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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this quantitative, multiple regression study was to examine the relationship between 10 adjunct instructor characteristics and organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Part-time instructors who taught for the institution during the 2012-2013 academic year completed an electronic survey with questions from three valid and reliable instruments: perceived person-organization fit (Cable & DeRue, 2002), part-time faculty job satisfaction survey (Hoyt, Howell, & Eggett, 2007), and organizational commitment questionnaire (Fields, 2002). Data from the survey was analyzed using separate hierarchical regressions to answer the following research questions: (a) Do adjunct instructor characteristics (age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, teaching discipline, outside work status, teaching load, and teaching modality [online vs. on site], discipline), and perceived fit predict job satisfaction? (b) Do any of these same adjunct instructor characteristics and perceived fit predict organizational commitment? Results indicated that the fourth block of variables (overall model) was statistically significant for both job satisfaction and organizational commitment and explained 43.1% of the variability in job satisfaction and 58.1% of the variability in organizational commitment. The individual predictor variables of gender, education level (first professional), teaching modality (online and blended), and person-organization fit individually contributed to the overall variance of job satisfaction, whereas the predictor variables of age group, ethnicity, teaching modality (online) and person-organization fit individually contributed to the overall variance of organizational commitment.

Descriptors: Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, person-organization fit, Demographics
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Due to the increasing numbers of adjunct instructors, some authors and educational leaders have suggested that college administrations need to be concerned with providing optimal working conditions to increase retention and productivity of instructors (American Federation of Teachers, 2010; Ballantyne, Berret & Harst, 2010; Halcrow & Olson, 2008; Pearch & Marutz, 2005). Many adjunct instructors feel isolated, unsupported, and classified as second-class citizens (Gaillard-Kenney, 2006). However, very few college administrators direct their efforts toward integrating adjunct faculty because these instructors are viewed as transients who typically have short tenures and, therefore, few resources are invested (Halcrow & Olson, 2008). This approach to managing part-time instructors is problematic, though, due to evidence which suggests faculty who are satisfied with their work tend to stay, reducing turnover that can be costly due to hiring and training staff (Nedd, 2006). In addition, faculty members with higher job satisfaction are likely to be more motivated and innovative (Truell, Price, & Joyner, 1998), as well as dedicated to and inspired by their work (Syptak, Marsland, & Ulmer, 1999), and this is advantageous for student learning. Research has demonstrated that faculty who are committed and loyal to their organizations are more productive, more independent, more likely to stay long-term with the organization, and go above and beyond their formal job requirements (Schroeder, 2008).

Because most of the research conducted with adjuncts has either been carried out in four-year research universities or two-year community colleges, a need exists to understand adjunct instructors at a four-year “career college”, especially given the current emphasis on institutions that are designed to provide career and technical workforce training and the fact that the United States underinvests in subbaccalaureate, technical, and career education (Gonzalez, 2012). To
better understand the adjunct instructor phenomenon, this study seeks to determine whether select adjunct instructor characteristics and perceived fit can be used to predict organizational commitment and job satisfaction at a career college located in the Midwest.

**Background of the Study**

The use of adjunct instructors in higher education institutions has increased during the past several decades. Researchers estimate that adjunct instructors account for approximately 66% of all college teachers in the United States, equating to more than 800,000 instructors (Louis, 2009), and the National Education Association (2007) reported an 11% increase in the use of adjunct instructors between 1981-2003. According to the American Association of University Professors (2009), between the years of 1975-2009, part-time faculty increased from 24% to 41% in the university setting, yet full-time tenured faculty decreased from 29% to 16.8%, and full-time tenured track faculty decreased from 16.1% to 7.6%. In the fall of 2003, part-time faculty made up 65% of all faculty in U.S. colleges and universities (Curtis & Jacobe, 2006). By 2009, that number jumped to almost 70% of all faculty (Knapp, Kelly-Reid, & Ginder, 2010), illustrating the continuing rise in the use of adjunct instructors. The expansion of the community college system has been proposed as the reason for the significant increase in adjunct instructor use (Benjamin, 2003a), and community colleges tend to exhibit the greatest need for using adjuncts, whereas public colleges have the least need for adjunct instructors (Parrott et al., 2007).

Because the cost of hiring adjunct instructors is significantly less than full-time faculty members, the primary reason for hiring adjuncts, especially during times of diminishing budgets, is monetary (Halcrow & Olson, 2008). For example, a 2010 survey conducted by the Coalition on the Academic Workforce showed that low median compensation for adjunct instructors is $2,700 for a three-credit class, which equates to $21,600 annually (four courses per semester),
compare to beginning tenure-track faculty that average $66,000 (Landry, 2013). However, other factors for hiring adjuncts include fluctuations in enrollments, the ease of hiring and firing part-time instructors (Halcrow & Olson, 2008), decreases in state aid (Green, 2007), and a possible increase in dedication to teaching over full-time faculty since a majority of their time is spent in the classroom compared to full-time faculty members (Schmidt, 2008). In addition, the need for “real-world” expertise (Berry, 1999), the greater need for flexible scheduling (Lyons, 2007; Puzziferro & Shelton, 2009), and increasing enrollments (Green, 2007) contribute to the rise in adjunct instructor use.

As more institutions are utilizing adjunct instructors to teach in all disciplines, adjunct instructor satisfaction and organizational commitment are concerns for administrators who have been charged with the challenges of academic leadership and resource allocation. Several studies have been conducted on factors that influence job satisfaction and organizational commitment among full-time and part-time adjunct faculty at collegiate institutions. In particular, these studies have found that satisfaction is influenced by relationships with students and coworkers (Lane, Esser, Holte, & McCusker, 2010; Paul & Phua, 2011; Schroder, 2003); recognition for positive efforts (Dolan, 2011); service to society (Martinak, Karlsson, Faircloth, & Witcher, 2006); seeing students learn and grow (Marston & Brunetti, 2009); and autonomy (Hashim & Mahmood, 2011; Saad, Samah, & Juhdi, 2008). Dissatisfaction is influenced by lack of departmental recognition (Fagan-Wilen, Springer, Ambrosino, & White, 2006), job security (American Federation of Teachers, 2010; Gappa, 2000), salary (Fountain, 2005; Gappa, 2000; Milliken & Jurgens, 2008), lack of benefits (Gappa & Leslie, 1997), exclusion from meetings, curriculum design, etc. (Waltman, Hollenshead, August, Miller, & Bergom, 2012). In terms of organizational commitment, studies have found that commitment for faculty is influenced by
working conditions and achievement (Schroder, 2003), feelings of organizational support (Carver & Candela, 2008; Leininger, 2004; Messer, 2006), training and career development (Lawrence, Ott, & Bell, 2011; Sarabia, 2002), role ambiguity and role conflict (Gormely, 2005), integration into campus culture (Schuster, 2003), and mentor assignment (Carlson, 2005). These empirical studies are significant because they support the two theories that will inform this research study: Herzberg’s two-factor theory for job satisfaction and the Social Exchange Theory for organizational commitment. Herzberg’s two-factor theory, also known as the motivation-hygiene theory, suggests that job satisfaction is caused by motivating factors, such as interesting work, recognition of achievement, and enhanced responsibility, whereas dissatisfaction is caused by a lack of hygiene factors, such as policy, administration, salary, working conditions, etc. (Herzberg, Mansner, & Snyderman, 1959). As indicated from the empirical studies mentioned previously, job satisfaction is caused by what Herzberg would call “motivators”, such as relationships, recognition, and autonomy, verifying the support of this theory on the empirical job satisfaction studies. The Social Exchange Theory, first introduced by Blau (1964), states that relationships between individuals are created when they can provide each other with valued resources, and the exchange of resources will create reciprocity amongst those involved (Umbach, 2008). As mentioned in the background section, adjunct instructors provide postsecondary institutions with a cost-effective means of instruction, and in return, these institutions provide adjunct instructors with intrinsic rewards, feelings of support, proper working conditions, and other factors related to commitment, as indicated by the empirical research. This verifies that the Social Exchange Theory supports the empirical research on factors related to organizational commitment.
In terms of demographic variables, all ten variables being investigated have been analyzed in previous studies in their relationship to job satisfaction and organizational commitment (see Table 1 and 2). However, in relation to job satisfaction, previous studies have shown contradicting results in terms of the relationship between variable and satisfaction with age (Boord, 2010; Dickens, 2011); gender (Ghafoor, 2012; Malik, Saleem, & Ahmad, 2010), ethnicity (Boord, 2010; Dickens, 2011); education level (Selingo, 2008; Brown & Sargeant, 2007), teaching experience (Brown & Sargeant, 2007; Castillo & Cano, 2004), teaching discipline (Akroyd, Bracken & Chambers, 2011; Bentely et al., 2013; Dickens, 2011), and perceived fit (Castiglia, 2006; Chunjiang, Honglan, & Ye, 2011). In relation to organizational commitment, previous studies have shown contradicting results in terms of the relationship between variable and commitment with age (Chughtai & Zahar, 2006; Gebremichael & Prasada Rao, 2013); gender (Dixon, Turner, Cunningham, Sagas, & Kent, 2005; Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979; Salami, 2008), education level (Gebremichael & Prasada Rao, 2013; Sharma, 1994), teaching experience (Austin-Hickey, 2013; Sharma, 1994), and teaching load (Demirtas, 2010; Riehl & Sipple, 1996). In addition, some variables have never been studied in a higher education setting, such as teaching load. Due to these mixed results and populations, it is crucial that these variables are studied with adjunct instructors at a career college to add to the literature and analyze a new population.

**Theoretical Framework**

For job satisfaction, the theory that I will use to guide my research is Herzberg’s Two-factor theory. This theory, developed in 1959 by Frederic Herzberg, was originally developed after interviewing over 200 accountants and engineers regarding what caused job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction (Smerek & Peterson, 2007). Herzberg studied twelve different organizations,
and from these studies, classified work dimensions into two categories: motivators and hygiene factors. The motivators were events described by the interviewees as satisfying, and included achievement, work itself, advancement and growth, recognition, and responsibility (Smerek & Peterson, 2007). Hygiene factors was a term Herzberg gave to factors that created negative experiences amongst the interviewees, and these often included the following: company policy and administration, relationship with supervisor, salary, work conditions, supervision, security, subordinates, personal life, relationship with peers, and status (Smerek & Peterson, 2007).

Herzberg noticed that hygiene factors were related to external disruptions, whereas motivators were related to internal processes and feelings. Herzberg’s dual theory on job satisfaction contradicted the traditional notion that increasing a hygiene factor, such as salary, would increase job satisfaction, by showing that you can only improve job satisfaction by increasing the six motivators, not by improving the ten hygiene factors (Smerek & Peterson, 2007). Herzberg concluded that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are on different continua, and that motivational factors cause satisfaction or no satisfaction (but not dissatisfaction), whereas hygiene factors cause no dissatisfaction when present and dissatisfaction when absent (Mehboob, Bhutto, Azhar, & Butt (2012).
Despite the fact that Herzberg originated his theory from interviews with accountants and engineers, several studies have demonstrated the theory’s applicability to higher education institutions for both full-time faculty (Cohen, 1974; Iiacqua, Schumacher, & Li, 2001; Malik, 2011; Mehboob et al., 2012) and adjunct faculty (Boord, 2010; Dickens, 2011; Lewis, 2012; Ramsey, 2011; Tomanek, 2010). Since these studies found similar results to Herzberg’s original study, this theory is appropriate to guide this research study. However, there have been several criticisms of Herzberg’s Two-Factor theory over the years, with one of those criticisms being that Herzberg did not take individual differences into consideration when designing his theory (Hackman & Oldman, 1976; in Darteg-Bach & Amoako, 2011). Herzberg claimed that his
model is applicable to all individuals in the workforce, regardless of individual differences such as age, experience, gender, etc (Hackman & Oldman, 1976; in Darteg-Bach & Amoako, 2011). In 1997 Wiley conducted a survey of 460 agencies from a variety of sectors and found that pay and job security were top rated motivators, despite that fact that Herzberg classified these as hygiene factors (Kim, 2006). All of the variables being analyzed in the current study have been demonstrated to show relationship to both job satisfaction and organizational commitment (see Tables 1 and 2), and therefore Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory is appropriate to serve as the theoretical framework for this study, despite not taking individual differences into account.

For organizational commitment, the theory that I will use to guide my research is the social exchange theory. This theory was developed by Peter Blau (1964) and has been used to study individual relationships and the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960). One of the essential themes of the social exchange theory is that relationships develop over time into mutual commitments based on loyalty and trust (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; in Malik et al& Naeem, 2011). This is applied to the employee-organization relationship, in which an exchange of resources (tangible or symbolic) are exchanged between both parties, and that interactions among individuals occurs through social and/or material exchanges for the purpose of achieving a desired resource (Cook & Rice, 2006; in Gutierrez, Candela, & Carver, 2012). As long as both parties are satisfied with the exchange, the relationship will continue (Bielkiewicz, 2011). In terms of organizational commitment, the social exchange theory posits that individuals will form relationships with those who can provide desired resources, and that individuals will therefore feel committed to organizations that offer support and rewards (Umbach, 2007). Employees that perceive a high level of support from their organizations are more likely to demonstrate positive attitudes, high levels of affective commitment, and lower intentions to leave the organization and
increased commitment to organizational goals (Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli, & Lynch, 1997; in Lew, 2009). Social exchange theory also suggest that part-time employees typically exhibit lower levels of commitment, causing decreased levels of performance, but that may not necessarily apply to faculty (Umbach, 2007).

Although there have been several studies that have looked at the variables being researched in the current study and organizational commitment (see Table 2), very few studies have used the social exchange theory as the theoretical framework when looking at organizational commitment of higher education faculty (Lawrence et al., 2011; Murphy, 2009; Salim, Kamarudin, & Kadir, 2008; Umbach, 2007). Since this study is focused on adjunct faculty, the social exchange theory is applicable to determine if contingent faculty exhibit high levels of commitment, and that the variables being researched have been linked to impacting organizational commitment.

Problem Statement

Despite the numerous studies that exist depicting what influences satisfaction and commitment with adjunct instructors, very few studies have examined the relationship between adjunct instructor characteristics and their relationship to job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In researching job satisfaction, a few studies have investigated age (Boord, 2010; Dickens, 2011; Malik, 2011) Schulz, 2009; Tomanek, 2010), career status (American Federation of Teachers, 2010; Lewis, 2012), gender (Boord, 2010; Dickens, 2011;Gahfoor, 2012; Malik, 2011), ethnicity (Boord, 2010; Dickens, 2011; Ramsey, 2011; Seifert & Umbach, 2011; Tack & Patitu, 1992), and discipline (Akroyd, Bracken, & Chambers, 2011; Bentely et al., 2013; Dickens, 2011; Outcalt, 2002; Schroder, 2008; Wagoner, 2007), years of teaching experience (Dickens, 2011; Lewis, 2012; Milliken & Jurgens, 2008), teaching load (American Federation of
Teachers, 2010), and subject matter (Benjamin, 1998; Boord; 2010; Dickens, 2011; Tomanek, 2010). However, these studies have produced contradictory results in terms of age (Boord, 2010; Dickens, 2011; Malik, 2011) Schulz, 2009; Tomanek, 2010), career status (American Federation of Teachers, 2010; Lewis, 2012), gender (Boord, 2010; Dickens, 2011;Gahfoor, 2012; Malik, 2011), ethnicity (Boord, 2010; Dickens, 2011; Ramsey, 2011; Seifert & Umbach, 2011; Tack & Patitu, 1992), and discipline (Akroyd et al., 2011; Bentely, Coates, Dobson, Goedegebuure, & Meek, 2013; Dickens, 2011; Outcalt, 2002; Schroder, 2008; Shiffman, 2009; Wolf, 2012). In addition, several theoretically justified characteristics have rarely been examined in higher education settings in terms of how they impact job satisfaction and organizational commitment, such as perceived fit (Castiglia, 2006; Olsen, Maple, & Stage, 1995).

The number of online instructors is growing significantly, and almost all institutions (83%) offer distance education with expectations that this trend will increase (Allan & Seaman, 2007). Several researchers have studied the motivators for online instructors (Lewis, 2009; Runyon, 2008; Satterlee, 2008; Schopieray, 2006; Schroeder, 2008; Shiffman, 2009; Wolf, 2012). However, only two studies have compared the causes of job satisfaction between traditional and online instructors from the same institution (Preziosi & Gooden, 2003; Swartz, Cole, & Shelley, 2010). Both found that traditional instructors were overall more satisfied than online instructors, but these studies combined data from full-time and part-time instructors and both examined only one specific discipline (business law and business education). To accurately assess differences in adjunct instructor job satisfaction between face-to-face, online, and blended modalities, satisfaction should be compared between only adjunct instructors across all disciplines at the same institution to help control for various elements, such as assignments, textbooks, etc. (Weber & Lennon, 2007). Moreover, faculty satisfaction has been used as an accurate measure for
program effectiveness (Lock Haven University, 2004). In addition, no studies have researched adjunct instructor characteristics and job satisfaction in blended classes, a conspicuous gap in the current research. In terms of organizational commitment, only one study has compared the organizational commitment of adjunct instructors teaching in the online versus face-to-face environments (Borchers & Teahen, 2001), and they found no significant difference in commitment between traditional full-time, online full-time, traditional part-time, and online part-time. A weakness of this study was that it looked at two institutions, and did not focus solely on adjunct instructors.

Lastly, all of the studies that have researched adjunct instructor characteristics and job satisfaction and organizational commitment have either utilized populations from community colleges (Austin-Hickey, 2013; Boord, 2010; Dickens, 2011; Engle, 2010), four-year universities (Brown & Sargeant, 2007; Castillo & Cano, 2004; Dickens, 2011; Lewis, 2012; Seifert & Umbach, 2008), or graduate schools (Preziosi & Gooden, 2003), for both online and residential (Gould, 2007; Preziosi & Gooden, 2003; Swartz et al., 2010; Tomanek, 2010; Vest, 2009). No studies have investigated adjunct instructor characteristics and how they relate to satisfaction and commitment at multiple-campus career college systems. Career colleges focus more on hands-on training in fields that demand a specific skill set, such as health care and technology, in contrast to a traditional university that focuses on a more broad educational experience directed more toward skills such as research and analysis (Lake City Reporter, 2012). Determining if adjunct characteristics can be used to predict satisfaction and commitment at career colleges is needed in order to ensure that these characteristics are being analyzed for all institutions.
Purpose Statement

The purpose of this correlational study will be to determine if select characteristics of adjunct instructors can be used to predict job satisfaction and organizational commitment at a Midwestern career college system. The predictor variables to be analyzed in this study were selected based on the lack of data, inconsistency of current data, and new variables that have never been analyzed but are nonetheless theoretically relevant—thus, the study will be, in part, exploratory. The ten predictor variables for this study consist of the following: age, gender, employment status, education level, course load, teaching experience, teaching discipline, ethnicity, teaching modality, and perceived fit. Each of these predictor variables are defined later in this chapter and their empirical significance will be discussed.

One criterion variable, *job satisfaction*, will be defined as how people perceive the different aspects of their jobs (Spector, 1997). Another criterion variable, *organizational commitment*, will be defined as a strong belief in the values and goals of the organization and a willingness to apply extra effort for the organization (Mowday et al., 1979). The overall purpose of this research is to expand the existing scholarship by providing more in-depth analysis of the factors that can be used to predict job satisfaction and organizational commitment for adjunct instructors at a career college.

Significance Statement

This research is important for several reasons. First, this study will add to the existing literature regarding characteristics of adjunct instructors as they relate to job satisfaction and organizational commitment. By studying the relationship between variables that have provided conflicting results in previous studies in addition to studying new variables important to this institution and other colleges like it, the goal will be to provide a more complete picture of job
satisfaction and organizational commitment as these outcomes apply to adjunct instructors. Colleges and universities are increasingly using adjunct instructors to teach classes in all disciplines due to the benefits that these instructors provide, including reduction of costs, enrollment flexibility, and real-world expertise (Maldonado & Riman, 2009). Although numerous studies have been conducted to assess the factors that cause job satisfaction and organizational commitment, few have taken into consideration specific adjunct characteristics. If higher education leaders truly want to understand factors that can help predict satisfaction and commitment, then a complete picture of which variables are linked to satisfaction and commitment must be developed.

In addition, understanding which characteristics predict job satisfaction and organizational commitment can be an asset for administrators when hiring adjunct instructors and when they make decisions about program structure and planning. This study has practical importance for all college administrators who hire adjunct instructors (such as deans and department chairs), as well as any college administrator who has a direct interest in cost savings for the institution. If it is found that certain characteristics or values of adjunct instructors are related to organizational commitment or job satisfaction, administrators will still be able to hire adjuncts more quickly to fill last-minute vacancies but will have more certainty that those hired will likely be more satisfied and committed.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

The following research questions and hypotheses will inform this study:

**RQ1:** Do the variables of age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, outside work status, teaching load, teaching modality, teaching discipline, and perceived fit of adjunct instructors predict the attitudinal construct of job satisfaction?
H1: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variables of age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, outside work status, teaching load, teaching modality, teaching discipline, and perceived fit of adjunct instructors and the attitudinal construct of job satisfaction.

H01: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor age and job satisfaction.

H02: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor gender and job satisfaction.

H03: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor ethnicity and job satisfaction.

H04: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor education level and job satisfaction.

H05: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor teaching experience and job satisfaction.

H06: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor teaching discipline and job satisfaction.

H07: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor teaching load and job satisfaction.

H08: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor outside employment and job satisfaction.
H₀₉: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor teaching modality and job satisfaction.

H₀₁₀: There will not be statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor perceived fit and job satisfaction.

RQ₂: Do the variables of age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, outside work status, teaching load, teaching modality, teaching discipline, and perceived fit of adjunct instructors predict the attitudinal construct of organizational commitment?

H₁: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variables of age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, outside work status, teaching load, teaching modality, teaching discipline, and perceived fit of adjunct instructors and the attitudinal construct of organizational commitment.

H₀₁: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor age and organizational commitment.

H₀₂: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor gender and organizational commitment.

H₀₃: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor ethnicity and organizational commitment.

H₀₄: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor education level and organizational commitment.
H₀₅: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor teaching experience and organizational commitment.

H₀₆: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor teaching discipline and organizational commitment.

H₀₇: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor teaching load and organizational commitment.

H₀₈: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor outside employment and organizational commitment.

H₀₉: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor teaching modality and organizational commitment.

H₀₁₀: There will not be statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor perceived fit and organizational commitment.

Selection and Identification of Variables

The predictor variables in this study will be the ten adjunct characteristics used to describe the population (age, gender, employment status, education level, teaching experience, course load, teaching discipline, ethnicity, teaching modality, and perceived fit). Tables 1.1 and 1.2 illustrate the empirical reasons as to why these variables were selected for the current study.
Table 1.1

Reasons for Variable Selection for Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Related to Job Satisfaction?</th>
<th>Relationship to Job Satisfaction in Higher Education</th>
<th>Reason for inclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Yes (Boord, 2010; Brown &amp; Sargeant, 2007; Feldman &amp; Turnley, 2001; Schulz, 2009; Tomanek, 2010)</td>
<td>Community College (Boord, 2010; Dickens, 2011; Ramsey, 2011; Schulz, 2009; Tomanek, 2010)</td>
<td>• Mixed results • No data for career colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (Dickens, 2011; Malik, 2011; Ramsey, 2011)</td>
<td>Four-year (Dickens, 2011)</td>
<td>• Add to existing literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Yes (Boord, 2010; Gahfoor, 2012; Seifert &amp; Umbach, 2008)</td>
<td>Community College (Boord, 2010; Dickens, 2011; Ramsey, 2011; Rosser &amp; Townsend, 2006; Tomanek, 2010)</td>
<td>• Mixed results • No data for career colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (Dickens, 2011; Malik, 2011; Ramsey, 2011; Rosser &amp; Townsend, 2006; Sayagi, Tolon, &amp; Tekogul, 2011; Tomanek, 2010)</td>
<td>Four-Year (Dickens, 2011; Seifert &amp; Umbach, 2008)</td>
<td>• Add to existing literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large University (Gahfoor, 2012; Malik, 2011; Sayagi et al., 2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Yes (Boord, 2010; Seifert &amp; Umbach, 2011; Tack &amp; Patitu, 1992)</td>
<td>Community College (Boord, 2010; Dickens, 2011; Ramsey, 2011; Tomanek, 2010)</td>
<td>• Mixed results • No data for career colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (Dickens, 2011; Olsen, et al., 1995; Ramsey, 2011)</td>
<td>Four-Year (Dickens, 2011; Seifert &amp; Umbach, 2008)</td>
<td>• Add to existing literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large University (Olsen et al., 1995; Tack &amp; Patitu, 1992)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Related to Job Satisfaction?</th>
<th>Relationship to Job Satisfaction in Higher Education</th>
<th>Reason for Inclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>Yes (Blank, 1993; Dickens, 2011; Niehoff, 1997; Outcalt, 2002; Selingo, 2008; Schroder, 2003; Schroder, 2008; Wagoner, 2007)</td>
<td>Community College (Outcalt, 2002; Ramsey, 2011; Wagoner, 2007)Four-Year (Dickens, 2011)</td>
<td>• Mixed Results • No data for career colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (Brown &amp; Sargeant, 2007; Ramsey, 2011)</td>
<td>Large University (Brown &amp; Sargeant, 2007; Niehoff, 1997; Selingo, 2008)</td>
<td>• Add to existing literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>Yes (Brown &amp; Sargeant, 2007; Dickens, 2011; Santhaparaj &amp; Alam, 2005)</td>
<td>Community College (Ramsey, 2011)Four-Year (Dickens, 2011)</td>
<td>• Mixed Results • No data for career colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (Castillo &amp; Cano, 2004; Saifuddin, Zaman, &amp; Nawaz, 2010; Ghafoor, 2012; Mehboob et al., 2012; Malik, 2011; Ramsey, 2011)</td>
<td>Large University (Brown &amp; Sargeant, 2007; Castillo &amp; Cano, 2004; Saifuddin et al., 2010, 2010; Ghafoor, 2012; Malik, 2010); Mehboob et al., 2012; Santhaparaj &amp; Alam, 2005)</td>
<td>• Add to existing literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Discipline</td>
<td>Yes (Akroyd et al., 2011; Outcalt, 2002; Schroder, 2008; Wagoner, 2007)</td>
<td>Community College (Akroyd et al., 2011; Outcalt, 2002; Wagoner, 2007)</td>
<td>• Mixed Results • No data for career colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (Bentely et al., 2013; Dickens, 2011, Saifuddin et al., 2010, 2010)</td>
<td>Four-Year (Dickens, 2010)Large University (Bentley et al., 2013; Saifuddin et al., 2010, 2010)University Administration and Staff (Schroder, 2008)</td>
<td>• Add to existing literature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Related to Job Satisfaction?</th>
<th>Relationship to Job Satisfaction in Higher Education</th>
<th>Reason for Inclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Load</td>
<td>Yes (American Federation of Teachers, 2010; Cashwell, 2009; Hoyt, 2012)</td>
<td>Community College (Cashwell, 2009)</td>
<td>• Few studies exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large University (Hoyt, 2012)</td>
<td>• No data for career colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community College, Four-Year College, and University (American Federation of Teachers, 2010)</td>
<td>• Add to existing literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Work Status</td>
<td>Yes (American Federation of Teachers, 2010; Feldman &amp; Turnley, 2001; Lewis, 2012)</td>
<td>Community College, Four-Year College, and University (American Federation of Teachers, 2010)</td>
<td>• Few studies exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large University (Feldman &amp; Turnley, 2001; Lewis, 2012)</td>
<td>• No data for career colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Add to existing literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Modality</td>
<td>Yes (Gould, 2007; Preziosi &amp; Shelley, 2010; Swartz et al., 2010; Tomanek, 2010; Vest, 2009)</td>
<td>Large University (Gould, 2007; Preziosi &amp; Gooden, 2003; Swartz et al, 2010; Vest, 2009)</td>
<td>• Few studies exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community College (Tomanek, 2010)</td>
<td>• Only one study looking at hybrid instruction (Tomanek, 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No data for career colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Add to existing literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Fit</td>
<td>Yes (Chunijiang et al., 2011; Karakurum, 2005; Liu, Liu, &amp; Hu, 2010; Olsen et al., 1995)</td>
<td>Large University (Olsen et al., 1995)</td>
<td>• Few studies exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Four-year college (Castiglia, 2006)</td>
<td>• No data for career colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (Castiglia, 2006)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Add to existing literature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.2

*Reasons for Variable Selection for Organizational Commitment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Related to Commitment?</th>
<th>Relationship to Commitment in Higher Education</th>
<th>Reason for inclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Four-Year University Adjunct Instructors (Murphy, 2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full-Time College and University Instructors (Nagar, 2010; Sharma, 1994; Tabbodi, 2009)</td>
<td>• Few studies in higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community College (part-time and full-time) (Engle, 2010)</td>
<td>• No data for career colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Yes (Akintayo, 2010; Alfolabi Obude, Okediji, &amp; Ezeh, 2008; Gebremichael &amp; Prasada Rao, 2013; Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2010; Nagar, 2012; Tabbodi, 2009) No (Murphy, 2009; Salami, 2008)</td>
<td>Four-Year University Adjunct Instructors (Murphy, 2009)</td>
<td>• Mixed results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full-Time College and University Instructors (Nagar, 2012; Tabbodi, 2009)</td>
<td>• Few studies in higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Administrators and Staff (Gebremichael &amp; Prasada Rao, 2013)</td>
<td>• No data for career colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Yes (Andrews-Little, 2007; Cohen, 2006; Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2010; Murphy, 2009)</td>
<td>University Administration (Andrews-Little, 2007)</td>
<td>• Few studies in higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Four-Year University Adjunct Instructors (Murphy, 2009)</td>
<td>• No data for career colleges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Related to Job Satisfaction?</th>
<th>Relationship to Job Satisfaction in Higher Education</th>
<th>Reason for Inclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (Sharma, 1994)</td>
<td>Full-Time college &amp; University Instructors (Ling &amp; Ling, 2012; Sharma, 1994)</td>
<td>• Few studies in higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Administrators &amp; Staff (Gebremichael &amp; Prasala Rao, 2013)</td>
<td>• No data for career colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>Yes (Al-Aameri, 2000; Austin-Hickey, 2013; Demirtas, 2010; Gebremichael &amp; Prasada Rao, 2013; Uchenna &amp; Tolulope, 2013)</td>
<td>Full-Time College and University Instructors (Sharma, 1994)</td>
<td>• Mixed results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (Sharma, 1994)</td>
<td>University Administrators and Staff (Gebremichael &amp; Prasada Rao, 2013; Uchenna &amp; Tolulope, 2013)</td>
<td>• Few studies in higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community College (part-time and full-time) (Austin-Hickey, 2013)</td>
<td>• No data for career colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Discipline</td>
<td>Yes (Richards, O’Brien, &amp; Akroyd, 1994)</td>
<td>Vocational Teachers (Richards, 1994)</td>
<td>• No studies in higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Load</td>
<td>Yes (Riehl &amp; Sipple, 1996)</td>
<td>No studies in higher education</td>
<td>• No studies in higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (Demirtas, 2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Work Status</td>
<td>Yes (Austin-Hickey, 2013)</td>
<td>Community College (part-time and full-time) (Austin-Hickey, 2013)</td>
<td>• Few studies in higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No data for career colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Modality</td>
<td>No (Borchers &amp; Teahen, 2001)</td>
<td>Private, Midwestern University (Borchers &amp; Teahen, 2001 )</td>
<td>• Few studies in higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Fit</td>
<td>Yes (Castiglia, 2006; Karakurum, 2005; Liu et al., 2010; Silverthorne, 2004)</td>
<td>Four-year College (Castiglia, 2006)</td>
<td>• Few studies in higher education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following categories will be used for each of the predictor variables:

**Age**

The same categories for age utilized in the National Study of Post-Secondary Faculty (2005) will be used for this study, which are: Under 35, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-69, and 70 or Over.

