DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 427 597 HE 031 788

AUTHOR Antony, James Soto; Valadez, James R.
TITLE An Exploration of the Job Satisfaction of American Part-Time College Faculty. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
SPONS AGENCY Association for Institutional Research.
PUB DATE 1998-11-00
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (23rd, Miami, FL, November 5-8, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Career Development; Faculty College Relationship; Full Time Faculty; Higher Education; *Job Satisfaction; *Part Time Faculty; Quality of Working Life; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; *National Study of Postsecondary Faculty

ABSTRACT

This study examined factors associated with job satisfaction among part-time faculty at different types of institutions of higher education. The study used data from the 1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, which sampled 974 institutions and 31,354 faculty. This study analyzed the 15 items from the survey, grouped into three categories, which addressed aspects of job satisfaction: (1) satisfaction with personal autonomy, (2) satisfaction with students, and (3) satisfaction with demands and rewards. Analysis indicated that part-time faculty were statistically less satisfied than full-time faculty in terms of autonomy and students, but were equally satisfied with demands and rewards. Part-time faculty were more satisfied than full-time faculty with their jobs overall, were more committed to an academic career, and were less likely than full-time faculty to leave their current jobs for other opportunities. Part-time faculty at two-year institutions were significantly more likely than part-time faculty at four-year institutions to value tenure enough to leave their present positions to achieve it. Part-time faculty at four-year institutions appeared to be more research-oriented than their two-year counterparts. (Contains 25 references.) (DB)

Running head: PART-TIME FACULTY SATISFACTION

An Exploration of the Job Satisfaction of American Part-time College Faculty

James Soto Antony

James R. Valadez

University of Washington

Paper presented at the 1998 annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE), Miami, Florida.

James Soto Antony and James R. Valadez are Assistant and Associate Professors, respectfully, in the College of Education, Educational Leadership & Policy Studies, University of Washington, Box 353600, Seattle, WA 98195-3600. This research was supported by a grant from the Association for Institutional Research (AIR). Opinions reflect those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the granting agency.

ASHE *Association for the Study of Higher Education*

Headquartered at the University of Missouri-Columbia • College of Education • Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis • 211 Hill Hall, Columbia, MO 65211 • 573-882-9645 • fax 573-884-5714

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held in Miami, Florida, November 5-8, 1998. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

Abstract

A rich body of research has emerged that clearly illuminates the issues of unequal compensation and lower status among part-time college faculty members. Additionally, the research on part-time faculty has made evident the structures and practices of colleges that serve to marginalize part-time faculty. As such, many logically assume that faculty who work in part-time appointments are generally unhappy with their role, and that there is little satisfaction gained from work as a part-time faculty member. However, in truth, little is known about part-time faculty members' motivations for choosing to work in part-time positions, or the level of satisfaction these faculty report with their careers. This study examines the factors that are associated with various forms of job satisfaction among part-time faculty.

An Exploration of the Job Satisfaction of American Part-time College Faculty

Over the years, it has become increasingly clear that the hiring of part-time (as opposed to permanent, tenure-track) faculty at all types of postsecondary institutions would become a common place practice. For many institutions, hiring part-time faculty began largely as a transient administrative policy that offered a convenient way of meeting the demands for instruction while maintaining cost effectiveness during an era of limited budgetary support. However, it can now be argued that the hiring of part-time faculty has quickly become a more permanent strategy within academe—one that has made part-time faculty a substantial group among the professorate (Leslie & Gappa, 1994).

The increased production of Ph.D. recipients over the last two decades (NCES, 1994) and the simultaneous decline in the availability of permanent full-time tenure-track positions have influenced many potential academics to become pessimistic about their chances of getting a regular academic appointment. Coupled with the continued institutional reliance on part-time appointments, this pessimism has fueled many popular notions or conceptions regarding part-time academic work that, although possibly valid, are rarely (if ever) supported by empirical evidence. Many of these notions and conceptions often pertain to the reasons why individuals work part-time, who these individuals are, and the extent to which part-time faculty are satisfied with their careers. For example, a popular, yet empirically unsupported conception of part-time faculty is that they are greatly dissatisfied with their part-time status, often expressing regret and disenchantment (some would say, because they really want full-time jobs). Although this assertion can definitely be supported by the experiences of many part-time faculty, in truth, no detailed comparative (i.e., by institutional type and part-time/full-time status)

studies of part-time faculty members' satisfaction in aggregate have been conducted. As such, there is a paucity of empirically founded information about the dimensions of satisfaction among this increasingly important group of faculty, or the factors that may influence satisfaction in these faculty members.

