

DOES ADJUNCT FACULTY STATUS VARY BY INSTITUTIONAL SETTING?

by

Katlin N Barrett
A Thesis
Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty
of
George Mason University
in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree
of
Masters of Arts
Interdisciplinary Studies

Committee:

_____	Director
_____	Committee Member
_____	Committee Member
_____	Program Director
_____	Dean, College of Humanities and Social Sciences

Date: _____ Spring Semester 2015
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA

Does Adjunct Faculty Status Vary By Institutional Setting?

A Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Arts at George Mason University

by

Katlin N Barrett
Bachelor of Arts
George Mason University, 1987

Director: Shannon Davis, Professor
Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Spring Semester 2015
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA



This work is licensed under a [creative commons attribution-noncommercial 3.0 unported license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/).

DEDICATION

This is dedicated family who has always been my motivation, from an early age you fostered my growth and encouraged me to peruse higher education. Thank you for providing a foundation that has allowed me flourish into the leader I am today. Thank you for your limitless love and patience. I look forward to what our futures holds. Love you, mean it.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

While here at George Mason University all my success can be attributed to Dr. Shannon Davis who has taught me the tenants of hard work and success in higher education as a professional Sociologist.

Rutledge Dennis was very helpful and always offering a listening ear, and alternative approaches. His directness is second only to mine and his ability for acute insights is jarring and sobering, when you need it most. In short, Dennis is that voice in the back of your head verbalizing what you wish you had the nerve to say, and for that quality I am always grateful.

Joe Scimecca has been a joy to work with and I am thankful for his vast knowledge and dedication to a greater understanding of Higher Education systems. I am also thankful to his commitment to my committee and constant presence although you did not have to assist in my efforts. Thank you!

Also a note to all the educators who have demonstrated professional excellence and encouraged me to become the person I am today. It began at Union Elementary with Sandra Raymond, an unconventional instructor who's challenging classroom leadership I mimic today, Janice Gore who ensured my grammar and word choices are sheer perfection and taught me the f-word; focus. At West Brunswick High School, Ashley Speckman, provided intellectual freedom, encouragement and opportunities for me to be a leader. While at East Carolina, Dr. Ken Wilson, Dr. Richard Caston and Dr. Rebecca Powers all demonstrated the highest level of professionalism and support in and outside of the classroom.

It takes a village to raise a child, and to my village I am grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	vi
List of Abbreviations or Symbols	vii
Abstract	viii
Chapter One	Error! Bookmark not defined. 1
Background and Literature Review	2
Chapter Two.....	18
Chapter Three.....	25
Chapter Four	47
References	52

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
Table 1 Descriptive Statistics for Fall 2011 Back-To-School Sample by Institutional Settings ..	5
Table 2 Most access to textbooks compared by Institutional Setting.....	27
Table 3 Most access to sample syllabi compared by Institutional Setting.....	28
Table 4 Most access to curriculum guidelines compared by Institutional Setting.....	29
Table 5 Most access to office space compared by Institutional Setting.....	30
Table 6 Most access to telephone compared by Institutional Setting.....	31
Table 7 Most access to computer compared by Institutional Setting.....	32
Table 8 Most access to printer compared by Institutional Setting.....	33
Table 9 Most access to copy services compared by Institutional Setting.....	34
Table 10 Most access to library borrowing privileges compared by Institutional Setting.....	35
Table 11 Most access to parking compared by Institutional Setting.....	36
Table 12 Least access to textbook compared by Institutional Setting.....	37
Table 13 Least access to sample syllabi compared by Institutional Setting.....	38
Table 14 Least access to curriculum guidelines compared by Institutional Setting.....	39
Table 15 Least access to office space compared by Institutional Setting.....	40
Table 16 Least access to phone compared by Institutional Setting.....	41
Table 17 Least access to computer compared by Institutional Setting.....	42
Table 18 Least access to printer compared by Institutional Setting.....	43
Table 19 Least access to copy services compared by Institutional Setting.....	44
Table 20 Least access to library borrowing privileges compared by Institutional Setting.....	45
Table 21 Least access to parking compared by Institutional Setting.....	46

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Adjunct Faculty..... AF
Tenure Track Faculty TT
The New Faculty Majority Foundation.....NFMF

ABSTRACT

DOES ADJUNCT FACULTY STATUS VARY BY INSTITUTIONAL SETTING?

Katlin N Barrett, M.A.

George Mason University, 2015

Thesis Director: Dr. Shannon Davis

This thesis investigates the Weberian concept of “status” by investigating any potential differences between Adjunct Faculty statuses based upon institutional settings. The institutional settings investigated include Two-Year, Four-Year, and For-Profit colleges and universities. This project is an exploration into the status measurements of class preparation times, number of classes worked per semester, as well as access to resources, as these factors are independent of income or what Weber calls “class”. Analysis found significant differences in the status and resources provided by institutional setting by the amount of time to prepare for classes, as well as access to resources. The specific resources that differ based upon an Adjunct Faculty’s (AF) status and institutional setting include parking, office space, telephones and curriculum guidelines. The goal of the project is to deepen understanding of Adjunct Faculty experiences and acknowledge the various settings that a contingent faculty may find themselves, as well as a be utilized in the transformation of part-time labor in higher education.

CHAPTER ONE: LITERATURE REVIEW AND BACKGROUND

Millions of Americans have looked to higher education for upward mobility, and as a means to economic stability since the Great Recession (NCES 2012; Katsinas, Tollefson and Reamy 2008). While people born between the 1980s and 2000s, Millennials, have stopped investing in the stock markets enjoyed by their Baby-boomer grandparents who were born after the second World War but Millennials have not stopped risky investing altogether (Chen 2001). Millennials invest in themselves via their college education and have created a highly-educated citizenry (Jenkins 2007). The institutions that provide education and promise to equip students with the training necessary for a better tomorrow have changed fundamentally to adapt to new economic environments in which federal, state and local budget cuts redirected education costs to the individual students and their families (Katsinas et al 2008). As budgets have been reduced, so have full-time employees in higher education settings across the United States. Colleges and universities now rely heavily on part-time or adjunct faculty as a means to cut human resource expenses, as well as other university employees (Fruscione 2014). Adjunct Faculty (AF) now comprise an estimated 70% of all teachers or instructors in higher education (Komos 2014; Segran 2014; Pramas 2013; SEIU 2011). The hiring shift favoring AF is taking higher education settings into unprecedented domain, with AF frequently in uncharted and ethically-void situations whose cornerstones are low-wages, low levels of inclusion, and a lack of resources that negatively impact student outcomes. This project is designed to investigate

whether the status of AF varies by institutional setting as a means to investigate the unforeseen impacts stemming from shifts in higher educational funding and the corporatization of higher education (Segran 2014).

Background and Literature Review

Adjunct faculty positions are sometimes also referred to as adjunct, part-time, independent contractors, instructors, and/or lecturers (Komos 2013; Caruth and Caruth 2013). For AF, course assignments are often given and canceled days prior to the course's start date (Komos 2014; Irvine 2011). Adjuncts, those faculty on part-time or contingent contracts (AF) are expected to require less administrative and clerical support, but must meet the same student learning objectives and outcomes in the classroom as their tenured or tenure track (TT) counterparts (Reevy and Deason 2013). Adjuncts are frequently not provided office spaces to fulfill their contractual obligation to regularly meet students outside of the classroom, or may be assigned to shared spaces void of computers to enable electronic communication and/or class preparation while on campus (Reagan 2007; Ryesky 2003). The required office hours are not included in an adjunct's pay as they are only paid for classroom instruction time (Reagan 2007; Reevy et al. 2014).

Neoliberal Context

With a stalled flow of monies stemming from the Great Recession, budgets at every level of government are squeezed. The "do more with less" mentality coupled with a free-market economy drives the current model of sequestration that greatly impacts higher education. While the executive branch looks to higher education to put America back to work

with job specific skills, the budgets remain stagnated or declined (Friedel and Thomas 2013). Most college and universities receive their funding from state and county municipalities, but there has been a shift towards government funding to increased tuition and fees, with 40-46% (up to 58% for Black students) paying their bills from Federally subsidized loans. Wright, Walters, and Zarifa (2013) notes the current educational trend is to shift the financial responsibility from all levels of government onto the individuals enrolled and/or their families.

Students are not alone with the discrepancy in funds allocated from federal and local monies, colleges and universities look to adjunct faculty to cut corners in human resource expenses and shift the financial burden to educated persons seeking to forge a career (Jackson and Reynolds 2013). The shift towards increased tuition to fund entire college and universities is just a fraction of the new model, AF are another intricate piece. Academic employment is being restratified (Rhoades and Slaughters 1997). This is clearly tangible as AF move upwards to 70% on average of college and university's hiring pools they take wage cuts that result in “[AF] subsidizing higher education” (Segran, 2014). Pramas (2013) adds that administrators are saving money on the backs of AF. Reeve et al (2014:1) highlights that the “hiring of contingent faculty is not economically necessary, but rather...the result of a choice to prioritize investments in technology and facilities over...instruction.”