**Gender**

Measured on a dichotomous scale as either male or female (Johnson, 2009).

**Employment Status**

The same categories for employment status utilized in the National Study of Post-Secondary Faculty (2004) will be used for this study, which are: only employment is part-time at the institution (excluding consulting), part-time but preferred full-time, part-time employment is primary, and other current jobs/full-time employment.

**Education Level**

The same categories for education level utilized in the National Study of Post-Secondary Faculty (2004) will be used for this study, which are doctorate, first-professional, masters, bachelors, and less than bachelor’s. For the category “first-professional,” the researcher will include those instructors who have credits beyond a master’s degree, and this includes an educational specialist degree as well.

**Teaching Experience**

The same categories for amount of teaching experience utilized by Dickens (2011) will be used for this study, which are: 0-3 years, 4-6 years, 7-9 years, and greater than 10 years.
Course Load

The following categories will be used for course load: one-three courses/year, four-six courses/year, seven-ten courses/year, greater than 10 courses/year.

Teaching Discipline

Discipline categories will include the following: Business, Education (including early childhood education), Health Sciences, General Education (which will include math, English, and communications), and Social Sciences (which will include Human Services, Criminal Justice, Interpreter Training, and Psychology). In addition, developmental education will be a separate category (math, reading, and writing) and will be compared with the other disciplines.

Ethnicity

The same categories for ethnicity utilized in the National Survey of Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty (American Federation of Teachers, 2010) will be used for this study, which are: Caucasian, African American, Hispanic, Asian, and other. However, if the population is determined to be mostly Caucasian, then ethnicity will be measured on a dichotomous scale as either Caucasian or Non-Caucasian (Johnson, 2009).

Teaching Modality

Environment will either be completely online, completely face-to-face, or blended (combination of online and face-to-face).

Perceived Fit

Perceived fit will be defined as how well individuals perceive that their values and personality match those of the organization (Cable & Judge, 1997), and will be measured using the perceived person-organization fit instrument to determine employee’s own perception of their fit within the organization (Cable & Judge, 1997).
The criterion variables in this study will be organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

**Job Satisfaction**

Churchill, Ford, and Walker (1974) operationally defined job satisfaction as the work-related affection states that covers the work aspects of supervisors, colleagues, jobs, compensation, and promotion opportunities (Zhu, 2012). Job satisfaction will be measured using part-time faculty job satisfaction survey, developed by Hoyt et al. (2007).

**Organizational Commitment**

Mowday et al. (1979) operationally defined organizational commitment as the “relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (Curtis, Upchurch, & Severt, 2009, p. 257). Organizational commitment will be measured with the shortened organizational commitment questionnaire, which was originally developed by Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982).

**Definitions of Key Terms**

**Adjunct Instructor**: A faculty member who is employed on a per term contingency basis with no guarantee of being hired for the next term or academic year (Pearch & Marutz, 2005).

**Online Environment**: Classes that are “taught in a cybernetic environment in which instruction does not have to be in real time, the students are not present in one place, and the instructor monitors most of the activity from a distance” (Swartz et al., 2010, p. 2).

**Face-to-Face Environment**: Classes that are “taught in real time with the students and the instructor present” (Swartz et al., 2010, p.2).

**Blended Environment**: Classes that are taught with a mix of face-to-face interaction and Web-based distance learning (McFarlin, 2008).
**Ethnicity**: At the individual level, ethnicity can be regarded as a set of integrated outlooks and sense of belonging based on “shared beliefs, culture, and common ancestry” (Wimmer, 2008, p. 973).

**Developmental Education**: Courses in math, reading, and writing that are non-credit and designed to prepare students for college (Ashby, Sadera, & McNary, 2011).

**Career College**: A career-focused postsecondary educational institution that typically offers both nondegree and degree programs, including baccalaureate degrees (McComis, 2006). Career colleges offer trainings and certifications for high-need occupations in the community (Youngberg, 2008).

**Research Summary**

This is a quantitative correlational study that will be conducted through the use of electronic surveys sent to adjunct instructors. The correlational research approach is the most appropriate design because the study is attempting to discover potential relationships between variables (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). In this study, correlational relationships will be explored between specific adjunct characteristics and job satisfaction and specific adjunct characteristics and organizational commitment. Although definitive conclusions generally cannot be made in research designs measuring relationship between variables, correlational coefficients can provide the direction and degree of the relationship which can help to make predictions for this study, as well as determine if further, more rigorous studies are required (Gall et al., 2007). Moreover, regression analysis does allow the researcher to conclude with certainty which predictor variables forecast the criterion variables while holding all other predictors constant (Field, 2013). Similar studies that have examined different factors relating to job satisfaction and organizational
commitment have also used the correlational design and multiple regression analysis to
determine if a relationship exists (Hoyt et al., 2007; Johnson, 2009).
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Higher education institutions of all types have significantly increased the use of adjunct instructors for all disciplines during the past couple of decades, and these institutions depend on adjunct instructors to remain viable (Hoyt et al., 2007). Advantages of using adjunct instructors includes the flexibility of hiring and firing based on enrollments (Christensen, 2008; Umbach, 2007; Wallin, 2007); the decrease in cost compared to hiring full-time faculty (Gordon, 2003; Witt, Wattenbarger, Gollattscheck, & Suppiger, 1994); and the real-world expertise they bring (Berry, 1999). However, due to a number of factors, adjunct instructors are often less committed to the organization and less satisfied than full-time faculty, and this can lead to high rates of turnover, which is costly to the organization, directly, in terms of recruitment and retraining and, indirectly, in terms of severed relationships (Rosser & Townsend, 2006). However, if colleges and universities understood whether or not specific adjunct characteristics could predict organizational commitment and job satisfaction, they could continue to hire on a needed basis but have more certainty that the instructors would be satisfied and committed.

In this chapter I will begin by examining the theoretical frameworks that will be used as the foundation for this study. Following the theoretical frameworks, I will address the use of adjunct instructors, reasons for hiring adjuncts, recent research about online instruction, adjunct instructor demographics, and overall reasons for job dissatisfaction and organizational commitment. Finally, I will examine studies that have specifically addressed job satisfaction and organizational commitment with adjunct instructors, including literature on relationships between adjunct instructor demographics and satisfaction and commitment.
Theoretical Framework

Motivation-Hygiene Theory

The two-factor theory, also known as Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory, will be the foundation for the job satisfaction portion of the current research study. The motivation-hygiene theory is related to job satisfaction and suggests that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are caused by two different factors (Herzberg, 1974). Factors that create job satisfaction are called “motivators” and are related to the content of the job, such as recognition, achievement, interest of work, responsibility, growth, and advancement (Herzberg et al., 1959). However, factors related to job dissatisfaction are related more towards how they are treated as opposed to what they do, and these include company policies, administrative practices, interpersonal relationships, salary, benefits, job security, and status (Herzberg et al., 1959). Herzberg called these factors “hygiene” factors since they are representative of environmental conditions that can be prevented. Because separate factors create job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction, these two feelings are not opposite one another (the opposite of satisfaction is no satisfaction). According to this theory, the nature of motivators is that they have a much more lasting effect on the attitudes and perceptions of employees than hygiene factors (Herzberg, 1968) and, therefore, organizations should put more resources into developing the intrinsic motivating factors that will produce job satisfaction, as opposed to focusing on hygiene factors that are associated with dissatisfaction.

Herzberg’s two-factor theory provides an appropriate lens through which to view the problem of adjunct instructor satisfaction and commitment in part due to the empirical support researchers have found for this theory in explaining job satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Ivancevich, Konopaske, & Matteson, 2011; Pink, 2009). For example, several studies have
shown that adjunct instructors are satisfied with academic freedom, intrinsic satisfaction with teaching, intellectual stimulation of the work, and the impact on student lives, which are described as motivator factors by Herzberg, yet were overly dissatisfied with issues such as salaries, pensions, benefits, job security, and lack of support, which are described as hygiene factors by Herzberg (American Federation of Teachers, 2010; Antony & Valadez, 2002; Diener, 1985; Gappa, 2000; Hoyt et al., 2007; Tompkins, 1995). Several other researchers focused on adjunct and full-time instructor job satisfaction have also used the two-factor theory as the explanatory framework to determine if the motivator and hygiene factors described by Herzberg relate to adjunct instructors (Boord, 2010; Dickens, 2011; Gullickson, 2011; Hoyt et al., 2007).

Padilla-Velez (1993) demonstrated that the motivation-hygiene theory was applicable in education settings. However, Menon et al. (2008) point out one flaw in Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory in that it fails to consider individual characteristics, such as demographics, and how these characteristics relate to employee satisfaction and motivation (Dickens, 2011). Dinham and Scott (2000) also suggested that it was a flaw in design to omit personal characteristics, and based on this, Menon et al. (2008) designed a more complex theory that included these individual characteristics (Dickens, 2011).

**Social Exchange Theory**

Although Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory helps to explain the causes of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction and can be applied to educational settings, it does not necessarily help explain factors related to organizational commitment. Therefore, social exchange theory, based on the concept of “reciprocity,” or the exchange of goods or ideas between individuals or parties (Ahmed, Ismail, Amin, & Ramzan, 2011), will be the foundation for the organizational commitment portion of this research. According to social exchange theory, one party receives
something of value from another, and the receiving party feels obligated to return something of value in exchange; if an individual wants to continue receiving benefits, that person must give something of value in return (Blau, 1964). In social situations, individuals will examine the worth of a social benefit, determine if it is valuable, and determine what they should give in return to keep receiving the benefit (Murstein, Cerreto, & MacDonald, 1977). Research has shown that when one party receives something of value from another, the receiving party has a high level of commitment towards the offering party (Becker & Gerhart, 1996) and that the social exchange theory applies to both individual relations (Blau, 1964; Rousseau, 1989) as well as relationships within the workplace (Shore, Sy, & Strauss, 2006). Basically, the social exchange theory states that an individual’s commitment to the organization is largely dependent on the balance of perceived rewards over what is inputted into the organization (Gouldner, 1960; Homans, 1958; March & Simon, 1958). This balance emphasizes the relationship between organizations and individuals; the more favorable individuals perceive the exchange, the greater his or her commitment is to the organization (Hrebinjak & Alutto, 1972). Because adjunct instructors typically have limited relationships with their collegiate employers and often receive a lack of support, they could, commensurate with this theory, exhibit low levels of organizational commitment (Umbach, 2007). Research in other areas has shown that contingent workers are, in fact, less committed than more permanent employees (Connelly & Gallagher, 2004; Liden, Wayne, Kraimer, & Sparrowe, 2003; Pearce, 1993).

**Adjunct Instructor Use**

The use of adjunct instructors to teach collegiate-level courses has increased significantly in recent years. Between 1975 and 1995, the overall increase in faculty was 50%, yet the number of part-time instructors increased by 103% (from 30 to 41% of total faculty), as compared to full-
time faculty which increased by 27% (from 70 to 59% of total faculty) (Benjamin, 2002). During this time, the number of adjunct faculty grew four times faster than the number of full-time faculty (Kavanagh, 2000). Today, almost 75% of undergraduate courses in colleges and universities are taught by adjunct instructors, and adjunct instructors now account for 47% of all faculty, and this percentage is much higher in community colleges, where adjunct instructors account for nearly 70% of faculty (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). Due to this significant rise in the use of adjunct instructors, adjuncts have become a vital resource to the country’s community colleges (Charlier & Williams, 2011) as well as other types of higher education institutions (Halcrow & Olson, 2008).

Advantages for Hiring Adjunct Instructors

The reason for the dramatic increase in the use of adjunct instructors at all types of collegiate institutions is the numerous benefits that adjuncts bring to both the institutions they serve, as well as the students. A significant benefit of hiring adjunct instructors is to provide institutions with flexibility in hiring and firing based on rapid enrollment fluctuations (Christensen, 2008; Umbach, 2007; Wallin, 2007). The spike in college enrollments seen across the country in recent years and the demands created by these enrollments could not be met without the use and reliance of adjunct instructors (Levin, 2007; Sophos, 2003; Wallin, 2004). This rise in enrollment is happening in all types of institutions, and there is only so much room that they can dedicate to full-time faculty (Halcrow & Olson, 2008). In addition, the number of classes needed to serve all students is beyond what full-time faculty are able to teach (Halcrow & Olson, 2008), and research faculty are typically less interested in teaching lower level classes at research institutes, illustrating the need for adjunct instructors (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).
Another advantage for using adjunct instructors is the economic benefit they provide to the institution. Adjunct instructors cost less to hire than full-time faculty, and in addition typically do not receive any form of benefits, such as health insurance and vacation days (Gordon, 2003; Witt et al., 1994). Due to this, institutions can hire more adjunct instructors for the same amount of money it would cost to hire one full-time faculty member. Using adjunct instructors, therefore, creates a large surplus of individuals willing to teach for low salaries and no benefits (Halcrow & Olson, 2008). In addition, adjunct instructors often do not require clerical support or office space (Witt et al., 1994). As opposed to the notion that adjunct instructors were hired based on their expertise and to complement the skills of existing faculty, the hiring of adjunct instructors is now regarded as a consequence of shrinking budgets and the state of the economy (Ehrenberg, 2000; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Jacoby, 2005; Leslie & Gappa, 2002).

Aside from meeting the enrollment and budget demands, other institutional benefits to hiring adjunct instructors includes the fact that they are typically uninterested in administrative operations (Leslie & Gappa, 2002), can be terminated at any time and are not given long-term employment contracts which helps administration deal with unstable conditions (Gappa, 1984; Sonner, 2000), and help to replace aging faculty who are about to retire or go on leave (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Gappa, 2000; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Pearch & Marutz, 2005).

In terms of teaching, adjunct instructors provide a number of benefits to the institution. Adjunct instructors are often practitioners that are currently working in their field of expertise, and that they are often better equipped to educate students regarding current practices and methods that are being used in the field and provide students with a different perspective, whereas full-time faculty often do not have that up-to-date experience necessary to prepare
students for today’s careers (Louziotis Jr., 2000; Maldonado & Riman, 2009; Wallin, 2007). Adjunct instructors bring a wealth of practical experience which enriches the culture and allows for the institution to offer programs and courses in specialized areas (Umbach, 2007; Wagoner, Metcalfe, & Olaore, 2005).

Many critics of the tenure system also argue that tenure increases costs, inhibits faculty innovation and productivity, and decreases the ability for institutions to rapidly adapt to changing market conditions (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Gappa, 2000; Leslie, 1998; Massy & Wilger, 1992; Tierney, 1998). In addition, most studies have shown that the teaching abilities of adjunct instructors are as effective as full-time faculty at meeting the student outcomes of the course (Leslie & Gappa, 2002).

**Disadvantages for Hiring Adjunct Instructors**

While there are several advantages to using adjunct instructors, there are also several disadvantages. One of the biggest disadvantages would be that they often lack formal training in education, teaching methodology, and grading methods (Erwin & Andrews, 1993), which leads to a decrease in the quality of education and teaching (Louziotis, 2000). Due to this, there is evidence that adjunct instructors overall are underperforming in their delivery of course material compared with tenured and tenured-track faculty, and also interact less with students, infrequently use collaborative and active learning methodologies, spend less time preparing for class, and have lower student expectations than full-time faculty (Umbach, 2007). This is particularly a disadvantage to less-prepared students and those in non-elite institutions who need more faculty attention (Benjamin, 2002). The reason for this lack of preparedness is largely in part due to the fact that colleges and universities are less willing to commit scarce resources into developing and training adjunct instructors since they are temporary employees (Fincher, 2006;
Poor institutional assimilation and support have been shown to reduce instructional quality and create a less cohesive environment (Benjamin, 2003a, 2003b; Cross & Goldenberg, 2003; Elman, 2003; Schuster, 2003; Thompson, 2003; Townsend, 2003). Therefore, as the number of adjunct instructors continues to rise, the potential for grade inflation and inadequate teaching methods also increases, and institutions will need to decide if the benefits of using adjuncts outweigh the costs (Sonner, 2000).

Another disadvantage argued by critics of the adjunct instructor model is that the decreasing number of tenure-track positions will irreversibly damage the academic profession and destroy academic freedom (Clark, 1987; Tierney, 1998). Adjunct instructors have been accused of demeaning academic quality and the integrity of the institution because their teaching abilities are inferior to those of full-time faculty (Gordon, 2003). Therefore, the overreliance on part-time faculty may undermine the successful integration of students (Benjamin, 2002) and cause higher attrition of student and lower retention and graduation rates. A study conducted by Harrington & Schibik (2001) found that freshman who had a greater percentage of classes taught by adjunct instructors were more likely to drop out than those who had full-time faculty teachers. A similar study looked at data from a large number of institutions dating back to 1986 and discovered that graduation rates decreased 2.65% for every ten percent increase in employment of adjunct instructors at four-year institutions (Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005). Early exposure to part-time faculty has also been shown to negatively affect students’ major selection (Bettinger & Long, 2010). Adjunct instructors typically have earned fewer graduate degrees or credits and have less teaching experience (Conrad & Hammond, 1982), and this contributes to the thought that adjunct instructors are damaging the quality of education.
Reasons Adjunct Instructors Teach and Full-Time Versus Part-Time Preference

The reasons why a large pool of potential adjunct instructors exists at most collegiate institutions is due to the numerous reasons why adjunct instructors want to teach. While conditions are often less than ideal, many adjunct instructors have willingly accepted their part-time positions despite substandard wages and benefits (Halcrow & Olson, 2008). The reasons for this include personal growth and satisfaction, sharing their knowledge and expertise, or earning extra income (Halcrow & Olson, 2008). Adjunct instructors often are excited to teach because they love their subjects, love to teach, and are eager to share their knowledge with others (Halcrow & Olson, 2008). In addition, 50% of part-time faculty prefer part-time teaching and are not looking for full-time positions, and 34% of this group like the flexibility of adjunct instruction so that they can spend more time with personal matters, such as family (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). Adjunct instructors have reported that most are not looking for full-time positions, and instead desire respect and support from their institutions, especially from full-time faculty, and more and better support in terms of payment, benefits, and stability (Eaton, 2012). However, the percentage of adjunct instructors preferring a full-time teaching position increases to 60% for those under the age of 50, compared to 37% preferring part-time. In addition, instructors who have been at their institution five years or less prefer part-time over full-time (59% to 39%). However, instructors who have worked between 6-10 years are split on their desire to obtain a full-time position (48% part-time, 49% fulltime). Those instructors who have worked 11 or more years at their institution decisively prefer part-time over full-time (59% to 39%) (American Federation of Teachers, 2010).

In terms of other demographic characteristics, faculty teaching at four year institutions prefer part-time over full-time (51% to 45%), however faculty at two-year institutions were more
evenly split (49% each). There were also significant differences between males and females, with men preferring full-time over part-time (50% to 48%) while females preferred part-time over full-time (53% to 43%). Those earning more money per class ($2,500 or more) preferred full-time status (55% to 42%) compared to those earning less, instructors with a doctorate degree preferred part-time over full-time (55% to 42%), whereas instructors with a master’s degree were split in their preference (49% each). Instructors only having one job or multiple jobs that are not teaching both prefer part-time over full-time, however, individuals who have multiple teaching jobs prefer full-time over part-time (57% to 38%). Lastly, those teaching in the Humanities and Social Sciences prefer full-time over part-time (50% to 46%), whereas those teaching in the Physical Sciences prefer part-time over full-time (57% to 41%) (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). This data illustrates the fact that adjunct instructor characteristics can impact job preferences and desire for full-time or part-time.

Gappa and Leslie (1993) divided adjunct instructors into four categories based on their stage of life and what they are looking for as adjunct instructors. The first category, professionals, specialists, or experts, are faculty who have primary employment outside the institution and teach for the intrinsic satisfaction of the work itself and their dedication to teaching and the students they serve. The second category, career enders, are those who are either retired or in the process of retiring and want to continue to give back. The third category, freelancers, prefer working simultaneously in multiple positions, one of which is teaching part-time, and the fourth category, aspiring academics, are part-timers who aspire to become full-time, tenure-track professors (Gappa, 2000).
Adjunct Demographics and Characteristics

In 2010, the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) conducted a national survey of part-time/adjunct faculty in which they surveyed 500 part-time and adjunct faculty members employed at two-year and four-year institutions throughout the country. In this survey, AFT gathered extensive data on demographics and characteristics of adjunct faculty, including gender, age, education level, ethnicity, outside employment, and disciplines. In addition, the survey collected information on salaries, perceived levels of support, and advancement opportunities.

In terms of gender, the survey found that adjunct instructors consist of an even mix of men (52%) and women (48%), and that women make up the majority of instructors at two-year institutions (54%), while men make up the majority at four-year institutions (54%). Four-year private institution faculty consisted largely of male adjunct instructors (63%), but the proportions of faculty by gender were more evenly distributed at public institutions (51% male, 49% female). These numbers differ from demographic data in the early 1990s, in which adjunct instructors were most likely to be female as compared to full-time faculty (45% versus 33% in 1992) (Snyder & Hoffman, 2000).

Most adjunct instructors are white, non-Hispanic (84%) with the remaining instructors as four percent African American, three percent Hispanic, two percent Asian, and three percent Other (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). Approximately half of adjunct instructors (46%) are under the age of 50 (American Federation of Teachers), and the average age in 1992 was 46 years (15% under 35, 34% between 35-44, 30% between 45-54, 14% between 55-64, and 7% 65 or older) (Snyder & Hoffman, 2000). The vast majority of adjuncts have either a master’s degree (57%) or a Ph.D./professional degree (26%), with 13% stating that they only have a four-year degree (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). Faculty teaching at four-year institutions
are more likely to have a Ph.D. (33%) than faculty teaching at two-year institutions (16%). Both have decreased since the early 1990’s, in which 38% of faculty at four-year institutions had a doctorate degree compared with 13% at two-year institutions (Snyder & Hoffman, 2000).

In terms of experience, employment, and division, more than half (57%) of adjunct instructors have been teaching at their current institution for ten years or less, with 25% working five or less years and 32% working six to ten years. Twenty-eight percent of instructors have been teaching between 11-20 years, and 13% have been teaching more than 20 years (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). For employment, most faculty have multiple jobs, with 34% of faculty having only one job and 66% have two or more jobs (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). Three-fourths of adjuncts held employment outside of the college or university, with an average of 1.7 additional jobs held by faculty (Conley & Leslie, 2002). Adjunct faculty also demonstrate a long-term commitment to the institution, averaging 6.3 years of service at their current institution (Conley & Leslie, 2002). While a majority of adjunct instructors have employment elsewhere, approximately 50% prefer full-time employment at the institution and an additional 20% want to teach more courses than what they are currently teaching (Jacoby, 2001, 2005).

Lastly, the fields that contribute to the highest number of adjunct instructors include vocational (such as business and health) and liberal arts (such as English, fine arts, and mathematics), and fields that have relatively few adjunct instructors are primarily liberal arts oriented with the exception of agriculture and home economics (Benjamin, 1998). For example, Toukkoushia & Bellas (2003) found that women adjunct instructors were overall less satisfied than men, yet Milliken & Jurgen (2008), Dickens (2011), and Tomanek (2010) found no difference between genders. Similarly, Benjamin (1998) found that instructors in vocational
fields (such as first professional health, nursing, law, and business) were more satisfied than
instructors from liberal arts fields (such as history, English, and political science), yet Dickens
(2011) found no difference in satisfaction amongst disciplines.

**Online Instruction**

**History of Online Instruction**

An increasing number of U.S. workers today are telecommuters who perform their job remotely for several days of the week, and this includes adjunct instructors teaching online distance education courses (Dolan, 2011), which has become the fastest growing area in American education (Conhaim, 2003). Online distance education courses are “education or training courses delivered to off campus locations via audio, video, or computer technologies” (National Center for Education Statistics, 1999, p. 3). Education at a distance has been a part of higher education since the existence of a reliable mail system, and was originally designed solely for the military, corporate, and university continuing education (Schrum & Ohler, 2005). However, in the last few decades, the situation has changed dramatically with higher education diversifying and more people becoming interested in higher education, and societal pressures have forced institutions to offer more courses in the distance education format (Schrum & Ohler, 2005). While distance education was primarily through satellite and audio conferencing at one time, now distance education primarily includes an online component (Schrum & Ohler, 2005).