Background

Although a body of literature that examined the role part-time faculty played within institutions of higher education began to emerge in the 1970s, a fair amount of this work is dated or largely concentrates on the role of part-time faculty only within the two-year institutional context (e.g., Ashworth, 1988; Cain, 1988; Cohen & Brawer, 1977; Curzon-Brown, 1988; Davis, 1986; Eliason, 1980; Hartleb & Vilter, 1986; Hoenninger & Black, 1978; McGaughey, 1985; Pollack & Breuder, 1982; Tuckman & Caldwell, 1979; Tuckman & Vogler, 1979; Vaughan, 1986; Willett, 1980). Interestingly, the impetus of much of this early community college research was a general concern for how an increased reliance upon part-time faculty impacted instructional effectiveness and overall quality. Additionally, many of these studies explored various strategies for managing the use of part-time faculty and for integrating them into the culture of individual departments and the overall institution, as well as examining the effect of salary inequities upon institutions' abilities to secure talented part-time instructors. Moreover, a few studies explored the make-up of part-time faculty, illuminating the fact that these individuals lived a nomadic lifestyle by working at several institutions and were, more often than not, women or instructors having more modest academic qualifications than their full-time colleagues (Clark & Corcoran, 1987; Davis, 1986; Vaughn, 1986; Weis, 1987).

The community college focus within the literature is largely attributable to the fact that part-time faculty have traditionally been employed mostly at two-year institutions. These circumstances offered few compelling reasons for the plight of part-time faculty at four-year public and private colleges or universities to be examined in detail. However, as the continuously depreciating academic job market began to be felt more uniformly throughout higher education, a greater number of four-year institutions, including many of the elite colleges and universities, began to also increase their reliance upon part-time faculty (Clausen, 1988; Franklin, 1988; Reed & Grusin, 1989; Selvadurai, 1990). Once again, this growth of part-time faculty led many to argue that the practice of hiring part-time faculty exploits these faculty, erodes educational quality, and threatens the concept of tenure (Mangan, 1991).

Overall then, a rich body of research has emerged that clearly illuminates the issues of unequal compensation and lower status among part-time faculty members. Additionally, the research on part-time faculty has made evident the structures and practices of colleges that serve to marginalize part-time faculty. As such, many logically assume that faculty who work in part-time appointments are generally unhappy with their role, and that there is little satisfaction gained from work as a part-time faculty member. Moreover, there is no work that can illuminate whether part-time faculty satisfaction is multidimensional and whether satisfaction is a function of the type of institution within which part-time faculty work. Therefore, this study explores the factors that are associated with part-time faculty job satisfaction. We construe satisfaction in a multidimensional sense, examining levels of satisfaction among faculty at different types of institutions.

Method

Data Source

The data used in this study are drawn from the 1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF). NSOPF was sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics and provides a national profile of faculty including their professional backgrounds, responsibilities, workloads, salaries, benefits, and attitudes. The first cycle of NSOPF was completed in 1987-88 with a sample of 480 institutions and 11,000 faculty. The second cycle of NSOPF, and the focus of this study, sampled 974 institutions and 31,354 faculty.

A two-stage stratified clustered probability design was used to select the sample. The first-stage-sampling frame consisted of 3,256 institutions drawn from the 1991 IPEDS universe. A modified Carnegie classification system was used to stratify institutions by control and type. There were two levels of control, public and private, and nine types including research universities, other doctoral granting universities, comprehensive colleges and universities, liberal arts colleges, two-year colleges, independent medical schools, and religious colleges. At the second stage of sample selection, the NSOPF sampling frame consisted of lists of faculty obtained from 817 of the participating institutions. Each institution was randomly assigned a target total sample size of forty-one or forty-two. This yielded the desired cluster size of 41.5. The faculty survey relied on a multi-modal data collection design, which combined an initial mail survey with mail and telephone prompting supplemented by computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI).

