunct Faculty Perceptions of Job Satisfaction with Multi-year Teaching Appointments

Job Satisfaction with Multi-Year Contracts

• I am satisfied having this contract. I do feel satisfied.
• Job satisfaction to me is, are my students satisfied with the work I am doing?
• I don't have any dissatisfaction with it.
• I think it's a plus for all the instructors. It's not a plus for the department, and it’s a plus for the students.
• My job satisfaction has not changed since I have received the contract—I love teaching and taught quite happily without the contract.
• I am not dissatisfied with my job—particularly during the pandemic, I was glad to be working and interacting with students.
• Achievement in terms of student engagement and success is what I perceive my job to be. That is a daily source of satisfaction and challenges. And satisfaction again.
• I do not have any dissatisfactions that I am aware of at this time—I am glad that this institution had the three-year contract policy, and that I was able to benefit from it.
• My job satisfaction is entirely in my ability to engage with my students in the way that I want to.
• There are so many things that go into job satisfaction and teaching. Again, it is hard to pull out those that have to do with the three-year appointment. But I feel a lot more, actually a lot more satisfied with my relationship with my students.
• Three-year appointment is designed to give the adjunct some kind of job security, and feeling of confidence; it does that, and that gives you satisfaction, much more satisfaction.
• I was frustrated and felt really bad and had very low satisfaction because I felt taken advantage of as an adjunct. But now that I'm teaching the minimum number of credits under a three-year contract, I am satisfied.
• I feel I’m in a better place because of that multi-year contract.
• No, I am not satisfied because of multi-year contracts

Job Security

• A multi-year contract gives me a little more security.
• It gives me security that I’ll be able to teach it again next semester.
• I am accustomed to teach as an adjunct on a semester basis, but when the three-year appointment came on, I am like, wow, this is fabulous because they are telling me that for three years, I will have stable employment even if enrollment is down.
• For example: obtaining credit for a car loan, or a lower mortgage interest rate.
• The multi-year contract itself provides as much job stability as one can have without, for the length of the contract.
• The contract offers some job stability in an unstable post-pandemic University setting. My job itself has not changed, nor has the way I execute my responsibilities or my course delivery.
I definitely feel more peace of mind and security knowing that my three-year contract has been renewed.

I don't feel as pressured. Some of it is the security of the three-year contract

A multi-year teaching contract is as a guarantee work for a certain period of time.

It is job security even if it is only three years.

Well, for me a multi-year contract is having the security of not having to go through a reappointment process on a continuous basis.

I have no delusions, even with a multi-year contract there’s no job security for an adjunct, ever.

To be honest, the only difference between being a semester-by-semester adjunct and having a multi-year contract is that at least I have a job for three years.

My multi-year contract has been a relief to know that I will get to teach at least two classes every semester, though it is always "pending enrollment." I am not yet sure how that works if enrollment is too low.

It gives a lot more of a sense of job security.

With a multi-year contract, I am guaranteed to teach a number of courses every semester for a period of three years.

Enhanced job security.

It affords a bit of job security, even if only for a few years.

On paper, and for the Human Resources office, my job appears to be more permanent than simply a 15-week stint in the English Department. That helps with financial concerns that less permanent work does not afford.

A bit more secure.

Job security is the biggest area of change with the contract and the one that provides the most significant difference in my perception: job security is what the contract affords.

There’s security, there’s some job security, so I really like that.

With multi-year contract you have a sense of job security.

I like the fact that I have three years guaranteed.

A multi-year contract is assurance you have a job.

The work, with or without a contract is the same: to achieve and maintain student success, inspiration, and opportunities to think different, and differently.

I'm not sure the work is all that much different than it would be if I wasn't in a three-year contract.

What’s job security if you're not paid enough? How is that secure? That’s not secure. So, they stopped beating us with a large stick, instead they beat us with ropes; they’re still beating us!

Job Stability

A multi-year contract is job stability albeit temporary.

It is assurance that you have a job.

For me, in terms of work, a multi-year contract means that I usually get the same courses every semester or at least I teach a variation of 1, 2, or 3 courses within the department; so, I’m able to improve on it.