The diverse parameters and experiences of AF in Higher Education

As noted above, an adjunct faculty member or AF is an instructor in higher education who is employed on a temporary basis and is ineligible for tenure. An adjunct is not guaranteed full time work or security in their position, as they may be terminated at any time with or without cause (Reeve and Deason 2014; Caruth and Caruth 2013; Dolan et al 2013). When adjuncts were

utilized in the 1970s they comprised one--fifth or twenty percent of the university teaching pool, but multiple reports from 2007 show adjunct faculty (AF) representing up to seventy percent of teaching faculty in higher education (Dolan, Karlsson, and Martinak 2013 and SEIU 2011). The adjunct model was first implemented as a temporary solution but is now a permanent fixture in higher education (Komos 2013; Reevy et al. 2014; Teeuwen and Hantke 2007; Segran 2014). Adjunct teaching contracts are usually one semester or quarter in duration with no promise or expectation of renewal (Dolan et al 2013; Reevy et al 2014).

There are limits from government agencies that regulate the percentage of adjuncts allowed to be hired if a college or university wishes to gain access to Federal and state funding (Dolan et al. 2013; Pramas 2013). These limits also place boundaries on job prospects for instructors. It is common for some adjunct faculty (AF) to work at multiple institutions and/or have other part-time jobs that do not offer benefits (Dolan et al. 2013; Komos 2013). It is important to note that while all AF are subjected to short--term contracts the adjunct-experience can vary dramatically. As noted above some AF commute to multiple institutions creating a full--time teaching schedule with multiple part--time, or adjunct positions at multiple colleges and universities (Allison, Hoverman and Lynn 2014 and Fruscione 2014). Other AF may utilize teaching as a way to make extra money in conjunction with another full, or part--time positions outside of higher education (Pramas 2013). Others become AF as a part--time job to dedicate time to family commitments, or because of the abundance spouse's income (Teeuwen and Hantke 2007 and Fruscione 2014). The variance in AF experience is captured by Katherine Anderson Howell, a unionized adjunct of writing at George Washington University, when she describes that she has a retirement package, health insurance, a shared office, and university provided computer

as well as an acknowledgement that most of her counterparts at other schools do not (Fruscione 2014). Most AF do not have the resources they need to create a comfortable educational experience including but not limited to office spaces and other material resources (Reevey and Deason 2014).

Weber's Class, Status and Party: An Explanation and Linking to AF Experiences

This project is aimed to investigate inequality via the theory of stratification presented by Max Weber's "Class, Status, Party". Weber almost predicted the struggle of the adjunct to gain fair pay and status in saying, "this mode [differential higher education employee compensation] monopolizes the opportunities for profitable deals for all those who, provide...goods". Status is defined as one's position in a hierarchy not void of economic influence but instead based upon the social order (Gerth and Mills 1946:187). In Weber's stratification theory status refers directly to how prestige or honor dictate the power that one social actor or group may have over another actor or group. Status is one third of his perspective that also includes the equally important components of class, and party. For Weber the three dimensions are inextricably intertwined and cannot be separated, as they influence one another heavily. A very simple example of a status group is Women who in general share a biological status. While women all share the same community and status, a woman's perspective and life experience is also influenced by her class, or access to resources within the marketplace and party, or proximity to the creation of laws and influence on governance which yields varied experiences within the status group of females. One piece to assist in the deciphering of which social actors occupy the same status can be found and defined by whom is buying similar products within the marketplace (Gerth et al 1942;

Livesey 2009). A status group Weber focuses on in his writings are the Jewish communities of Eastern Europe during World War II, as he also links ethnicity as a potential marker of status. This is not true of AF, as the role of AF is filled by people from varied ethnicities. Status does not necessarily yield a community, while it can facilitate sodality (Gerth and Mills 1946 and Kieran 2004). This is especially true of AF who frequently commute and do not have a space to collaborate in person, unless very intentionally self organized (Segran 2014; Reevey et al 2014).

The next portion of Weber's social theory is Party, which is dictated by how much power a social player has in the creation of laws or governance of one's global or local community, or a lack of power to influence the creation of laws. The third and final portion of Weber's ideal type of stratification is Class, which represents who has access to limited resources and who does not. Weber defines class as the possession of goods, opportunity of income that structure life chances (Gerth et al 1964). Resources that dictate power via class, party, or status include but are not limited to property, money, respect, or intellectual knowledge (Livesey 2009). Resources that dictates one's power position located within the matrix of social stratification may change with time and is truly defined by limited access. The lack of access to any certain resource is what increases value of the resource. Weber observes that laws are created to support the social order, not the inverse and argues that power is distributed based on prestige instead of net-worth independently, as his predecessor Marx and Engels had concluded with their focus on class singularly as presented in the Communist Manifesto (Marx and Engels 1848). Weber's weight of the social order within the creation of power structures does

not exclude the influence of the almighty dollar on the creation and maintenance of power. The status position is a culmination of outwardly respect of one's position influenced by their class or economic opportunities, as well as their power or ability to influence the law or the creators of the law. Status is fluid and complex (Kiernan 2004). Status upholds economic disparities and creates barriers towards upward mobility.

AF status, like for most groups, is not self-defined. The professorial ranking system and perception of AF by groups other than themselves impact the status position held by AF. Since status is separate from economic positions, or class, this section will focus on how the social order of higher education impacts AF experiences. "Stress over the stigma of status [or] rank is a unique stressor for [AF]" (Reeve et al 2014). The lack of community between AF in higher education can be attributed to a lack of physical spaces, as well as a reluctance to out one's self as an AF for fear of the stigma attributed with the title. No matter the barriers to naming the status occupation of AF status is unified within a matrix of instability. This definition is demonstrated in the factors of low-income that stem from short-term, part-time contracts void of health benefits which showcases the intersectionality of AF economic-class and status within higher education. AF are seen as expendables instead of an investment to higher education administrators (Komos 2014). Their status is also demonstrated in the exclusion of AF from permanent office spaces and faculty meetings/development that negatively impact a collective spirit and sometimes student outcomes (Dolan et al 2013). Fruscione (2014) reports that the majority of instructors in higher education are AF, and therefore excluded from governance (depending on their department/s) due to their part-time status which gives more power to administrators and gives no outlet or avenue for the adjunct perspective to be heard. Adjuncts

have a unique and growing position in higher education that is clearly defined and is often trivialized compared the shrinking population of their Tenure or TT counterparts as Rudolphus Teeuwen (2007) notes that being and AF is “absen[t] of clear rules, equal chances, and just rewards.” The two main components that define AF status is (A.) their position in the professional ranking system as well as (B.) the perceived effectiveness of part-time faculty. “Once the status order is set, it tends to solidify (and correspond to economic wealth), because those in the highest rank monopolize the currency of status.” (Moody 2004:2).

Higher Education's Professorial Social Order: Professorial Ranking's Impact on Status

A centralized component in social order or status related to AF is based upon professorial ranking within higher education. To begin I will explain the spectrum of faculty employment in higher education. The model explained below is not omnipresent but is common at most university settings. Please imagine a ladder. The top of the ladder in this metaphor will represent the highest status of the professorship, Emeritus. Emeritus is a title of distinction given after years of service at a college or university. The position comes with no pay or teaching schedule, usually professors just maintain an office in their department. The next rung below Emeritus is tenured professors. Tenured faculty (TF) are the highest paid of all faculty. A tenured professor cannot be terminated as a means to promote academic freedom (Wolfe 1973). The US tenure track has origins in the 1960s when professors needed protection while engaging in civil rights reform/research and other controversial topics of the era (Segran 2014 and Wolfe 1967). A tenured professor may not be terminated unless a grave offense is committed, and is eligible for health insurance, unemployment insurance, salary pay, and sometimes 401K plans. Those in tenured positions, especially those employed by research

institutions, are expected to conduct research and publish scholarly articles regularly in conjunction with their instructional duties. The rung located third in sequence is the Associate level professors whom sometimes, but not at always, enjoy the permanency of tenure.

The Associate level professor works for the department by teaching classes, and publishing, while also being engaged in their campus and department community as a means to gain a permanent position, if not tenured or to establish their work ethic in their department. The rung located next in the metaphor is the Assistant professor, or a tenured track (TT). AT professor is an entry level full time position and comprises the pool from which the next tenured line of professors is selected. An Assistant professor is an entry level full time position. This position like the two above it in the ladder metaphor teacher but their position is considered entry-level. The next rung, is occupied by the Research professor, who in some cases is also known as a visiting scholar. The main focus of a Research professor is to publish with less focus on teaching. In some cases the research position is funded with grants. Towards the bottom of the metaphorical ladder of professorial ranking is the Adjunct Faculty. Adjunct Faculty are known by many names including contingent faculty, part-time, graduate lecturers, instructors, to name a few common titles. While AF comprise the majority of faculty members in all levels of higher education, their large population does not yield power and usurps the idea of majority rule (Komos 2014; Segran2014; Pramas 2013 and SEIU 2011). AF may also have dual roles as graduate student and instructor, this population is also AF but is compensated by assistantships or grants that cover part or all of a students' professional degree. This group is commonly called Graduate Lecturers or Graduate Teaching Assistants

(GL or GTA). Allison et al study of George Mason faculty found that one-third of their respondents were graduate lectures (2014).