In all, 974 institutions were contacted, with a total of 827 institutions participating in the study (84.9 percent response rate). Of the 31,354 faculty sampled among these institutions, a total of 25,780 interviews were completed, yielding a response rate of 86.6 percent. For the purposes of this study, faculty members across all types of institutions who had part-time appointments and who also indicated that their primary responsibility was teaching were drawn for analyses. This led to a sample of 7,522 part-time teaching faculty (29.2 percent of the overall sample).

Analyses

Faculty are engaged in a variety of activities, including teaching, research, and various forms of service. Of all the faculty respondents included in the NSOPF sample, nearly 80 percent indicated that their primary responsibility was teaching. Only 5 percent indicated their primary responsibility was research. The remainder of the faculty in the sample distributed evenly among various primary responsibilities, including Technical work, Clinical Service, Public Service, Administration, and Advising/Counseling. Therefore, in an effort to maximize the numbers of faculty members in the analytic sample, and in an effort to ensure that these faculty had contact with students, we selected from the data set only faculty members whose primary activity was teaching.

Because the primary purpose of this research was to examine the levels of satisfaction that part-time faculty express, the 15 items from the instrument that address how satisfied individuals are with various aspects of their jobs were examined. The results of an exploratory factor analysis (principal components) indicated that 14 of these items could be reliably grouped

into one of three dimensions of satisfaction—Satisfaction with Personal Autonomy (alpha = .87), Satisfaction with Students (alpha = .79), and Satisfaction with Demands and Rewards (alpha = .77). The remaining variable "Overall Job Satisfaction" was allowed to remain as a stand-alone variable representing a global measure of job satisfaction. Table 1 shows the four job satisfaction indicators (i.e., the three dimensions of satisfaction along with each scale's associated component variables and reliability coefficient, and the stand-alone global satisfaction measure).

In addition to using these scales as outcome variables, the individual items making up each of these scales, as well as the stand-alone measure of global job satisfaction, were examined for faculty across different types of institutions. Specifically, mean satisfaction on each was analyzed (using independent-samples t-tests or one-way ANOVAs) as a function of several socio-demographic variables in the data (e.g., race, gender, age, marital status, and the highest levels of formal education completed by the respondents' mothers and fathers), and as a function of institutional type. These analyses were conducted first comparing full-time faculty to part-time faculty, and then comparing part-time faculty working in two-year and four-year institutions.

Results

The final sample of faculty examined in this study was comprised of 20,308 part-time and full-time teaching faculty at various types of institutions. Panel A of Table 2 shows the distribution of part-time and full-time teaching faculty across two- and four-year institutions. It is clear that part-time faculty are more likely to be found at two year institutions (56.4 percent). However, the representation of part-time faculty at four-year institutions is very high (43.6 percent), once again signaling the need to understand part-time faculty satisfaction across all

domains of higher education.

Panel B of Table 2 shows the gender distribution of full-time and part-time teaching faculty. Overall, 55.8 percent of all teaching faculty are men and 44.2 percent are women. When comparing these figures to the representation of men in women in either full- or part-time positions, it becomes clear that there is a slight overrepresentation of women among the ranks of part-time faculty, and a slight overrepresentation of males among the ranks of full-time faculty.

Panel C of Table 2 shows the ethnic distributions of full-time and part-time teaching faculty. Interestingly, although it is clear there is generally a low representation of minority faculty overall, the distributions of ethnic groups among the ranks of full- and part-time faculty simply mirror their distribution in the professoriate overall. Said differently, when comparing ethnic distributions within ethnic groups across full-time and part-time status, we see there is rough parity with these groups' levels of representation in the professoriate overall. However, when compared to the population overall, or when compared to the population of minorities who have the requisite credentials to be eligible for a faculty career, the rates of minority participation in both full- and part-time positions is low (Antony & Taylor, 1998).

Panel D of Table 2 shows the composite parental education level (a proxy for socio-economic background) of full-time and part-time teaching faculty. Immediately apparent is the fact that the vast majority of faculty, regardless of employment status, stem from middle or low social class backgrounds. This social class composition of the American professoriate has largely been attributed to the increased access to graduate education, and the corresponding increases in available faculty positions, made possible by the GI Bill (Boatsman & Antony, 1994). Other

research (Boatsman & Antony, 1995) has shown that as the aging faculty who benefited from the GI Bill begin to retire, they are being systematically replaced by younger faculty who come from higher social class backgrounds. Notwithstanding this future change in the social class composition of the faculty, the present data indicate that faculty members from low or medium social class backgrounds are equally likely to work either full- or part-time, faculty who have a high social class background are more likely to be employed full-time.