Online instruction has become an important method of higher education course delivery (Farrington, 1999; Katz, 1999; Rickard, 1999). In 1999, approximately one-third of all U.S. colleges were offering accredited online degrees, and one million students were taking at least one online course (Huffstutter & Fields, 2000). In 2004, the number of students taking at least one online course jumped to at least two million students (Allen & Seaman, 2004), and this
increased to 2.33 million by 2006 (Pope, 2006). The number of students in Fall 2006 taking at least one online course represented almost 20% of all students enrolled, which was an increase of 10.1% since 2002 (Allen & Seaman, 2007). The primary reason for this drastic increase in online instruction was due to demand (Allen & Seaman, 2007). Higher education institutions offering online courses cited increasing student access as the biggest reason for offering online courses, with 63% stating that this was very important and 30% saying it was important (Allen & Seaman, 2007).

**Advantages to Online Instruction**

There are several advantages to online instruction, such as the anytime, anywhere delivery of courses for student who are unable or have no desire to commute to campus to take face-to-face classes (Rovai & Gallien, 2005). This flexibility is highly desirable, even for on-campus students who demand convenience (Conhaim, 2003). In addition to flexibility, online instruction has allowed for the return of nontraditional students in terms of both age and responsibility. These are students who are attending college many years after graduating high school and typically have many responsibilities in their adult lives, and with this they must overcome barriers in regards to scheduling, distance, and financial support for their education, which can be achieved through the online environment (Schrum & Ohler, 2005). Institutions are feeling vulnerable because they can no longer rely on a market based solely on geography, and instead must reach out to adult learners via distance education (Schrum & Ohler, 2005).

In addition to advantages for students, there are also favorable perceptions of online instruction with instructors. Schrum and Ohler (2005) found that 78.5% of online faculty were favorable or somewhat favorable towards online instruction, with only 5.4% being very unfavorable and 7.1% being somewhat unfavorable, and that participants favorably ranked the
appropriateness of technology and its match to course content (Schrum & Ohler, 2005). Green, Alejandro, and Brown (2009) found three leading motivators of distance education faculty, which were a personal motivation to use technology, ability to reach new audiences, and presence of strong technical and administrative support. Similarly, online adjunct instructors are found to be motivated by flexible working conditions (97.37%), opportunity to share knowledge with others (89.4%), opportunity to use technology (86.84%), opportunity to gain valuable teaching experience (78.95%), the opportunity for career development and advancement (71.05%) and the challenge of learning a new teaching methodology (71.05%). Many faculty members are motivated to teach online courses because of various institutional-derived incentives such as availability of technology and departmental commitment, inducements such as pay increases and chances for promotion, as well as intrinsic rewards such as personal/professional growth, career advancement, and personal satisfaction (Moore & Anderson, 2003).

**Challenges of Online Instruction for Adjuncts and Administrators**

While there are several advantages for both adjuncts and administrators to teach and offer online education, there are also several challenges. One of the biggest challenges is the feeling of isolation that adjunct instructors experience when teaching online. Isolation that results from physical separation is a huge obstacle to develop meaningful and rewarding relationships, and these feelings of disconnection from the institution, issues, and polices affecting students and from the overall culture appears to hinder efforts in training and development of faculty (Dolan, 2011). Educational administration is often focused on the outcomes and accomplishments of task without taking the time to identify the importance of building and maintain relationships and personal connections with online instructors (Dolan, 2011). One issue that can result from
isolation is a lack of communication. It is not uncommon for online instructors to become frustrated with the lack of communication and social cues that traditional instructors are exposed to, and this can have an impact on trust and job satisfaction (Dolan, 2011). In addition, research has shown that a correlation exists between frequency of communication and organizational commitment, trust, and a sense of affiliation with the organization (Marshall, Michaels, & Mulki, 2007), and building a trusting relationship is extremely difficult from a distance (Morgan & Symon, 2002).

Another challenging issue with the online environment for instructors and administrators is the issue of burnout. Hogan and McKnight (2007) found that online instructors had an average score on the emotional exhaustion subscale, a high degree of depersonalization, and low degree of personal accomplishment, and according to Budinick (2005), higher scores on both emotional exhaustion and depersonalization subscales are indicators for higher levels of burnout. Lower scores on personal accomplishment also indicate higher levels of burnout, and these results indicate that online instructors are, on average, close to burnout and moving towards a high degree of burnout (Hogan & McKnight, 2007). As growth in distance education increases, the demands on faculty will also increase, and they must be constantly online to meet the high demands of the asynchronous environment, which could lead to more incidences of burnout and high levels of faculty turnover (Dunlap, 2005; McCann & Holt, 2009). However, McCann and Holt (2009) found that emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishments for online instructors are improving over time, and this is likely due to the fact that distance learning is being refined and improved through trial and error, and that the standardization of content management formats allow for instructors to be familiar with the format as they move from school to school.
Another challenge faced by administration to solicit participation of faculty in distance education is the lack of fit the online program has with the mission and goals of the university, which can lead to a lack of support from the institution (Sumrall, 2002). Institutions that are unable to convince faculty that the technology is reliable, the quality of the online program is at least equal to that of traditional programs, provide faculty with adequate time to prepare their distance education course, and do not establish a clear vision of distance education programs are unlikely to recruit quality faculty for online courses (Keeton, 2000).

Other challenges to the online environment include complexities of the learning paradigm due to the addition of having to learn about methods, content, and delivery systems used for online education (Hogan, McKnight, & Legier, 2006), time and effort required to teach online versus the traditional format, lack of financial compensation for work performed, lack of institutional support, lack of recognition for efforts and accomplishments, lack of adequate training, and lack of online teaching experience (Belcheir & Cucek, 2002; Bower, 2001; Brown, 2003; Giannoni & Tesone, 2003; Moore & Anderson, 2003; Passmore, 2000; Schweber, Kelley, & Orr, 1998; Sumrall, 2002).

**Adjunct Perceptions of Modality**

Despite the increase in part-time adjunct instructors, many higher education institutions do not have adequate procedures and policies in place to support these faculty members (Eaton, 2012; June, 2012). According to Alfred (2003), colleges and universities place a great deal of trust and responsibility in adjunct instructors due to their significant roles, yet do not meet the needs of these instructors. A lack of support can lead to feelings of being undervalued, unsupported, unappreciated, and excluded from collegial activities (Halcrow & Olson, 2008). Wyles (1998) stated that part-time faculty are often asked to serve loyally without enjoying
professional respect or trust from the organization. These actions can often lead to lower levels of job satisfaction and performance (Fagan-Wilen et al., 2006), which can be detrimental to institutions in terms of high turnover and low retention rates for adjunct instructors (Pearch & Marutz, 2005). Adjunct faculty turnover has been shown to be costly in terms of course adaptation and redevelopment and the retraining of faculty (Pferdehirt, Smith, & Al-Ashakr, 2005). In addition, due to factors such as low pay and being undervalued, adjunct instructors are possibly not as committed to the organization as full-time faculty (Borchers & Teahen, 2001). Green (2007) emphasized that many adjunct instructors feel disconnected and unappreciated by the organization and feel as if they are not truly a part of the institution. Often, adjuncts feel as if full-time faculty do not respect and admire adjunct faculty, and this can greatly lower morale and enthusiasm, which can be detrimental to the institution (Green, 2007).

Adjunct instructors who teach in distance education programs often have similar perceptions of self-value as those who teach in the on ground environment. Online instructors often feel isolated and experience a lack of recognition from the institution, lack of technical support, and ineffective evaluations (Hiltz, Kim, & Shea, 2007). Teaching an online class is a different from teaching in a traditional classroom for several reasons: increased use of technology, lack of face-to-face interaction, instructor perception of spending more time facilitating online than in the traditional format, and the increased complexity of the learning paradigm--instructors for online courses are responsible for the methods and delivery systems in addition to the traditional responsibilities of lesson planning and instruction (Hogan et al., 2006; Shepherd, Alpert, & Koeller, 2007). Due to these changes, many online instructors additionally feel as if their training was insufficient and that the process of acquiring the knowledge and skills
to deliver highly effective instruction in the online environment is likely an added stress and source of burnout for online instructors (Hogan & McKnight, 2007).

Aside from strictly face-to-face or strictly online, another modality developed in recent years to offer courses is through a blended format, which is defined as the combination of face-to-face classroom instruction with online educational technologies (McFarlin, 2008). Peercy and Cramer (2011) emphasized the different learning styles of the “net generation” and how the traditional methods of teaching will no longer apply, and that the push for more blended instruction may be the solution (Popma, 2012). Blended instruction allows for the course to provide the benefits of both an online course (such as flexibility and ease of discussion) with a traditional face-to-face course (such as face time and personal connections) (Lamport & Hill, 2012). However, similar to the online environment, the adoption of blended instruction by faculty has been slow, and dissatisfaction can arise due to greater preparation demands, increased workload, technological demands, and instructional support (Oh & Park, 2009). These trends point to an increasing emphasis for higher education leaders to recognize the existence and possible consequences of job dissatisfaction among adjunct instructors.

If higher education leaders had a general understanding of adjunct instructor characteristics that impact job satisfaction and organizational commitment, they could tailor professional development and other support services towards these needs and adjust current adjunct hiring practices to address problems in organizational commitment and job satisfaction and, therefore, increase productivity, student learning, and overall retention. Others, however, believe that part-time instructors are employed elsewhere by choice and teach part-time solely for personal satisfaction, economic gain, and potential career advancement (Louziotis, 2000;
Lyons, 1999). According to this view, improving conditions to increase commitment and satisfaction should not be a priority.

**Job Satisfaction**

**Definition and Importance of Job Satisfaction**

According to Spector (1997), job satisfaction is defined as “how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs. It is the extent to which people like or dislike their jobs” (p.2). Job satisfaction reflects the degree to which the work environment (i.e. career, coworkers, administration, tasks, etc.) meet the needs and desires of the individual (Baotham, 2010) and refers to a pleasurable state created through an individual’s work experience (Locke, 1976). Job satisfaction is typically measured in degrees and can be examined using multiple constructs and categories, as well as from a variety of viewpoints (Schmidt, 2007). Job satisfaction is influenced by ‘motivating’ factors, such as challenging work, interest, accountability, and autonomy to make decisions (Herzberg, 1987).

Job satisfaction is an area of study that has received significant attention over the years, as many classic theorists such as Herzberg (1971) and Vroom (1964) relate this to voluntary turnover (Wilson, 2009). Job satisfaction, therefore, is a concern to managers and administrators (Balzer et al. 2000). A recent survey conducted by the Conference Board Research Group showed that only 45% of Americans are satisfied with their work, which is the lowest level in the 22 years of studying this issue (down from 61% in 1987) (Gibbons, 2010). This can be attributed to a number of factors, such as weak wage growth, higher individual costs for health insurance, and overall finding jobs less interesting (Gibbons, 2010). This overall lack of job satisfaction means that more unhappy workers are remaining at their jobs, which can stifle innovation and hurt America’s productivity and competitiveness (Gibbons, 2010). In addition, it
has been documented that job satisfaction has a direct impact on absenteeism (Scott & Taylor, 1985), turnover (Tett & Meyer, 1993) and model citizenship (Bateman & Organ, 1983) and a direct positive correlation exists between high job performance and job satisfaction (Foulkrod, Field, & Brown, 2010). Chen, Yang, Shian, & Wang (2006) demonstrated that adjunct instructors who are more satisfied typically exhibit higher quality teaching and research (Dickens, 2011).

There are several theories that have been developed relating to job satisfaction, such as the person work theory which suggests that individuals who have very little or no decision-making power and job control increases job stress and that employee satisfaction increases when individuals had a high level of control in a demanding and stimulating job (Karasek & Theorell, 1990; in Dickens, 2011). The met expectations theory (Travis, 2006) is a theory related to personal responsibility of the employee and that as an employee increased effort, performance increased resulting in both extrinsic and intrinsic rewards, and that increases job satisfaction (Travis 2006; in Dickens, 2011). The sense of coherence theory (Strumpfer & de Bruin, 2009) states that employees that develop a strong cohesive bond tend to view the workplace in a positive light, and that job satisfaction varies depending on the level of cohesion (Strumpfer & Bruin, 2009; in Dickens, 2011). The flow theory (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990) discusses the optimal experience at the workplace, which Csikszentmihalyi calls “flow”, which combines experiences that enhanced competence combined with the elimination of distractions, self-consciousness, and fear of failure, and that a perfect balance must be maintained between the challenges presented and the level of skill available to meet those challenges (Dickens, 2011).

Research has shown that job satisfaction is one of the most important employee characteristics, if not the most important, for organizational success. Roznowski and Hullin
(1992) believed that once an individual is hired, knowing the satisfaction levels of that individual is the most important piece of information a supervisor can have (Brown & Sargent, 2007). Job dissatisfaction can stifle innovation and overall hurt productivity and competitiveness (CBS News, 2010). In addition, job satisfaction and dissatisfaction can have devasting effects for organizations, and job dissatisfaction can lead to high levels of absentism (Hackett & Guion, 1985), poor health, high rates of turnover (Aziri, 2011; Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertnet, 2000) and individual complaints (Schmidt, 2007). A satisfied workforce leads to higher productivity because of fewer disruptions, less departures of good employees, and less incidences of destructive behavior (Brown & Sargent, 2007), and satisfied employees are more fully engaged, dedicated to their organization, and maintain high levels of performance and motivation (Hagedorn, 2000; Ostroff, 1992; Rosser, 2004, 2005; Smart, 1990; Spector, 1997). Due to this, there has been a big interest in identifying factors that can help to predict or influence job satisfaction since satisfaction has several benefits for the organization (Robbins, 1998).

As mentioned above, one of the most severe consequences for employee dissatisfaction is high rates of turnover within the organization. Studies have shown that measures of employee job satisfaction are negatively correlated with turnover intentions (Strawser, Flagg, & Holmes, 2000) and that job satisfaction is an important predictor of turnover intentions (Baotham, 2010). Price (1977) explained a number of determinants of job satisfaction and its impact on turnover and defined the main determinants as integration, pay level, instrumental communication, formal communication, and centralization, with the first four correlating positively with turnover and the last one, centralization, correlating negatively with turnover (Premalatha, 2011). Similarly, Mobley (1979) suggested four determinants for intentions to quit and turnover, with the first one being job satisfaction-dissatisfaction (Premalatha, 2011).
Organizational commitment and job satisfaction have both been significant areas of study when hiring individuals for employment, as it has been shown that employee attitude directly affects job satisfaction, and that organizational commitment has been linked to causing job satisfaction (Tella, Ayeni, & Popoola, 2007). The importance of understanding how organizational commitment and job satisfaction impact employee performance, and the interrelationship between the two, are related to and supported by the social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Coleman, 1973; Cook, 1977; Homans, 1961) for organizational commitment and the motivator-hygiene theory for job satisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959; Herzberg, 1968).

**Factors Related to Job Satisfaction in Higher Education**

In general, people are motivated and satisfied with their careers by intrinsic factors, such as achievement, responsibility, recognition, advancement, and the work itself (Hackman & Oldman, 1980; Herzberg, 1957). Overwhelmingly, studies show that workers at all types of institutions want recognition for what they accomplish, autonomy, fair pay and benefits, and time for family and leisure (Clark & Oswald, 1996; Kreps, 1997; Rynes, Gerhart, & Minette, 2004). Johnsrud and Rosser (2002) stated that faculty members overall are dedicated to their work and love what they do, and that these intrinsic motivations trump any extrinsic hygiene factors. Other studies have shown that certain extrinsic factors, such as company policies, salary, and administrative practices play an important role in motivating employees (Butler, 1982; Gruenburg, 1980; Herzberg, 1957; Seybolt, 1976), and while work satisfaction and other intrinsic factors often supersede extrinsic factors, pay has been found to be positively correlated with overall job satisfaction (Judge & Church, 2000).
Chen et al. (2006) found that job satisfaction in higher education is similar to job satisfaction in other corporate organizations (Dickens, 2011). In higher education, several studies have looked at job satisfaction and found that employees in higher education are consistent with those in non-educational settings in that enhanced job characteristics increase intrinsic job satisfaction and overall improve job performance (Iiacqua & Schumacher, 1995; McKeachie, 1997; Oshagbemi, 2000; Rossser, 2005; Terpstra & Honoree, 2004; Winter & Sarros, 2002). Faculty members tend to be satisfied if they feel they are valued, that their pay reflects that value, and if they have respect from supervisors and colleagues (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011) and these results are similar to what was found with assembly line workers (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939). The happier and more satisfied faculty employees are the ones who are fully engaged and dedicated to their institutions, and are satisfied with the work and the environment (Hadegorn, 2000). When looking at all four instructor role attributes (pedagogical, managerial, technical, and subject design), Juhdi and Hamid (2009) discovered that all attributes were positively correlated with job satisfaction, and that the pedagogical role attributes are the best predictor for job satisfaction. In comparison with other professional groups, higher education faculty exhibited lower levels of dissatisfaction with extrinsic aspects of their job (Blank, 1993). A few studies have looked at administration at colleges and universities and job satisfaction and found mixed results, including no difference in job satisfaction between faculty and administration (Olasiji, 1983), lower levels of extrinsic job satisfaction compared to other professional groups (Blank, 1993), and administrators having higher levels of extrinsic job satisfaction than other professional groups (Niehoff, 1997; Schroder, 2003).
Factors Related to Adjunct Faculty Job Satisfaction

According to the national survey of part-time instructors conducted by the American Federation of Teachers (2010), 62% of adjunct instructors are either very satisfied (28%) or mainly satisfied (34%) with the conditions at their institution. In addition, adjunct faculty satisfaction varies by type of institution, with similar levels of satisfaction at two-year institutions and four-year private institutions (68% and 67%, respectively), but instructors at four-year public institutions was much less (50% either very satisfied [20%] or mainly satisfied [30%]). However, faculty at four-year institutions were more satisfied with their level of autonomy than their two-year college counterparts, and neither group was highly satisfied with their students, with two-year faculty being less satisfied (Valadez & Antony, 2001).

Anthony and Valadez (2002) found that adjunct instructors, in some cases, are as satisfied or more satisfied than full-time faculty members. However, there are mixed results, with other studies showing that adjunct instructor job satisfaction was less than full-time faculty when taking into consideration the motivation levels of adjunct instructors (Gordon, 2002; in Dickens, 2011). Research throughout all types of institutions has discovered a variety of support structures and other factors that lead to adjunct instructor job satisfaction. One of the biggest areas that increase instructor job satisfaction is a strong professional development program that is tailored to specific instructor needs. Faculty need to know what the institution expects of them through effective orientation and other support programs that integrate faculty into the institutional culture (Wallin, 2007). Roueche et al. (1995) emphasized the importance of culture integration and the recognition of the accomplishments and importance of instructors to the teaching and learning process. Examples of effective support structures for adjunct instructors include an academy for part-time teachers at Northeast Texas Community College, a Center for
Teaching and Learning at Black Hawk College, and the Adjunct Faculty Institute at Tacoma Community College (Academic Leader, 2005). Landrum (2009) found that there were significant differences in the amount of support received by adjunct instructors compared with full-time faculty, and that part-time faculty have the same teaching and grading requirements as full-time faculty but with much less support (Meixner, Kruck, & Madden, 2010).

The National Survey of Part-Time Faculty conducted by the American Federation of Teachers (2010) found that other factors that are related to high levels of job satisfaction for adjunct instructors include academic freedom (80% felt it was as good as can be expected), manageable class sizes and workloads (76% were satisfied), evaluation procedures for promotion and retention, levels of communication and support from administration, institutional support for office hours, and job security. Other studies have shown that motivating factors for adjunct instructors include flexibility in scheduling, opportunities to experiment with new pedagogy, training in technological skills, natural curiosity, marketability of skills, and opportunities to share knowledge (Andersen, 2004; Hiltz et al., 2007; Keeton, 2000; Schnitzer & Crosby, 2003; Theall, 1999; Townsend & Haus, 2002).

Factors Related to Adjunct Faculty Job Dissatisfaction

Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory states that intrinsic rewards (such as recognition, satisfying work, etc.) cause satisfaction, whereas hygiene factors (extrinsic rewards), such as institutional support, salary, workload, benefits, and perceptions of fairness and quality of the environment, cause dissatisfaction (Herzberg et al., 1959). Dissatisfaction of adjunct instructors often fall into two categories: practical and substantive. Practical issues include lack of time to prep for courses since many instructors are offered courses days or even hours before they begin (Ludlow, 1998; Sheeks & Hutcheson, 1998), lack of orientation to the campus and culture,
prohibited from basic knowledge due to not being on campus full-time, and a lack of adequate workspace (Sheeks & Hutcheson, 1998). Many adjunct instructors lack phones, offices, mailboxes, computers, and other basic equipment to effectively advise students and do their jobs (Jacoby, 2006).

Substantive issues include feelings of undervalue, marginalization, disconnection, and feeling like “second-class citizens” at their colleges and universities (Kerlinger & Sibary, 1998). Adjunct instructors often feel isolated because they teach outside of regular operating hours and their presence, existence, and contributions can largely go unnoticed (Parrot et al., 2007). This disconnection is especially prevalent for online instructors, who have been observed as feeling exceptionally vulnerable to feeling disconnected to the institution (Dolan, 2011; Schnitzer & Crosby, 2003). According to Nelson (2002), there are three obstacles that impede success in distance education, and these are people losing interaction with the college, the ability to contribute to the team, and the sense of bonding and culture disappearing.

Aside from feeling isolated and disconnected, other sources of dissatisfaction for adjunct faculty include the overall level of support and feelings of being undervalued (Cohen & Brawer, 1987; Dolan, 2011; Halcrow & Olson, 2008), having little input into departmental affairs and administrative operations, such as having the right to select textbooks (Meixner, Kruck, & Madden, 2010), excessive workload and desire for change, poor salaries, high stress, geographic location, desire for change, and lack of collegiality (Conklin & Desselle, 2007). Overall, 45% of part-time faculty are dissatisfied with job security, 56% dissatisfied with advancement opportunities, and 90% dissatisfied with pay (Gappa & Leslie, 1997).
Demographic Characteristics Related to Job Satisfaction

While there has been some research on demographics and job satisfaction at higher education institutions, a majority has been on either full-time faculty and/or university staff, and not adjunct instructors. Age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, and teaching discipline have all been studied at various types of institutions in relation to job satisfaction, such as community colleges (Akroyd et al., 2011; Boord, 2010; Outcalt, 2002; Ramsey, 2011; Rosser & Townsend, 2006; Schulz, 2009; Tomanek, 2010; Wagoner, 2007), four-year institutions (Dickens, 2011; Seifert & Umbach, 2008) and large universities (Bentely et al., 2013; Brown & Sargeant, 2007; Castillo & Cano, 2004; Saifuddin et al., 2010; Feldman & Turnley, 2001; Ghafoor, 2012; Malik, 2011; Mehboob et al., 2012; Niehoff, 1997; Olsen et al., 1995; Santhaparaj & Alam, 2005; Saygi et al., 2011; Selingo, 2008; Tack & Patitu, 1992). However, these studies show mixed results in terms of the variable impact on job satisfaction. For both full-time faculty and adjunct faculty, there have been several studies that have looked at job satisfaction and the variables that are being analyzed in the current study.

Gender. In terms of gender, there have been numerous studies that have examined the impact of gender on job satisfaction in both higher education institutions, K-12 institutions, and non-educational institutions, and these studies have demonstrated mixed results. For example, research has shown that woman are overall more satisfied with their jobs than men (Hoppock, 1935), men are more satisfied than women (Hulin & Smith, 1964; Locke, Fitzpatrick, & White, 1983), and that there are no differences between the two groups (D’Arcy, Syrotuik, & Siddique, 1984; Golding, Resnick, & Crosby, 1983; Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990; Iiacqua & Schumacher, 1995, Schroder, 2003). Several studies have looked at the relationship between full-time faculty and staff job satisfaction and gender and have found that a majority of studies
have found that male faculty are more satisfied overall than female faculty (Aguirre, 2000; Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Castillo & Cano, 2004; Gormley, 2003; Hurtado & DeAngelo, 2009; Malik, 2011; Ponjuan, 2006; Seifert & Umbach, 2008; Trower & Bleak, 2004). The National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (1993) also found the women were less satisfied than men in all facets of job satisfaction, with the largest gender difference being in salary satisfaction (Toutkoushian & Bellas, 2003). This study supported a study by Finkelstein, Seal, & Schuster (1998) that found that women faculty were less satisfied than men in a number of factors with the exception of “benefits and spousal employment” (p. 60). Other studies have demonstrated that females were overall more satisfied than their male colleagues (Bas & Ardic, 2002; Hutton & Jobe, 1985), and that there was no difference between genders and job satisfaction (Bentley et al., 2013; Corbin, 2001; Iiacqua et al., 2001; Johnson, 2009; Mehboob et al., 2012; Rossser & Townsend, 2006; Saygi et al., 2011; Schroder, 2008; Tomlinson & Wilson, 2011).

While there have been fewer studies that have analyzed the relationship between gender and job satisfaction with adjunct instructors, previous studies similarly demonstrate mixed relationships, with several showing a positive relationship between gender and satisfaction (Boord, 2010; Gahfoor, 2012) and with males being overall more satisfied with their jobs than females (Toutkoushia & Bellas, 2003; Wagoneer, 2007). However, a majority of studies involving adjunct instructors show that there is no relationship between gender and job satisfaction (Dickens, 2011; Malik, 2011; Ramsey, 2011; Rosser & Townsend, 2006; Saygi et al., 2011; Tomanek, 2010).

**Age.** Similar to gender, more studies have been conducted with full-time faculty than with adjunct instructors when examining if a relationship exists between age and job satisfaction of higher education faculty. In addition, the results are also similar to gender in that various
studies have shown mixed results. Several studies regarding full-time faculty age and job satisfaction have shown a positive relationship, with satisfaction increasing with age (Bas & Ardic, 2002; Brown, 2005; Brown & Sargeant, 2007; Nestor & Leary, 2000; Saygi et al., 2011; Schroder, 2008), and according to Schroder (2008), this could be due to the fact that employees over the age of 50 are more likely to be financially stable and have achieved the desired employment status. Studies outside of higher education have also supported this positive relationship (Gibson & Klein, 1970; Khillah, 1986). However, there were also several studies regarding full-time faculty and the relationship between age and job satisfaction that showed no relationship between the two variables (Blank, 1993; Castillo & Cano, 2004; Saifuddin et al., 2010; Ghafoor, 2012; Ilacqua, Schumacher, & Li, 2001; Malik, 2011; Mehboob et al., 2009; Scott, Swortzel, & Taylor, 2005). Schroder (2008) justified the rationale for not seeing a difference between age and job satisfaction due to the fact that intrinsic areas of job satisfaction, such as advancement, achievement, recognition, growth, responsibility, and the work itself potentially have the same importance throughout an individual’s lifetime.

As mentioned earlier, previous studies have demonstrated a u-shaped pattern with age and job satisfaction, in which job satisfaction is high at the early stages of a career, reaches a low point towards the middle of the career, and rise to high levels once again towards the end of a career (Cockburn, 1998; Oswald, 1996). This relationship was also found with studies looking at full-time faculty at higher education institutions (Selingo, 2008; Sharma & Jyoti, 2010). Selingo (2008) called this the “honeymoon effect” at the beginning of the career, when young employees are ambitious and eager, whereas more veteran instructors have more teaching experience and therefore feel more comfortable in the classroom.
While there have been fewer studies that have compared age and job satisfaction with the adjunct instructor population, several studies have been conducted that demonstrate a positive relationship between job satisfaction and age (Boord, 2010; Feldman & Turnley, 2001; Schulz, 2009; Tomanek, 2010). These results are supported by Hagedorn (2000), who found that, on average, job satisfaction increases with advanced life stages. Feldman & Turnley (2001) found that adjunct instructors in the early stages of their careers were the most disappointed by lack of advancement opportunities, while mid-career instructors were more dissatisfied with the troubles of balancing work and family obligations. Late-career employees, however, were the most satisfied because of either a long-standing commitment to their profession or because a lack of job security or low pay are not as much of an issue. Other studies, such as the Iowa Department of Education Community College Adjunct Instructor Survey (2009) found that the oldest group of adjunct instructors (60 and above) were the most satisfied, yet the 40-49 age group was more satisfied than the 50-59 age group, indicating age is a strong indicator of overall job satisfaction (Boord, 2010). Despite the number of studies showing a positive relationship, other studies have demonstrated that while there may be subtle differences, a significant relationship does not exist between age and job satisfaction with adjunct instructors (Dickens, 2011; Ramsey, 2011).