The perception of AF performance is binary, some are advocates for AF in higher education, on and off the tenure track, while critics point to lackluster student outcomes to highlight the shortcomings a high reliance on AF (Segran 2014). While some researchers may simply see the negative student outcomes as a means to discredit AF, a closer look will yield that AF's classroom shortcomings actually stem from limited resources (Dolan et al 2013; Komos 2014). The limited to resources is especially highlighted when juxtaposed to that of professors ranked differently within the teaching hierarchy. From the literature, three main status related themes that this project seeks to investigate have emerged related to AF status and include (1) the course load taught (2) amount of time notification for course assignments and (3) access to resources in and outside the classroom.

Adjunct Faculty Status stemming from the Number of courses taught by AF

The first component that was discussed in the literature reported that higher education's contingent staff usually instruct at multiple institutions and teach course loads that are hefty. Due to time constraints associated with travel, grading, lesson-planning, research, office hours and other responsibilities the large course load would require "cutting corners" by AF to make at living at or above the household poverty threshold (Desaivtis 2011; Dolan et al 2012). I argue that the course load AF teach is the first part of AF status. Tenured and TT professors are subject to more stability from salary/pay based upon the social order for higher education teaching via professorial ranking. Due to the low pay stemming from AF status and a

perception of less work in a reality of hours well beyond full time, for some AF in the DC Metro Area, the desire to earn the same wage as their full-time counterparts has led AF to teach six or more courses per semester to survive financially (Allison et al 2014). Not all AF rely solely on teaching for their livelihood and may seek other employment to pay their bills, some also only need part-time work depending on their life's circumstances (Teeuwen et al 2007; Fruscione 2014). Since AF need to find complementary assignments, if they seek full time compensation from Adjuncting, I would hypothesize that AF working at both proprietary and 2-year or 4-year schools will be teaching more classes than those employed by one institution.

Measuring Adjunct Faculty Status based on the time allotted to prep for classes

Allison et al (2014) found that lax hiring practices, delayed notification and delayed hiring notification before the semester is still common place for AF. Since AF are often excluded from course creation and design, their status allows a last-to-know position for information, especially in relation to course prep time and hiring. A limited amount of time is another reason Dolan et al (2012) insist that AF's having negative impact on first-year students re-enrolling is systemic and not the result of incompetent faculty members. If AF faculty, the teaching majority, have narrow timeline for course design and no orientation to their institution they are not likely to be adequately prepared in the classroom. Since Community colleges and for-profit schools utilize AF at higher rates, I expect that these types of institutions will grant more notification than their 4-year counterparts. I also anticipate that the hybrid category comprised of online classes will have a lower notification time due to the fast pace and shorter, condensed educational experiences.

Measuring Adjunct Faculty Status based on AF's Access to facilities and resources

This project also seeks further investigation into the access to resources necessary for success in the modern classroom (Komos 2013). In a time and culture where technology seems omnipresent, all college and university teaching staff are expected to train up-and-comers of their discipline with the newest skills for the job market. If an AF member does not seem committed Heller (2012) suggests it may be caused by structural factors. For this project I will divide the access to resources into two categories of (1) soft resources such as time or instructor knowledge (i.e. course objectives, previous syllabi, or training and (2) hard resources vis a vis computers, printers, office spaces, office supplies. In my personal experience adjuncting, I was expected to use my personal computer to assist in compliance with Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) by my department, provide a printer, paper, ink, and any other classroom materials, while sharing a bare office with three other department's adjuncts and graduate lectures. My experiences are also reported in numerous texts who highlight that the former, faculty-centered higher education design of the 1970s, has now reconfigured its post-recession-budget into creating learning environments outside of the traditional classroom. The new investments prioritized in higher education are realized in the building of new recreation centers and luxury dormitories, to name a few (Segran 2014; DeSantis 2011; Teuween et al 2007). This trend is not solely true of the adjuncting community, Fruscione (2014) interviewed Shondra Goward and she highlighted that "the professoriate is not the only aspect of the academy that has become adjunctified," extending the situation of part-time contracts and limited resources to low-level administrators, facilities and food service employees. Since for-profit schools charge a higher rate

that public and private schools (those colleges and universities that make up the 2-year and 4-year categories) I anticipate them offering more hard resources as their funding is not based on government agencies. For 2-year schools I imagine that the availability of both soft and hard resources will be present based upon their higher reliance on AF. I am uncertain as to the potential experiences for 4-year faculty.

Higher Education's Social Order and its impact on Adjunct Faculty Status

AF status is located on the lowest rung of the professorial ranking system (as mentioned above) which limits the quality and quantity of resources they are given, especially since AF are seen as “consumables, rather than investments” by higher education administrators (Komos 2014). Since AF status leaves part-time faculty frequently excluded in department governance, or Weberian terminology Party, AF have no decision making power that impacts that stems from a low ranked status and directly influences (1) unpredictable enrollments and late notification of course assignments that impact the amount of time AF have to prepare for their classes, (2) access to “materials, resources, teaching strategies, and [past] assignments”, and (3) the number of classes they must teach to make above the poverty level (Komos 2014; Segran 2014; Reevey et al 2014; Allison et al 2014). All of these limitations that stem from AF status in higher education have been noted to also negatively impact students’ especially first year students, the main student population that is taught by AF (Segran 2014; Fruscione 2014). The impact on the AF’s target community is why the variables related to access to resources, the number of courses taught, and notification of hire and course assignment(s).

Differentiated Higher Education Settings That Require Inquiry

Community Colleges or 2-years Schools

The most distinguishing quality of two years schools in the US is their open access (Cohen 2012). Open access at community colleges means that there is no barrier to attendance in relation to test scores or grade point averages. The Community college or 2-year schools are a means to educate all. Although most 2-year schools issue Associates Degrees, some institutions grant bachelor's degrees. The main function of a 2-year school is to assist in the transfer of their students into 4-year schools (Fruscione 2014). Many 2-year programs teach not only transferrable credits, but also grant certification in many trade industries such as esthetics/cosmetology, and electrician, to name a few. In general the community college is more focused on teaching than research, unlike their public and private university or 4-year counterparts. Community colleges, or 2-year schools rely most on AF (Komos 2013). Due to the Community College reliance on AF, this project will investigate whether community college AF enjoy access to more resources, notified in more time of class assignments, and/or teach less classes based upon their increased utilization at this institutional setting.

Two-year schools, like their university or 4-year counterparts, also get funding from local, state, and federal agencies. Community college and universities both utilize tuition increases at the same rate. A rise in tuition is used as a means to gain revenue lost by government spending, especially at the state level (Katsinas et al 2008). Degree completion rates are low at the Community College and Technical schools with most students taking an

average of seven years to obtain a 2-year degree (Komos 2014). Community colleges serve communities often not considered by 4-year schools, mainly rural populations (Howley, Chavis and Kester 2013).

Universities (4-year)

Colleges and universities that grant a bachelor's, masters, and/or doctoral degrees comprise the 4-year setting. The 4-year school is often research oriented with a focus and emphasis on the creation of new knowledge, but the campus prioritization of research or teaching depends on the university's charter and current function within their local economic system. Four-year schools have exclusive admissions processes including a certain score on standardized testing, an application, and in most cases a writing sample to be admitted. The increased selectiveness of 4-years schools send more students to Community Colleges (Katsinas et al 2008). The atmosphere of 4-year colleges is extremely diverse from geographical location, populations served (ie) Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Tribal Colleges, degree offerings, student type (ie) residential or commuter, just to name a few variations.

While the admission requirements and funding structure may be similar campus communities and atmospheres vary. Like their 2-year counterparts, colleges and universities may either be publically funded by state and federal governments or privately. Four-year schools are more highly structured due to the varied functions and multifaceted focuses. Four-year schools are increasingly corporatized, and filled with student services that are not

frequently found in teaching centered community colleges. A large portion of 4-year schools also offer residency to their students.

For Profit

For-profit schools are designed to serve students as their 2 and 4 year counterparts but with a completely different methods to gain revenue. The factor that sets for-profit schools apart is that they are publically traded, and answers to its shareholders instead of a dean or provost in 2 and 4 year models. A for-profit school often has increased tuition rates when compared to public colleges and universities, and ample funds to serve its clients. In the for-profit sector there is no tenure, and AF are heavily relied upon (Komos 2013). Similar to its 2-year school counterpart, for-profits schools also have a low completion rate. Many for-profit schools utilize online programs to reach working adults, their main student population. For-profit students pay more money for the convenience and shorter-length course terms that complement their presumed busy schedule. Challenges with for-profit degrees stem from aggressive business techniques and a very focused recruitment of adults not necessarily academically prepared for secondary education, which in practice has resulted in grade inflation (McCann 2013).