Lastly, Panel E of Table 2 shows the highest degree earned by full- and part-time faculty. Clearly, those faculty who are working full-time are more likely to have earned as their highest degree the doctorate (53.5 percent of full-time faculty versus 19.6 percent of part-time faculty). However, a majority of part-time faculty members (71.1 percent) have a Master's degree as their highest degree earned. As would be expected, professional degrees account for a relatively small proportion of faculty who are employed either full- or part-time.

Faculty Job Satisfaction--Comparing Full- and Part-timers

In this section of the paper we begin to address the question of how satisfied faculty were with their roles. Table 3 displays the mean differences between part-time and full-time faculty across each of the three satisfaction dimensions, as well as on the overall job satisfaction item. In terms of satisfaction with autonomy, a measure that purports to uncover how satisfied faculty members are with their authority to develop course content and to work independently, full-time faculty members were significantly more likely than part-time faculty to express satisfaction ($p < .001$). Examining the standard deviations for this item it is clear that full-time faculty members express much greater consistency in their levels of satisfaction along this dimension than do part-

time faculty members

Upon examining potential differences in the levels of satisfaction experienced along the demands and rewards scale, both full- and part-time faculty members express equal levels of satisfaction. Said differently, although individual faculty members are surely the exception, there is no evidence to suggest that as a group, full-time and part-time faculty experience significantly different levels of satisfaction with their workloads, job security, opportunities for advancement, pay or benefits.

The last satisfaction scale examined pertained to faculty members' levels of satisfaction with the time available to advise students and with the quality of students. Although overall, both full- and part-time faculty members indicated low levels of satisfaction along this scale, full-time faculty members were significantly more satisfied with students than were part-time faculty ($p < .001$). An examination of the standard deviations for the mean scored on this scale clearly show the degree of variation among individual responses, indicating that other characteristics besides being part-time or full-time status contribute to the levels of satisfaction faculty members derive from students.

As shown in Panel B of Table 3, we also tested for potential differences between full- and part-time faculty members' levels of satisfaction along a global indicator--overall satisfaction with the job. Overall, both full- and part-time faculty members express moderately high levels of satisfaction on this item, showing similar degrees of variation in their responses. Contrary to popular conceptions of full-time and part-time faculty satisfaction, these data clearly indicate that part-time faculty significantly more satisfaction with their jobs overall than do full-time faculty

($p < .001$).

Examining Rough Indicators of Job Commitment

In an effort to further tease out the sources of those differences in job satisfaction we uncovered between part- and full-time faculty, we also compared full-time and part-time faculty along two additional items on the survey which, globally speaking, could be considered rough indicators of job commitment. Specifically, one of these items asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement with the statement, "If I had to do it all over again, I would still choose an academic career." Our rationale in examining this item was that we believed the extent to which faculty were satisfied with their career would be associated with their willingness or reluctance to enter academe if they had a chance to do it all over again. This rationale is supported by the fact that the zero-order correlation coefficients between this new item and the four satisfaction indicators tested above were moderate to moderately high (r coefficients ranged from .56 to .78). As shown in Panel A of Table 4, although the majority of full-time faculty strongly agreed that they would choose an academic career again (58.9 percent), a greater preponderance of part-time faculty indicated agreed strongly that they would repeat the experience (65 percent). It is also interesting to note that when comparing part-time faculty with all respondents, part-time faculty members were slightly more likely to state that they would repeat the experience than were faculty in aggregate (65 percent versus 63 percent). Clearly, despite the negative aspects of working part-time, individuals who work as faculty members enjoy academic work. To a certain extent, the negative experiences associated with being either full- or part-time do not outweigh the positives, leading professors to want to choose a faculty

career if they had to do it all over again. Why part-time faculty members are more certain they would choose a faculty career again is uncertain. However, this finding is clearly inconsistent with popular conceptions of part-time faculty members that assert, in aggregate, part-timers are disenchanted with academic work.