**Ethnicity.** Several studies have examined the relationship between ethnicity and job satisfaction in higher education, and a majority of these studies are focused on full-time faculty. In addition, a vast majority of the previous literature has demonstrated that a relationship does exist between these variables, and that Caucasian faculty are more satisfied overall than their minority counterparts (Allen et al., 2002; Barnett, Gibson, & Black, 2003; Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, 2009; Ponjuan, 2006; Seifert & Umbach, 2011; Tack & Patitu, 1992). Olsen et al. (1995) suggested that there are considerable differences in satisfaction based on minority status,
and that despite the lesser satisfaction, many minorities express satisfaction with their jobs (Bower, 2002; Olsen, 1993; Ponjuan, 2006). Suggested reasons include a potential negative racial climate (Jayakumar et al., 2009), the multiple roles that women minorities are often expected to perform in addition to being a scholar and teacher (Turner, 2002), the difficulty of building relationships with colleagues due to feeling of isolation as they can often be the only minority faculty (Aguirre, 2000; Tack & Patitu, 1992), the perception that they were only hired due to affirmative action (Turner & Meyers, 2000), and that minority faculty are less likely to agree that the institutional climate is fair for all faculty (Ponjuan, 2006). However, while most studies show this relationship, other studies with full-time faculty have shown that no significant relationship exists between ethnicity and job satisfaction (Corbin, 2001; Johnson, 2009).

Very few studies have looked at the relationship between ethnicity and job satisfaction with adjunct instructors. Dickens (2011) studied the adjunct instructor population at eight different higher education institutions in Texas and found that there was no difference between job satisfaction and ethnicity. Schulz (2009), however, contradicted the results by finding that a difference does exist in the adjunct faculty population in an Iowa community college, and that Caucasian instructors were overall more satisfied than their minority counterparts.

**Education level.** Similar to gender, age, and ethnicity, the results from previous studies that have examined the relationship between education level and job satisfaction for higher education faculty have demonstrated mixed results. Several studies have shown that a relationship does exist between education level and job satisfaction, and that many of these studies indicated that full-time faculty with a doctoral degree are the most satisfied with their jobs (Blank, 1993; Brown, 2005; Ghafoor, 2012; Schroder, 2008). Wagoner (2007) found that vocational faculty who have a first professional degree are likely to be less satisfied, suggesting
that faculty who have more connections to the non-academic sector and who possess skills sought after by private industry are less satisfied. In addition, those who have doctoral degrees are often more likely to be satisfied because they have likely achieved their desired position (Schroder, 2008). However, even though Schroder (2008) found high levels of satisfaction with faculty who possess a doctoral degree, he also found equally high levels with those who have a high school diploma, suggesting that these individuals may be more content and more willing to evaluate their work as meaningful and appreciate the environment compared to more educated faculty. Niehoff (1997) studied Catholic university faculty and found that those with a either high school or a master’s degree had higher levels of mission value congruence and satisfaction than those with a doctorate, and Outcalt (2007) reported the opposite in that faculty with doctoral degrees are less satisfied than those without doctoral degrees. Contradictory to these results, however, were several studies that demonstrated no relationship between education level and job satisfaction amongst full-time higher education faculty (Brown & Sargeant, 2007; Saifuddin et al., 2010; Ilacqua et al., 2001; Malik, 2011).

Very few studies have examined the relationship between educational level and job satisfaction for adjunct instructors. Wagoner (2007) studied both full-time faculty and adjunct faculty and found that with part-time instructors, those with a doctoral degree were significantly less satisfied than those with lower degrees, which reinforced the idea that those with the highest qualifications and the ones who are most likely to be immersed in academia are going to be less satisfied with part-time positions. Ramsey (2011) studied online instructors at rural community colleges in Alabama, and contrary to the results from Wagoner (2007), this study found no relationship between education level and job satisfaction.
Teaching experience. The relationship between the years of teaching experience and job satisfaction in higher education have demonstrated mixed results in the literature. A few studies have shown that teaching experience does have a relationship with job satisfaction for full-time faculty, and that the more experienced faculty are the most satisfied (Chimanikire, Mutandwa, Gadzirayi, Muzondo, & Mutandwa, 2007; Saifuddin et al., 2010; Ghafoor, 2012; Hagedorn, 1994; Kumar & Giri, 2009; Niehoff, 1995). According to Hagedorn (1994), the proximity to retirement can have an impact on job satisfaction, and those closest to retirement usually are the ones who have the most experience. In addition, newcomers may have more expectations from their jobs compared to veterans, which could lead to less satisfaction (Saifuddin et al., 2010).

However, this positive relationship is not always the case, and while there have been no studies found showing a negative relationship with full-time higher education faculty, negative relationships have been shown with teachers, indicating that those with less experience are more satisfied than those with more experience (Khilla, 1986; Ma & MacMillan, 1999), indicating that those who stay in the teaching profession longer are less satisfied with their job (Ma & MacMillan, 1999) and that those in the middle have the lowest job satisfaction, which is after the honeymoon stage but before becoming truly comfortable (Khilla, 1986). There have also been several studies with full-time faculty that have shown no relationship between years of teaching experience and job satisfaction (Castillo & Cano, 2004; Johnson, 2009; Malik, 2011; Mehboob et al., 2009; Schroder, 2008; Tomlinson & Winston, 2011).

Fewer studies have examined the relationship between teaching experience and job satisfaction for adjunct instructors. Dickens (2011), Selingo (2008), and Schulz (2009) found that a relationship does exist between teaching experience and job satisfaction and both studies indicated a positive relationship between the two variables. Dickens (2011) found a difference in
job satisfaction between those who have taught between 4-7 years and those over 12 years, as well as those who taught between 1-3 years and over 12 years (this was the greatest difference). They suggested that those who have over 12 years of teaching experience likely have developed better relationships with colleagues, are more satisfied with the pay and benefits, enjoy teaching, and feel more connected to the institutional mission and goals. The reason for the dissatisfaction in the 4-7 years of experience group could be a result of moving from the beginnings of their careers. Schulz (2009) found similar results to Dickens (2011), in which satisfaction increases with the addition of years of experience. This study found that 91.5% of instructors who were in the 16-20 years of experience group and 90.9% in the 21 and over group were either satisfied or very satisfied with their jobs. Selingo (2008), however, found contradictory results from those of Dickens (2011) and Schulz (2009), in which instructors at the beginning of their careers showed more job satisfaction than those towards the end of their career. In fact, Selingo found that when employees reach their forties or more than eight years of experience on their campus, they reach their lowest satisfaction levels in career development, fairness, and overall job satisfaction.

According to Barry Glassner, who is the executive vice provost at the University of Southern California, this is likely due to idea that young academics arrive with enthusiasm and fresh ideas, despite entering an often difficult environment, and this perception changes over time (Selingo, 2008).

**Employment status.** Since full-time faculty are already employed full-time and typically only have that position as their sole source of employment, the studies focusing on the relationship between employment status and job satisfaction relate solely to adjunct instructors, who often have different levels and degree of employment outside of the higher education institution. As would be expected, a few studies looking at the relationship between these two
variables with adjunct instructors have demonstrated that those looking for full-time employment are less satisfied than instructors who prefer to work part-time (American Federation of Teachers, 2010; Wallin, 2004; Wilson, 1998). For example, the American Federation of Teachers (2010) National Survey of Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty found that 75% of instructors who prefer to work part-time were very or mainly satisfied, compared to 49% of instructors who were seeking full-time employment. However, other studies have shown roughly the same level of satisfaction regardless of employment status (Lewis, 2012), and that most adjunct instructors actually prefer to work part-time. Specialist and experts (categories created by Gappa & Leslie, 1993), for example, have little motivation to seek full-time as they are typically content experts who already hold other positions in their respective fields (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; McGee, 2002). Schulz (2009) also found that only 42.9% of adjunct instructors would prefer to work full-time at their institutions, which suggests that they are satisfied with their current part-time status. Similar results from Leslie and Gappa (2002) and U.S. Department of Education (2000) showed that over half of all community college adjunct instructors prefer part-time status.

**Teaching modality.** There has been a lot of previous research that has looked at the relationship between teaching modality (either face-to-face or online instruction) and job satisfaction for higher education faculty, however, a majority of the research has looked at whether or not instructors are satisfied with online instruction; few studies have examined the satisfaction levels between face-to-face and online instruction from the same population. In terms of online instruction, there have been mixed results in the literature in terms of satisfaction with this modality. Several studies have shown that instructors are satisfied with the online modality (Almeda & Rose, 2000; Arvan & Musumeci, 2000; Bolliger & Wasilik, 2009; Conceicao, 2006; Conrad, 2004; Harasim, 2000; Hartman, Dziuban, & Moskal, 2000; Navarro,
2000; Satterlee, 2008; Sloan Consortium, 2006; Swartz et al., 2010; Thompson, 2002b; Ulmer, Watson, & Derby, 2007), and reasons for this satisfaction include a renewed enthusiasm for teaching as students are often more engaged (Harasim, 2000; Hartman et al., 2000; Sloan Consortium, 2006), effective for student performance and instructor-to-student interaction (Ulmer et al., 2007), affords access to higher education for a more diverse student population (Sloan Consortium, 2006), allows for flexibility and accessibility for the online courses (Almeda & Rose, 2000; Arvan & Musumeci, 2000; Hartman et al., 2000). Due to these advantages, Hartman et al. (2000) found that 83.4% of instructors were satisfied with the online environment and 93.6% were willing to continue teaching online courses, and Thompson (2002b) found that only 10% of instructors teaching online were dissatisfied.

However, other studies have shown that higher education instructors are not satisfied with the online teaching modality (Almeda & Rose, 2000; Bender, 2003; Harasim, 2000; Hartmen et al., 2000; Hislop & Ellis, 2004; Lai, 2007; Lapke, 2009; Santilli & Beck, 2002; Smith et al., 2002; Thompson, 2002b), and reasons for this dissatisfaction include inadequate training (Lai, 2007), many hours of preparation (Bender, 2003; Hislop & Ellis, 2004; Santilli & Beck, 2005; Smith, Ferguson, & Caris, 2005), having to understand course design and pedagogy on top of technology (Harasim, 2000), and barriers to communication and lack of student interaction and student readiness (Lapke, 2009). Hogan & McKnight (2007) found that these reasons for dissatisfaction with online instruction can lead to high levels of emotional exhaustion and burnout.

Few studies that have examined the satisfaction levels between instructors teaching in the face-to-face environment and instructors teaching in the online environment, and the results have been mixed with several studies showing that face-to-face instructors are more satisfied than
online instructors (Hislop & Atwood, 2000; Lefebvre, 2009; Shelley, Swartz, & Cole, 2007, 2008; Swartz et al., 2010). Reasons for the face-to-face preference were primarily the student interaction and classroom-based instruction mentality (Shelley et al., 2007, 2008). In addition, a dissatisfaction with online courses may also be due to the inability for online professors to use a variety of preferred teaching styles and methods (Preziosi & Gooden, 2003). Other studies have shown that either higher education faculty are more satisfied with the online environment than the face-to-face environment (Shea, Pelz, Frederikson, & Pickett, 2002; Vest, 2009) or that there is no significant relationship between teaching modality and job satisfaction (Preziosi & Gooden, 2003; Tomanek, 2010). Lastly, there have been no studies that have compared face-to-face, online, and blended instruction, however, Jackson & Helms (2008) have found that hybrid classes often exhibit the same weaknesses as online courses that were mentioned above, and the additional face-to-face interaction often does not mitigate these weaknesses for faculty.

**Teaching discipline.** The relationship between teaching discipline and job satisfaction for higher education faculty is an area that has rarely been investigated compared to other full-time and adjunct instructor characteristic. However, similar to several of the other characteristics, the results from previous research are mixed on whether or not a relationship exists between teaching discipline and job satisfaction in higher education. Outcalt (2007) found that community college instructors who teach in liberal arts tend to be less satisfied than those in other disciplines. This result is somewhat contradictory to that of Akroyd et al. (2011) who found that women faculty who teach in general education are more satisfied than women who teach in occupational areas. This could be due to the idea that women who teach in occupational areas are exposed to more internal and external pressures of market demands (Duderstadt, 1999; Duderstadt & Womack, 2003). Fugate and Amey (2000) contradicted both of
these studies by showing that little difference exists in professional development, view of roles, and career paths between liberal arts faculty and vocational/occupational faculty, and these are indirect connections that can lead to job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction. Women faculty were also investigated in another study (Hagedorn, Nora, & Pascarella, 1996) and found that women faculty in sciences, including applied science, report a more unfriendly work environment, leading to job dissatisfaction. However, other studies have been contradictory by showing that there is no relationship between teaching discipline and job satisfaction (Benteley et al., 2013; Saifuddin et al., 2010).

The relationship between teaching discipline and job satisfaction has also been investigated with adjunct instructors, and similar to full-time faculty, the results have been mixed in terms of whether or not a relationship exists, and if so, which disciplines show more satisfaction. When a relationship was found, it was typically the disciplines of applied technology (Tomanek, 2010) and technical fields (Dickens, 2011) and vocational and training (Wagoner, 2007), with the lowest satisfaction in health and public services (Tomanek, 2010) and arts and sciences (Wagoner, 2007). While Dickens found that adjunct instructors in technical fields were more satisfied than those in academics, the difference was not statistically significant. One reason this may be because faculty teaching in academics may have been teaching with several full-time faculty and therefore perceived as not feeling equal, whereas technical fields are more dominated by part-time instructors (Pearch & Marutz, 2005).

**Teaching load.** Similar to teaching discipline, few studies have examined the relationship between teaching load and job satisfaction of higher education faculty, and the studies that have been found are focused on adjunct instructors. Ramsey (2011) found that adjunct instructors teaching three or more courses in one semester were more satisfied with their
jobs than instructors only teaching one course. However, there was no statistically significant
difference between any of the teaching load groups and job satisfaction. However, the American
Federation of Teachers (2010) National Survey of Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty survey was in-
depth study on various adjunct instructor characteristics from a sample of all types of institutions
nationally, and found that in terms of workload, faculty who teach fewer courses are, on average,
more satisfied than those with heavier course loads, which contradicts the study conducted by
Ramsey (2011). The survey found that 72% of adjunct instructors only teaching one course were
satisfied and 27% were just somewhat or not satisfied. Satisfaction drops to 63% for those
teaching two courses per semester and 56% for those teaching three or more courses.

**Person-organization fit.** While there are several definitions that exist for Person-
organization (P-O) fit, most researchers define it as the compatibility between the organization
and individual (Kristof, 1996), and more specifically refers to the resemblance between values of
the individual and the perceived values of the institution (Saleem, Adnan, & Ambreen, 2011).
Kristof (1996) went further to define P-O fit beyond simply compatibility to say that P-O fit
occurs when compatibility is present and at least one party provides what the other needs, they
share fundamental characteristics, or both.

P-O fit has been shown to significantly impact employee turnover intention, job
performance, work attitude, ethical behaviors (Liu et al., 2010), job satisfaction, organizational
commitment, and intention to quit (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005; Hoffman &
Woehr, 2006; Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003; Wheeler, Gallagher, Brouer, & Sablynski,
2007), as well as organizational attraction and retention and new hire selection decisions (Resick,
Baltes, & Shantz, 2007). Therefore, P-O fit has become a critical component for many
organizations in the hiring process. A lack of fit with the organization can increase turnover
intentions and decrease job satisfaction, which are significant problems for administrative staff as turnover increases cost for replacement but also cause a loss in the organization’s knowledge capital (Shaw, Gupta, & Delery, 2005). In fact, according to Saari & Judge (2004), P-O fit is the most influential factor that affects both turnover intention and job satisfaction, and therefore understanding how individuals fit with the organization is critical. Schneider (1987) observed that employees are more willing to stay with an organization in which their values align and they have something in common, and researchers have discovered that the better an individual fits with the organization, the less likely they will have intentions to leave (Brown & Yoshioka, 2003; Moynihan & Pandey, 2007; Vandenberghe, 1999), and therefore the greater the compatibility between the organization and individual, the greater the attraction for the individual to become and remain an employee with the organization (Carless, 2005; Erdogan & Bauer, 2005).

There have been numerous studies that have looked at the relationship between person-organization fit and job satisfaction, and a majority of studies demonstrate that a lack of job satisfaction is a result of poor fit with the organization (Adkins, Russell, & Werbel, 1994; Caldwell & O’Reilly, 1990; Chatman, 1989; Erdogan, Kraimer, & Liden, 2002; Kristof, 1996; McCulloch & Silverhart, 2000). Person-Organization fit has been shown to predict job satisfaction and organizational commitment a significant time after it was measured (O’Reilly III, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991) and that P-O fit has a positive impact on job satisfaction and a negative impact on turnover (Liu et al., 2010). While these studies focused on non-academic populations, a few studies have examined the relationship between P-O fit and job satisfaction in higher education. Olsen, Maple, & Stage (1995) examined the relationship with full-time university professors and found that person-organization fit was a highly, and positively,
significant predictor of job satisfaction. Castiglia (2006), in contrast to Olsen et al. (1995) did not find a significant relationship between P-O fit and job satisfaction, and actually found that for some faculty a negative relationship existed between the two variables. Possible explanations for this finding include a faulty instrument that was designed for corporate environments and not academia and that faculty members focused exclusively on the job and not the context of the job.

**Organizational Commitment**

**Definition and Importance of Organizational Commitment**

Although there are several different iterations of the definition for organizational commitment, Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) defined it as “a strong belief in and acceptance of an organization’s goals and values, a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization” (p. 226). Organizational commitment refers to the extent to which employees have developed emotional attachments and are involved with their organization because of the goals and values of that organization (Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boultian, 1974). It is an attitudinal variable indicating the level of loyalty, trust, and support employees feel for their organization (Baotham, Hongkhuntod, & Rattanajun, 2010). Organizational commitment differs from job satisfaction as a construct because it is more global and emphasizes employee connection to the organization and its goals and values, as opposed to job satisfaction, which is more focused on individual, specific tasks (Mowday et al., 1979). Commitment to the organization is likely to be positively related to organizational change, as committed individuals are more likely to accept changes that lead the organization in a new direction and towards a new vision (Vakola & Nikolaou, 2005). However, commitment can decline if the organization in which employees are committed begins to change (Fedor, Caldwell, & Herold, 2006), and individual employee characteristics also affect
commitment. Employees who are committed to their organization are more loyal, and this has been shown to result in higher productivity, fewer absences, reduced turnover, and more instances of employees going above and beyond basic job duties (Young, Worchel, & Woehr, 1998). Chan (2002) related these findings to faculty in higher education by showing that increasing the retention of committed faculty is related to creating a culture that fosters faculty support and work satisfaction (Al-Hussami et al., 2011). Al-Hussami et al. (2011) found similar trends amongst university faculty in that a positive correlation exists between organizational commitment and job satisfaction, job autonomy, support, salaries, and workload.

Previous studies have suggested that there are three types of bonds that exist between an employee and an organization. Compliance, which reflects instrumental behavior utilized to achieve rewards, identification, in which an employee identifies that an organization has attractive goals and values and therefore want to maintain a relationship, and internalization, which reflects behaviors driven by internal values that are similar to those of the organization (Premalatha, 2011).

Meyer and Allen (1991) defined three forms of organizational commitment: affective, continuance, and normative. Affective commitment refers to the emotional attachment, identification, and involvement formed between an employee and the organization. In this type of commitment, employees tend to stay with the organization because they want to and not due to necessity. Continuance commitment is when an individual is committed to the organization because the costs of leaving the organization are substantial. In this type of commitment, employees tend to stay with the organization because of the need. Normative commitment relates to the feelings of obligation that employees have to continue employment and stay with
the organization. In this type of commitment, employees tend to stay with the organization because they should (Baotham et al., 2010).

Several studies have demonstrated the importance of organizational commitment and its impact on employees and organizations. Brantley (1993) suggested that organizational commitment is an extremely valuable component in education institutions, and organizational commitment plays a critical role in the choice as to whether employees leave or stay with an organization (Premalatha, 2011). Organizational commitment is frequently used in management, marketing, psychology, and other disciplines as a precursor to such factors as organizational citizenship, turnover intentions, job involvement, and organizational alternatives (Lacity, Iyer, & Rudramuniyaiah, 2008; Sorensen, 1990). A lack of organizational commitment had detrimental effects such as increases in turnover rates and intentions, poorer performance and lack of productivity which affects efficiency and effectiveness negatively (Addae & Parboteeah, 2008; Becker, Billings, Eveleth, & Gilbert, 1996; Cohen & Hudacek, 1998; Jones, Chonko, Rangarajan, & Robert, 2007; Lum, Kervin, Clark, Reid, & Sirola, 1998), and increased absenteeism rates (Mowday, 1999). Organizational commitment also has intrinsic value, as commitment to employment adds meaning to individual’s lives by increasing perceived self-worth (Mowday, 1999). Organizational commitment is important for all occupations, including part-time faculty at higher education institutions, in which two-year part-time college faculty cited numerous factors that would influence their decision to stay or leave and indicated more frequently than their four-year counterparts that high salary, benefits, administrative responsibilities, quality facilities, advancement opportunities, job security, and tenure-track positions are factors that would influence their decision (Valadez & Antony, 2001).
Demographic Characteristics Related to Organizational Commitment

Similarly to job satisfaction, there have been several studies in higher education that have looked at the relationship between the variables being researched in this study and organizational commitment at various types of higher education institutions, including community college (Austin-Hickey, 2013; Engle, 2010) and four-year colleges and universities (Borchers & Teahen, 2001; Castiglia, 2006; Gebremichael & Prasada Rao, 2013; Ling, 2012; Murphy, 2009; Nagar, 2012; Sharma, 1994; Tabbodi, 2009; Uchenna & Tolulope, 2013). Similar to job satisfaction, a majority of research looking at the relationship between demographic characteristics and organizational commitment has been conducted in non-academic environments, and research that has been conducted at higher education institutions has primarily focused on either full-time faculty and/or university staff, and not adjunct instructors. In addition, these studies show mixed results in terms of the variable impact on organizational commitment. For both full-time faculty and adjunct faculty, there have been several studies that have looked at organization commitment and the variables that are being analyzed in the current study.

Gender. There have been several previous studies that have examined the relationship between gender and organizational commitment, and these studies have shown mixed results. Numerous non-academic studies showed that a relationship did exist, and that in some cases, male employees were more committed to their organization than female employees overall (Hart, Patricia, & Barrians, 1988; Irving, Coleman, & Cooper, 1997; Pala, Eker, & Eker, 2008; Tsui, Egan, & O’Reilly, 1992) or in one or more of the commitment areas, such as continuous commitment (Abdulla & Shaw, 1999; Lim, 2003) and affective commitment (Lim, 2003). However, most studies outside of academia show that women are more committed to their organizations than men (Akintayo, 2010; Hrebinjak & Alluto, 1972; Lincoln & Kalleberg, 1990;
Marchiori & Henkin, 2004; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; Unterbrink et al., 2007), and this has been supported for women in business professions (Angle & Perry, 1981) as well as the private sector (Grusky, 1966). Other studies involving non-academic participants have contradicted these studies by demonstrating that there is no relationship between organizational commitment and gender (Giffords, 2009; Salami, 2008; Schroder, 2003; Stevens, Beyer, & Trice, 1978).

When looking at the relationship between gender and organizational commitment for higher education faculty and staff, the results are similar to those found in non-academic populations whereas different studies demonstrate different relationships or lack thereof. A few previous studies have shown that male faculty are more committed to their organization than female faculty (Callister, 2006; Huang, 2004; Watanabe, 2010), and this could be related to the fact that female faculty scored higher levels on emotional exhaustion (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996; Lackritz, 2004) which would lead to less commitment. In addition, women are often more disadvantaged due to several factors, which can lead to underrepresentation and less commitment (Hart, Partricia, & Barrians, 1988). Other studies have contradicted these results by showing and female faculty are more committed than male faculty (Marchiori & Henkin, 2004; Smart, 1990; Taylor, 2005). Smart (1990) found that while female tenured faculty were more committed than male tenured faculty, there was no difference in non-tenured faculty. While a few studies show that males are more committed and a few other studies show that females are more committed, the majority of the literature looking at higher education faculty and staff and the relationship between gender and organizational commitment have shown that a significant relationship does not exist between these variables (Al-Hussami et al., 2011; Borchers & Teahen,

Age. Similar to gender, studies examining the relationship between age and organizational commitment have mixed results. A vast majority of previous non-academic studies have shown that age tends to have a positive relationship with organizational commitment (Abdulla & Shaw, 1999; Al-Aameri, 2000; Allen & Meyer, 1993; Alutto, Hrebinia, & Alonso, 1973; Dodd-McCue & Wright, 1996; Hackett, Bycio, & Hausdorf, 1994; Hrebinia & Alutto, 1972; Iqbal, 2010; Mannheim et al., 1997; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Morris & Sherman, 1981; Morrow, 1993; Salami, 2008; Salancik, 1977; Sneed & Herman, 1990; Sommer, Bae, & Luthan, 1996; Stevens et al., 1978; Suliman & Iles, 2000; Wiedmer, 2006; Yucel & Bektas, 2012). In addition, Bhuain & Al-Jabri (1996) found that age is negatively related to employee turnover. This positive relationship between age and organizational commitment has been shown to exist for a variety of occupational groups, such as lower-level employees in business settings (Angel & Perry, 1981); newspaper transportation employees (Fukami & Larson, 1984); psychiatric care medical teams (Morris & Sherman, 1981); laboratory scientists (Sheldon, 1971); high tech personnel (Mannheim et al., 1997; Morrow, 1993) and federal employees (Stevens et al., 1978). Reason why older employees are more committed to their organizations than younger employees can be due to the fact that older employees see their time spent as an investment and therefore more difficult psychological to switch careers (Yucel & Bektas, 2012), it is more socially acceptable for younger employees to switch careers (Smola & Sutton, 2002), and older employees may have lower and more realistic expectations of their workplace and can better adapt to work situations (Newstrom, 2007). There were a few studies that contradicted these studies by either showing that younger employees are more committed
(Pourghaz, Tamini, & Karamad, 2011) or that there was no significant relationship between age and organizational commitment (Chughtai & Zahar, 2006; Iqbal, 2010; Pala et al., 2008). One study contradicted all previous studies by showing a U-shaped pattern, in which younger and older employees were the most committed with those in the middle being the least committed (Cohen, 1993).

In terms of higher education faculty and staff, similar results to the studies for non-academic participants have been observed, with several studies for both full-time faculty and adjunct faculty demonstrating a positive relationship between age and organizational commitment (Al-Hussami et al., 2011; Al-Kahtani, 2004; Brown & Sargeant, 2007; Carver & Candela, 2008; Engle, 2010; Gebremichael & Prasada Rao, 2013; Murphy, 2009; Peace, 1998; Schroder, 2003). However, other studies have contradicted the results of these studies by showing that no relationship exists between age and organizational commitment for higher education faculty (Borchers & Teahen, 2001; Chughtai & Zahar, 2006; Huang, 2004; Iqbal, Kokash, & Al-Oun, 2011; Sharma, 1994; Stengel, 1983). However, one study contradicted both previous research that showed a positive relationship and research that demonstrated no relationship by demonstrating that different age groups showed different levels of commitment. For example, Kaiser (2005) showed that Baby Boomers and Generation X faculty had higher levels of commitment than Veteran and Millennials, and the conclusion was that there was significant variation amongst the four generations.

**Ethnicity.** There have been relatively few previous studies that have looked at the relationship between ethnicity and organizational commitment. Cohen (2006) indicated the importance of cross-cultural research on organizational commitment and that the differences between ethnic groups within a country may be even strong than between countries, and
therefore ethnic group divergences may be stronger than national divergences (Clugston, Howell, & Dorfman, 2000; Cohen, 1999b, Mueller, Iverson, & Price, 1999).