Similarities between different institutions

Since the Great Recession all levels of higher education have seen an increase in nontraditional students (Katsinas 2008; 2013). Students enrolled at 2-year, 4-year, or for-profit schools are all eligible to apply for Federally subsidized loans via Free Application for Federal Student Aid, unless they are a convicted felon. No type of institution in particular

has been impacted more by an increasingly corporatized perspectives; all seem to have shifted to a balance sheet oriented operational structure at a similar rate. On average multiple degree granting institutions at 2-year, 4-year and for-profit institutional levels of higher education hire AF at 60-76% of their total teaching/researching/lecturing population (Komos 2013; Segran 2014; Katsinas 2008;2013).

The current research has not situated the AF experience within Weber's ideal of status. It is necessary to do so as a means to extend the challenges facing AF beyond just purely economic (ie) low wages. This project proposes that status measurement variables are created utilizing the main themes from the literature review to extend an investigation. The institutional differences should also be examined to see if differences in funding, admissions policies that influence the student body population, and overall functions of the institution have an effect on the AF experience. The current literature frequently highlights the number of courses taught, access to resources, and notification of course assignments being indicative of AF treatment and deprioritization (Dolan et al 2014; Reevey et al 2013; Segran 2014; Teeuwen et al 2007). Within Weber's status definition this treatment is based upon AF low situation in the social order of higher educational hiring practices, also known as the professorial ranking system utilized by college administrators. Now that the social order of higher education has been discussed the methodical approach to this project will be discussed.

CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY

Approach to Measure Status

To investigate if AF status varies by institutional setting, I will analyze the Fall 2009 Survey of Contingent Faculty Back-To-School Survey administered by The New Faculty Majority Foundation, a member-organization dedicated to gaining economic justice for AF. A secondary data analysis of the survey will be conducted to create AF status measurements and define four institutional settings, 2-year, 4-year, or for-profit to analyze to find any significant relationships. There was a hybrid category created for respondents who taught at multiple teaching settings but the population only included sis respondents and was too small for the test that needed to be conducted. The survey has 526 respondents who have been employed as AF, and are due paying members of NFMF. The survey does not include demographic information such as income, sex, age, or race/ethnicity. The use of this survey does have limitations on the investigation including the aforementioned lack of demographic information, as well as no questions that allow for the separation of public and private schools systems, which do have very strong situational differences as well. The project has three prong plan (1) define the populations and create categories for the independent variables (2) create the status measurement dependent variables that were selected from the survey based upon the themes found in the literature review and (3) run an ANOVA or chi-square tests to investigate if these status

measurement variables are significantly impacted by the institutional setting. This research project will utilize the Survey of Contingent Faculty Back-to-School Survey to answer the research question, does AF status vary by institutional setting? The respondent data from the Survey of Contingent Faculty Back-to-School Survey will be used to investigate what, if any, institutional variances at 2- year, 4-year, or for-profit category and AF who teach any combination of institutional type. Some structural differences between 2-year, 4-year, and for-profit category of colleges and universities include the varied sources of funding, admission policies, and overall functional differences. Any variations in the 2-year, 4-year, or for-profit categories may give insight into institutional and/or structural impacts on AF reported experience. Since AF are excluded from governance, often AF do not have any input regarding the course offerings of the department that are taught and depending on their utilization of the part-time work offered by higher education institutions they may or may not have other employment. Since AF are low within the professorial social order the number of classes taught can highlight the status of AF by accentuating whether AF have to teach more as a means to live above the poverty rate (Allison et al 2014). Therefore, the first measure of status will be the number of courses AF teach at a time.

The second marker to measure status is the amount of preparation time an AF is given for a class. As mentioned above AF are utilized as “consumables” they are often the last to know regarding course assignments. A decreased amount of time to prepare has been noted to negatively impact students learning outcomes, as the course may seem unorganized with no clear learning objectives (Dolan et al 2013 and Reevey et al 2014). The amount of

time an adjunct is given to prepare for their class is a measurement for status, as it is likely dictated by the AF's low position within professorial ranking and their lack of prestige.

Finally, the access, or lack thereof to tangible and intellectual resources is a measure of AF status. With limited time to prepare for class many AF also find to be ill-equipped with the needed resources for classroom success (Komos 2013 and Reevey et al 2014). The low position of AF professorial rank and the myth that AF require less support, make the dimension of access to resources one to investigate. In the *Status* portion of this paper access to resources was defined as a means to measure class situations and not to measure "no" status. To clarify this portion of the investigation is not meant to define class, but instead highlight that AF's denial to resources such as syllabi, an office, and a computer is based upon their lack of prestige not inability to purchase these resources. The focus is more on the provision of the resources by administrators to yield effective teaching rather than an adjuncts potentially inability to procure these materials in the marketplace (Komos 2103). Chi- squares are employed to investigate if there are any significant differences between AF experiences at varied settings.

Creating and Defining the Institutional Setting Samples

The survey's respondents are divided by institutional levels to create comparison groups. This project compares and contrasts the experiences of AF at the community college/2-year level, the university/4-year level, for-profit/proprietary college level (ie) University of Phoenix. To define which respondents are employed at two or four year institutions Question 8 in the Survey of Contingent Faculty Back-to-School will be utilized.

Question 8 asks respondents, “Are you teaching at an institution that primarily grants two-year degrees or four-year degrees?” with the choices of “Two-year degree granting institution(s)”, “Four-Year degree granting institution(s) (including graduate schools)”, or “I have teaching appointments at both types of institutions.” For this project I coded “Two-year degree granting institution(s)” as 2-years, “Four-Year degree granting institution(s) (including graduate schools)” as 4-years. It is important to note that while the types of degree offering and obtainment of funding will be similar within each category, 2-year, 4-year, and for-profit school atmosphere, geography, student population, and many other components may be very different. The purpose of dividing the institutions is to see if any differences in AF status are present not to naively project that all institutions at a certain level are identical. The final component of the population will be defined by respondents’ response to Question 9 which asks, “Are any of the campuses where you teach proprietary institutions?” No”. Those who responded with “Yes” had their response combined with their response with Question 2 that asked “If you are teaching, at how many campuses are you currently teaching for all 2011? Count each campus of one institution separately” with response options of “Not applicable, as I am not teaching this term” who will be excluded from the category, “I am teaching at one campus this term” which created the purely for-profit category since they are teaching at once campus and identified it to be proprietary with a “Yes” .

Status Measurements

Number of classes taught

The first status related question that will be utilized in this section is Question 3, “How many classes are you currently teaching for Fall 2011?” It lists an ordinal responses including “1”-“5” and with a final selection of “6 or more”. The respondents’ selection will reflect how many classes they taught for the Fall 2012 school year.

Notification of hiring and/or class assignment

Question 4 in the SCFBTSS survey touched on status via the amount of time in advance that a professor is notified that they will be teaching a course. Question 4 asks “Regardless of where you are teaching, how many weeks prior to the start of classes did you have to prepare for fall 2011 classes? If you have multiple appointments, please use the appointment that provided the most lead time” with response options in an interval range of “less than 2 weeks”, “Between 2 and 3 weeks”, “Between 4 and 6 weeks”, and “More than 7 weeks”. This variable does not need to be recoded for the ANOVA as it is already in intervals of two weeks. Part-time adjuncts have been reported to spend less time preparing for class (Reevey et al 2014). Question 5 expands on the inquiry of AF appointment lead times for the hybrid category by asking “For those with multiple appointments, please answer the question using the appointment with the least lead time. Regardless of where you are teaching how many weeks prior to the start of classes did you have to prepare for fall 2011 classes?” with the same options of “less than 2 weeks”,

“Between 2 and 3 weeks”, “Between 4 and 6 weeks”, and “More than 7 weeks” with an additional response of “Not applicable I only have one appointment.”

Access to teaching resources

Effective teaching is the process of selecting the materials, resources, teaching strategies and assignments that will promote critical thinking and assist student in meeting the learning objectives (Komos 2013). The AF status question regarding access to the aforementioned tools from the survey instrument included Question 16 A and B. Section A asked AF respondents what necessary materials they had most access to before their semester ranging from textbooks, syllabi, phones, computers, and copiers to name a few. Question 16 B asks AF which of the same material listed above that they had the least access to with an interval scale of “Less than two weeks”, “2-4 Weeks”, “5-6 Weeks”, “More than 7 weeks”, “I was not provided with the resource”, and “I did not need this resource.” This responses were recoded into three categories (1) I did not get this resource, (2) I received this resource seven weeks or more prior to the start of the semester, and (3) I did not need this resource. This coding was to facilitate the output and make it clear who was given what void of time as that factor is not included in the scope of this project. This question assisted in identifying the resources obtained as well as the time the resources were or were not offered to AF.