Panel B of Table 4 shows the differences between part-time and full-time faculty on other individual items related to the notion of job commitment. These items were examined because they provide insight on what would cause a faculty member to leave his or her present positions. For full-time faculty, important issues include moving into another full-time tenure track position, job security, and benefits. Full-time faculty members were significantly more likely than part-time faculty to view the availability of a tenure-track position as a reason to leave their current job. Obviously, tenure and part-time status do rarely go together, part-time faculty members are not as likely as full-timers to view tenure as a necessity for engaging in academic work. More importantly, however, this finding does not support the popular belief that part-time faculty simply biding their time until a tenure-track position becomes available.

Similarly, full-time faculty are significantly more likely than part-time faculty members to leave their current positions in pursuit of better benefits, better research facilities, better job opportunities for a spouse or partner, and to work in an institution that is in a better geographic location ($p < .001$). Why benefits are more associated with full-time faculty members than part-time faculty members is unclear--particularly in light of the fact that fewer part-timers than full-timers receive benefits. However, the pursuit of better research facilities clearly is consistent with full-time faculty, as many of these faculty members work in four-year institutions that, to a

certain degree, value research. Panel B of Table 4 also shows that full-time faculty members were more concerned than part-time faculty with the geographic location of their job, and whether or not their spouse would find opportunity for employment.

Panel B of Table 4 also shows that part-time faculty would be significantly more likely than full-time faculty to leave their current positions in pursuit of a greater opportunity to teach, or a greater opportunity to perform administrative duties. Because part-time faculty members, by definition, consider teaching as their primary role, it makes sense that these faculty members would be more teaching oriented than their full-time counterparts. Moreover, because many part-time faculty are paid by the number of classes or credits they teach in a given term, it is reasonable that these faculty members would aspire to be at an institution where there is a more substantial teaching load. It is unclear why administrative duties would be more appealing to part-time faculty. However, perhaps administration is a more viable option for part-time faculty to increase their participation in an institution. Such increased participation also increases the part-timer's visibility and sense of belonging within a department and at the institution, reducing the chance that these faculty members, or departments that increasingly rely on part-timers, become faceless (Leatherman, 1997).

From the data presented thus far, although part-time faculty are statistically less satisfied than full time faculty in terms of autonomy and students, and equally satisfied in terms of demands and rewards, surprisingly, part-timers are significantly more satisfied than full-time faculty with their jobs overall. Moreover, part-time faculty members are somewhat more likely than their full-time counterparts to agree strongly that they would choose an academic career if

they had a chance to do it all over again. Lastly, when considering what would influence them to leave their current positions, part-time faculty members provide surprising results once again. Specifically, they are less likely than full-time faculty to want to leave their current jobs in pursuit of things that, the absence of which are typically thought to be sources of great distress for part-time faculty (e.g., a tenure-track job, job security, better benefits, opportunities for a partner or spouse, and a better geographic location).

A Reexamination of Part-time Faculty across Institutional Type

Clearly, part-time faculty members present many complexities that are masked by comparing them, in aggregate against full-time faculty. Moreover, in examining the standard deviations associated with the mean responses to several variables, part-time faculty members show high levels of response variation. All of these findings illustrate the pitfalls of treating part-time faculty as a monolithic category. More specifically, these results illuminate the need for examining in more detail the part-time faculty sample in order to tease out sources of variation. Rather than use full-time faculty as a standard against which we compare part-timers, in the remaining sections of this paper, we examine part-time faculty as an important group in its own right. First, we explore the distribution of part time faculty across institutional type, gender, ethnicity, and social class. Secondly, we examine differences in the levels of satisfaction and job commitment between part-time faculty who work in two-year versus four-year institutions.