A little bit of job stability and job security.
Multi-year teaching appointments lessen job anxiety

- Before I had a multi-year contract, I asked myself, “am I teaching next semester?”
- Anxiety
- A little less anxiety
- Multi-year teaching appointments lessen job anxiety.
- In a nutshell a multi-year appointment feels a little better, but the anxiety is still there.
- At the end of the three years, who knows what’s going to happen? I’m not losing sleep over it because I didn’t even know I had it.
- As a regular adjunct I have a little bit of anxiety, meaning pretty nervous about whether or not I would get my job. Having now a multi-year contract has allowed me to know that I would have work at my college for consecutive three years.
- It is less stressful than being on a semester-to-semester contract.
- I don’t have to worry every semester or every year if I am going to pay my bills.
- It is more restful and allows me to make long range plans. Beyond that, we’re just a higher class of dirt.
- I like it because of continuity and less stress.
- It is less stressful than being on a semester-to-semester contract.
- Less stress.

Recognition

- Multi-year contracts are a recognition of seniority.
- Teaching performance.
- They recognize that we have proven ourselves to be effective teachers.
- It is quite a benefit.
- I see it as a plus.
- To get a multi-year contract one has to earn it by teaching for ten consecutive fall and spring semesters at the same college and academic department.
- The number of adjuncts eligible for a multi-year contract is rather narrow.
- Multi-year contracts make one feels a little bit more recognized, a little bit more valued, but not valued enough for the higher education establishment to take qualified adjunct faculty over tenured track.
- Recognition
- Respect
- Because I have a three-year contract, my courses are assigned to me before those adjuncts who don’t have a multi-year appointment.
- When I first got the contract, I was gratified by the idea that my Chair had thought of me to offer the contract. I perceived it as a vote of confidence.
- In terms of personal achievements: first achievement was to get the contract offer; the next would be to get a renewal.
• For me personally, being awarded the contract and then to be given a contract renewal.
• I feel good about multi-year contract because it is an accomplishment.

Salary
• No additional compensation under multi-year contract
• Not paid fairly and enough
• I’m not getting paid any extra because I am teaching under multi-year contract. That’s a problem. I am being paid the same as when I was on a one-year contract or just teaching under a renewable by semester contract.
• A multi-year contract is a financial cushion for adjuncts.
• They don’t pay me. They don't pay me what I’m worth. Plain and simple.

Multi-year contracts are bells and whistles.
• They keep us complacent, when it’s not really adding anything for us.
• Multi-year contracts are an attempt to throw a few crumbs to make you feel better about the fact that we're not being paid anywhere near what we should be, especially if they recognize that we have proven ourselves to be effective teachers.
• They’re throwing me a bone, and this dog is getting a little tired of bones and would like some meat.
• I think that in some departments the three-year contract is used as a carrot, to dangle in front of your nose, that if you say yes to all the right questions, we make sure you get your three-year contact. Not those who are not in favor.
• They keep us complacent, when it's not really adding anything for us.
• It’s a piece of paper
• It’s not a big deal to me.
• I don’t want to treat it in a too blasé of a manner. I appreciate it.
• Multi-year contracts are an insult
• Even with multi-year contracts, we are still adjuncts.
• Respect
• You are still an adjunct
• Even when adjuncts have multi-year contracts, full-timers get assigned their classes first.

Institutional Support
• Also, the opportunity to teach courses that I had not been able to teach before, such as composition.
• Yeah, oh yeah. I was given office hours…I was giving the use of a conference room to meet with students. We have access to computers, printers and any needed resources were provided for us.
• Lack of inclusion
• Lack of communication
• I was given business cards

There is life after multi-year contracts
• If multi-year teaching appointments end, if I’m given the opportunity, I’ll teach full time.
• I am not interested in a full-time or tenured position. The burden of attending committee meetings and all that is too much!
• I think it's important to consider that should be included in a project in a research project like this well I think in terms of multi-year appointments I think that perhaps maybe in upcoming future contracts that adjuncts under multiyear appointments will be given perhaps additional responsibilities resulting of course in the you know additional compensation and that might be a motivating factor for other adjunct you know to seek a multiyear appointment
• I hope that my contract will continue to be renewed; if not, I will go back to what I was doing before—teaching as many courses as are available at my two schools, and at other places.
• If a tenured track job comes to me, I will take it. If not, I will continue with the multi-year appointments as they are available or work as I was before the contract: semester to semester.
## Appendix N