Does Adjunct Status Vary by Institutional Setting?

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether there are status differences based upon the two measures of status, number of courses taught and time allotted for class preparation across institutional settings. The ANOVA is suited to these two measurements because many of the status measurement variables are written in ordinal or scale form. The ANOVA was performed utilizing SPSS to test if the mean of the outcome variables are significantly different across the institutional groups (2-year, 4-year, for-profit). This analysis was selected as a means to determine if there are any significant differences between the 2-year, 4-year and , for-profit groups. All variables will be processed using ANOVA since all responses are coded or re-coded into ordinal or interval levels of measurement. The second analysis that will be utilized is chi-squared for the categorical questions related to resources. A chi square will be used to see if there are any significant relationships between AF institution type and access to resources.

CHAPTER THREE: FINDINGS

Again this project was designed to investigate if any differences in AF status exist based upon their institutional setting, since the setting of higher education institutions run the gamut and have been discussed in the literature as a homogenous population despite structural and functional differences. In this chapter the information obtained through data analysis will be presented. The analysis was conducted to investigate if there are different experiences between AF at varied institutional settings based upon the amount of time the AF is given to prepare for classes, the number of classes being taught in the Fall 2011 semester, and the access to resources. The purpose of investigating AF experiences stratified by their campus setting is a means to capture the varied experiences of the AF work, and investigate what AF may need more assistance and support for themselves and their students. As explained in earlier paragraphs there are fundamental differences between Four-Year, Two-Year, and For-profit schools ranging from admissions processes to funding from outside agencies. The aim of this project is to also highlight and honor the vast experiences of AF across many climates and work towards a more comprehensive understanding of challenges faced by AF at different settings as a means to better serve this underserved population of educators.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Fall 2011 Back-To-School Sample by Institutional Setting (N=516)

<u>Variables</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std.</u> <u>Deviation</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
Institutional Settings	1.8	.66	1	3
Number of Classes Taught in Fall 2011	3.04	1.525	1	6
<i>Most Access to Resources</i>				
Number of weeks to prepare before the semester began	2.88	1.124	1	4
Textbook	1.1582	.67122	.00	2.00
Sample Syllabi	1.1512	.65342	.00	2.00
Curriculum Guidelines	1.0413	.68045	.00	2.00
Office Space	.9412	.59603	.00	2.00
Phone	.9534	.63501	.00	2.00
Computer	.9656	.57774	.00	2.00
Printer	.9927	.55278	.00	2.00
Copy Services	1.0391	.59363	.00	2.00
Library Borrowing Privileges	1.0958	.44739	.00	2.00
Parking	1.0605	.55189	.00	2.00
<i>Least Access to Resources</i>				
Number of weeks to prepare before the semester began	2.17	1.113	1	4
Textbooks	1.1189	.64007	.00	2.00
Sample Syllabi	1.1044	.63514	.00	2.00
Curriculum Guidelines	1.0331	.68232	.00	2.00
Office Space	.8771	.75437	.00	2.00
Phone	.8268	.78480	.00	2.00
Computer	.9553	.70169	.00	2.00
Printer	.9500	.71124	.00	2.00
Library Borrowing Privileges	1.0778	.60219	.00	2.00

Copy Services	1.0660	.40589	.00	2.00
Parking	1.1061	.59484	.00	2.00
Source: New Faculty Majority Foundation				

Descriptive Statistics

As seen in Table 1, the majority of respondents are Four-Year AF (N=222). The average instructor had three classes assigned to them per semester. Most instructors had 2.88 weeks to prepare before the semester started. In the “Most Access to Resources” and “Least Access to Resources” the majority of AF received the resources listed. The resources that most AF had access to include textbooks, sample syllabi, curriculum guidelines, office space, telephones, computer, printer, copy services, library borrowing privileges and parking.

ANOVA

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine the differences in the number of classes taught and the amount of time AF had to prepare before the semester began by institutional setting. The significant F value of 39.92 for number of classes taught reveals that the means for the four institutional settings are not equal. The ANOVA found that there are statistical differences between Two-Year, Four-Year, and For-Profit F instructor’s number of classes taught. For-Profit AF report slightly higher number of classes taught (4.5 classes), second to Four-Year AF who teach just under 3 classes per semester.

The significant F value of 9.68 for number of weeks to prepare for classes before the semester reveals that the means for all three institutional types are not equal. AF in the For-Profit category of respondents get approximately one additional day to prepare for courses than those teaching at Four-Year schools, and about four more days than AF at For-Profit institutions. The

range of weeks to prepare gained from this instrument are two-and-a-half weeks to three-and-a-half weeks, with the most lead time recorded.

Chi-Square

Table 2: Most access to textbooks compared by Institutional Setting

	Institutional Settings			Total
	Two-Year	Four-Year	For-Profit	
Textbooks Not Given	19 13.9%	36 16.7%	10 16.9%	65 15.8%
Given 2-7 w	82 59.9%	98 45.6%	36 61.0%	216 52.6%
Not Needed	36 26.3%	81 37.7%	13 22.0%	130 31.6%
Total	136 100.0%	137 100.0%	215 100.0%	59 100.0%

n=411
 $\chi^2=10.12$ with 4 *df*

As shown in Table 2, most respondents regardless of their institutional setting were given access to a textbook between 2 or 7 plus weeks before the start of the semester. However 15.8% of AF at all institutional levels did not receive access to this resource at all. Two- Year and For-Profit AF report higher access to textbooks at similar rates (59.9% and 61%) while over one-third of For-Year AF reported that they did not need a textbook. There is a significant relationship between institutional setting and their access to a textbook, as the chi square value is 10.12 with four degrees of freedom.

Table 3: Most access to sample syllabi compared by Institutional Setting

		Institutional Settings			Total
		Two-Year	Four-Year	For-Profit	
Sample Syllabi	Not Given	19 14.0%	35 16.3%	7 11.9%	61 14.9%
	Given	76	112	38	226
	2-7 w	55.9%	52.1%	64.4%	55.1%
	Not Needed	41 30.1%	68 31.6%	14 23.7%	123 30.0%
Total		136 100.0%	215 100.0%	59 100.0%	410 100.0%

n=410

$\chi^2=2.97$ with 4 *df*

As shown in Table 3, most respondents regardless of their institutional setting were given access to a sample syllabi between 2 or 7 plus weeks before the start of the semester, while 14.9% of AF at all institutional levels did not receive access to this resource at all. For-profit AF reported the lowest need for sample syllabi and the highest access to the resource. Four-year AF experienced the least access to simply syllabi with 16.3% reporting they were not given the resource, while over one-third of Four-Year AF did not need a sample syllabi at all. There is not a significant relationship between institutional setting and access to sample syllabi (either Two-Year, Four-Year, or For-Profit), as the chi square value is 2.97 with four degrees of freedom.

Table 4: Most access to curriculum guidelines compared by Institutional Setting

		Institutional Settings			Total
		Two-Year	Four-Year	For-Profit	
Curriculum Guidelines	Not Given	24 17.3%	52 24.3%	11 18.6%	87 21.1%
	Given 2-7 w	80 57.6%	104 48.6%	37 62.7%	221 53.6%
	Not Needed	35 25.2%	58 27.1%	11 18.6%	104 25.2%
Total		139 100.0%	214 100.0%	59 100.0%	412 100.0%

n=412

$\chi^2=5.8$ with 4 *df*

As shown in Table 4, most respondents regardless of their institutional setting were given access to curriculum guidelines between 2 or 7-plus weeks before the start of the semester, while about 1 out of 5 of AF at all institutional levels did not receive access to this resource at all. The group reporting the least access to curriculum guidelines was Four-year AF with almost one-fourth of respondents reporting they were not given the resource (24.3%). For-Profit AF had the most access to this resource with 62.7% reporting they were given access to a curriculum contract between 2 and 7 plus weeks before the semester. There is not a significant relationship between

institutional setting (either Two-Year, Four-Year, or For-Profit), as the chi square value is 5.80 with four degrees of freedom.

Table 5 : Most access to an office space compared by Institutional Setting

		Institutional Settings			Total
		Two-Year	Four-Year	For-Profit	
Office Space	Not Given	42 31.6%	30 13.9%	13 22.0%	85 20.8%
	Given 2-7 w	72 54.1%	153 70.8%	37 62.7%	262 64.2%
	Not Needed	19 14.3%	33 15.3%	9 15.3%	61 15.0%
Total		133 100.0%	216 100.0%	59 100.0%	408 100.0%

n=408
 $\chi^2=16.7$ with 4 *df*

As shown in Table 5, most respondents regardless of their institutional setting were given access to an office space between 2 or 7-plus weeks before the start of the semester, while 1 out of 5 of AF at all institutional levels did not receive access to this resource at all. There are large differences between the percentage of Two-Year AF who were not provided with office space (31.6%) and those at other institutions, with a rate much higher than Four-Year and For-Profit AF experiencing access to office space. Four-Year AF members who reported a much higher rate of access to office space at 70.8% of this institutional level give access to an office. There is a

significant relationship between institutional setting (either Two-Year, Four-Year, or For-Profit), as the chi square value is 16.07 with four degrees of freedom.