Previous studies have demonstrated that a relationship exists between ethnicity and organizational commitment, and that different ethnic groups have different levels of commitment. For example, Ahmad, Yunus, Norwani, and Musa (2012) showed that levels of organizational commitment varied between teachers of Indian, Chinese, and Malay ethnicities, and that ethnicity was only significantly related to normative commitment, and not continuous or affective organizational commitment. Cohen (2006) also examined the relationship between ethnicity and organizational commitment amongst teachers of Arab and Jewish decent living in the same country and found a significant difference between the two groups, emphasizing the importance of understanding cultural and ethnic values.

When examining the relationship between ethnicity and organizational commitment amongst higher education faculty, few studies found a significant relationship existed between these variables and that Caucasian faculty were almost always more committed than their minority colleagues (Lawrence et al., 2011; Rosser, 2004; Watanabe, 2010). The only contradictory study found was Murphy (2009), which found that African American faculty are more committed than Caucasian faculty to student development, and this could be due to African American faculty being more aware of how their students’ social development is impacted by their presence in the classroom. Hurtado (2001) and Cole (2007) support this theory and suggest that student learning about diversity and community service is enhanced by minority teachers in the classroom.

**Education level.** There have been numerous studies, both inside and outside academia, that have looked at the impact of education level on organizational commitment, and the results
of have been mixed. Several studies outside of academia have demonstrated that a relationship exists between these variables, and that relationship was both positive (Adeyemo, 2000; Pala et al., 2008; Peace, 1998) and negative (Abdulla & Shaw, 1999; Arnold & Feldman, 1982; Dubin, Champux, & Porter, 1975; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002; Morris & Sherman, 1981; Steers, 1977; White, 1987). Potential reasons why individuals who have more education are more committed to their organizations include the idea that highly qualified individuals have a better awareness of their organizational attitude and environment than those less qualified and sense of belongingness often improves with qualifications (Khan, Nawaz, Khan, H, Khan, S, & Kundi, 2013). Potential reasons for a negative relationship include the difficulty individuals with lower qualifications have in changing careers and therefore are more committed to their current organization (Khan et al., 2013), it is difficult for organizations to provide sufficient rewards to equal exchange for highly qualified individuals (Steers, 1977), and highly educated individuals are often more committed to their profession than a particular organization (Dubin, Champux, & Porter, 1975). Results of other studies contradicted these results by showing that there was no significant relationship between education level and organizational commitment for non-academic participants (Buchko, Weinzimmer, & Sergeyev, 1998, Dorgham, 2012; Iqbal, 2010; Ors, Acuner, Sarp, & Onder, 2003).

Previous literature examining the relationship between education level and organizational commitment with higher education faculty and staff supports studies with non-academic participants by also demonstrating mixed results. A majority of the studies found that a relationship does exist between these variables, with a few studies showing a positive relationship (Al-Kahtani, 2004; Borchers & Teahen, 2001) and several showing a negative
relationship (Engle, 2010; Iqbal et al., 2011; Austin-Hickey, 2013; Khan et al., 2013). Austin-Hickey (2013) found that an inverse relationship exists between degree level and normative commitment and that those holding a doctoral degree did not discuss affective commitment when discussing the organization’s commitment to them. There have been other contradictory studies showing that no relationship exists between educational level and organizational commitment for higher education faculty and staff (Al-Hussami et al., 2011; Sharma, 1994; Stengel, 1983).

Teaching experience. While very little research has been conducted on the relationship between teaching load and organizational commitment, extensive research exists on the relationship between years of experience at an organization and level of commitment. Research comparing years of experience and organizational commitment have been conducted in multiple environments, including higher education and other environments, and those in other settings have shown mixed results, with a majority of studies showing a positive relationship between experience and commitment (Demirtas, 2010; Dorgham, 2012; English, Morrison, & Chalon, 2010; Gregersen, 1993; Grusky, 1966; Heinzman, 2004; Hackett et al., 1994; Iqbal, 2010; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002; Newstrom, 2007; Salami, 2008; Santos & Not-Land, 2006; Sheldon, 1971; Suliman & Iles, 2000). Ettore (1997) discovered that turnover of employees with 15 or more years of service at an organization is very rare, which supports the notion that those with more years of service are more committed to the organization. Employees who stay longer with an organization often feel more responsible for the success of that organization (Meyer et al., 2002), longer service employees tend to develop more affective attachment to the organization (Yucel & Bektas, 2012), longer service suggests an accumulation of their organizational career (Sheldon, 1971), and time invested becomes a resource with privilege due to longevity of service (Grusky, 1966). In addition to commitment,
Gregersen & Black (1992) found that longer tenure decreases an employee’s turnover tendency. Other studies have contradicted the results of these studies by showing that either a negative relationship exists (Pourghaz, Tamini, & Karamad, 2011) or that no relationship exists between experience and commitment (Giffords, 2009; King, 2002; Pala et al., 2008).

Previous studies looking at the relationship between years of experience and organizational commitment with higher education faculty and staff have shown similar results to studies examine participants outside of higher education in that a majority of the studies showed a positive relationship between experience and commitment (Al-Hussami et al., 2011; Borchers & Teahen, 2001; Iqbal, & Kokash, Al-Oun, 2011; Murphy, 2009; Poppens, 2000; Uchenna & Tolulope, 2013). An example of a positive result in higher education showed that employees working between 15-25 years having higher levels of commitment than those who have worked between 5-10 years (Brown & Sargent, 2007). Other studies have shown that the relationship varies depending on the type of commitment. Huang (2004) found that there was no relationship between affective and normative commitment, but a significant positive relationship did exist with continuous commitment. Similarly, Marchiori & Henkin (2004) found that experience was significantly associated with affective organizational commitment but less of a predictor with continuance commitment. There have been other studies that have contradicted these results by either showing that a negative relationship exists between experience and commitment (Engle, 2010; Thomas, 2008) or that a relationship does not exist (Al-Kahtani, 2004; Brookover, 2002; Merriman, 2000; Peace, 1998; Stengel, 1983).

**Employment status.** There were no studies located in the literature that compared the employment status of adjunct instructors (desiring full-time, prefer part-time, have full-time outside of teaching. or have several part-time jobs) and organizational commitment. A few
studies looked at the difference in organizational commitment between part-time adjunct instructors and full-time instructors (Borchers & Teahen, 2001; Engle, 2010; Merriman, 2010; Murphy, 2009), and academic rank (Huang, 2004), but did not compare the employment status of adjunct instructors in terms of outside employment.

**Teaching modality.** While numerous studies have looked at instructor perspectives on online and face-to-face instruction, very few have compared the levels of organizational commitment between online and face-to-face instructors in the same study. Borchers & Teahen (2001) found that there was no difference in organizational commitment between instructors that teach online and in the face-to-face environment. Numerous other studies have found that adjunct instructors who teach online often have high levels of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, and a low degree of personalization (Hogan & McKnight, 2007), perceive online instruction as more work and more time consuming, therefore becoming a significant stressor (Hislop & Ellis, 2004), have difficulty building relationships of mutual trust (Morgan & Symon, 2002) and are vulnerable to feelings of disconnection to the organization (Dolan, 2011; Schnitzer & Crosby, 2003), and feel unvalued and taken for granted (Dolan, 2011), and these factors can potentially decrease the organizational commitment of online instructors. Marshall, Michaels, & Mulki (2007) found that a correlation exists between frequency of communication, organizational commitment, and a sense of connection to the organization.

While the previous studies mentioned examined reasons why online instructors could have less commitment to their organizations than face-to-face instructors, other studies have contradicted these findings by showing that online instructors could be more committed than face-to-face instructors. Shea (2007) found that online instructors often prefer this environment because of the flexibility to accommodate life needs, reduces commuting time, and allows more
free-time for other professional duties. In addition, online instruction can allow for a heightened sense of teaching and a global connection to a community of educators (Ko & Rossen, 2003), online allows for more frequent interaction with students (McKenzie, Mims, Bennet, & Waugh, 2000), and the fact that distance learning is becoming more fine-tuned, standardized, and faculty are learning to adapt has changed the perception of many faculty members (McCann & Holt, 2009). These reasons suggest that online instruction could potentially increase organizational commitment.

**Teaching discipline.** Three studies found have examined the relationship between teaching discipline and organizational commitment, and each of these studies found that a relationship exists. Busch, Fallen, & Pettersen (1998) found that with full-time faculty, nursing faculty had the highest levels of organizational commitment, followed by teacher education faculty, with the least committed faculty from the business administration division. Lawrence et al. (2011) somewhat contradicted the Busch, Fallen, & Petersen study by showing that business administration faculty were highly committed. This study found that full-time faculty in arts and humanities and business are more committed than science and math faculty. Neumann & Finaly-Neumann (1990) supported the results of Lawrence et al. (2011) by also showing that faculty in arts and humanities were more committed than faculty in math and science.

**Teaching load.** While specific teaching load has never been studied in relation to organizational commitment, few studies have examined the relationship between workload and organizational commitment with mixed results. Parker, Axtell, & Turner (2000) and Barling, Kelloway, & Iverson (2003) both found that workload has a positive impact on organizational commitment, but has a relatively small impact. Demirtas (2010) investigated teachers in private courses and found that weekly work load (lesson hours) did not impact organizational
commitment. However, other studies have shown a positive relationship between workload and commitment. Yoon & Thye (2002) stated that high workloads often allow for employees to have a greater opportunity to contribute to the organization, which increases self-esteem, self-efficacy, and commitment. Potter & Rinaldi (2001) examined faculty members and found that equitable workloads showed fairness and support from administration, and therefore different loads could impact perceptions and commitment.

**Person-organization fit.** As mentioned in the job satisfaction section, person-organization fit is defined as the compatibility between organizations and individuals (Sekiguchi, 2003). A relationship between person-organization fit and organizational commitment has been documented, and similar to job satisfaction, all studies looking at this relationship demonstrated that it was highly positive (Bretz, Boudreau, & Judge, 1994; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005; Guan, Deng, Bond, Zhang, & Hu, 2011; Handler, 2004; Muthusamy, 2009; Hoffman & Woehr, 2006; O’Reilly III, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991; Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003; Wheeler et al., 2007), and this was also the case for higher education academic staff (Saleem et al., 2011), which found that P-O fit was a strong predictor for organizational commitment, and full-time college faculty (Castiglia, 2006). Gutierrez, Candela, & Carver (2012) investigated nursing faculty and found that the higher the perceived fit, the more they are committed to the organization and the more they report higher levels of affective commitment.

While P-O fit has been positively related to organizational commitment, several studies have related P-O fit to increased tenure and decreased turnover. Handler (2004) found that increased fit likely results in an increase in tenure which reduces the significant costs associated with turnover. Employees, therefore, with high P-O fit are less likely to leave (Carless, 2005; Erdogan & Bauer, 2005; Liu et al., 2010). Saleem, Adnan, & Ambreen (2011) found that higher
P-O fit results in higher employee identification with the goals and objectives of the institution, which leads to extra efforts and dedication, leading to organizational success. It has also been found that infusing P-O fit into the hiring process was predicted to improve employee attitudes and reduce absenteeism and turnover, despite the initial investment in time and resources (Bowen et al., 1991). In addition, a poor fit has been associated with increased turnover (Caldwell & O’Reilly, 1990; Chatman, 1989; Joyce & Slocum, 1982).

**Summary**

Researchers and scholars have studied factors that influence satisfaction and commitment for both full-time and part-time adjunct instructors at various types of colleges and universities. In addition, researchers have examined relationships between various instructor demographics (such as age, gender, etc.) and both job satisfaction and organizational commitment. However, few studies exist that comprehensively analyze the ten adjunct characteristics examined in this study from the same population of instructors to determine which ones might be correlated with satisfaction and organizational commitment. In addition, only one study exists that compared job satisfaction for online versus on-ground adjunct instructors (Swartz et al., 2010), but this applied only to one discipline (business law) and no other characteristics. Lastly, all of the studies on adjunct job satisfaction and organizational commitment have researched populations at either community colleges or four-year public and private colleges and universities. No comprehensive research study has ever analyzed adjunct job satisfaction and commitment along with characteristics related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment at a career college system that comprises multiple onground campuses and a separate online campus.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to determine if a predictive relationship exists between ten different adjunct instructor characteristics (age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, teaching load, teaching discipline, outside work status, teaching modality [online, onground, and blended], and perceived fit) and both organizational commitment and job satisfaction. If a relationship exists between any of the factors mentioned above, then college administrators could use this information when hiring adjunct instructors and planning training and professional development, which could save time and money by reducing turnover and increasing productivity and student success. The methodology section will include information about the design used for this study, the research questions and hypotheses, participants, setting for the study, the instrumentations that were used to collect data, and how the data was collected and analyzed.

Design

The quantitative method of correlational research was utilized to determine if a relationship exists between any of the ten adjunct instructor characteristics and two criterion variables, job satisfaction or organizational commitment. Quantitative methods were selected for this study because quantitative prediction studies consider different sources of variability (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006). Specifically, the correlational research design allows the researcher to “analyze the relationships among a large number of variables in a single study” (Gall et al., 2007, p. 336) and provides information of the degree of the relationship between the variables under study (Gall et al., 2007), as well as serves as beginning research to determine if more rigorous research is warranted. This study examined the relationship between a number of...
predictor variables associated with adjunct instructors and satisfaction and commitment, and the
correlational analysis provided information on how each variable related to one another to
predict commitment and satisfaction.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

The following research questions and hypotheses informed this study:

**RQ1:** Do the variables of age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, outside
work status, teaching load, teaching modality, teaching discipline, and perceived fit of adjunct
instructors predict the attitudinal construct of job satisfaction?

**H₁:** There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variables of
age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, outside work
status, teaching load, teaching modality, teaching discipline, and perceived fit of adjunct instructors and the attitudinal construct of job satisfaction.

**H₀₁:** There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the
variable of adjunct instructor age and job satisfaction.

**H₀₂:** There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the
variable of adjunct instructor gender and job satisfaction.

**H₀₃:** There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the
variable of adjunct instructor ethnicity and job satisfaction.

**H₀₄:** There will not be a statistically significant relationship
between the variable of adjunct instructor education level and job
satisfaction.

**H₀₅:** There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the
variable of adjunct instructor teaching experience and job
satisfaction.

**H₀₆**: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor teaching discipline and job satisfaction.

**H₀₇**: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor teaching load and job satisfaction.

**H₀₈**: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor outside employment and job satisfaction.

**H₀₉**: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor teaching modality and job satisfaction.

**H₀₁₀**: There will not be statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor perceived fit and job satisfaction.

**RQ₂**: Do the variables of age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, outside work status, teaching load, teaching modality, teaching discipline, and perceived fit of adjunct instructors predict the attitudinal construct of organizational commitment?

**H₁**: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variables of age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, outside work status, teaching load, teaching modality, teaching discipline, and perceived fit of adjunct instructors and the attitudinal construct of organizational commitment.

**H₀₁**: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor age and organizational commitment.
H₀₂: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor gender and organizational commitment.

H₀₃: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor ethnicity and organizational commitment.

H₀₄: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor education level and organizational commitment.

H₀₅: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor teaching experience and organizational commitment.

H₀₆: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor teaching discipline and organizational commitment.

H₀₇: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor teaching load and organizational commitment.

H₀₈: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor outside employment and organizational commitment.

H₀₉: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor teaching modality and organizational commitment.
commitment.

\( H_{010} \): There will not be statistically significant relationship between the variable of adjunct instructor perceived fit and organizational commitment.

**Participants**

The population for the study consisted of all adjunct faculty members who taught either online or face-to-face in all disciplines at the collegiate institution for the 2012-2013 academic year (September 2012 – August 2013). The institution utilizes the quarter system, and the academic year is divided into four quarters (Fall, Winter, Spring, and Summer), with each quarter being ten-weeks in duration for onground campuses (except for Summer, which is nine weeks) and twelve-weeks for the online college. Adjunct faculty had to teach at least one quarter in order to be considered for the study. All adjunct instructors who taught in the 2012-2013 academic year were included, and the sample consisted of those who responded to the survey.

Different experimental and non-experimental designs have various recommendations for sample sizes, and correlational research studies typically require larger sample sizes due to the need for wide variations in the scores (Gay, 1987). Wilson Van Voorhis and Morgan (2007) stated that the sample size “rule of thumb” for relationship studies (correlations and regressions) is approximately 50 participants and that a minimum of 10 participants per predictor is appropriate for regression equations using six or more predictors. However, according to Tabachnik and Fidell (2007), “the ratio of \( N \) (number of cases) to \( k \) (number of predictors) has to be ‘substantial’ for a regression analysis to give believable results. On the basis of work by Green (1991), they recommended a minimum \( N > 50 + 8k \) for tests of multiple \( R \) and a minimum of \( N > 104 + k \) for tests of significance of individual predictors. The larger of these two minimum \( N \)’s should be
used to decide how many cases are needed Thus, for a multiple regression with k=5 predictors, the first rule gives N > 75 and the second rule gives N > 109; at least 109 cases should be used” (p. 570). Tabachnick & Fidell (2013) indicated the sample sizes mentioned by Green (1991) assume a medium effect size (0.30), an alpha level of .05 and a power of .20. However, a researcher would have higher power to detect a smaller effect size with 30 participants per predictor variable (Wilson & Morgan, 2007). Since this study has ten predictor variables, the researcher needed to achieve a minimum of greater than 114 participants to detect a medium effect size and a minimum of greater than 300 participants to detect a small effect size.

When using a survey administered via email, a 40% response rate is considered average, a 50% response rate is considered “good”, and a 60% response rate is considered “very good” (University of Texas, 2011). Therefore, a minimum of a 40% response rate was sought after for this study. However, since many of the instructors surveyed only teach during different quarters other than fall quarter when the survey was administered it was likely that the response rate would be lower than 40%.

The study did not utilize random sampling, as every adjunct instructor who taught during the 2012-2013 academic year was included in the population and not randomly selected. Therefore, the type of sampling procedure used was convenience sampling due to the convenience of the population for the researcher, familiarity of sites, and the sample suits the purposes of the study (Gall et al., 2007). Each participant was selected based on whether they taught in that academic year and whether or not they have taught for at least one quarter. In terms of specific participant information, there was a wide variety of ages, experiences, educational levels, disciplines, and work statuses, as well as a mix of genders. Since the study was conducted in various geographic areas in the Midwest, there was variation in ethnicity.
Setting

The collegiate institution used for this study is located in the Midwestern area of the United States. This institution, North Central College (pseudonym), is a private, not-for-profit, career college system, with nine on-ground campuses located in diverse geographical settings ranging from rural to urban, as well as a virtual online college. Established in 1911, this institution has approximately 36,000 students as a system, with campus sizes ranging from approximately 1,500 to approximately 5,000 students. North Central College offers more than 140 certificate, associate, and bachelor degrees in both the online and on-ground formats in the areas of business administration, computer information systems, education and human service, engineer and technology, health sciences, automotive, and culinary, as well as four master’s degrees and one doctoral degree through the online college, and since it is a career college, primarily uses adjunct instructors with “real-world” experience to teach a majority of the classes for all programs. North Central College is regionally accredited through the Higher Learning Commission, which is affiliated with the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools.

Each of the nine on-ground campuses for North Central College offers the same courses, utilizes the same textbooks and student learning outcomes for each course, and has the same academic policies and procedures in place. The only differences between the on-ground campuses are their size, geographic location, and array of program offerings (larger campuses have more programs), but everything else is identical. This helped to minimize extraneous variables that could impact the results of the study. In terms of hiring procedures, each campus uses similar procedures for adjunct instructor hiring, which consists of advertising in local newspapers, on the college website, and through word-of-mouth. Qualifications for each campus, including the online college, are similar and based on individual accreditation bodies for
specific programs. The only criteria that potential adjunct instructors must meet is the educational qualification set forth by accreditation, and if a program is not accredited, then individuals must possess a degree that is one level higher than the degree the students are pursuing (i.e. must have a master’s if students are pursuing a bachelor’s, must have a bachelor’s if students are pursuing an associate’s, etc.). Because North Central College is a career college, many of the programs only require associate degree qualifications (or less) due to the nature of the program (such as automotive) and the lack of individuals in the field with advanced degrees. The specific processes for hiring and training adjunct instructors vary slightly from campus to campus within the system, but recruitment typically begins by either word-of-mouth or local newspaper advertisements. Adjunct instructors are interviewed by a representative of the department, such as director and/or dean, and if hired, fills out an application packet which includes an application, account request, tax forms, transcript requests, background check documentation, etc. Once hired, new instructors are shown how to access curriculum, email accounts, and their courses, and typically attend a training session geared towards teaching strategies for new faculty. Other sessions that are available to new adjuncts once hired include Blackboard training, and a quarterly instructor kickoff that has professional development for all instructors is typical on most campuses.

As mentioned earlier, residential courses are ten-weeks in duration for fall, winter, and spring quarters, and nine-weeks for summer quarter. For each course, one credit hour equates to fifty minutes of instruction per week, and since a majority of courses are four-credits, a typical class would be 200 minutes of instruction each week. Therefore, class times are usually scheduled for one day/week meeting for three hours and forty minutes (twenty minute break) or two days/week for one hour and fifty minutes each session (two 10-minute breaks). Blended
classes meet both in the online and face-to-face environment, and while percentages may vary, typically meet physically for 50% of the class, and virtually for 50%. This is often accomplished by alternating face-to-face and online instruction on a weekly basis. To accommodate working individuals, many classes are scheduled during the evening hours. Classrooms vary within and amongst campuses in terms of equipment and technology. A standard classroom contains a computer, projector, and whiteboard. Other classrooms may contain individual student computers and/or Smartboards (interactive whiteboards). Similarly, seating varies amongst classrooms and campuses, with variations in student capacity, type of table (i.e. round versus square), and type of seating.

Adjunct instructors contacted for inclusion in the study were those who taught in the fall 2012, winter 2013, spring 2013, and summer 2013 quarters at North Central College. Adjunct instructors who teach in the face-to-face environment can use Learning Management Systems, such as Blackboard, to supplement their course, but it must be a course that meets physically for every class period (unless a class is cancelled and rescheduled using an online component). For online courses, instructors utilize either a complete asynchronous format (in which students can log on and complete assignments anytime) (Ally, 2004) or a combination of asynchronous and synchronous instruction (an environment that allows real-time communication between instructor and students) (Ally, 2004). There are varying degrees of instructor control over course development dependent on the course and discipline. North Central College is currently undergoing a process for all curriculum in which professional instructional designers are working with content experts to develop student outcomes appropriate for the program and assessments that match those outcomes. Within these courses, professional instructional designers create anywhere from 60-80% of assessments for instructors, with the rest being developed by the
instructor. Other courses have what is called “direct measure” assessments, and these are assessments that must be strategically utilized in the same course throughout all campuses to demonstrate student competency and consistency amongst locations. Courses that have yet to undergo the revised curriculum process or that do not have direct measure components have no prescribed assessments for instructors. However, to ensure continuity, similar courses across all campuses utilize the same student learning outcomes and same textbooks. In addition, each course has a “faculty guide”, which is a tool that breaks down each week of the course with student learning outcomes that should be taught that week, teaching strategies, and other suggestions.

Instrumentation

This study utilized questions from three separate instruments to measure adjunct instructor perceptions of fit, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction. In addition, demographic and experience questions were asked on the survey. The instrumentation setting was wherever the instructor had internet access and the capability to complete the survey, and could be either at home or at the college. Organizational commitment was measured with the shortened organizational commitment questionnaire, which was originally developed by Mowday et al. (1982). This instrument consists of 9 items to describe global organizational commitment (Fields, 2002), and has been shown to be positively related with the original 15-item organizational commitment questionnaire developed by Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979). Respondents indicated the degree of agreement or disagreement to a series of statements that represent possible feelings individuals may have towards the organization using a 7-point Likert-type scale. Statements discuss an individual’s loyalty, pride, inspiration, etc. This instrument is appropriate for this study (Mowday et al., 1982) due to its high reliability (Cronbach’s alpha...
range of 0.82 to 0.90, depending on the population being sampled) and validity. Moreover, the original OCQ has been extensively used in determining organizational commitment in a number of studies for both full-time and part-time instructors (Borchers & Teahen, 2001; Marchiori & Henkin, 2004; Maynard & Joseph, 2008; Mojtahedzadeh, Hoda, & Gholamhosini, 2011; Thomas, 2008). Borchers and Teahen (2001) used the original organizational commitment questionnaire to study organizational commitment between online and face-to-face faculty. Numerous studies have shown that coefficient alpha values that measure reliability for the shortened OCQ have ranged from 0.74 to 0.92 (Aryee, Luk, & Stone, 1998; Cohen, 1995, 1996; Dulebohn & Martocchio, 1998; Huselid & Day, 1991; Jones, Scarpello, & Bergmann, 1999; Kirchmeyer, 1992; Mathieu & Farr, 1991; Netemeyer, Burton, & Johnston, 1995; Thompson & Werner, 1997; Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997). Organizational commitment has also been validated in numerous studies, showing convergent validity (Karim & Noor, 2006) and discriminate validity (Karim & Noor, 2006). Riggs & Knight (1994) showed that there was discriminate validity between organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and personal efficacy; whereas Cohen (1999b) demonstrated discriminate validity among affective organizational commitment, career commitment, and continuance organizational commitment. It correlates positively with involvement in the organization for job satisfaction, moral reasons, perceptions of justice, and involvement (Brett, Cron, & Slocum, 1995; Johnston & Snizek, 1991; Kacmer, Carlson, & Brymer, 1999; Lee & Johnson, 1991; Mathieu, 1991). For this study, the researcher examined one composite score of organizational commitment and studied the individual predictor to determine if organizational commitment varies depending on adjunct characteristics. The range of scores is between one and seven for each question, and 9 and 63 for the instrument. If participants select either “5” (slightly agree), “6” (moderately agree), or “7”
Job satisfaction was measured using the part-time faculty job satisfaction survey, which was developed by Hoyt et al. (2007). While there are many job satisfaction instruments for business and industry, they are not often applicable to the working conditions of faculty in higher education (Hill, 1986). The part-time faculty job satisfaction survey contains eight dimensions of job satisfaction (recognition, work preference, autonomy, classroom facilities, faculty support, honorarium, quality of students, and teaching schedule, as well as overall job satisfaction). The survey consists of 36 questions, and participants respond using a six-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Upon the recommendation of Kevin Love, professor of Management at Central Michigan University (personal communication, August 23, 2013), the author re-scaled the 6-point survey items to 7-point to mitigate or minimize threats to validity that might arise from respondents considering the differing weights of 6 and 7-point values of survey items. Although no definitive source could be found in support of this exact re-scaling, Harwell and Gatti (2001) support re-scaling ordinal data to interval for the purpose of statistical analysis. The re-scaling for this study did follow that same philosophy. Scores for each dimension are calculated by summing the value for each item and dividing by the total number of questions (Hoyt et al., 2007), and therefore scores range from 1-7 for each question, and 36-252 for the instrument. If participants select either “5” (slightly agree), “6” (moderately agree), or “7” (strongly agree), they would be considered satisfied to the organization regarding those particular topics (see Appendix A for survey questions). The survey was tested with 762 part-time faculty representing a wide range of demographics, working experience, disciplines, and teaching modalities, and therefore it is appropriate for this study. The coefficient alpha value
for reliability was 0.85, which supported the internal consistency of the summated rating scale measuring part-time faculty job satisfaction (Hoyt et al., 2007). In terms of validity, a factor analysis was completed to determine which items inter-correlate high with one another, which would reflect that they measure the same construct (Spector, 1992). Job satisfaction has been validated in numerous studies, showing that it positively correlates with perceived job performance, coping with change, organizational commitment (Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, & Barrick, 1999), as well as age, tenure, psychological commitment to the organization, and intention to stay (Cohen, 1997). Job satisfaction has been shown to be negatively correlated with role conflict, role overload, work-home conflict (Bacharach, Bamberger, & Conley, 1991), as well as frequency of absences, job level, conflict between work and non-work roles, and years in occupation (Cohen, 1997). The questions for the subscales of pay, class, facilities, quality of students, and work preference had heavy loadings on intended factors, whereas the questions measuring satisfaction with teaching schedule and levels of faculty support had very good to excellent loadings on intended factors. For this study, I examined one composite score of job satisfaction, and looked at the individual facets to determine if different aspects of job satisfaction differ depending on adjunct characteristics (See Appendix A for survey questions).