### Interview - Co-Researcher 1

**Individual Structural Description of the Experience with Multi-Year Teaching Contract (MYTC)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Questions/Topics</th>
<th>Summary Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Description of multi-year teaching appointments</td>
<td>1. Assurance of a job for three years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience teaching under multi-year appointments</td>
<td>2. Four years. Lessened anxiety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Connecting with students, full-time faculty, chairs, deans, provost, and president</td>
<td>a. No different than a regular adjunct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Liking multi-year appointments</td>
<td>3. MYTC guarantees your job for three years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disliking multi-year appointments</td>
<td>4. With or without MYTC, they need to pay us more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Definition of job satisfaction</td>
<td>5. Freedom to be who you are, and respect. Being recognized for teaching performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Institutional support</td>
<td>7. No different than before. Sounds like a broken record but, they don't pay us enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Advantages of multi-year appointments</td>
<td>10. Employment for at least three-years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Disadvantages of multi-year appointments</td>
<td>11. I don't know much about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Motivating factors adjuncts perceive as contributing to job satisfaction with multi-year appointments:</td>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Achievement</td>
<td>a. Not related to MYTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recognition</td>
<td>b. Department recognized me with an MYTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Work</td>
<td>c. Same as before. A filed piece of paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Responsibility</td>
<td>d. No added responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Advancement and Growth</td>
<td>e. No advancement. I've grown personally, and not because of MYTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Institutional Policy and Administration</td>
<td>a. New requirement on me because of MYTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Supervision</td>
<td>b. No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Working Conditions</td>
<td>c. Same as before.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>d. Same as before.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Salary</td>
<td>e. Same as before. No salary increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Status</td>
<td>f. A little different than regular adjuncts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Job Security</td>
<td>g. Grateful I have a three-year contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Job Instability</td>
<td>h. Anxiety and hopeful to get an MYTC reappointment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MYTC means Multi-year Teaching Contract*
## Appendix O

### Interview - Co-Researcher 2

#### Individual Structural Description of the Experience with Multi-Year Contract Teaching Contract (MYTC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Questions/Topics</th>
<th>Summary Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Description of multi-year teaching appointments</td>
<td>1. MYTC simply says, yes, you have a job for three years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience teaching under multi-year appointments</td>
<td>2. Four years. Less stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Connecting with students, full-time faculty, chairs, deans, provost, and president</td>
<td>a. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Liking multi-year appointments</td>
<td>3. The chair gives you a little more respect because the MYTC comes from the provost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disliking multi-year appointments</td>
<td>4. The pay is not up to the amount of effort that the teacher is putting out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Definition of job satisfaction</td>
<td>5. What I can accomplish with the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Perception of job satisfaction with multi-year appointment</td>
<td>6. “I’m very happy to have gotten a multi-year contract.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Institutional support</td>
<td>7. There’s no increase in money. Money will show an appreciation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Job dissatisfaction</td>
<td>8. Who evaluate your teaching performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Advantages of multi-year appointments</td>
<td>10. Guaranteed workload of at least 3 classes per semester and payment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Disadvantages of multi-year appointments</td>
<td>11. MYTC do not have benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Motivating factors adjuncts perceive as contributing to job satisfaction with multi-year appointments:</td>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Achievement</td>
<td>a. The same with or without MYTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recognition</td>
<td>b. The multi-year appointment itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Work</td>
<td>c. Same. Not enough money to survive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Responsibility</td>
<td>d. It is the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Advancement and Growth</td>
<td>e. Never suggested a different status, like lecturer. No growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Institutional Policy and Administration</td>
<td>a. The same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Supervision</td>
<td>b. Chair didn’t recommend my MYTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Working Conditions</td>
<td>c. They took my office and put me in hallway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>d. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Salary</td>
<td>e. Nothing has changed in salary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Job Security</td>
<td>g. Psychological comfort of little job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Job Instability</td>
<td>h. Anxiety. Amazed the university doesn’t think their teachers deserve pay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MYTC means Multi-year Teaching Contract*
## Appendix P