Table 6: Most access to a telephone (phone) compared by Institutional Setting

		Institutional Settings			Total
		Two-Year	Four-Year	For-Profit	
Phone	Not Given	40 29.9%	36 16.7%	16 27.1%	92 22.5%
	Given	71 53.0%	141 65.6%	31 52.5%	243 59.6%
	2-7 w				
	Not Needed	23 17.2%	38 17.7%	12 20.3%	73 17.9%
Total		134 100.0%	215 100.0%	59 100.0%	408 100.0%

n=408
 $\chi^2=9.94$ with 4 *df*

As shown in Table 6, most respondents regardless of their institutional setting were given access to a telephone between 2 or 7-plus weeks before the start of the semester, while 22.5% of AF at all institutional levels did not receive access to this resource at all. AF in Four-Year institutions were more likely to be given access to a telephone than were those at other institutional types. There is a significant relationship between institutional setting (either Two-Year, Four-Year, or For-Profit), as the chi square value is 9.94 with four degrees of freedom.

Table 7: Most access to a computer compared by Institutional Setting

		Institutional Settings			Total
		Two-Year	Four-Year	For-Profit	
Computer	Not Given	27 20.1%	37 17.3%	11 18.6%	75 18.4%
	Given 2-7 w	89 66.4%	142 66.4%	40 67.8%	271 66.6%
	Not Needed	18 13.4%	35 16.4%	8 13.6%	61 15.0%
Total		134 100.0%	214 100.0%	59 100.0%	407 100.0%

n=407

$\chi^2=.967$ with 4 *df*

As shown in Table 7, most respondents regardless of their institutional setting were given access to a computer between 2 or 7 plus weeks before the start of the semester, while 18.4% of AF at all institutional levels did not receive access to this resource at all. There is not a significant relationship between respondents institutional setting (either Two-Year, Four-Year, or For-Profit), as the chi square value is .946 with four degrees of freedom.

Table 8: Most access to a printer compared by Institutional Setting

		Institutional Settings			Total
		Two-Year	Four-Year	For-Profit	
Printer	Not Given	25 18.4%	29 13.4%	10 17.2%	64 15.6%
	Given 2-7 w	91 66.9%	153 70.8%	41 70.7%	285 69.5%
	Not Needed	20 14.7%	34 15.7%	7 12.1%	61 14.9%
Total		136 100.0%	216 100.0%	58 100.0%	410 100.0%

n=410
 $\chi^2=2.05$ with 4 *df*

As shown in Table 8, most respondents regardless of their institutional setting were given access to a printer between 2 or 7 plus weeks before the start of the semester, while 15.6% of AF at all institutional levels did not receive access to this resource at all. There is not a significant relationship between institutional setting (either Two-Year, Four-Year, or For-Profit), as the chi square value is 2.05 with four degrees of freedom.

Table 9: Most access to copy services compared by Institutional Setting

		Institutional Settings			Total
		Two-Year	Four-Year	For-Profit	
Copy Services	Not Given	10 7.2%	8 3.8%	3 5.2%	21 5.1%
	Given 2-7 w	119 85.6%	174 82.1%	47 81.0%	340 83.1%
	Not Needed	10 7.2%	30 14.2%	8 13.8%	48 11.7%
Total		139 100.0%	212 100.0%	58 100.0%	409 100.0%

n= 409
 $\chi^2=5.78$ with 4 *df*

As shown in Table 9, most respondents regardless of their institutional setting were given access to a printer between 2 or 7-plus weeks before the start of the semester, while 5.1% of AF at all institutional levels did not receive access to this resource at all. There is not a significant relationship between institutional setting (either Two-Year, Four-Year, or For-Profit), as the chi square value is 5.78 with four degrees of freedom.

Table 10: Most access to library borrowing privileges compared by Institutional Setting

		Institutional Settings			Total
		Two-Year	Four-Year	For-Profit	
Library Borrowing	Not Given	15 11.0%	3 1.4%	5 8.8%	23 5.7%
	Given 2-7 w	98 72.1%	180 84.1%	44 77.2%	322 79.1%
	Not Needed	23 16.9%	31 14.5%	8 14.0%	62 15.2%
Total		136 100.0%	214 100.0%	57 100.0%	407 100.0%

n=407

$\chi^2=16.72$ with 4 *df*

As shown in Table 10, most respondents regardless of their institutional setting were given access to library borrowing privileges between 2 or 7 plus weeks before the start of the semester, while 5.7% of AF at all institutional levels did not receive access to this resource at all. AF at Four-Year institutions were most likely to be given library borrowing privileges. There is a significant relationship between institutional setting (either Two-Year, Four-Year, or For-Profit), as the chi square value is 16.72 with four degrees of freedom.

Table 11: Most access to a parking space compared by Institutional Setting

		Institutional Settings			Total
		Two-Year	Four-Year	For-Profit	
Parking	Not Given	10 7.2%	34 15.8%	7 11.9%	51 12.3%
	Given 2-7 w	111 79.9%	130 60.5%	45 76.3%	286 69.2%
	Not Needed	18 12.9%	51 23.7%	7 11.9%	76 18.4%
Total		139 100.0%	215 100.0%	59 100.0%	413 100.0%

n=413

$\chi^2=17.09$ with 8 *df*

As shown in Table 11, most respondents regardless of their institutional setting were given access to parking between 2 or 7 plus weeks before the start of the semester, while 12.3% of AF at all institutional levels did not receive access to this resource at all. AF at Four-Year institutions were both more likely not to be given access to parking and were more likely not to need access to parking as compared to other AF at other institutional types. There is a significant relationship between institutional setting (either Two-Year, Four-Year, or For-Profit), as the chi square value is 17.09 with four degrees of freedom.

Table 12: Least access to a textbook compared by Institutional Setting

		Institutional Settings			Total
		Two-Year	Four-Year	For-Profit	
Textbooks Least Access	Not Given	8 12.7%	8 11.8%	12 22.2%	28 15.1%
	Given 2-7 w	39 61.9%	34 50.0%	34 63.0%	107 57.8%
	Not Needed	16 25.4%	26 38.2%	8 14.8%	50 27.0%
Total		63 100.0%	68 100.0%	54 100.0%	185 100.0%

n=185
 $\chi^2=9.90$ with 4 *df*

As shown in Table 12, most respondents regardless of their institutional setting were given access to a textbooks between 2 or 7 plus weeks before the start of the semester, when recording their experiences with the least access to resources. For-Profit AF reported that lowest need for textbooks and the highest access to textbooks when accounting for their experiences with the least access if they teach at multiple institutions or have multiple assignments with one setting. Meanwhile 15.1% of AF at all institutional levels did not receive access to this resource at all. There is a significant relationship between institutional setting (either Two-Year, Four-Year, or For-Profit), as the chi square value is 9.90 with four degrees of freedom.

Table 13: Least access to a sample syllabi compared by Institutional Setting

		Institutional Settings			Total
		Two-Year	Four-Year	For-Profit	
Sample Syllabi Least Access	Not Given	8 13.1%	11 16.4%	9 16.7%	28 15.4%
	Given 2-7 w	36 59.0%	34 50.7%	37 68.5%	107 58.8%
	Not Needed	17 27.9%	22 32.8%	8 14.8%	47 25.8%
Total		61 100.0%	67 100.0%	54 100.0%	182 100.0%

n=182

$\chi^2=5.82$ with 4df

As shown in Table 13, most respondents regardless of their institutional setting were given access to a sample syllabi between 2 or 7 plus weeks before the start of the semester, when reporting their experiences with the least access. For-profit schools were most likely to receive a sample syllabi (68.5%) and For-Year AF were the least (50.7%). Four-Year AF also did not need the resource when accounting for their experiences with the least access given for the semester. Meanwhile 15.4% of AF at all institutional levels did not receive access to this resource at all. There is not a significant relationship between institutional setting (either Two-Year, Four-Year, or For-Profit), as the chi square value is 5.82 with four degrees of freedom.