Part-time Faculty Demographics

Table 5 presents the distribution of part-time faculty members across two-year and four-year institutions as a function of institutional control (Panel A), gender (Panel B), ethnicity

(Panel C), and social class background (Panel D). As shown in Panel A, part-time faculty who work in four-year institutions are more likely to be found at private colleges and universities (55.5 percent) than in public institutions (45.5 percent). Conversely, part-time faculty members who work at two-year institutions overwhelmingly are found at public colleges (97.1 percent). In terms of gender, part-time faculty across all institutional types are more often men than women (52.6 percent versus 47.4 percent), with a slight overrepresentation of men as part-time faculty in two-year institutions (52.9 percent) and a slight overrepresentation of women as part-time faculty in four-year institutions (47.7 percent). Compared to their representation among the ranks of part-timers across all types of institutions, some ethnic groups are slightly over-represented in two year institutions (e.g., American Indian and Alaska Native faculty, Hispanic faculty, and White faculty) whereas others are slightly over-represented in four-year institutions (e.g., Asian and Pacific Islander faculty, African American and Black faculty). Lastly, much as the social class distribution of all faculty in higher education, most part-time faculty tend to come from low to middle social class backgrounds. However, there is a slight over-representation of part-time faculty from low social class backgrounds in two-year institutions (50.2 percent), and a slight over-representation of part-time faculty from middle (51.9 percent) and high (4.4 percent) social class backgrounds in four-year institutions.

Faculty Satisfaction and Job Commitment among Part-timers--Comparing Faculty Across Institutional Type

As shown in Panel A of Table 6, when it comes to whether a faculty member would choose an academic career if they had the chance to do it all over again, there is little difference

between part-time faculty members at two- and four-year institutions. Essentially, part-time faculty, who earlier were shown to be more likely than full-time faculty to want to be committed to an academic career, consistently hold this sentiment--regardless of whether they work in a four- or two-year institution. This provides additional evidence that the sorts of people who work as part-time faculty are strongly committed to academic work and, although they may be dissatisfied with particular elements of working part-time, these elements are not enough to dissuade them from being committed to an academic job.

Whereas full-time faculty members were shown above to be more likely than part-time faculty to leave their current positions for a variety of reasons, it appears that institutional type plays a role in differentiating part-time faculty members' feelings. Specifically, Panel B of Table 6 shows that part-time faculty employed at two-year institutions are significantly more likely than those at four-year institutions to leave their current positions for a variety of reasons. These reasons include a higher salary, a tenure-track position, greater job security, having opportunities for job advancement, better benefits, better instructional facilities and equipment, a greater opportunity to teach, and greater opportunities for administrative responsibilities. Clearly, where a part-time faculty member works plays an important role in how committed they are to their current positions.

Two interesting elements in this table deserve further interpretation. Specifically, it is interesting that part-time faculty at two-year institutions are significantly more likely than those faculty at four-year institutions to value tenure enough to be willing to leave their positions in order to have it. Given that tenure (especially how to get it and keep it) is generally based, in-

part, on research productivity among four-year institutions, whereas this is rarely the case at two-year institutions, perhaps part-time faculty working at four-year institutions have become more disenchanted with the concept of tenure, thus desiring it less. Conversely, faculty at two-year institutions observe the direct link between quality teaching and tenure and, being teaching oriented (as are most part-time faculty) value tenure at a comparable institution. In a similar vein, it is interesting to see that part-time faculty at four-year institutions are more likely than those at two-year institutions to want to leave their current positions in pursuit of better research facilities and equipment. Clearly, this implies that the part-time faculty members at four-year institutions are more research oriented than their two-year counterparts. Such a distinction is important when considering not only the motivations for working part-time, but also the factors that maintain high levels of satisfaction among part-time faculty. Specifically, part-time faculty at different types of institutions desire different things. Policies intended to promote the satisfaction and job commitment of part-time faculty at two year institutions are likely not suitable for enhancing the satisfaction and job commitment of part-time faculty who work at four-year colleges and universities.

Further emphasizing this last point, we see in Table 7 that part-time faculty employed at four-year institutions are significantly more satisfied along the "satisfaction with autonomy" scale and the "satisfaction with students" scale ($p < .001$). Both groups of part-time faculty are equally satisfied with the demands and rewards of their jobs. These findings suggest that, although how their work is structured or how they are compensated are both absolutely crucial issues, these elements alone do not differentiate between part-time faculty at four- and two-year

institutions. However, part-time faculty members at four-year institutions express greater satisfaction with their level of autonomy. This finding can possibly be attributed to the fact that at most two-year institutions, governance is centrally managed and institutions are typically organized in a hierarchical fashion, leaving individual faculty members and students feeling as if they have no voice (Cohen & Brawer, 1996). Despite these higher levels of satisfaction among part-time faculty members working at four year institutions, interestingly, those who work at two-year institutions express slightly greater overall job satisfaction than those who work at four year institutions--a difference that is significant ($p < .001$).