### Interview - Co-Researcher 3

**Individual Structural Description of the Experience with Multi-Year Contract (MYTC)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Questions/Topics</th>
<th>Summary Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Description of multi-year teaching appointments</td>
<td>1. A more secure job. Feel elevated, but still an adjunct faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience teaching under multi-year appointments</td>
<td>2. Three years. Less stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Connecting with students, full-time faculty, chairs, deans, provost, and president</td>
<td>a. MYTC allows me to work more cooperatively with students. No change interacting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with colleagues and higher education officers</td>
<td>3. I can relax and focus on the development and success of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Liking multi-year appointments</td>
<td>4. Contract could be longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disliking multi-year appointments</td>
<td>5. Feeling I am doing my job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Definition of job satisfaction</td>
<td>6. MYTC creates less stress for me, and less stress opens up for more creativity to teach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Perception of job satisfaction with multi-year appointment</td>
<td>7. No different than before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Institutional support</td>
<td>8. Adjuncts are treated as substandard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Motivating factors adjuncts perceive as contributing to job satisfaction with multi-year appointments:</td>
<td>a. The MYTC was, but it was taken away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Achievement</td>
<td>b. The MYTC was a show of respect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recognition</td>
<td>c. Satisfied I had a job for three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Work</td>
<td>d. No. Adjuncts do not serve on committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Responsibility</td>
<td>e. None as per having a MYTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Advancement and Growth</td>
<td>13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Hygiene factors perceived as contributing to job dissatisfaction with multi-year appointments:</td>
<td>a. None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Institutional Policy and Administration</td>
<td>b. No change, although evaluation was faulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Supervision</td>
<td>c. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Working Conditions</td>
<td>d. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>e. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Salary</td>
<td>f. Same as before. There is not increased status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Status</td>
<td>g. High job security but temporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Job Security</td>
<td>h. Anxiety for lack of guarantee of a secure job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Job Instability</td>
<td>14. MYTC should have check-ins for unfolding performance and evaluation purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Additional thoughts about the lived experience teaching under multi-year contract.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MYTC means Multi-year Teaching Contract*
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**Interview - Co-Researcher 4**

*Individual Structural Description of the Experience with Multi-Year Contract (MYTC*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Questions/Topics</th>
<th>Summary Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Description of multi-year teaching appointments</td>
<td>1. A relief to know I will get at least two classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience teaching under multi-year appointments</td>
<td>2. Four years/less anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Connecting with students, full-time faculty, chairs, deans, provost, and president</td>
<td>a. Same as when teaching as a regular adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disliking multi-year appointments</td>
<td>4. Temporary job security and stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Definition of job satisfaction</td>
<td>5. Same salary as before. Serving students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Perception of job satisfaction with multi-year appointment</td>
<td>Having a stable job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Institutional support</td>
<td>6. Satisfied due to its job security and stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Job dissatisfaction</td>
<td>7. No different than before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Achievement</td>
<td>a. The multi-year appointment itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recognition</td>
<td>b. The multi-year appointment itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Work</td>
<td>c. Same as working terms a regular adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Responsibility</td>
<td>d. No added responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Advancement and Growth</td>
<td>e. None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Institutional Policy and Administration</td>
<td>a. No perceived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Supervision</td>
<td>b. No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Working Conditions</td>
<td>c. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>d. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Salary</td>
<td>e. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Status</td>
<td>f. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Job Security</td>
<td>g. Temporary while the 3-year contract lasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Job Instability</td>
<td>h. Anxiety 3-year contracts would end</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MYTC means Multi-year Teaching Contract*
**Appendix R**

**Interview - Co-Researcher 5**

**Individual Structural Description of the Experience with Multi-Year Contract (MYTC*)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Questions/Topics</th>
<th>Summary Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Description of multi-year teaching appointments</td>
<td>1. A relief to know I will get two classes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Experience teaching under multi-year appointments  
a. Same as when teaching as a regular adjunct |
| 4. Disliking multi-year appointments | 4. Nothing so far |
| 5. Definition of job satisfaction | 5. I love teaching and taught quite happily without the contract |
| 7. Institutional support | 7. No different than before |
| 8. Job dissatisfaction | 8. Temporary Job stability and security |
| 9. Meaning of multi-year appointments | 9. “It affords a bit of job security, even if only for a few years.” |
| 10. Advantages of multi-year appointments | 10. On paper MYTC appears in Human Resources as a more stable position. |
| 11. Disadvantages of multi-year appointments | 11. “None that I have encountered as yet.” |
| 12. Motivating factors adjuncts perceive as contributing to job satisfaction with multi-year appointments:  
a. Achievement  
b. Recognition  
c. Work  
d. Responsibility  
e. Advancement and Growth | 12.  
a. “To get the contract offer and the renewal”  
b. being awarded the contract  
c. Same as working terms a regular adjunct  
d. No added responsibility  
e. Serves to apply for promotion. Grow via interacting with students |
| 13. Hygiene factors perceived as contributing to job dissatisfaction with multi-year appointments:  
a. Institutional Policy and Administration  
b. Supervision  
c. Working Conditions  
d. Interpersonal Relations  
e. Salary  
f. Status  
g. Job Security  
a. Glad the college had the MYTC policy  
b. Generous without being stifling.  
c. No dissatisfaction  
d. Not changed pre- or during the contract.  
e. Pay is the same. Job security has changed  
f. No change with or without MYTC  
g. The biggest area of change.  
h. Stability for the length of the contract |
| 14. Additional thoughts about the lived experience teaching under multi-year contract. | 14. Some job stability. My job itself has not changed, nor has the way I execute my responsibilities or my course delivery. |