Table 14: Least access to curriculum guidelines compared by Institutional Setting

		Institutional Settings			Total
		Two-Year	Four-Year	For-Profit	
Curriculum Guidelines Least Access	Not Given	10 16.7%	14 20.9%	15 27.8%	39 21.5%
	Given 2-7 w	35 58.3%	32 47.8%	30 55.6%	97 53.6%
	Not Needed	15 25.0%	21 31.3%	9 16.7%	45 24.9%
Total		60 100.0%	67 100.0%	54 100.0%	181 100.0%

n=181

 $\chi^2=4.96$ with 4 *df*

As shown in Table 14, most respondents regardless of their institutional setting were given access to a curriculum guidelines between 2 or 7 plus weeks before the start of the semester, while over 1 out of 5 (21.5%) of AF at all institutional levels did not receive access to this resource at all, while overall over 50% of AF did not need access to curriculum guidelines. Two-Year AF had slightly higher access to curriculum guidelines, compared to their Four-Year and For-Profit counterparts. There is not a significant relationship between institutional setting (either Two-Year, Four-Year, or For-Profit), as the chi square value is 4.96 with four degrees of freedom.

Table 15: Least access to an office space compared by Institutional Setting

		Institutional Settings			Total
		Two-Year	Four-Year	For-Profit	
Office Space Least Access	Not Given	18 30.0%	22 33.8%	23 42.6%	63 35.2%
	Given 2-7 w	30 50.0%	24 36.9%	21 38.9%	75 41.9%
	Not Needed	12 20.0%	19 29.2%	10 18.5%	41 22.9%
Total		60 100.0%	65 100.0%	54 100.0%	179 100.0%

n=179

$\chi^2=4.58$ with 4 *df*

As shown in Table 15, most respondents regardless of their institutional setting were given access to an office space between 2 or 7 plus weeks before the start of the semester, when reporting about their experiences with the least access. Many For-Profit AF did not get office space, while Two-Year AF received the most access (50.0%). Over one-third or 35.2% of AF at all institutional levels did not receive access to this resource at all. There is not a significant relationship between institutional setting (either Two-Year, Four-Year, or For-Profit), as the chi square value is 4.58 with four degrees of freedom.

Table 16: Least access to a telephone(phone) compared by Institutional Setting

		Institutional Settings			Total
		Two-Year	Four-Year	For-Profit	
Phone Least Access	Not Given	24 39.3%	23 35.4%	26 49.1%	73 40.8%
	Given 2-7 w	26 42.6%	22 33.8%	16 30.2%	64 35.8%
	Not Needed	11 18.0%	20 30.8%	11 20.8%	42 23.5%
	Total	61 100.0%	65 100.0%	53 100.0%	179 100.0%

n=179
 $\chi^2=5.13$ with 4 *df*

As shown in Table 16, most respondents regardless of their institutional setting were given access to a telephone between 2 or 7 plus weeks before the start of the semester when reporting their experiences with the least access to resources. One-third of Four-Year AF did not need access to a telephone. 40.8% of AF at all institutional levels did not receive access to this resource at all. There is not a significant relationship between institutional setting (either Two-Year, Four-Year, or For-Profit), as the chi square value is 5.13 with four degrees of freedom.

Table 17: Least access to a computer compared by Institutional Setting

		Institutional Settings			Total
		Two-Year	Four-Year	For-Profit	
Computer Least Access	Not Given	12 20.0%	17 26.2%	19 35.2%	48 26.8%
	Given 2- 7 w	38 63.3%	29 44.6%	24 44.4%	91 50.8%
	Not Needed	10 16.7%	19 29.2%	11 20.4%	40 22.3%
Total		60 100.0%	65 100.0%	54 100.0%	179 100.0%

n=179

$\chi^2=7.57$ with 4 *df*

As shown in Table 17, most respondents regardless of their institutional setting were given access to a computer between 2 or 7 plus weeks before the start of the semester, while one out of four AF at all institutional levels did not receive access to this resource at all when reporting their experiences with the lease access. Two- Year AF report the highest access to a computer, at almost 20% higher rate than Four-Year and For-Profit AF. There is not a significant relationship between institutional setting (either Two-Year, Four-Year, or For-Profit), as the chi square value is 7.57 with four degrees of freedom.

Table 18: Least access to a printer compared by Institutional Setting

		Institutional Settings			Total
		Two-Year	Four-Year	For-Profit	
Printer Least Access	Not Given	15 24.6%	16 24.6%	19 35.2%	50 27.8%
	Given 2- 7 w	35 57.4%	30 46.2%	24 44.4%	89 49.4%
	Not Needed	11 18.0%	19 29.2%	11 20.4%	41 22.8%
Total		61 100.0%	65 100.0%	54 100.0%	180 100.0%

n=180

$\chi^2=4.64$ with 4 *df*

As shown in Table 18, most respondents regardless of their institutional setting were given access to a printer between 2 or 7 plus weeks before the start of the semester when recording their experiences with the least access. Almost one-third (29.2%) of Four-Year AF did not need a printer. Two- Year AF reported the highest access to printers when accounting for their experience with the least access before the semester began. Meanwhile 27.8% of AF at all institutional levels did not receive access to this resource at all. There is not a significant relationship between institutional setting (either Two-Year, Four-Year, or For-Profit), as the chi square value is 4.64 with four degrees of freedom.

Table 19: Least access to a copy services compared by Institutional Setting

		Institutional Settings			Total
		Two-Year	Four-Year	For-Profit	
Copy Services Least Access	Not Given	9 15.0%	10 15.4%	9 16.7%	28 15.6%
	Given 2- 7 w	42 70.0%	37 56.9%	37 68.5%	116 64.8%
	Not Needed	9 15.0%	18 27.7%	8 14.8%	35 19.6%
Total		60 100.0%	65 100.0%	54 100.0%	179 100.0%

n=179

$\chi^2=4.50$ with 4 *df*

As shown in Table 19, most respondents regardless of their institutional setting were given access to a copy services between 2 or 7 plus weeks before the start of the semester, when reporting their experiences with least access. A large majority of Two-Year AF (70%) were given access to copy services, as well as For-Profit (68.5%). 27.7% of Four-Year AF did not need access to copy services. Meanwhile 15.6% of AF at all institutional levels did not receive access to this resource at all. There is not a significant relationship between institutional setting (either Two-Year, Four-Year, or For-Profit), as the chi square value is 4.5 with four degrees of freedom.

Table 20: Least access to a library borrowing privileges compared by Institutional Setting

		Institutional Settings		
		Two-Year	Four-Year	For-Profit
Library Borrowing Privileges Least Access	Not Given	8 13.1%	7 10.8%	11 20.4%
	Give 2-7 w	38 62.3%	44 67.7%	32 59.3%
	Not Needed	15 24.6%	14 21.5%	11 20.4%
Total		61 100.0%	65 100.0%	54 100.0%

n=54

$\chi^2=2.59$ with 4 *df*

As shown in Table 20, most respondents regardless of their institutional setting were given access to library borrowing privileges between 2 or 7 plus weeks before the start of the semester when accounting for their least access to this resource, one out of 5 (20.4%) of AF at all institutional levels did not receive access to this resource at all. Almost one out of four (24.6%) of Two-Year AF did not need library borrowing privileges. For-Profit schools reported the lowest access to library borrowing privileges at 20.4%. There is not a significant relationship between institutional setting (either Two-Year, Four-Year, or For-Profit), as the chi square value is 2.59 with four degrees of freedom.

Table 21: Least access to parking compared by Institutional Setting

		Institutional Settings			Total
		Two-Year	Four-Year	For-Profit	
Parking Least Access	Not Given	6 9.8%	10 15.6%	7 13.0%	23 12.8%
	Given 2- 7 w	44 72.1%	30 46.9%	40 74.1%	114 63.7%
	Not Needed	11 18.0%	24 37.5%	7 13.0%	42 23.5%
Total		61 100.0%	64 100.0%	54 100.0%	179 100.0%

n=179

$\chi^2=13.93$ with 4 *df*

As shown in Table 21, most respondents regardless of their institutional setting were given access to parking between 2 or 7 plus weeks before the start of the semester, while 12.8% of AF at all institutional levels did not receive access to this resource at all. Most Two- Year AF were given access to parking with only 9.8% reporting that they were not given parking. Four-Year AF had over one-third (37.5%) that did not need a parking space for the semester. There is a significant relationship between institutional setting (either Two-Year, Four-Year, or For-Profit), as the chi square value is 13.93 with four degrees of freedom.

CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSIONS AND RECCOMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Out of the status measurement variables there was a significant difference between the numbers of weeks to prepare for classes, and access to textbooks, office space, telephones, library borrowing privileges, and parking when compared by institutional setting. For profit instructors were notified of a class assignment three weeks before the start of the semester while Four-Year AF were given two weeks and three days. Two year AF were given the least time to prepare for the semester with just two weeks and a day allotted to prepare for a class. While the findings are significantly different, the macro-observation draws the conclusion that AF report being given between two and three weeks to prepare for a class.