To measure person-organization fit, a person-organization fit instrument developed by Cable and DeRue (2002) was used. This instrument uses three items to directly determine an employee’s perception of his or her fit with their organization. Responses for each of the three items are obtained using a 7-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). If participants answer each question with a “5” (slightly agree), “6” (agree), or “7” (strongly agree), than they are considered a good fit with the organization (see Appendix A for questions). In terms of reliability, Cable and DeRue (2002) found that the coefficient alpha
was 0.92. In regards to validity, Cable and Judge (1997) found that perceived person-organization fit had a positive correlation with employee perceptions of job satisfaction, fit, commitment, and employee rating of the importance of person-organization fit. While this has not been used to assess adjunct instructor perceived fit in previous studies, the questions broadly relate individual and organizational values, and therefore can be effectively utilized across all sectors.

Questions from all three survey instruments were combined to form one survey and were distributed to participants electronically through Survey Monkey. The layout and development for demographic questions was modeled after a survey developed by Papavero (2009), in which the demographic section was separated into the following subsections: About You (age, gender, and ethnicity), Education and Work Experience (education level, amount of teaching experience), and Your Job (teaching discipline, teaching load, teaching modality, and outside employment status.) Since this was an electronic survey, participants were able to select the appropriate category for each demographic variable. For the demographic and experience questions, dummy coding was utilized for analysis, as it is the simplest method for coding categorical data (Pedhazur, 1997; in Starkweather, 2014). Dummy coding is used when the researcher wants to compare all predictor variables in a group to one other predictor variable, known as the reference (Starkweather, 2014). Dummy coding, therefore, allows for the exploration of mean differences by comparing categorical groups (Starkweather, 2014).

When creating dummy variables, the number of dummy variables is \( k-1 \), where \( k \) equals the number of categories for a predictor variable. The reference category is always represented as “0”, and all other categories will be assigned as “1”, which is necessary as one dummy variable for each predictor category would violate the assumption of no perfect collinearity.
(Hardy, 1993; in Starkweather, 2014). In addition, when research does not involve a control group, such as the present study, than the reference group is usually determined arbitrarily (Starkweather, 2014). However, Garson (2006) recommends that it should not be a miscellaneous category, should have many cases, and should be in the middle as to represent the best choice for comparing others (Starkweather, 2014). Therefore, in the current study, dummy coding was used for instructor variables with two or more categories, which included gender, age, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, teaching load, teaching discipline, teaching modality, and outside employment status.

Organizational commitment questions made-up part II of the survey, and represent questions 11-20. These questions looked at willingness to take on extra responsibility, inspiration from the organization, caring about the organization, and overall happiness of choosing to work at the organization. Part III of the survey dealt with job satisfaction (questions 21-56) and is broken into eight sections: overall job satisfaction (questions 21-24), recognition (questions 25-28), work reference (questions 29-32), autonomy (questions 33-36), classroom facilities (questions 37-40), faculty support (questions 41-44), Honorariums (questions 45-48), quality of students (49-52) and teaching schedule (53-56). Part IV of the survey consisted of questions related to perceived fit (questions 57-59) and relate to the perception of value alignment between the individual and the organization.

**Procedures**

The policy at North Central College is that all internal research conducted on multiple campuses needs approval from the President’s Council (Presidents from all campuses) before Institutional Review Board (IRB) materials are submitted and research conducted. The completed IRB application was sent to the Presidents on September 3, 2013 and their approval
was granted on September 5, 2013. The IRB application for Liberty University was initially sent on September 3, 2013 and for North Central College on September 5, 2013. Due to the nature of the research, the researcher applied for exempt status. The IRB application for North Central College was preliminarily approved on September 16, 2013, with full-approval contingent on approval from Liberty University’s IRB committee. Liberty University’s IRB committee approved the research on September 24, 2013, and North Central College’s IRB committee approved the research on September 26, 2013 for a one-year period. The IRB approval documents are included in Appendix B and C, respectively. During the IRB approval process (September 2013), a listing of all adjunct instructors from all campuses for the 2012-2013 academic year was obtained manually by the researcher through the institutions computer system. Once the lists were obtained, the researcher manually gathered email addresses for all instructors who taught on all campuses for the 2012-2013 academic year through the computer system. Once IRB approval was obtained, the survey was sent out to all instructors who taught during the 2012-2013 academic year on the researcher’s campus as a pilot to determine if any errors needed to be corrected in the instrument. For the pilot study, an email message was sent to all adjunct instructors at the researcher’s campus on October 7, 2013 with a recruitment letter explaining the research and the importance and rationale for the research (see Appendix D). In addition, a consent form was attached to the email explaining that this was a voluntary request and that anonymity of all participants will be ensured, as well as more specific details on the research and contact information for the researcher and IRB committees for both institutions (see Appendix E). The recruitment letter requested that the adjunct instructors complete the anonymous, voluntary web-based survey within a one-month period (two-weeks for the pilot study), and the consent form contained a link to the survey created in SurveyMonkey. This gave
the participants a sufficient amount of time to access and complete the survey. However, for the pilot study, a two-week period was used, as this was deemed sufficient by the researcher to gather enough information to make informed decisions regarding changes before conducting the full study. Responses gathered from the pilot study were included in the overall data for analysis. Kittleson (1997) found that sending follow-up reminders to potential respondents of online surveys can double the number of responses. Therefore, two follow-up emails were sent as reminders: one after three days and one after nine days. A summary of communications and corresponding dates for the pilot study are included below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 7, 2013</td>
<td>Original Survey E-Mailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 10, 2013</td>
<td>Email reminder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 16, 2013</td>
<td>Last email reminder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 21, 2013</td>
<td>Survey closed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon completion of the two-week pilot study, the researcher spent one week fixing any issues identified through the pilot study. The only issue discovered through the pilot study was misspelled words in each of the Likert-scale categories, which was easily corrected. There were no issues identified in terms of survey questions, length of survey, etc. After making corrections, the survey was sent to adjunct instructors on all campuses using the same recruitment letter and consent from the pilot study, with an email reminder after two weeks and after three weeks. A summary of communications and corresponding dates for the study are included below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 28, 2013</td>
<td>Original Survey E-Mailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 11, 2013</td>
<td>Email reminder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 18, 2013</td>
<td>Last email reminder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 28, 2013</td>
<td>Survey closed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the web-based survey format and having participants respond anonymously to the researcher protected instructor identity. Another advantage to using a web-based survey is that it helps to ensure anonymity, which can ease anxiety and allow for more open and honest answers, thereby reducing the percentage of dishonest answers due to fear of repercussions (McFarland, Ryan, & Paul, 1998).

**Data Analysis**

Multivariate correlational methods were utilized to determine if predictor variables are related to the criterion variables *organizational commitment* and *job satisfaction*. Two hierarchical multiple regressions were used to determine which predictor variables are the most statistically significant at predicting job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The SPSS statistical software package (version 22) was used for all statistical calculations. Descriptive statistics included the mean and standard deviation for each predictor and criterion variable, and the multiple coefficient of determination ($R^2$) specified the effect size (Howell, 2011). The alpha level for the regression was set at 0.05.

Before the correlational methods were utilized, the sample was checked for the assumption of normality by conducting a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (because the sample is larger than 50) and multivariate normality. Multivariate normality is more complex than bivariate and allows the researcher to explore more complex relationships between a criterion variable and several predictor variables (Thompson, 1991). To test for multivariate normality, a goodness-of-fit test was run on the data using SPSS and Cook’s $d$ was determined, which can be used to compare properties of this data with theoretical data from a multivariate normal distribution (Warner, 2013). A histogram, box plot, and stem-and-leaf diagram were generated to examine the shape of the distribution of scores for all quantitative variables and determine if outliers or
extreme values exist. In addition, the assumptions of linearity and homoscedasticity were tested by creating a scatterplot of residuals for each predictor-criterion relationship and looking at the data to determine if the assumptions are tenable (Howell, 2011). A Pearson-product-moment correlation coefficient \((R)\) was computed to determine the magnitude of the relationship between each predictor variable. This allowed the researcher to check for multicollinearity, which is when multiple predictor variables are highly correlated with each other (Howell, 2007). The assumption of multicollinearity was also tested by examining the variance inflation factor (VIF), which indicates whether a predictor variable has a strong linear relationship with another predictor variable, as well as tolerance, which is the reciprocal of the VIF (Field, 2013).

Independence of errors (independence of residual terms for any two observations) (Field, 2013; Norusis, 2010) was measured with the Durbin-Watson test, which tests for correlation between adjacent residuals.

Correlational statistics are best used to measure the degree and direction of the relationship between variables, as opposed to developing a strong conclusion (Gall et al., 2007), and this study is designed to document the degree and direction of possible relationships between instructor characteristics and satisfaction and commitment. Multicollinearity was analyzed if the correlation between variables exceeded 0.9, as correlations above 0.9 typically cause problems that need to be investigated (Katz, 2006). In addition, a VIF greater than 10 or a tolerance factor below 0.2 indicate a potential problem with multicollinearity. In addition, a Pearson-product-moment correlation coefficient \((R)\) was computed to determine the magnitude of the relationship between each predictor variable separately and job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Gall et al., 2007).
Multivariate correlational statistics was utilized to determine the interrelationships between the multiple predictor variables (Gall et al., 2007). To do this, two hierarchical multiple regression analyses, which are used to “determine the correlation between a criterion variable and a combination of two or more predictor variables” (Gall et al., 2007, p. 353), was utilized, one for job satisfaction and one for organizational commitment.

Since the purpose of this study is to determine which factors can help predict satisfaction and commitment, a multiple regression was chosen to help determine which combinations of variables achieve the highest correlations with these criterion variables. To run the multiple regression analysis for job satisfaction, the correlation for the best single predictor and the criterion variable was first entered into the regression, and this generated a multiple correlation coefficient ($R$) (for the first predictor, this value will be the same as the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient) (Gall et al., 2007). Next, the researcher entered the next best predictor based on research and theory into the multiple regression, which generated a new $R$ value. This continued until all predictor variables have been entered into the regression. In addition a Coefficient of Determination ($R^2$) was calculated from each combination to determine the amount of variance in the criterion variable explained by one or a combination of predictor variables (Gall et al., 2007). The separate multiple regression were conducted for job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and an $R^2$ increment was calculated to explain the amount of additional variance in the criterion variable that is explained by adding a new predictor variable, and this was tested for statistical significance using a standard significance level of .05.

In this study, there are multiple predictor variables, and to determine which predictor variables can provide evidence to predict job satisfaction and organizational commitment,
hierarchical regression is the most advantageous. Hierarchical multiple regression analysis is a sequential process in which predictor variables are entered into the equation separately (Lewis, 2007). Unlike stepwise regression, a hierarchical regression allows for the researcher to select the order in which variables are entered based on theory and previous research (Lewis, 2007). Hierarchical multiple regression is the most ideal method for analysis for the current research because this study seeks to determine the amount of variance in the criterion variables that can be predicted from the predictor variables; a hierarchical regression is the most appropriate analysis for this type of research (Pedhazur, 1997). In addition, similar studies looking at adjunct instructor demographics and job satisfaction used a hierarchical multiple regression (Bedeian, Ferris, & Kacmar, 1992; Boord, 2010), justifying the use of this design when analyzing the effects of demographic characteristics on adjunct instructor satisfaction and commitment.

Previous studies examining instructor characteristics and job satisfaction and/or organizational commitment have used a variety of statistical designs, including standard multiple regression (Lewis, 2012; Tomanek, 2010), stepwise multiple regression (Castillo & Cano, 2004; Ramsey, 2011), ANOVA (Saifuddin et al., 2010; Ghafoor, 2012; Iiacqua et al., 2001; Saygi et al., 2011), Chi-Square (Bergmann, 2011), MANOVA (Truell et al., 1998), Logistic Regression (Akroyd et al., 2011), Frequency Distribution (Tomanek, 2010), Cross-Tabulation (Tomanek, 2010), and hierarchical multiple regression (Boord, 2010). Despite the limited use of the hierarchical multiple regression method, it is the best choice for the current study because it can be used to examine incremental validity, evaluate contribution of predictors over previously entered predictors, and allow for the researcher to have control on the sequential order of variable entry (Lewis, 2007). In addition, hierarchical regression is ideal to analyze the effects of different predictor variables while controlling for other variables, which is achieved by
determining the adjusted $R^2$ for each step, which will determine the incremental variance for each variable as it is entered into the regression (Pedhazur, 1997; in Lewis, 2007). Since this study is examining how predictor variables explain the variance in job satisfaction and organizational commitment, while controlling for previously entered variables, hierarchical regression is the ideal statistical analysis methodology.

When determining the sequential order of variables, independent variables are often entered according to theoretical or empirical importance to determine if these independent variables add to the prediction of the dependent variable as they are entered (UC Denver, n.d.). Often, researchers prefer to enter demographic variables, such as age, gender, and ethnicity, first before adding more practical variables in later steps (Abrams, 2002). This allows the researcher to control for demographics while looking at other predictor variables.

The order of variable entry for this study is based on the two previous studies looking at job satisfaction and instructor characteristics using hierarchical regression, as well as past studies regarding each variable and its predictive nature on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Boord (2010) studied the impact of independent variables gender, age, benefits, instruction, relationships, and physical environment on adjunct instructor job satisfaction and entered these variables in the following order: block 1 (gender and age), block 2 (gender, age, and benefits), block 3 (gender, age, benefits, and instruction), block 4 (gender, age, benefits, instruction, and relationships), and block 5 (gender, age, benefits, instruction, relationships, and physical environment). In addition, Tables 1 and 2 illustrate that age, gender, ethnicity, and education level have been studied frequently in terms of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and have empirically been shown to impact these variables. Therefore, for this study, block 1 consisted of age, gender, ethnicity, and education level. Block 2 consisted of
variables related to teaching experience and teaching discipline, as these variables have demonstrated mixed results in the literature yet have not been significantly empirically proven to affect job satisfaction and organizational commitment due to the lack of research. Block 3 consisted of variables related to teaching load, teaching modality, and outside work status due to the lack of empirical research, especially in the higher education setting. Lastly, block 4 consisted of perceived fit, which will be the last variable entered into the regression. The placement of this variable is due to the fact that perceived fit has never been analyzed with adjunct instructors, and therefore this variable will have significant importance when all other variables are controlled. Figure 2 illustrates the order of variable entry into the regression model.
Figure 2. Blocks and Order of Variable Insertion into Regression Model
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS AND DATA ANALYSIS

As stated in chapter one, the purpose of this study was to examine age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, outside work status, teaching load, teaching modality, teaching discipline, and perceived fit of adjunct instructors to determine if these variables can predict the attitudinal constructs of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. This chapter is organized in terms of the two specific research questions that informed the study and includes a description and analyses of the data collected from the survey instrument (Appendix A).

Survey Responses

The author manually collected instructor email addresses by analyzing class lists from each of the nine on-ground campuses (for the online campus, the author was sent the names of all instructors who currently teach) for each quarter during the 2012-2013 academic year (fall, winter, spring, and summer) and looking up each instructor in the online college directory to obtain the email address. Several instructors’ email addresses were removed from the system as they no longer teach at North Central College, and, therefore, the author was unable to contact them. Including the pilot study, the author sent 2,799 emails containing the recruitment letter and consent from with survey link. After initial contact, 16 email addresses were returned undeliverable, and seven instructors indicated that they were full-time faculty, not adjunct instructors; therefore, the sample comprised 2,776 participants. A total of 862 participants responded to the survey, for a response rate of 31%. However, 13 participants indicated that they did not teach during the 2012-2013 academic year, and were, consequently, removed from the survey. In addition, 38 participants completed the demographic information but did not answer any questions related to organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and person-organization fit, and therefore these responses were also removed from the data. Therefore, a
total of 811 surveys were accepted for the study, producing a response rate of 29%, which is a concern due to non-response bias but which nonetheless meets accepted standards for educational research using surveys to collect data (Porter & Whitcomb, 2003). Moreover, Andrews, Nonnecke, and Preece (2003) have indicated that response rates of 20% are common (although not ideal) for electronic survey methodologies.

**Demographics**

Respondents were asked to answer nine demographic questions that were then used to determine if these responses could be used to predict organizational commitment and job satisfaction. These nine questions asked for respondent gender, age, ethnicity, highest degree attained, years of teaching experience, discipline(s) in which they teach, average course load per year, teaching modalities, and outside employment status. The majority of respondents indicated that they were female (60.3%) compared to male (30.7%); an equal majority fell within the 45-54 age group (28.4%), and the 55-64 age group (28.4%), were predominantly Caucasian (87.3%), held a master’s degree as their highest degree attained (48.8%), had 10 or more years of teaching experience (51.5%), taught in the general education department (26.7%), had an average course load of 1-3 courses per year (29.8%), taught in the traditional face-to-face modality (72.9%), and had other full-time employment outside of teaching (48.9%). Detailed descriptions of the personal demographic information are presented in Table 4.1.
Table 4.1

Demographics of North Central College Adjunct Faculty Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N = 811$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>61.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>38.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N = 811$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>22.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>28.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>28.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 and Over</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racial/Ethnic Background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N = 811$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>87.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest Degree Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N = 811$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>18.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Professional</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>12.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>49.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>12.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Bachelors</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N = 811$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3 Years</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>15.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 Years</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>18.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 Years</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or More Years</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>51.79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discipline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N = 811$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>19.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>27.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>15.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology, Engineering, &amp; Transportation</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>21.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Education</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Course Load</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N = 811$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Courses/Year</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>29.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 Courses/Year</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>29.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 Courses/Year</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>26.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more Courses/Year</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>14.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Modality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N = 811$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>27.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>73.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended Instruction</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>15.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outside Employment Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N = 811$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Only by Choice</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>21.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time But Prefer Full-Time</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>14.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time is Primary with Other Part-Time Jobs</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>14.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Employment Outside of Teaching</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>49.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Numbers do not include respondents who responded to demographic questions only or who did not teach during the 2012-2013 academic year.

The survey instrument utilized for the current research was divided into three main categories: Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Person-Organization Fit. Each component consisted of a series of questions related to the topic, and responses were measured on a 7-point Likert-scale. Table 4.2 shows the number of questions for each section as well as the mean, standard deviation, and reliability for responses relative to each section.
Table 4.2

*Mean, Standard Deviations, and Reliability for Total Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Person-Organization Fit.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Section</th>
<th>Number of Questions</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Reliability (Cronbach’s Alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organization Fit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further, the job satisfaction component of the survey was divided into nine different categories based on various aspects of the adjunct instructor role. These categories included overall job satisfaction, recognition, work preference, autonomy, classroom facilities, faculty support, honorariums, quality of students, and teaching schedule. Table 4.3 shows the number of questions for each sub-category under job satisfaction and the mean score and standard deviation for each sub-category.
Table 4.3

Mean and Standard Deviations for Job Satisfaction Sub-Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Section</th>
<th>Number of Questions</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Preference</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Facilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorarium</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Schedule</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions Testing

Because multiple regression is a parametric test, the following normal distribution assumptions should be investigated if reliable predictions are to be made from the data: linearity, homoscedasticity, normally distributed errors, and no perfect multicollinearity (Field, 2013; Levine, Stephan, & Szabat, 2013; Lind, Marchal, & Wathan, 2013; Warner, 2013). Results for
the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test showed that organizational commitment, $D$ (806) = 0.110, $p < .001$, job satisfaction, $D$ (806) = 0.079, $p < .001$, and person-organization fit, $D$ (791) = 0.229, $p < .001$ were statistically significant meaning that the assumption was not tenable. However, according to Field (2013), the fundamental problem with normality significance tests is that the results can be significant in a large sample for small and unimportant effects. An overemphasis on normality testing for parametric statistics has also been confirmed by Langley (1968), Pearson (2010), and Good and Hardin (2009). In addition, multiple regression analysis with large samples sizes has been shown to be robust against violations of normality (Lind et al., 2013; Pearson, 2010) and sampling distributions of means are normally distributed in sufficiently large sample sizes, regardless of variable distribution (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). To further analyze the data for normality, histograms and p-p plots were created and visually examined for organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and person-organization fit, as well as for the eight job satisfaction subcategories. Visual examination showed that the data had a relatively normal distribution. However, organizational commitment had a skewness of -0.973 ($SE = 0.086$) and kurtosis of 0.832 ($SE = 0.172$); job satisfaction had a skewness of -0.604 ($SE = 0.086$) and kurtosis of 0.034 ($SE = 0.172$); and person-organization fit had a skewness of -1.057 ($SE = 0.087$) and kurtosis of 0.814 ($SE = 0.174$). Therefore, both skewness and kurtosis measures were both statistically significant ($\alpha = .05$) for organizational commitment and person-organization fit, while skewness was statistically significant ($\alpha = .05$) for job satisfaction. Significance was tested by converting the scores for skewness and kurtosis into $z$ scores, and values greater than 1.96 ($p < .05$) indicate significance (Field, 2013). However, Field (2013) indicates that these tests should not be used in large samples since they are likely to be significant even when they are not different from a normal distribution.
Identification of outlier variables was accomplished through both visual inspection of a stem-and-leaf diagram and boxplot for job satisfaction, organizational commitment, person-organization fit, and the nine subcategories for job satisfaction, as well as diagnostic methods through the calculations of Cook’s Distance and standardized residual calculations. Using visual inspection, data points indicated as extreme points in the stem-and-leaf diagram and located beyond the adjacent values (indicated by the horizontal lines at the end of the whiskers) in the boxplot are considered to be outliers. Job satisfaction contained 22 outliers, organizational commitment contained 21 outliers, and person-organization fit contained 14 outliers (the job satisfaction categories of autonomy, classroom facilities, and honorariums did not contain any outliers). Cook’s distance was obtained for each value—this is a measure of “the overall influence of a case on the model” (Field, 2013, p. 306) and reveals which data points are most influential on the regression (Stevens, 1984) and, therefore, is a useful technique to identify multivariate outliers that have an impact on the data. According Stevens (1984), values greater than 1 are considered to be influential and need to be analyzed as possible outliers. There were no data points in any of the variables in this study that equaled or exceeded this value, and, consequently, no single data point had an excessive influence on the regression model as a whole. In addition, the residuals were examined to determine if any stood out as being significantly large, and all standardized residuals met the criteria of having no more than 1% of sample cases with an absolute value greater than 2.58 and no more than 5% greater than 1.96 (which would indicate that the level of error in the model is unacceptable and the model is a poor representation of the data) (Field, 2013).

It is also important to note that, according to Warner (2013), researchers must make the most reasonable judgment call on whether or not to omit outliers and that dropping outliers to
obtain the desired correlation results is not a satisfactory justification for removing outliers. Since this research focuses on the satisfaction and commitment of adjunct instructors and that outlier data points indicate a potential problem that needs to be resolved at the organizational level, the decision was made to leave all outliers that were visually identified in the data. However, in order to assess the impact of this decision, outliers were removed from job satisfaction, organizational commitment, person-organization fit, and the eight job satisfaction sub-categories and compared to data that included the outliers. Analysis of the data with outliers removed showed that it had little impact on the means and standard deviations for each category. Similar to the results with outliers, the results for the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test showed that organizational commitment, \( D (790) = 0.096, p < .001 \), job satisfaction, \( D (793) = 0.072, p < .001 \), and person-organization fit, \( D (775) = 0.228, p < .001 \) were statistically significant, meaning that the null hypothesis of normality should be rejected (and this was also the case for all job satisfaction sub-categories). Skewness was also not influenced by the removal of outliers, as it was still statistically significant \((\alpha = .05)\) for organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and person-organization fit. However, removal of outliers did impact kurtosis, with all three variables being statistically non-significant \((\alpha = .05)\).

Multicollinearity (strong correlation between two or more predictors) was analyzed by examining the variance inflation factor (VIF) and the tolerance statistic for each predictor. According to Bowerman and O’Connell (1990), Myers (1990), and Lind et al. (2013), a VIF greater than 10 is a cause for concern, and a tolerance below 0.2 indicates a potential problem (Field, 2013; Menard, 1995). The highest VIF value between all predictor variables and criterion variables was 1.695, and the lowest tolerance value was 0.621, indicating there is no
concern with multicollinearity for these data. This was also the case when outliers were removed.

Independence of errors (independence of residual terms for any two observations (Field, 2013; Norusis, 2010) was measured with the Durbin-Watson test, which tests for correlation between adjacent residuals. The test statistic ranges between 0 and 4, with a value of 2 indicating that the residuals are not correlated, and values less than one and greater than three are causes for concern (Field, 2013). The Durbin-Watson statistic for organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and person-organization fit ranged from 2.008 to 2.095, and the range for the eight job satisfaction sub-categories ranged from 1.932 for work preference to 2.055 for teaching schedule, indicating that the residuals for all variables are not correlated. Similar results were obtained from the data with outliers removed.

The assumptions of linearity and homoscedasticity were tested by visually analyzing scatterplots comparing the values of the residuals for each variable compared with predicted outcome values from the model (Field, 2013). The scatterplot graphs for all variable comparisons showed no relationship or patterns, and, therefore, the assumptions of linearity and homoscedasticity were met. However, for qualitative categorical variables, which include all predictor variables in this research with the exception of person-organization fit, the variables were specially coded as dummy variables (0 or 1) (dichotomous), and linearity is assumed since a dichotomous variable can only have a linear relationship with another variable (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). This was also the case when data was analyzed without the outlier variables.
Data Analysis

**RQ1**: Do the variables of age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, outside work status, teaching load, teaching modality, teaching discipline, and perceived fit of adjunct instructors predict the attitudinal construct of job satisfaction?

To determine if the 10 adjunct instructor characteristics predicted the attitudinal construct of job satisfaction, a hierarchical multiple regression was conducted for job satisfaction. The model consisted of four blocks that were entered sequentially into the model; the order of variable entry was dictated by empirical research. The first block comprised age, gender, ethnicity, and education level. The second block included age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, and teaching discipline. The third block consisted of age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, teaching discipline, teaching load, teaching modality, and outside work status. Finally, the fourth block consisted of age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, teaching discipline, teaching load, teaching modality, outside work status, and person-organization fit. The adjusted $R^2$ value was used to determine model impact on the criterion variable as it compensates for the addition of predictor variables and can increase or decrease depending on whether or not the added predictor variable adds to the explanatory power of the model (AcaStat, 2012).

The first block of independent variables explained 0.5% of the variance in job satisfaction (as indicated by the adjusted $R^2$ value) (Table 4.4) and was not statistically significant, $F(11, 779) = 1.356; p = .189$ (Table 4.5). In the first block, the $f$-value for the significance of the model is equal to the $f$-value for change ($p = .189$). One individual contributor, education (less than a bachelor’s degree) significantly contributed to predicting job satisfaction in the model. After the block 2 variables were entered, total variance explained by the model as a whole was
0.4% (Table 4.4). This means that the introduction of teaching experience and teaching discipline decreased the predictive capability of the model by 0.1% from the first block after controlling for age, gender, ethnicity, and education level indicating that the first block was more predictive of job satisfaction than the second block, but this change was not statistically significant ($F(9, 770) = .880; p = .543$ (Table 4.4). Similar to the first block, the second block was also not statistically significant, $F(20, 770) = 1.141; p = .301$ (Table 4.5), and had no significant individual contributors.

After entering block 3 variables, the total variance explained by the model as a whole equaled 2.4% (Table 4.4), which was statistically significant, $F(28, 762) = 1.702; p = .014$ (Table 4.5). This means that the introduction of teaching load, teaching modality, and outside work status explained an additional 2% of variance in job satisfaction from the second block of variables after controlling for age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, and teaching discipline, a statistically significant change in predicting job satisfaction ($R^2$ Change = .02; $F(8, 762) = 3.044; p = .002$ (Table 4.4). The adjusted $R^2$ value increased from .004 to .024, suggesting that when the addition of teaching load, teaching modality, and outside work status were added to the model, the predictive utility of the third block of variables increased from 0.4% to 2.4%.