*MYTC means Multi-year Teaching Contract*
**Appendix S**

**Interview - Co-Researcher 6**

**Individual Structural Description of the Experience with Multi-Year Contract (MYTC*)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Questions/Topics</th>
<th>Summary Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Description of multi-year teaching appointments</td>
<td>1. “It gives me security because at least I know I have employment for the three years.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience teaching under multi-year appointments</td>
<td>2. Four years/less anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Connecting with students, full-time faculty, chairs, deans, provost, and president</td>
<td>a. Same as when teaching as a regular adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disliking multi-year appointments</td>
<td>4. That MYTC is not offered to all adjuncts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Definition of job satisfaction</td>
<td>5. I am partially satisfied because I have less anxiety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Institutional support</td>
<td>7. No different than before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Job dissatisfaction</td>
<td>8. Focus should be on what could be improved. Not dissatisfaction with MYTC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Meaning of multi-year appointments</td>
<td>9. Job security; “that’s all what that means to me.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Advantages of multi-year appointments</td>
<td>10. “The advantage was the job security which again, makes one’s life less anxious.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Disadvantages of multi-year appointments</td>
<td>11. No disadvantages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Motivating factors adjuncts perceive as contributing to job satisfaction with multi-year appointments:</td>
<td>a. It gives me more breathing room to plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Achievement</td>
<td>b. Because of longevity and performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recognition</td>
<td>c. Happy to have employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Work</td>
<td>d. No added responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Responsibility</td>
<td>e. None. There was not salary increases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Advancement and Growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Hygiene factors perceived as contributing to job dissatisfaction with multi-year appointments:</td>
<td>a. No perceived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Institutional Policy and Administration</td>
<td>b. No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Supervision</td>
<td>c. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Working Conditions</td>
<td>d. Same as before. Salary should be increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>e. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Salary</td>
<td>f. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Status</td>
<td>g. Very satisfying although partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Job Security</td>
<td>h. Anxiety 3-year contracts would end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Job Instability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MYTC means Multi-year Teaching Contract*
Appendix T

Interview - Co-Researcher 7
Individual Structural Description of the Experience with Multi-Year Teaching Contract (MYTC*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Questions/Topics</th>
<th>Summary Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Description of multi-year teaching appointments</td>
<td>1. “For three years, I will have employment.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Experience teaching under multi-year appointments  
  a. Connecting with students, full-time faculty, chairs,  
     deans, provost, and president | 2. Four years  
  a. Same as before |
| 4. Disliking multi-year appointments | 4. Too many evaluation. Salary is the same. |
| 5. Definition of job satisfaction | 5. I’ve just been renewed. “It’s kind of only a  
     good thing for me.” |
| 7. Institutional support | 7. No different than before |
| 10. Advantages of multi-year appointments | 10. Temporary Protection from being layoff |
| 11. Disadvantages of multi-year appointments | 11. I should received similar compensation  
     given to full-timers and tenured faculty. |
| 12. Motivating factors adjuncts perceive as contributing to job  
    satisfaction with multi-year appointments:  
    a. Achievement  
    b. Recognition  
    c. Work  
    d. Responsibility  
    e. Advancement and Growth | 12.  
    a. The multi-year appointment itself  
    b. The multi-year appointment itself  
    c. Same as working terms a regular adjunct  
    d. No added responsibility  
    e. Yes. MYTC helps with career goals |
| 13. Hygiene factors perceived as contributing to job dissatisfaction  
    with multi-year appointments:  
    a. Institutional Policy and Administration  
    b. Supervision  
    c. Working Conditions  
    d. Interpersonal Relations  
    e. Salary  
    f. Status  
    g. Job Security  
    a. Evaluated twice. Overburden  
    b. No change  
    c. Same as before  
    d. Same as before  
    e. Same as before  
    f. Same as before  
    g. “I feel very good.”  
    h. Anxiety if MYTC ends |
| 14. Additional thoughts about the lived experience teaching  
    under multi-year contract. | 14. I didn’t get a salary rise. Adjuncts are  
    complacent. |