The challenges of preparing for the class are only compounded after considering the access to textbooks that will be used in the classroom. For-Profit AF had the most access to textbooks. A larger amount of Four-Year AF did not need a textbook (37.7-38.2%). AF at Four-Year schools also reported the lowest access to textbooks compared to their Two-Year and For-Profit counterparts. When preparing for class, Four-Year AF had the most access to an office to plan for the semester (70.8%) while 54.1% of Two-Year AF were given access to an office. The rate AF access to office space is strongly correlated access to telephones. AF at

Four year schools have the most access to telephones with 65.6% having access to a phone. One out of five (20.5%) AF at the For-Profit institutional setting did not need a telephone. Once the semester begins or in the weeks preceding Two- Year AF have the most access to parking on their campus. For-Profit AF had the second most access to parking, while 46.9-50.0% of Four-Year AF do not have access to parking. Lastly, is library borrowing privileges, the resource that the majority of AF at all levels have access to with only 5.7% not having access to borrow books from their campus' library. Two-Year AF have the least access at 11.2%, and Four-Year AF having the most access when compared by institutional setting.

My hypothesis that AF status varies based upon institutional setting is partially supported by these findings. The reason it is only partially supported is because five measurements proved to be significantly different, but does showcase that AF do vary in resources provided to them based upon their status. The meaning of the significant differences is that all AF do face challenges but Two and Four Year AF need more access to resources than their For-Profit counterparts. Simply put, Two-Year AF have significantly more access to parking, while For-Profit AF have significantly more time to prepare for classes and access to textbooks, and their Four-Year AF have significantly more access to office spaces, telephones and library borrowing privileges.

It is important to note that no matter the institutional level, one out of five AF are not provided with office space, curriculum guidelines, a telephone, or a computer. Dolan et al (2013) explained the lack to these resources has been shown to reduce first-year student

success and re-enrollments. This also supports Friscione (2014) and Teeuwen et al (2007) findings that AF have decreased access to resources. To address the particular question of this project does AF status vary by institutional settings a measurement was created that consists of number of classes taught, notification and/or preparation times for classes, and access to tangible resources was conducted using chi-square and ANOVA testing. AF status needed to be investigated by institutional setting because the complex nature of the part time professoriate impacts economic disparities and students outcomes that frequently mentioned in this research, but not the particular scope of this paper.

Limitations of This Study

This project has limitations in its scope. The first challenge is the data set which asked no demographic information. As this project is using secondary data analysis, there was no way to gather the income, race, age, and other demographic markers of the population surveyed. The survey instrument did not ask in the Two and Four Year AF worked at a public or private universities which may offer more insight into the stratification of challenges faced by AF at varied locations. Since demographic information was not collected, I could not engage in an investigation comparing responses and income, although I would hypothesize differences based upon pay, and also only slight variations in pay received by AF. The lack of economic information was not too detrimental since the current literature clearly articulates that AF are underpaid and have numerous job tasks that are unpaid , such as meeting with students and/or grading.

Implications for Future Research

It has been established in the literature that AF face challenges psychologically and economically that vary based on institutional level. The knowledge of what resources are limited and the amount of time given to prepare for classes can assist administrators who are seeking to meet the needs of AF based upon the institutional setting, and it can also assist AF who are coming together to discuss their experiences and request better working conditions . Beyond this study I encourage other academics to investigate collective bargaining barriers faced by AF, especially those located in right-to-work states, as university faculty moves toward solidarity and the creation of a collective voice. And as alluded to previously, I think it best that higher education administrators be sensitive and responsive to AF needs in an effort to promote economic justice on university campuses.

REFERENCES

- Allison, Marissa; Lynn, Randy and Hoverman Victoria. 2014. "Indispensable But Invisible". Public Sociology Association. Accessed via contingentfacultystudy.wordpress.com
- Caruth, Gail D. and Caruth Donald L. 2013. "Adjunct Faculty: Who are these Unsung Heroes of Academe?." *Current Issues in Education*. 16(3)
- Chen, Stacey. 2001. "Is Investing in College Education Risky?". University of Rochester And State University of New York at Albany.
- Cohen, Arthur M, Brawer, Florence B. (2008) *The American Community College*. Jossey and Bass. San Francisco, CA.
- Dolan, Dallas M; Hall, Marilyn S.; Karlsson, Carl R. and Martinak, M.L. 2013. "Five Years Later: Maryland Adjuncts Tell Us (Again) Who They Are and What They Want." *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*. 61:35-45.
- DeSantis, Sylvia M. 2011. *Academic apartheid: Waging the Adjunct war*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing. Tyne, UK.
- Friedel, Nahra F., Thomas, Gregory. 2013. "Differential Tuition: A community College Budgetary Strategy." *Community Journal For Research and Practice*. 37(3):147-152
- Fruscione, Joseph. 2014. "Adjuncting interviews adjunct on pay and working Conditions." *Inside Higher Ed*. Accessed August 28, 2014.
- Gerth, H.H. and Wright Mill, C. 1968. *Weber, Max, 1864-1920. From Max Weber: Essays in sociology / translated*. Routledge.
- Heller, Donald E. 2001. "Book Review: Financing a College Education: How it works, How its Changing." *The Journal of Higher Education*. 72(3):370-372

- Howley, C., Chavis, B., and Kester J. 2013. “‘Like human beings’: Responsive Relationships and institutional flexibility at a rural community college.” *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 28(8), 1-14.
Retrieved from <http://jrre.psu.edu/articles/28-8.pdf>.
- Jackson, Brandon A., Reynolds, John A. 2013. “The Price of Opportunity: Race, Student Loan Debt and College Achievement.” *Sociological Inquiry*.83(3):335-368
- Jenkins, Jim. 2007. “Leading the Four Generations at Work.” American Management Association. Accessed on December 22, 2014 via <http://www.amanet.org/movingahead/eprint.cfm?Ed=452&BNKNAVID=20&display=1>
- Katsinas, Stephen G.; Tollefson, Terrance A. and Reamey, Becky A. 2008. “Funding Issues in U.S. Community Colleges: Findings from a 2007 Survey of the National State Directors of Community Colleges.” American Association of Community Colleges. Washington DC.
- Katsinas, Stephen G.; Lacey, Vincent J.; Adair, Lucas; and Koh, Jonathan P. 2013. “Halfway Out of Recession, But a Long Way to Go.” Education Policy Center.
- Komos, Michael. 2013. “‘Thanks for asking’: Adjunct Faculty Members’ Views of Teaching Effective Teaching”. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*. 24 (4:133-164). Livesly, Christopher. 2009. “Social Inequality: Theories: Weber.” Accessed via www.sociology.org.uk
- Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick. 1848. *Communist Manifesto*. London, England: Penguin.
- Moody, James. 2004. “Max Weber.” Duke University. Accessed via http://www.soc.duke.edu/~jmoody77/TheoryNotes/Weber_CSP.htm
- Pramas, Jason. 2013. “Unionizing Adjunct Faculty Can Help Save American Higher Education Economy.” Open Media Boston. WMBR Local Edition.
- Reevey, Gretchen M. and Deason, Grace. 2014. “Predictors of Depression, stress, and Anxiety among non-tenured faculty.” *Frontiers in Psychology*. 5(701).
- Rhoades, Gary and Slaughter, Sheila. 1997. “Academic Capitalism, Managed Professional, and Supply-Side Higher Education.” *Social Texts*. 15(2).

- Segran, Elizabeth. 2014. "The Adjunct Revolt: How Poor Professors Are Fighting Back." The Atlantic. April 2014.
- Teeuwen, Rudolphus and Hantke, Steffen. 2007. "Gypsy Scholars, Migrant Teachers and The Global Academic Proletariat : Adjunct Labour in Higher Education." Rodopi.
- Wolfe, Dael. 1973. "Tenure." Science. 180 (4087).
- Wright, Laura; Walters, David; Zarifa, David. 2013. "Government Student Loan Default: Differences between Graduates of the Liberal Arts and Applied Fields in Canadian College and Universities". Canadian Sociological Association. 50(1): 89-115

BIOGRAPHY

Born to a wonderful family in North Carolina, I was always encouraged to pursue higher education as a means to better my life's chances and change the world. A natural leader I completed my high school diploma at West Brunswick High School in Shallotte, North Carolina where I was Student Body Vice-President, on Varsity Tennis and Track, and President of DECA Business club. Wanting to cultivate more knowledge, I attended East Carolina University where my pursuit for justice lead me to complete a Bachelor's of Science in Applied Sociology with a concentration in Law and Society. While attending East Carolina (Go Pirates!) I was Co-President of Alpha Kappa Delta Sociological Honor Society, an Orientation Assistant welcoming new Pirates, and employed as a Public Health Student Educator. While at East Carolina University I also studied abroad at Manchester Metropolitan University in England. With my new found skill-set I decided to move closer to the heart of American policy making to attend George Mason University. At George Mason I am a self-funded Graduate Lecturer who will be graduating this Spring 2015. I am a student leader on campus balancing multiple jobs and working to encourage her students in Communications 101. I must say thank you to Dr. Shannon Davis who has guided me along the rigorous journey of Graduate School and my family for their continued patience and love.