After block 4 was entered, total variance explained by the model equaled 43.1% (Table 4.4), which was statistically significant, $F(29, 761) = 21.593; p < .001$ (Table 4.5). This indicates that the introduction of person-organization fit explained an additional 40.7% of job satisfaction from the third block of variables after controlling for age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, teaching discipline, teaching load, teaching modality, and outside work status; this change was statistically significant ($R^2$ Change = .39; $F(1, 761) =$
544.548; \( p < .001 \) (Table 4.4). The adjusted \( R^2 \) value increased from .024 to .431, which means the addition of person-organization fit increased the predictive power of the model from 2.4% to 43.1%. 
### Table 4.4

*Hierarchical Regression Model Summary for Job Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.356</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>3.044</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>544.548</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5

ANOVA Table Indicating Model Significance for Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>779</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regressions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to assessing the cumulative contribution made by each block of predictor variables and the changed predictive effect after the addition of each block, the coefficients (Table 4.6) were also calculated for each predictor variable. Note that the table contains both unstandardized and standardized $b$-values. Some researchers (Field, 2013; Lewis-Beck, 1980; Pearson, 2010) recommend using the standardized $b$-values for interval or ratio-level variables when interpretation issues might arise based on the scale of the independent variable. Recommendations to use standardized betas, however, apply only to interval- or ratio-level predictors and only when interpretation of the outcome might not be straightforward due to scale confusion (e.g., batting average as a predictor of total wins in baseball because batting average is scaled as a decimal between 0 – 1 whereas wins represent a whole number value from 0 – 162). For dichotomous predictor variables, the standardized betas are not needed to deal with scale issues in the same way because standard deviation units are not meaningful for dummy coded, nominal-level variables. Lewis-Beck (1980), Field (2013), Pearson (2010) and the UCLA Statistical Consulting Group (“Regression with SPSS,” n.d.) suggest using the unstandardized
coefficients, then, for categorical predictors because they can be interpreted in a straightforward manner and for all “linear” variables that can be interpreted in a straightforward manner, as is the case with the variables in the current study.

The “significance” column in the regression output simply indicates the probability of finding results as calculated in the regression equation by mere chance alone. Specifically, the significance output gives the \( p \)-value, which is a measure of risk. The \( p \)-value, properly defined, is the probability of finding results as extreme or more extreme than the ones calculated in the statistical analysis given that the null hypothesis is the best explanation for the findings (Wright, 1997). Much has been written recently about the dangers, disadvantages, and problems associated with placing too much emphasis on or having a misguided obsession with \( p \)-values and null hypothesis statistical significance testing in general (Cohen, 1994; Harlow, Mulaik & Steiger, 1997; Zilak & McCloskey, 2008). However, in their proper context, \( p \)-values help researchers determine the role of chance in the data analysis. The \( p \)-value simply answers the question, “What is the likelihood that the results obtained were due to chance or sampling error?” With that appropriate focus in mind, note that all statistically significant variables (\( p < .05 \)) have been bold-typed.

Neither of the first two blocks of variables provided statistically significant predictive utility, and therefore the focus will be on blocks three and four, both of which indicated statistically significant explained variance. However, the first block did contain one variable that made an individually significant contribution, which was education (less than a bachelor’s degree) (\( \beta = .232, p = .021 \)), which had a significantly higher mean from the “masters” group, which served as the reference group for this category (Table 4.6). Model two did not have any individually significant contributions.
In model three, “blended instruction” and “part-time employment not by choice” made individually significant contributions and had the highest unstandardized beta values ($\beta = .157, p = .021$ for “blended instruction” and $\beta = -.227, p = .003$ for “part-time employment not by choice”) (Table 4.6). This means that the group “blended instruction” had a significantly higher mean from the “face-to-face” group, which served as the reference group for this category. Moreover, the “part-time employment not by choice” group had a significantly lower mean from the “full-time employment outside of teaching” group. For “blended instruction,” the $b$-value was positive, indicating that as teaching modality moves from “face-to-face” (coded “0”) toward “blended instruction” (coded “1”) job satisfaction increased by .157 points. Job satisfaction for those who use blended instruction, therefore, was higher than job satisfaction of those teaching only face-to-face by 0.157 points. For “part-time employment not by choice”, the $b$-value was negative, which means that as employment status moved from “full-time employment outside of teaching” (coded “0”) to “part-time employment not by choice” (coded “1”), job satisfaction decreased by .227 points.

In model four, “gender” ($\beta = -.088, p = .038$), “first professional” ($\beta = -.157, p = .008$), “online” ($\beta = -.200, p < .001$), “blended” ($\beta = .124, p = .017$), and “person-organization fit” ($\beta = .321, p < .001$) made individually significant contributions (Table 4.6). For gender, the $b$-value was negative, indicating that as gender moved from male (coded “0”) to female (coded “1”), job satisfaction decreased by .088 units points. Therefore, female instructors were less satisfied with their job than their male counterparts. For “first professional”, the $b$-value was negative, suggesting that as education moved from “masters degree” (coded “0”) to “first professional,” (coded “1”) job satisfaction decreased by .157 points. For “online” teaching modality, the $b$-value was negative, indicating that as teaching modality moved from face-to-face (coded “0”) to
online (coded “1”) job satisfaction decreased by .200 points. The opposite was true for the “blended” teaching modality, which had a positive $b$-value (as teaching modality moved from face-to-face, coded “0,” to blended instruction, coded “1,” job satisfaction increased by .124 points). Lastly, the variable “person-organization fit” had a positive $b$-value, meaning that for every one point increase in person-organization fit, as measured by the 7-point Likert scale, job satisfaction increased by .321 points, also as measured by the 7-point Likert scale.
Table 4.6

**Coefficients Table for Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>5.075</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>55.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender: Female vs. Male</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. Under 35</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. 35 - 44</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. 55-64</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. 65 - 69</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. Over 70</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnicity: Caucasian vs. Other</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education: Masters vs. Doctorate</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education: Masters vs. First Professional</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>-.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education: Masters vs. Bachelors</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education: Masters vs. Less than Bachelors</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>5.023</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>47.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender: Female vs. Male</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. Under 35</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. 35 - 44</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. 55 - 64</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. 65 - 69</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. Over 70</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnicity: Caucasian vs. Other</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>-.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education: Masters vs. Doctorate</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education: Masters vs. First Professional</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education: Masters vs. Bachelors</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Masters vs. Less than Bachelors</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching: ≥ 10 vs. 0-3</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching: ≥ 10 vs. 4-6</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching: ≥ 10 vs. 7-9</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General vs. Business</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education vs. Business</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education vs. Education</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education vs. Social Science</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education vs. Technology</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education vs. Health Science</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>5.142</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Female vs. Male</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. Under 35</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. 35-44</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. 55-64</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. 65-69</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. Over 70</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: Caucasian vs. Other</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Masters vs. First</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Masters vs. First</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Masters vs. Less than Bachelors</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Unstandardized Coefficients</td>
<td>Standardized Coefficients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching: ≥ 10 vs. 4-6</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching: ≥ 10 vs. 7-9</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education vs. Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education vs. Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education vs. Social Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education vs. Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education vs. Health Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education vs. Developmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Load: 4-6 vs. 1-3</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Load: 4-6 vs. 7-10</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Load: 4-6 vs. &gt; 10</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Modality: Face-to-Face vs. Online</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Modality: Face-to-Face vs. Blended</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status: Full</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Outside of Teaching vs. Part-Time by choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status: Full</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Outside of Teaching vs. Part-Time Not by Choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status: Full</td>
<td>-.227</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Female vs. Male</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. Under 35</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. 35 - 44</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. 55-64</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.463</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. 65-69</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. Over 70</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: Caucasian vs. Other</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Masters vs. Doctorate</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Masters vs. Less than Bachelor</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching: ≥ 10 vs. 0-3</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching: ≥ 10 vs. 4-6</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching: ≥ 10 vs. 7-9</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education vs. Business</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education vs. Social Science</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education vs. Health Science</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Load: 4-6 vs. 1-3</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Load: 4-6 vs. 7-10</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Modality: Face-to-Face vs. Online</td>
<td>-.200</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Modality: Face-to-Face vs. Blended</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status: Full Time Outside of Teaching vs. Part-Time by choice</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status: Full Time Outside of Teaching vs. Part-Time Not by Choice</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status: Full Time Outside of Teaching vs. Multiple Part-Time</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Org Fit</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the results from the hierarchical multiple regression analysis for job satisfaction, the researcher rejected the overall null hypothesis given that the following variables showed a statistically significant relationship to job satisfaction when all variables where entered into the model: gender, first-professional, online, blended, and person-organization fit. Specifically, the following sub-hypotheses were rejected: $H_{02}$, $H_{04}$, $H_{09}$, $H_{10}$ although the researcher failed to reject $H_{01}$, $H_{03}$, $H_{05}$, $H_{06}$, $H_{07}$, and $H_{08}$ based on the last model in the regression. Person-environment fit had unique predictive utility in the model, given that it contributed an additional 39.3% of variability in job satisfaction (outcome variable) while holding constant all other variables in the model. Implications of these results will be discussed in chapter 5.

**RQ2:** Do the variables of age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, outside work status, teaching load, teaching modality, teaching discipline, and perceived fit of adjunct instructors predict the attitudinal construct of organizational commitment?

To determine if the same 10 adjunct instructor characteristics predicted the attitudinal construct of organizational commitment, a second hierarchical multiple regression was utilized. The model consisted of four blocks that were entered sequentially into the model, and, as with
job satisfaction, the order of variable entry was dictated by empirical research. The first block consisted of age, gender, ethnicity, and education level. The second block comprised age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, and teaching discipline. The third block included age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, teaching discipline, teaching load, teaching modality, and outside work status. Finally, the fourth block consisted of age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, teaching discipline, teaching load, teaching modality, outside work status, and person-organization fit. The adjusted $R^2$ value was used to determine model impact on the criterion variable as it compensates for the addition of predictor variables and can increase or decrease depending on whether or not the added predictor variable adds to the explanatory power of the model (AcaStat, 2012).

In the first step of hierarchical multiple regression, four predictors were entered (see above). The first block of independent variables explained 1.7% of the variance in organizational commitment (as indicated by the adjusted $R^2$ value) (Table 4.7) and was statistically significant, $F(11, 779) = 2.227; p = .012$ (Table 4.8). In the first block, the $f$-value for the significance of the model is equal to the $f$-value for change ($p = .017$). This indicates that 1.7% of the variance in organizational commitment can be explained by the variance of the predictors in this model (Table 4.7). Three individual contributors, gender; ethnicity, and education (doctorate) significantly contributed to predicting organizational commitment in the model (Table 4.7).

After entering block 2 variables, the total variance explained by the model was 2.3% (Table 4.7) and was statistically significant, $F(20, 770) = 1.911; p = .010$ (Table 4.8). This means that the introduction of teaching experience and teaching discipline explained an additional 0.6% of variance in organizational commitment after controlling for age, gender,
ethnicity, and education level. Although the model was statistically significant after entering block 2 variables, the change from block 1 to block 2 was not significant in predicting organizational commitment ($R^2$ Change = .017; $F(9, 770); p = .140$) (Table 4.7). The adjusted $R^2$ value increased from .017 to .023, suggesting that when the addition of teaching experience and teaching discipline were added to the model, the predictive capability of the second block of variables increased from 1.7% to 2.3%.

After entering block 3 variables, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 5.0% (Table 4.7); this was statistically significant, $F(28, 762) = 2.481; p < .001$ (Table 4.8). This result means that the introduction of teaching load, teaching modality, and outside work status explained an additional 2.7% of organizational commitment from the second block of variables after controlling for age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, and teaching discipline; this change was statistically significant ($R^2$ Change = .027; $F(8, 762) = 3.767; p < .001$) (Table 4.7). The adjusted $R^2$ value increased from .023 to .050, indicating that when the addition of teaching load, teaching modality, and outside work status were added to the model, the predictive capability of the third block of variables increased from 2.3% to 5.0%.

After entering block 4 of predictor variables, the total variance explained by the model equaled 58.1% (Table 4.7), which was statistically significant, $F(29, 761) = 38.842; p < .001$ (Table 4.8). Such a result means that the introduction of person-organization fit explained an additional 51.3% of the organizational commitment outcome variable (Table 4.7) from the third block of variables, after controlling for age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, teaching discipline, teaching load, teaching modality, and outside work status, and this change was statistically significant ($R^2$ Change = .53; $F(1, 761) = 968.739; p < .001$) (Table 4.7). The adjusted $R^2$ value increased from .050 to .581. This result indicates that when the
addition of person-organization fit was added to the model, the predictive power of the fourth block of variables increased from 5.0% to 58.1%.
Table 4.7

Hierarchical Regression Model Summary for Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>2.227</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>1.510</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>3.767</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>968.739</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.8

ANOVA Table Indicating Model Significance for Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Regression df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>779</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regressions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 4.9 illustrates, in the first model, gender ($\beta = .148, p = .042$), ethnicity ($\beta = -.338, p = .002$), and the educational level “doctorate” ($\beta = .195, p = .041$) made individually significant contributions. For gender, the $b$-value was positive, highlighting that as gender moved from male (the variable coded as “0”) to female (the variable coded as “1”), organizational commitment increased by .148 units (points) on a 7-point Likert-scale. Therefore, organizational commitment scores increase as instructors go from male to female, indicating that female instructors are more committed to the organization than are male instructors. For “ethnicity,” the $b$-value was negative, revealing that as ethnicity moved from “other” (coded as “0”) to “caucasian” (coded as “1”) organizational commitment decreased by .338 points. This suggests that non-caucasian instructors are more committed to the organization than Caucasian instructors. For the educational level “doctorate” category, the $b$-value was positive, which means that as the educational level of instructors moved from “masters degree” (coded as “0”) to “doctorate degree (coded as “1”), organizational commitment increased by .195 points.
In model two, “ethnicity” ($\beta = -.320, p = .003$), and “Business” ($\beta = .235, p = .016$) made individually significant contributions and had the highest unstandardized beta values (Table 4.9). For “ethnicity”, the $b$-value was negative, meaning that as ethnicity moved from “other” (coded as “0”) to “caucasian” (coded as “1”), organizational commitment decreased by .320 points. For the “general education” category, the $b$-value was positive, indicating that as teaching discipline moved from “general education” (coded as “0”) to “Business” (coded as “1”) organizational commitment increased by .235 points.

In model three, “gender” ($\beta = .184, p = .018$), “ethnicity” ($\beta = -.294, p = .006$), “health science” ($\beta = .216, p = .045$), “online” ($\beta = .347, p < .001$), and “part-time not by choice” ($\beta = -.270, p = .012$) made individually significant contributions and had the highest unstandardized beta values (Table 4.9). For gender, the $b$-value was positive, indicating that as gender moved from male (coded as “0”) to female (coded as “1”) organizational commitment increased by .184 points. For “ethnicity”, the $b$-value was negative, meaning that as ethnicity moved from “other” (coded as “0”) to “caucasian” (coded as “1”), organizational commitment decreased by .294 points. For the “Health Science” category, the $b$-value was positive, indicating that as teaching discipline moved from “general education” (coded as “0”) to “Health Science” (coded as “1”) organizational commitment increased by .216 points. For the “online” category, the $b$-value was positive, revealing that as teaching modality moved from “face-to-face” (coded as “0”) to “online” (coded as “1”) organizational commitment increased by .347 points. For “part time not by choice”, the $b$-value was negative, meaning that as employment status moved from “full-time employment outside of teaching” (coded as “0”) to “part-time not by choice” (coded as “1”) organizational commitment decreased by .270 points.
In model four, the age group “65-69” ($\beta = -.263, p = .007$), ethnicity ($\beta = -.286, p < .001$), “online” ($\beta = .180, p = .005$), and “person-organization fit” ($\beta = .525, p < .001$) made individually significant contributions and had the highest unstandardized beta values (Table 4.9). For the age group “65-69”, the $b$-value was negative, indicating that as age moved from the reference category of “45-54” (coded as “0”) to “65-69” (coded as “1”) organizational commitment decreased by .263 points, which suggests those in the 65-69 age group are less committed to the organization, overall, than instructors between the ages of 45-54. For “ethnicity”, the $b$-value was negative, highlighting that as ethnicity moved from “other” (coded as “0”) to “caucasian” (coded as “1”) organizational commitment decreased by .286 points. This means caucasian instructors are less committed to the organization than their non-caucasian counterparts. For the “online” category, the $b$-value revealed that as teaching modality moved from “face-to-face” (coded as “0”) to “online” (coded as “1”), organizational commitment increased by .180 points. This indicates that online instructors are more committed to the organization than face-to-face instructors. Lastly, the variable “person-organization fit” had a positive $b$-value, indicating that for every one unit increase in person-organization fit, as measured by the 7-point Likert-scale, job satisfaction increased by .525 units, also as measured by the 7-point Likert-scale.
### Coefficients Table for Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>5.618</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>43.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender: Female vs. Male</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. Under 35</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. 35-44</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. 55-64</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. 65-69</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>-.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. Over 70</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnicity: Caucasian vs. Other</td>
<td>-.338</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education: Masters vs. Doctorate</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education: Master vs. First Professional</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education: Masters vs. Bachelors</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education: Masters vs. Less than Bachelors</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>5.497</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>36.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender: Female vs. Male</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. Under 35</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>-.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. 35-44</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. 55-64</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. 65-69</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>-.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. Over 70</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnicity: Caucasian vs. Other</td>
<td>-.320</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>-.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education: Masters vs. Doctorate</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education: Master vs. First Professional</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education: Masters vs. Bachelors</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>-.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Masters vs. Less than Bachelors</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching: ≥ 10 vs. 0-3</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching: ≥ 10 vs. 4-6</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching: ≥ 10 vs. 7-9</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General Education vs. Business</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General Education vs. Education</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General Education vs. Social Science</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General Education vs. Technology</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General Education vs. Health Science</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General Education vs. Developmental</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>5.484</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Female vs. Male</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. Under 35</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. 35 – 44</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. 55-64</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. 65-69</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. Over 70</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: Caucasian vs. Other</td>
<td>-.294</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Masters vs. Doctorate</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Masters vs. First Professional</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Masters vs. Bachelors</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Masters vs. Less than Bachelors</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching: ≥ 10 vs. 0-3</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching: ≥ 10 vs. 4-6</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching: ≥ 10 vs. 7-9</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General Education vs. Business</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General Education vs. Education</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General Education vs. Social Science</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General Education vs. Technology</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discipline: General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education vs. Health</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General Education vs. Development</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Load: 4-6 vs. 1-3</td>
<td>-.176</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Load: 4-6 vs. 7-10</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Load: 4-6 vs. &gt; 10</td>
<td>-.224</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Modality: Face-to-Face vs. Online</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Modality: Face-to-Face vs. Blended</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status: Full</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Outside of Teaching vs. Part-Time by choice</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Status: Full</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Outside of Teaching vs. Part-Time Not by Choice</td>
<td>-.270</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status: Full</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Outside of Teaching vs. Multiple Part-Time</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.741</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Female vs. Male</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. Under 35</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. 35 – 44</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. 55-64</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age: 45-54 vs. 65-69</strong></td>
<td><strong>-.263</strong></td>
<td><strong>.097</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45-54 vs. Over 70</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity: Caucasian vs. Other</strong></td>
<td><strong>-.286</strong></td>
<td><strong>.071</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Masters vs.</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Masters vs. First Professional</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Masters vs.</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Masters vs. Less than Bachelors</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching: ≥ 10 vs. 0-3</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching: ≥ 10 vs. 4-6</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching: ≥ 10 vs. 7-9</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General Education vs. Business</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General Education vs. Education</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General Education vs. Social Science</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General Education vs. Technology</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General Education vs. Health Science</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: General Education vs. Developmental</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Based on the results from the hierarchical regression model for organizational commitment (specifically looking at model 4), the researcher rejected the null hypothesis that “There will not be a statistically significant relationship between the variables of age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, outside work status, teaching load, teaching modality, teaching discipline, and perceived fit of adjunct instructors and the attitudinal construct of organizational commitment.” Specifically, the variables of age (65-69), ethnicity, online, and person-organization fit showed a statistically significant relationship to job satisfaction when all variables where entered into the model. The following sub-hypotheses were rejected, H₀₁, H₀₃, H₀₉, H₁₀, while the researcher failed to reject H₀₂, H₀₄, H₀₅, H₀₆, H₀₇, and H₀₈ based on the last model in the regression.
As with the outcome variable job satisfaction, person-environment fit had unique predictive utility in the model, given that it contributed an additional 51.3% of variability in organizational commitment (outcome variable) while holding constant all other variables in the model. Implications of these results will be discussed, next, in Chapter Five.
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

Chapter five will recapitulate the problem that informed the current study and summarize its methodology. Following a brief description of methodology, the chapter will then compare the demographics of the study population to the demographics of adjunct instructors from previous studies and national surveys. The chapter will then discuss the study’s results, including how they relate to prior research and the implications of these results for both theory and practice. Finally, the chapter will discuss the assumptions, limitations, and future research recommendations and will conclude with a summary of the study and final conclusions.

Problem Statement

Despite the numerous studies that exist depicting what influences satisfaction and commitment with adjunct instructors, very few studies have examined the relationship between adjunct instructor characteristics and their relationship to job satisfaction and organizational commitment. As described in chapter one, with respect to job satisfaction, a few studies have investigated age, career stage, gender, ethnicity, years of teaching experience, teaching load, and subject matter. However, those studies have produced contradictory results (see pages 10-12 for citations of these studies). In addition, several theoretically justified characteristics have rarely been examined with adjunct instructors in terms of how they impact job satisfaction and organizational commitment, such as perceived fit (Castiglia, 2006; Olsen, Maple, & Stage, 1995). Conspicuously, although online instruction is growing and continues to become a major delivery system for higher education (Allan & Seaman, 2013), only a few studies have compared satisfaction between traditional and online instructors from the same institution (Preziosi & Gooden, 2003; Swartz et al., 2010), and these studies included both full-time and part-time
instructors and only from one discipline. No studies that have examined organizational commitment and job satisfaction with respect to instructors teaching blended classes, despite blended instruction’s acknowledged importance and increasing use (Caufield, 2011; Rovai, Ponton, & Baker, 2008; Stavredes, 2011; “The Coming Revolution”, 2013). When these variables have been studied in higher education settings with both full-time and part-time instructors, no attempt has been made to control for other variables that could have an impact the results. Studies that have researched adjunct instructor characteristics, job satisfaction, or organizational commitment have either utilized populations from community colleges, four-year universities, or graduate schools for both online and residential classes (see Table 1.1 for citations of these studies). Most importantly for the current study, no research has investigated adjunct instructor characteristics in terms of how they relate to satisfaction and commitment at multiple-campus, career-college systems. Career colleges focus more on hands-on training in fields that demand specific skills, such as health care and technology, in contrast to a traditional university, which tends to focus more on broad educational experiences directed toward acquisition of basic knowledge and research and analysis (Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Lake City Reporter, 2012). Determining if adjunct characteristics can be used to predict satisfaction and commitment at career colleges is needed to ensure that these characteristics are being analyzed for all institutions as they might be used to improve institutional effectiveness.

**Review of the Methodology**

A quantitative, hierarchical multiple regression study was conducted to determine if statistically significant relationships exist between job satisfaction and adjunct instructor characteristics, perceived fit, and teaching modality and between organizational commitment and adjunct instructor characteristics, perceived fit, and teaching modality. The sample for the study
contained 811 adjunct instructors from ten different campus locations throughout the career college system who taught during the 2012-2013 academic year (September – August). Results from this study might help higher education leaders, especially those in career-college or similar institutions, improve organizational commitment, job satisfaction and, ultimately, the education and training value for students. The current research expands the variables explored in previous research, it also analyzed variables while controlling for other variables to give a more robust analysis of the true relationship between variables, and it created new knowledge in the field by analyzing instructors at a career college in terms of their organizational commitment and job satisfaction, a previously ignored population.

Because the goal of this study was to examine the degree and direction of the relationship between the predictor variables and criterion variables, as opposed to developing a strong conclusion for cause-and-effect, the correlational research design was appropriate (Gall et al., 2007). In addition, because the interrelationships between multiple predictors and criterion variables were assessed, multivariate correlational statistics were utilized; for this study, that meant two hierarchical multiple regression analyses were employed to “determine the correlation between a criterion variable and a combination of two or more predictor variables” (Gall et al., 2007, p. 353), one for job satisfaction and one for organizational commitment. Hierarchical multiple regression was an appropriate statistical technique for the current research because it sought to determine the proportion of variance in the criterion variables that can be predicted from the predictor variables. Hierarchical regression is the most appropriate analysis for this type of research (Pedhazur, 1997) as it can be used to examine incremental validity, evaluate contribution of predictors over previously entered predictors, and allow the researcher to have control on the sequential order of variable entry (Lewis, 2007). In addition, hierarchical
regression is ideal to analyze the effects of different predictor variables while controlling for other variables, which will determine the incremental variance for each variable as it is entered into the regression (Pedhazur, 1997).

A pilot test was conducted (at researcher’s home campus) to test the survey instrument for possible changes needed to be made; however, the data collected from this group was incorporated into the results. The design of the study, therefore, included establishing the variables through existing research, identifying participants, collecting the data, and analyzing the data.

Summary of Results

**RQ1:** Do the variables of age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, outside work status, teaching load, teaching modality, teaching discipline, and perceived fit of adjunct instructors predict the attitudinal construct of job satisfaction?

To determine if a relationship exists between the 10 adjunct characteristics (predictor variables) and job satisfaction (outcome variable), a hierarchical regression model was utilized in which the predictor variables were entered in a specified order based on empirical research. The researcher utilized four different models: Model 1 (gender, age, ethnicity, and education level); Model 2 (gender, age, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, and teaching discipline); Model 3 (gender, age ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, teaching discipline, teaching load, teaching modality, and outside work status); and Model 4 (gender, age, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, teaching discipline, teaching load, teaching modality, outside work status, and person-organization fit).

The results of the study indicated that for job satisfaction, blocks one and two were not statistically significant and only accounted for 0.5% and 0.4% of the adjusted variance in job
satisfaction, respectively. However, blocks three and four were statistically significant and accounted for 2.4% and 43.1% of the adjusted variance in job satisfaction, respectively. Examining the impact of individual variables showed that in the first model, education (instructors with less than a bachelor’s degree) was the only predictor variable that had a significant, positive relationship on job satisfaction. However, when the variables of teaching experience and teaching discipline were added in the second block, none of the predictor variables had a significant impact on job satisfaction, and since education level was no longer significant, this highlights the importance of the effect that predictor variables can have on each other when analyzed together.

Both blocks three and four were statistically significant, indicating that they had a positive, significant relationship with the job satisfaction of adjunct instructors at this institution. When examining model three, the individual predictor variables of blended instruction and part-time employment not by choice were significant, with blended instruction positively impacting job satisfaction and part-time employment not by choice negatively impacting job satisfaction. However, block four, which contained all predictor variables analyzed in this study, explained 43.1% of the variance in job satisfaction, which was an increase of 40.7% from the third block. The individual predictor variables that were significant in the fourth block included gender (female instructors less satisfied than male instructors), education level (instructors with a first-professional degree were less satisfied than those with a master’s degree), teaching modality (online instructors were less satisfied than face-to-face instructors and blended instructors were more satisfied than face-to-face instructors), and person-organization fit (a strong, positive relationship existed between perceived fit with the organization and job satisfaction, with a partial correlation between the two variables of .629). Person-organization fit was the only new
predictor variable added to the fourth block, which suggests that the large increase in the variance explanation of job satisfaction from block three is the result of this predictor variable. Therefore, when examining the results of the fourth block, the predictor variables of age, ethnicity, teaching experience, outside work status, teaching load, and teaching discipline did not significantly impact job satisfaction.

**RQ2:** Do the variables of age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, outside work status, teaching load, teaching modality, teaching discipline, and perceived fit of adjunct instructors predict the attitudinal construct of organizational commitment?

To determine if a relationship exists between the 10 adjunct characteristics (predictor variables) and organizational commitment (outcome variable), a second hierarchical regression model was utilized in which the predictor variables were entered in a specified order based on empirical research. The researcher utilized four different models: Model 1 (gender, age, ethnicity, and education level); Model 2 (gender, age, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, and teaching discipline); Model 3 (gender, age ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, teaching discipline, teaching load, teaching modality, and outside work status); and Model 4 (gender, age, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, teaching discipline, teaching load, teaching modality, outside work status, and person-organization fit).