*MYTC means Multi-year Teaching Contract
# Appendix U

**Interview - Co-Researcher 8**

**Individual Structural Description of the Experience with Multi-Year Teaching Contract (MYTC*)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Questions/Topics</th>
<th>Summary Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Connecting with students, full-time faculty, chairs, deans, provost, and president</td>
<td>a. Same as when teaching as a regular adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Liking multi-year appointments</td>
<td>3. “I do feel there is more respect... a little less than a job anxiety.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disliking multi-year appointments</td>
<td>4. “I dislike that I am being judged, you know and that’s only three years.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Definition of job satisfaction</td>
<td>5. Derives from knowing I am helping students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Perception of job satisfaction with multi-year appointment</td>
<td>6. “I don’t have to worry for a few semesters by having to probe myself again.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Institutional support</td>
<td>7. No different than before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Job dissatisfaction</td>
<td>8. Treatment from the administration. Being judged to grant a three-year contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Advantages of multi-year appointments</td>
<td>10. A job for three-years, and possibly an additional three-year reappointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Disadvantages of multi-year appointments</td>
<td>11. There is any disadvantages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Motivating factors adjuncts perceive as contributing to job satisfaction with multi-year appointments:</td>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Achievement</td>
<td>a. Having the MYTC*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recognition</td>
<td>b. “I do feel that.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Work</td>
<td>c. “I am happy about that.” [Having a job]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Responsibility</td>
<td>d. No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Advancement and Growth</td>
<td>e. None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Institutional Policy and Administration</td>
<td>a. No perceived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Supervision</td>
<td>b. “I don’t feel any difference.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Working Conditions</td>
<td>c. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>d. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Salary</td>
<td>e. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Status</td>
<td>f. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Job Security</td>
<td>g. Feel a little more secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Job Instability</td>
<td>h. Uncertain if MYTC* will continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Additional thoughts about the lived experience teaching under multi-year contract.</td>
<td>14. MYTC* does not change anything. “It is just kind of a carrot and a stick.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MYTC means Multi-year Teaching Contract*
## Appendix V

### Interview - Co-Researcher 9

**Individual Structural Description of the Experience with Multi-Year teaching Contract (MYTC*)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Questions/Topics</th>
<th>Summary Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Description of multi-year teaching appointments</td>
<td>1. A job for three years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience teaching under multi-year appointments</td>
<td>2. Four years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Connecting with students, full-time faculty, chairs, deans, provost, and president</td>
<td>a. Same as when teaching as a regular adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disliking multi-year appointments</td>
<td>4. Lack of inclusion in meeting and governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Definition of job satisfaction</td>
<td>5. Being part of the department and serving students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Perception of job satisfaction with a multi-year appointment</td>
<td>6. Allows the instructor to improve teaching without worrying about job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Institutional support</td>
<td>7. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Job dissatisfaction</td>
<td>8. None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Meaning of multi-year appointments</td>
<td>9. “I am well considered and well thought of as a professional in the department.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Advantages of multi-year appointments</td>
<td>10. Feeling recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Disadvantages of multi-year appointments</td>
<td>11. Don’t know MYTC* employment terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Motivating factors adjuncts perceive as contributing to job satisfaction with multi-year appointments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Achievement</td>
<td>a. The multi-year appointment itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recognition</td>
<td>b. The multi-year appointment itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Work</td>
<td>c. Same working terms as a regular adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Responsibility</td>
<td>d. No added responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Advancement and Growth</td>
<td>e. None. Growth is personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Hygiene factors perceived as contributing to job dissatisfaction with multi-year appointments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Institutional Policy and Administration</td>
<td>a. No perceived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Supervision</td>
<td>b. No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Working Conditions</td>
<td>c. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>d. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Salary</td>
<td>e. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Status</td>
<td>f. Same as before. “I am still an adjunct.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Job Security</td>
<td>g. Temporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Job Instability</td>
<td>h. Uncertain if MYTC will continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Additional thoughts about the lived experience teaching under multi-year contract.</td>
<td>MYTC affects the sense of security among adjuncts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MYTC means Multi-year Teaching Contract
## Appendix W

### Interview - Co-Researcher 10

**Individual Structural Description of the Experience with Multi-Year Teaching Contract (MYTC*)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Questions/Topics</th>
<th>Summary Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Description of multi-year teaching appointments</td>
<td>1. “A lot of more of a sense of job security,”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience teaching under multi-year appointments</td>
<td>2. Four years/less anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Connecting with students, full-time faculty, chairs, deans, provost, and president</td>
<td>a. No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disliking multi-year appointments</td>
<td>4. Temporary job security and stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Definition of job satisfaction</td>
<td>5. Serving students. Having a stable job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Institutional support</td>
<td>7. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Job dissatisfaction</td>
<td>8. None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Advantages of multi-year appointments</td>
<td>10. Job security and stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Disadvantages of multi-year appointments</td>
<td>11. None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Motivating factors adjuncts perceive as contributing to job satisfaction with multi-year appointments:</td>
<td>12. Having a multi-year appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Achievement</td>
<td>a. Teaching longevity and performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recognition</td>
<td>b. Same as working terms a regular adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Work</td>
<td>c. No added responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Responsibility</td>
<td>d. None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Advancement and Growth</td>
<td>e. None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Hygiene factors perceived as contributing to job dissatisfaction with multi-year appointments:</td>
<td>13. No perceived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Institutional Policy and Administration</td>
<td>a. No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Supervision</td>
<td>b. No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Working Conditions</td>
<td>c. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>d. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Salary</td>
<td>e. Same as before, but please with it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Status</td>
<td>f. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Job Security</td>
<td>g. Temporary while the 3-year contract lasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Job Instability</td>
<td>h. None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Additional thoughts about the lived experience teaching under multi-year contract.</td>
<td>14. MYTCs should include additional responsibilities and compensation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MYTC means Multi-year Teaching Contract
# Appendix X

**Interview - Co-Researcher 11**

**Individual Structural Description of the Experience with Multi-Year Teaching Contract (MYTC)***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Questions/Topics</th>
<th>Summary Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Description of multi-year teaching appointments</td>
<td>1. It is less stressful than being on a semester to semester contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Connecting with students, full-time faculty, chairs, deans, provost, and president</td>
<td>a. Same as when teaching as a regular adjunct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disliking multi-year appointments</td>
<td>4. No salary increase. Uncompensated labor. “If I was going to make a very crass analogy to African American slavery, I am the lucky guy working in the kitchen instead of in the fields.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Definition of job satisfaction</td>
<td>5. Comes from serving students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Institutional support</td>
<td>7. It didn’t change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Job dissatisfaction</td>
<td>8. They don’t pay me what I’m worth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Motivating factors adjuncts perceive as contributing to job satisfaction with multi-year appointments:</td>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Achievement</td>
<td>a. Teaching longevity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recognition</td>
<td>b. The multi-year position itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Work</td>
<td>c. Recognized by the administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Responsibility</td>
<td>d. Developing instructional materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Advancement and Growth</td>
<td>e. None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Institutional Policy and Administration</td>
<td>a. Unclear if correlated with MYTC*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Supervision</td>
<td>b. Same as before: collegial and supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Working Conditions</td>
<td>c. Same. Not relevant to MYTC*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>d. No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Salary</td>
<td>e. Insulting. Same as before.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Status</td>
<td>f. Same as before. MYTCs* are an insult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Job Security</td>
<td>g. Yes, but not enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Job Instability</td>
<td>h. Sense of job insecurity due to politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Additional thoughts about the lived experience teaching under multi-year contract.</td>
<td>14. The MYTC* is an insulting delay tactic. Has afforded some brief lessening of stress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MYTC means Multi-year Teaching Contract
Appendix Y

Interview - Co-Researcher 12
Individual Structural Description of the Experience with Multi-Year Teaching Contract (MYTC*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Questions/Topics</th>
<th>Summary Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Description of multi-year teaching appointments</td>
<td>1. A relief to know I will get at least two classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience teaching under multi-year appointments</td>
<td>2. Four years/less anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Connecting with students, full-time faculty, chairs, deans, provost, and president</td>
<td>Same as when teaching as a regular adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disliking multi-year appointments</td>
<td>4. Temporary job security and stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Definition of job satisfaction</td>
<td>5. Same salary as before. Serving students. Having a stable job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Institutional support</td>
<td>7. No different than before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Job dissatisfaction</td>
<td>8. Temporary job stability and security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Advantages of multi-year appointments</td>
<td>10. Temporary job security and stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Motivating factors adjuncts perceive as contributing to job satisfaction with multi-year appointments:</td>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Achievement</td>
<td>a. The multi-year appointment itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recognition</td>
<td>b. The MYTC itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Work</td>
<td>c. Same working terms as a regular adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Responsibility</td>
<td>d. No added responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Advancement and Growth</td>
<td>e. None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Institutional Policy and Administration</td>
<td>a. Arbitrary non-communicated policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Supervision</td>
<td>b. No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Working Conditions</td>
<td>c. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>d. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Salary</td>
<td>e. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Status</td>
<td>f. Same as before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Job Security</td>
<td>g. Temporary while the 3-year contract lasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Job Instability</td>
<td>h. Anxiety 3-year contracts would end</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MYTC means Multi-year Teaching Contract
Appendix Z