The results of the study indicated that for organizational commitment, all four blocks were statistically significant. Block one accounted for 1.7% of the adjusted variance in organizational commitment, with the individual predictors of gender, ethnicity, and education (doctorate) showing a significant relationship with job satisfaction. Block two accounted for a 2.3% variance explanation in organizational commitment with ethnicity and teaching discipline (business) showing a significant relationship with organizational commitment, and block three
accounted for a 5.0% variance explanation in organizational commitment with the predictor variables of gender, ethnicity, teaching discipline (health), teaching modality (online), and work status (part time not by choice) showing a significant relationship with organizational commitment.

However, block four, which contained all predictor variables analyzed in this study explained 58.1% of the variance in job satisfaction, which was an increase of 53.1% from the third block. The individual predictor variables that were significant in the fourth block included age (instructors between the ages of 65-69 were less committed to the organization), ethnicity (Caucasian instructors were less committed to the organization than their non-Caucasian peers), teaching modality (online instructors were more committed to the organization than face-to-face instructors), and person-organization fit (a strong, positive relationship existed between perceived fit with the organization and commitment, with a partial correlation between the two variables of .751). Person-organization fit was the only new predictor variable added to the fourth block, which suggests that the large increase in the variance explanation of organizational commitment from block three is the result of this predictor variable. Therefore, when examining the results of the fourth block, the predictor variables of gender, education level, teaching experience, outside work status, teaching load, and teaching discipline did not significantly impact job organizational commitment.

**Discussion of Results and Relationship to Research**

The fourth block of both hierarchical regression models, which contained all predictor variables analyzed in this study, revealed unique predictive utility in terms of explaining job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The variable *person-organization* fit added significant, practical explained variance to both overall models (explaining an additional 41% of
job satisfaction and 53% of organizational commitment). Although other variables in both models were statistically significant, the focus of chapter five will be on the *person-organization fit* variable for two main reasons. First, less can be done about socio-demographic variables than most people think. Men are men, women are women; instructors who have doctorates have doctorates, etc. To suggest that, prima facie, being female or male or being Black or White predicts an outcome is to engage in specious reasoning that highlights outcome differences most likely attributable to other factors or the interaction of other factors (McCrae & Costa, 2003; Patterson, Grenny, Maxfield, McMillan, & Switzler, 2008; Rothbart, 2011). Moreover, focusing on demographic factors tends to perpetuate exactly the kind of inequality beliefs that researchers claim they are trying to eradicate (Steele, 1999). Focusing on malleable or changeable aspects of a person’s thinking or personality yields much more positive and much greater results (Dweck, 2006; Rothbart, Ahadi, & Evans, 2000). Second, *person-organization fit* had statistically significant predictive utility, holding constant for all other predictive variables in both models, suggesting that more important than any demographic variable is the perceived fit with an organization, which will be the focus of chapter five’s discussion.

There have only been a few previous studies examining the relationship between person-organization fit and job satisfaction in higher education, and most have supported the results of this study (Lindholm, 2003; Olsen et al., 1995). Only one study (Castiglia, 2006) contradicted the results by finding that either a relationship did not exist between person-organization fit and job satisfaction amongst college faculty or that those with the highest satisfaction have the lowest P-O levels. However, the author of this study documented that the results could have been due to faulty instrumentation leading to misinterpretation of questions. The large correlation between person-organization fit and job satisfaction could be due to the fact that people prefer to
work for an organization in which they have common values and beliefs (Ivancevich et al., 2011; Schneider, 1987). Since adjunct instructors teach for reasons beyond financial, it would make sense that they would select institutions that match their values. The organization in this study has a unique culture, mission, and guiding principles, and therefore instructors likely would leave the institution if they did not agree with and believe in the mission. This would explain why job satisfaction is high and why a strong correlation exists between these variables.

Previous studies examining organizational commitment amongst higher education faculty support the results of this study (Castiglia, 2006; Gutierrez et al., 2012; Lindholm, 2003; Saleem et al., 2011). The results from the current research are not surprising, and the explanation is similar to that of job satisfaction: Individuals with a high perceived person-organization fit may better identify with the goals, objectives, and mission of the institution (Saleem et al., 2011) making them more committed to the success of the institution. In addition, if an employee feels that he or she does not fit, that person is more likely to leave (O’Reilly et al., 1991), and, therefore, the instructors who are with the institution beyond one quarter are more likely to be committed.

Thinking about the results of this current research in light of the two theories (and others) used as explanatory frameworks can provide further clarification. Herzberg (Herzberg et al., 1959) theorized job satisfaction as a result of two factors: (a) those things that, in their absence would greatly de-motivate but would not motivate toward organizational excellence (b) and those factors that, in their absence would not greatly de-motivate but would have to present for employees to be highly motivated. The first he called hygiene factors or dissatisfiers, and the second he called motivators or satisfiers (Ivancecich et al., 2011). Dissatisfiers would be things such as pay and safe working conditions, whereas satisfiers would be more intrinsic factors such
as meaningful work, feelings of achievement, and opportunities for growth and advancement.

Pay matters, and people have to be paid enough to take the issue of money out of the discussion, although that amount is highly subjective and related to any number of geographic and personal factors. A related theory that can help clarify the pay issue and the intersection of additional motivators within the two factors in Herzberg’s research is the second theory selected for this study: social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Ekeh, 1974).

According to social exchange theory, employees and employers engage in social interactions and exchanges that establish a psychological contract. Employees give their time, ability, and resources to an employer in return for pay, meaningful work, opportunities for advancement, and other factors as noted by Herzberg, both hygiene-and satisfier factors. Ivancevich, Konopaske, and Matteson (2014) cite the work of Schein (1980) in describing the exchange expectation that employees have with their employers that lead to employees working hard, committing to the organization, and being satisfied with their work:

1. The extent to which employee expectations of what the organization will give them and what they owe the organization in return matches the organization’s expectations of what it will give and receive.
2. Assuming there is agreement on these expectations, the specific nature of what is exchanged (effort, pay, for example) (p. 133).

Further theoretical models that provide clarification on person-organization fit in terms of satisfaction and commitment, especially in consideration of pay and other motivational factors are Vroom’s (1964) expectancy theory and Adams’s (1963) equity theory.

Vroom (1964) posited that motivation was a by-product of three inter-related thinking processes. First, employees make a decision about the likelihood of effort leading to some kind
of performance. Second, employees assess whether that performance leads ultimately to a related job outcome and, finally, the employee attaches importance to the final outcome, known as valence. In the workplace, the model might look like the following: An employee is motivated (or not) to work if he thinks his effort will lead to a fair appraisal. The motivation of the employee, second, is influenced by whether or not she believes the appraisal will lead to appropriate organizational rewards. Finally, the employee is motivated to the degree that the organizational rewards are important to him or her (Robbins, 2008; Vroom, 1964).

Assessments about person-organization fit are also influenced by perceived equity and organizational justice (Adams, 1963; Ivancevich et al., 2014). The most widely cited and most commonly known theory to explain this phenomenon is Adams’s equity theory. According to Adams, employees make assessments concerning the effort they give and the rewards they get in turn, especially as they compare themselves to other people in the organizations. If an employee perceives inequity, the following responses are most likely: (a) Change inputs, usually meaning less time or effort (likely); (b) change outcomes, usually meaning negotiate for more money or benefits (not always possible); (c) change attitudes, usually meaning changing one’s mind about what the inequity means (not likely); (d) change the referent person to whom the comparison is being made (not likely); (e) change the inputs or outcomes of the referent other (often via sabotaging, dysfunctional, maladaptive, or “problem” behaviors in the workplace); (f) leave the organization (Ivancevich et al., 2014 p. 126).

Citing the work of Jansen and Kristof-Brown (2006), Ivancevich et al. (2014) offer the following summary assessment of person-organization fit:

Person-environment fit occurs when there is compatibility between individuals and their work environments. When an employee perceives that he or she fits well with the
organization, the employee is more likely to have higher levels of organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and adjustment, while experience lower levels of stress. (p. 251).

**Future Implications**

There are several major conclusions that can be drawn from this study that will have future implications for higher education leaders and researchers looking to investigate the relationship between demographics and job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the future. The first conclusion is that select demographic characteristics do play a role in predicting job satisfaction and organizational commitment. While previous studies show mixed results on whether or not specific characteristics impact satisfaction and commitment, the results from this study add to the literature by demonstrating that certain characteristics can be used to predict satisfaction and commitment. This information is important for higher education administrators as they seek to determine what causes satisfaction and commitment amongst their faculty and staff and how they can better create environments based on these characteristics to enhance satisfaction and commitment levels, thus reducing turnover.

The second conclusion is that controlling for variables is critical when attempting to assess the impact of specific characteristics on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. This study used a hierarchical regression model in which four blocks of variables were entered into the model, with each block containing all variables from the previous block with the addition of new variables. As the results indicate, some variables were considered significant when some of the blocks were entered, but not others, which indicates that the strength of the relationship between the predictor variable and job satisfaction or organizational commitment depends on which other variables are being controlled. This finding is extremely important, especially for
future researchers who want to study the impacts of demographic characteristics on satisfaction and/or commitment with adjunct faculty and who want to compare their results to other studies. While I compared the findings for each variable to that in previous studies, past studies either did not control for any variables when making their conclusion or very few, and therefore comparisons are difficult to make. The results from this study demonstrate that to effectively determine if adjunct instructor characteristics can be used to predict job satisfaction and/or organizational commitment, as many variables as possible must be controlled to accurately determine the impact.

Another significant conclusion is that both job satisfaction and organizational commitment are relatively high for this population of adjunct instructors, which is not always the case. As explained in Chapter Two, adjunct instructors often feel like second-class citizens (Kerlinger & Sibary, 1998), feel isolated (Parrot et al., 2007), disconnected, and undervalued (Dolan, 2011; Halcrow & Olson, 2008). In addition, many instructors at the current institution have had their teaching loads diminished in preparation of the Affordable Care Act, which could decrease their satisfaction and commitment. However, despite potential reasons for being dissatisfied and uncommitted, instructors from this study showed that they were committed and satisfied, and this has significant implications for higher education institutions as they attempt to understand the reasons for adjunct instructor attitudes that can impact turnover and retention, which ultimately affects student learning and success of meeting their mission and goals.

While both job satisfaction and organizational commitment were ranked relatively high by this population of adjunct instructors, another important result from this study was that different variables were significantly related to job satisfaction and organization commitment, suggesting that satisfaction and commitment are truly two separate workplace attitudes and that satisfied
instructors may not be committed and committed instructors may not be satisfied. This is significant because job satisfaction and organizational commitment have never been studied simultaneously from the same population of adjunct instructors, and since a lack of job satisfaction can lead to high levels of absenteeism (Hackett & Guion, 1985), high rates of turnover (Aziri, 2011; Griffeth et al., 2000) and individual complaints (Schmidt, 2007) and a lack of commitment can lead to lower productivity, more absences, and higher turnover (Young et al., 1998), it is critical for higher education administration to understand which instructor characteristics are related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment so that an environment can be created to enhance these attitudes for all instructors.

Lastly, the most significant result from this study was the overall impact and predictive power that perceived person-organization fit has on predicting both job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The increase in predictability of the fourth block was large and suggests that person-organization fit was the largest single independent variable that could be used to predict both job satisfaction and organizational commitment. While several previous studies have shown the positive relationship between person-organization fit and both job satisfaction and organizational commitment, this was the first study to look at person-organization fit while controlling for the selected characteristics in this study and was the first study to compare person-organization fit and satisfaction and commitment with adjunct instructors. This has major implications for higher education institutions when it comes to hiring and retaining adjunct instructors, as it has been demonstrated that the consideration of person-organization fit during the hiring and recruitment process has been identified as one of the main causes of creating organizational equality (Schneider, 1987) and predicting tenure (Handler, 2004). Therefore, if individuals who are responsible to hire adjunct instructors could somehow
assess the perceived person-organization fit between the individual and organization, they could hire only instructors who have a good perceived fit based on assessing their values and beliefs and how they align with the values and beliefs of the institution, and this would reduce instructor turnover. Therefore, the results indicate that while hiring staff cannot discriminate based on most of the characteristics assessed in this study, they could use person-organization fit as a guide when hiring adjunct instructors, which can be used to assist in predicting instructors that will have high job satisfaction and organizational commitment, thus increasing productivity, connectedness, and longevity of instructors.

**Further Recommendations for Practice**

Several additional practice recommendations might be gleaned from the current research. First, institutions must provide appropriate training, professional development, and resources to teach online, especially given the increased workload demanded of online instructors. According to Conceicao and Lehman (2011), neither instructors nor institutions are very well prepared for the demands and rigors of online education. Institutions want the benefits of institutional growth without the corresponding responsibility of providing appropriate pay or resources (to include training) to its faculty. Although one might question the current practice of hiring a majority (or more) of faculty as adjuncts and then paying them very little, to include no pay raises for multiple years, the employer has a responsibility, at least, to provide proper training to its faculty.

Second, institutions must monitor workload of online teachers. As highlighted by Conceicao and Lehman (2011), institutions tend to add increasing amounts of responsibility (to include number of students in class sections) to online instructors without enough consideration as to the implications of quality because of workload. School leaders often establish strict,
sometimes punitive policies and procedures concerning faculty grading and participation in
discussion forums without due consideration about how they have contributed to the problem
with untenable workloads. This is especially true because “Information on workload
management when teaching online has been meager. Most information is either anecdotal or
based on non-empirical studies” (Conceicao & Lehman, 2011, preface, p. x). Obviously, this
suggests further research, but in the meantime, colleges and universities must survey, interview,
and take seriously its faculty members’ concerns, recommendations, and solutions about
workload.

Third, instructional leaders should include regular feedback and fair performance appraisals
tied to key skills and core competencies. Many institutions that hire adjuncts expect full-time
work and quality for part-time (or less) pay, which is an unrealistic expectation. Nonetheless,
even within this unrealistic system of expectations, universities need to establish clear,
transparent, helpful, and developmental (not punitive) systems of feedback and performance
appraisal. However, the appraisals should be based on what is known from the research
literature, not what instructional and institutional leaders think should be the reality.
Furthermore, many adjuncts hold *earned* advanced degrees, many times from institutions more
prestigious than those of the people supervising them. Adjunct faculty members should be
included in conversations about feedback, performance, and expectations.

Related to this issue of performance appraisals and feedback is admission standards.
Schools should understand the connection between who they admit to university programs and
the expectations they have of their instructors. Admitting marginal students because one can get
money from them without considering the added instructor workload via hours of remedial
feedback is irresponsible and a poor educational model (Ostrander, 2009; Stavredes, 2011).
Fourth, pay adjuncts more when possible. Part-time instructors can see when an institution increases its enrollment by thousands or tens of thousands of students without increasing adjunct instructor pay. Not only is this symbolically unwise from a leadership perspective (Kouzes & Posner, 2008), but also this practice ignores the role of pay in employee perceptions of equity, effectiveness, social exchange, and trust, which ultimately influence perceptions of person-environment fit (Adams, 1963; Herzberg, 1959, Ivancevich et al., 2014).

Finally, the work of Blau (1964), Ekeh (1974), Herzberg (1959), Vroom (1964), and others highlights the following reality: “People differ in the importance they attach to job outcomes . . . Individual differences are important in studying organizational behavior because they have a direct effect on behavior . . . effective managers need to ask how such differences influence the behavior and performance of employees” (Ivancevich et al., 2014, p. 146, 63). This means leaders, to include instructional leaders, should know individual employee’s needs, motivations, and desires better to help adjunct instructors achieve their goals while leveraging the knowledge and skills of those same instructors to help the organization achieve its goals.

**Limitations**

Several limitations were identified throughout this study and should be addressed and considered when viewing the results. The first limitation was that since the survey was an electronic survey, the researcher could not determine if all instructors who were contacted and sent the survey actually received and were able to access the survey, which would have an impact on the percentage of returned surveys. In addition, since the survey was sent during the fall 2013 quarter, instructors who only teach during the winter, spring, or summer quarters may not have received or accessed the survey.
Another limitation in the current study was that the study was limited to only those adjunct faculty members who chose to respond to the survey and therefore does not provide information about the instructors who either chose not to respond or did not receive the survey. Consequently, the results are limited to the bias of instructors who chose to respond to the survey, and their responses may be different from instructors who did not respond. While it would be beneficial to compare the demographic data of those who completed the survey to the entire population who received the survey, there is no efficient and effective method to obtain this data from the adjunct instructor population, and therefore that is a limitation to this study.

Third, the study was a voluntary study and participants who did not respond may not have participated for a number of reasons, such as fear of repercussion if the survey was truly not anonymous, feelings that their situation would not change regardless of answering survey questions, lack of a setting conducive to complete the survey, etc. and it is possible that more instructors would have responded if a different setting could have been utilized.

Fourth, the surveys assumed that adjunct instructors were able to accurately self-report their levels of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and perceived fit on a seven-point Likert-scale. However, it may have been difficult for instructors to accurately assess the difference between levels on the scale, and therefore information gathered from the survey could potentially not be 100% accurate. Similarly, the data was cross-sectional in nature, meaning that it was collected at one point in time and therefore does not allow for the analysis of change in satisfaction and commitment over time. In addition, an expressed satisfaction or commitment, or lack thereof, with the job and organization may not truly be with the job or organization, but with other facets of the instructors’ lives, such as family, health, finances, etc. and not connected to the institution (Stanley & Burrows, 2001).
Fifth, the study was limited to adjunct instructors at one collegiate system, and therefore while generalizations were made, the data set was not representative of adjunct faculty from other types of higher education institutions. If researchers and higher education administrators truly want to know which characteristics can be used to assist in predicting job satisfaction and organizational commitment, this study would need to be repeated multiple times in a variety of institutional types to add to the literature.

Lastly, the goal of this study was to compare ten adjunct instructor characteristics to determine if they could be used to predict job satisfaction and organizational commitment of adjunct instructors. If we truly want to obtain a complete picture, all instructor variables should be analyzed, including variables such as marital status, relationship with other instructors, years since last degree attainment, etc. While this study thoroughly analyzed adjunct instructor characteristics and attitudes, a complete picture would have included more variables.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The number of adjunct instructors teaching in higher education will continue to increase at a significant rate as higher education institutions are faced with fluctuating enrollments, decreased budgets, and higher demand for skill training. Chapter Two describes in depth the reasons for the rise in adjunct instructor use and how they will continue to rise, and therefore understanding factors that are related to their job satisfaction and organizational commitment are critical to minimize turnover, which can be costly to the institution. The results from this study have generated several recommendations for future research that would be a natural extension of the current study.

While other previous studies have looked at the relationship between various adjunct instructor characteristics and job satisfaction and organizational commitment, this was the first
comprehensive study that examined the ten variables analyzed in this study, and the results showed that controlling for specific variables does have an impact on whether or not other characteristics are significant to job satisfaction and/or organizational commitment. However, the results are from one population of adjunct instructors from one college. Therefore, this study should be replicated using the exact same predictor variables, survey instruments, and methodology to determine if the results are replicable with different adjunct populations. In addition, the current study was completed at a career college system with multiple campuses, and therefore this study should be replicated in other career colleges as well as other types of institutions.

While the current institution primarily uses adjunct instructors, it also utilizes full-time faculty in several disciplines, and therefore this study should be replicated with comparing the same variables and using the same methodology with both full-time faculty and adjunct instructors to determine if a difference exists in their satisfaction and commitment levels, as well as if a difference exists in which variables are more predictive of satisfaction and commitment. If higher education institutions are committed to creating an environment that fosters satisfaction and commitment, than it is important to do so for both full-time and part-time faculty, and comparing predictor variables between full-time and part-time instructors at different institutions would provide valuable insight for higher education administration.

Another follow-up recommendation to the current study would be to add a qualitative component to uncover why instructors are satisfied and committed or unsatisfied and uncommitted. Results from the current study indicate that specific adjunct characteristics are related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment when other variables are controlled. However, the results do not indicate the causes for these attitudes, and this, coupled with
knowing the predictor variables, would be valuable information for higher education administration as they determine what causes satisfaction and commitment and what needs to be changed in order to enhance these attitudes.

Lastly, since perceived person-organization fit had the single greatest impact on predicting job satisfaction and organizational commitment for adjunct instructors, a future study should focus on this variable independently and explore in more depth the relationship between person-organization fit and these dependent variables. It is often assumed that individuals with higher degrees are automatically qualified to teach college-level courses even without training or experience in teaching (Lewis, 2012). This notion that degree equates to qualification must be abolished and administrators who hire adjunct instructors must understand the significance between fit and satisfaction and commitment, which will equate to hiring a staff of more qualified instructors, and therefore a more engaging and productive learning environment. Therefore, future research could look at using different instruments to assess person-organization fit and if the results are similar to the results from this study for both job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Summary

The use of adjunct instructors in higher education has risen significantly over the past few decades, with over 70% of all collegiate faculty being adjunct faculty (Knapp et al., 2010). This rise can be associated to budget constraints (Halcrow & Olson, 2008), increasing enrollments (Green, 2007), need for flexible scheduling (Lyons, 2007; Puzziferro & Shelton, 2009), and “real-world” expertise (Berry, 1999). Due to the rise of adjunct instructors, it is critical to understand factors that may affect their job satisfaction and commitment to the organization, as job satisfaction has been related to absenteeism (Scott & Taylor, 1985), turnover (Tett & Meyer,
1993), and job performance and quality teaching (Dickens, 2011). Similarly, commitment has been linked to loyalty, higher productivity, fewer absences, reduced turnover, and more instances of employees going above and beyond basic duties (Young et al., 1998).

The results from this hierarchical regression study indicated that when the ten adjunct instructor variables of age, gender, ethnicity, education level, teaching experience, outside work status, teaching load, teaching modality, teaching discipline, and perceived fit are analyzed to determine job satisfaction and organizational commitment, there were several variables significantly related to job satisfaction and organization commitment, which indicates that a relationship does exist and further analysis is needed to determine if that relationship is true to only this population or other populations of instructors. In addition, the significance level of the different models varied, indicating that specific combinations of predictor variables impact the predictability of the model as a whole for job satisfaction and organizational commitment, which emphasizes the importance of controlling for all variables when looking at the impact of a single variable. These results are critical for understanding causes and relationships for job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and add to the growing literature regarding adjunct instructors and how administration can work to improve commitment and satisfaction.

The adjunct phenomenon is not going away. In fact, much like the outsourcing and off-shoring that changed the face of American business in a globalized economy (Friedman, 2005), so too, the changing nature of higher education (“The Coming Revolution,” 2013) has forever altered the nature of higher education. With increasing numbers of students enrolling in an increasing variety of educational venues, the use (and overuse) of adjuncts will continue. Although individual instructors are responsible for managing their own perceptions, attitudes,
and behaviors, the organizations that hire instructors, especially part-time, adjunct instructors bear a significant responsibility.

Managing the psychological contract successfully is one of the more important and challenging aspects of most [leader’s] jobs. The more attuned the [leader] is to the needs and expectations of subordinates, the greater the number of matches that are likely to exist and be maintained in the psychological contract. This, in turn, can positively impact the direction, intensity, and persistence of motivation, [satisfaction, and commitment] in the organization. (Ivancevich et al., 2014, p. 134)
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Instructor Survey

Part I: Demographic Information

A. About You
1. Did you teach during the 2012-2013 academic year at Baker College?
2. Please select your gender.
   a. Male
   b. Female
3. Please indicate your age as of September 1, 2012.
   a. Under 35
   b. 35-44
   c. 45-54
   d. 55-64
   e. 65-69
   f. 70 or over
4. Please select one or more of the following choices to best describe your racial/ethnic background.
   a. Caucasian
   b. African American
   c. Hispanic
   d. Asian
   e. Other

B. Education and Work Experience
5. Please indicate your highest degree level.
   a. Doctorate
   b. First-professional (credits beyond a Masters, including Educational Specialist)
   c. Masters
   d. Bachelors
   e. Less than Bachelors
6. Please indicate years of teaching experience.
   a. 0-3 years
   b. 4-6 years
   c. 7-9 years
   d. Greater than 10 years

C. Your Job
7. Please indicate the discipline(s) in which you teach.
   a. Business
   b. Education (including Early Childhood Education)
   c. Health Sciences
   d. General Education (Math and English (100-level or above), and Communications)
   e. Social Sciences (Human Services, Criminal Justice, Interpreter Training, Psychology)
   f. Developmental Education (Math, English, and College Reading (below 100-level)

8. Please indicate your average course load per year.
   a. 1-3 courses/year
   b. 4-6 courses/year
   c. 7-10 courses/year
   d. Greater than 10 courses/year

9. Please indicate the teaching modality(ies) in which you teach.
   a. Online
   b. Completely Face-to-Face
   c. Blended Instruction (combination of online and face-to-face)

10. Please indicate your outside employment status.
    a. Part-time teaching is only employment
    b. Part-time but preferred full-time
    c. Part-time employment is primary
    d. Other current jobs/full-time employment
Part II: Organizational Commitment

Listed below is a series of statements that represent possible feelings that individuals might have about the company or organization for which they work. With respect to your own feelings about the particular organization for which you are now working, Baker College, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking one of the seven alternatives below each statement.

11. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. I would accept almost any types of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. I find that my values and the organization’s values are very similar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. It would take very little change in my present circumstance to cause me to leave this organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. I really care about the fate of this organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. For me, this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part III: Job Satisfaction

Listed below is a series of statements related to your satisfaction levels in regards to a variety of job aspects related to teaching at Baker College. Please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking one of the six alternatives below each statement.

**Overall Job Satisfaction**
21. I am completely satisfied with my job teaching courses as a part-time faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Based on my experience teaching as a part-time faculty, I would highly recommend the job to others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Considering everything, I have an excellent job as a part-time faculty teaching courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. I am dissatisfied with aspects of my job as a part-time faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recognition**

25. I am often thanked for teaching here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. I feel well respected as a part-time faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. Part-time faculty are recognized for their teaching contribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. A part-time faculty job is a valued position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work Preference**

29. I really enjoy teaching courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. I almost always look forward to teaching classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. If I had the choice, I would rather teach than do other types of work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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32. I would prefer to do work other than teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Autonomy**

33. I am completely satisfied with the level of autonomy that I have in teaching my courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. I have a lot of freedom to develop and modify course content to meet the needs of my students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. I have a satisfactory level of autonomy to select material and texts for my courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. I would like more freedom to determine the content, materials, and texts for my courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Classroom Facilities**

37. The classroom space where I teach classes is excellent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
38. The classrooms in which I teach are very well maintained and clean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. The classrooms in which I teach have up-to-date audiovisual equipment, computer connections, and equipment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. Space for my classrooms is well designed to meet my teaching and my students’ learning needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Support**

41. I receive very helpful advice and support from academic department faculty to improve my teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. Faculty in my academic department(s) are always available and accessible to me when I need assistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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43. Full-time faculty in my academic department(s) take a sincere interest in my success as a teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. I feel very comfortable requesting assistance from academic department faculty when I have questions about my courses or students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Honorarium**

45. The payment I receive for teaching classes is adequate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46. I feel that I am well compensated for my teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47. I am paid fairly for the amount of work I do to teach courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48. I am dissatisfied with the pay I receive for teaching courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Quality of Students

49. I am completely satisfied with the quality and caliber of students in my classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50. Students in my classes are very well prepared academically to take my courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51. Students here are highly engaged and very interested in their academic work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52. Students lack motivation or the academic skills to succeed in my courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teaching Schedule

53. The times scheduled for my class(es) have been convenient to my schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54. I have been very satisfied with my teaching schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
55. The times that I teach my classes work well with my personal or other family commitments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nor Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Nor Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56. I have to teach at times that are inconvenient for me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nor Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Nor Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part IV: Person-Organization Fit**

Listed below are three questions/statements related to your perception of how your personal values align with the institution. Please indicate the degree of your alignment with each statement by checking one of the seven alternatives below each statement.

57. The things that I value in life are very similar to the things that my organization values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nor Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Nor Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58. My personal values match my organization’s values and culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nor Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Nor Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59. My organization’s values and culture provide a good fit with the things that I value in life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nor Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Nor Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part V: Additional Questions**
In order to get more feedback on specific factors that contribute to job satisfaction and organizational commitment, please answer the open-ended questions below.

60. What factors contribute to your job satisfaction and organizational commitment at North Central College?

61. What factors contribute to your dissatisfaction or lack of commitment at North Central College?
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