General Findings Classified Under Themes and Sub-Themes

1. Multi-year teaching contracts provide partial job satisfaction.
2. Multi-year teaching contracts provide a little temporary job security.
3. Multi-year teaching contracts provide a little temporary job stability.
4. Multi-year teaching contracts lessen job anxiety.
5. Nothing has changed in teaching as a regular adjunct except a bit of job security.
6. Aside from perceiving recognition of seniority, adjuncts perceived multi-year contracts as guaranteed stable employment for some time.
7. When asked about the advantages of a multi-year contract, an adjunct said that having a stable job helps when applying for credit or a mortgage or a car loan as lenders consider the length of employment as part of the criteria to approve a loan application. To illustrate an advantage of the multi-year contract, she said: “For example: [multi-year contracts can be used to] obtaining credit for a car loan, or a lower mortgage interest rate.”
8. Multi-year appointments afford adjunct faculty job stability and a farther horizon to plan for curriculum development and materials (curriculum materials need to be developed as a multiyear sequence that helps).

Theme B: Institutional Recognition. Sub-Theme B.1. Seniority. Sub-Theme B.2. Teaching Performance
1. Adjunct faculty perceive multi-year teaching contracts as institutional recognition of seniority.
2. In the first and second cohort, multi-year appointments were granted only to those who have taught at the same college, and the academic department for ten consecutive spring and fall semesters and passed a comprehensive teaching performance evaluation.
3. Adjunct faculty perceive multi-year teaching contracts as institutional recognition of excellence in teaching performance.

Theme C: Bells and Whistles. Sub-Theme C.1. Insult. Sub-Theme C.2. Adjunct Faculty Complacency
- Adjunct faculty with a three-year contract feel appreciated for it until they realize the contract is moot concerning improving their plight.
- Having a multi-year contract does not change adjuncts’ regular employment terms.
- Having a multi-year contract is not a job security guarantee; adjuncts can be laid off for cause or not cause.
- The sick, annual leave, office hours, and professional hours for adjuncts with multi-year contracts are the same as regular adjuncts.
- The health insurance benefits for adjuncts with multi-year appointments are the same as those for regular adjuncts who teach on a semester basis contract.
- Multi-year teaching contracts do not allow developing and growing personally, professionally, or academically.
Multi-year teaching contracts do not include a salary increase.
Multi-year teaching contracts do not include additional institutional support.
Multi-year teaching contracts do not improve working conditions.
Multi-year teaching contracts do not improve adjunct faculty status.
The multi-year teaching contract does not change adjunct faculty supervision.
Students do not know who of their adjunct professors has a multi-year appointment.
Adjunct faculty’s colleagues seldom know who among themselves have a multi-year appointment in their department.
Adjunct faculty perceive multi-year teaching contracts as bells and whistles.
Adjuncts cannot think of any tangible, measurable achievement for teaching under a multi-year contract.
Multi-year teaching contracts keep adjunct faculty complacent. “They keep us complacent, when the contract is not really adding anything for us,” said one of the participants.
A multi-year teaching contract is an electronic or printed letter or a piece of paper that worth nothing.
An adjunct faculty with a multi-year teaching appointment is still an adjunct
Multi-year teaching contracts are bright shiny objects given to adjunct faculty to keep them distracted.
Higher education institutions and faculty unions use multi-year teaching contracts to keep adjunct faculty complacent without adding anything of significance for them.
Except for job security, study participants indicated that institutional policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, and status did not influence their perception of job satisfaction with the multi-year contract as these factors did not change due to transitioning from a regular adjunct faculty rank to a multi-year contract position.
Except for recognition and work, study participants indicated that factors such as achievement, responsibility, advancement, and growth did not influence their perception of job satisfaction with the multi-year contract as these factors did not change due to transitioning from a regular adjunct faculty rank to a multi-year contract position.
The ultimate job satisfaction adjunct faculty get is from students and realizing they did good and not from a temporary employment status as a multi-year contract.
Multi-year teaching contracts do not change adjunct faculty’s interpersonal relationship with students, colleagues, and administrative leaders.
Multi-year teaching appointments mean enduring grueling comprehensive teaching performance evaluation.
Academic departments do not invite adjunct faculty with a multi-year appointment to attend governance meetings.
Adjuncts with multi-year contracts are not allowed or invited to serve on committees.
Adjuncts with multi-year contracts are not assigned offices to meet with students.
Adjuncts who are eligible for multi-year appointments but decline the offer are not assigned any courses to teach in the immediate semester following the notification offer date.
Adjuncts are the indenture servants of academia.