Discussion and Conclusion

What do these data tell us about the differences in job satisfaction and job commitment between part-time and full-time faculty? Apparently, these data seem to project a different picture than we have been led to believe by the more popular accounts regarding part-time faculty. Despite the exploratory nature of these findings, the evidence presented here seems to indicate that part-time faculty are fairly satisfied with their roles. These findings are not meant to belittle the real concerns of part-time faculty for pay, benefits, and a quality work environment. Instead, what these data imply is that part-time faculty seem to be pursuing the careers they have planned for, and have reached a degree of satisfaction with their decisions. In the overall commitment item, faculty members were asked whether they would "do it all over again" and pursue an academic career. Not only were part-time faculty overwhelming in their agreement with this item, they indicated a stronger commitment than full-time faculty.

The data also indicated that part-time faculty were pursuing a profession that gave them

the opportunity to do what they enjoyed the most, that is teach. When asked what would influence their decision to leave their present position, they responded that the position needed to provide a greater opportunity to teach. This is in contrast to full-time faculty who indicated they would like greater opportunity to conduct research. In aggregate, full-time faculty members were also much more concerned with issues concerning job security, tenure, pay, and benefits, whereas part-time faculty, though concerned with these elements, were nonetheless not as willing as their full-time counterparts to leave their current positions in search of better pay, job security, or benefits.

From these results, it is possible to suggest an alternative model to that presented in the popular media and in much of the literature on part-time faculty. Specifically, instead of being largely disenfranchised with their status as part-time faculty, these college professors are in fact engaged in the kind of work they really enjoy--work that brings them a degree of satisfaction. A possible interpretation that may extend from this global finding is that as part-time faculty, they are given the opportunity to do what they enjoy, teach without being encumbered by other duties performed by full-time faculty including research, advising students, and service. This does not indicate by any means that nothing needs to be done for part-time faculty.

As indicated in this study, there was no significant difference between part-time and full-time faculty on the "demands and rewards" scale. It appears that part-time faculty are equally concerned as full-time faculty with issues concerning pay, benefits, advancement opportunities, and job security. Even though the data indicate that these issues would not influence part-time faculty to leave their jobs for another position elsewhere, it can be inferred that they seem to be

equally concerned as full-time faculty that their institution provide these opportunities. Moreover, when comparing part-time faculty across institutional types, it becomes clear that there are higher levels of satisfaction among those who work at four-year institutions, and a higher likelihood of leaving in pursuit of better pay, tenure, job security, advancement opportunities among those who work at two-year institutions. The implication here is that although part-time faculty may be more satisfied in aggregate than their full-time faculty on certain dimensions, and more committed based upon particular aspects of their jobs, any reforms at increasing the overall satisfaction and job commitment of part-time faculty must take institutional type into account. Specifically, the sorts of policies and reforms that might increase satisfaction and job commitment among part-timers at four-year institutions might have the opposite effect on those working at two-year institutions. Additionally, more work needs to be conducted in order to further tease out why, despite being less satisfied on particular dimensions (namely, satisfaction with autonomy and satisfaction with students) part-time faculty are nonetheless more satisfied with their jobs overall. Lastly, future studies should also further explore not only the differences in levels of satisfaction between part- and full-time faculty, but whether the dimensions of satisfaction are the same for these two groups. Moreover, given the importance and permanence of part-time faculty in higher education, it would appear prudent in future research to conduct studies of models and policies that effectively increase satisfaction, both in the multidimensional sense, and overall.

References

Asworth, T. (1988). Improving the effectiveness of part-time faculty in community colleges. Community Services Catalyst, 18(3), 15-18.

Boatsman, K. C. & Antony, J. S. (1995). The interactions between social class, race, and gender in defining faculty diversity. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA). San Francisco, CA.

Boatsman, K. C. & Antony, J. S. (1994). Social class: The forgotten component of faculty diversity? Poster session prepared for the annual meeting of the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE). Chicago, IL.

Cain, M. (1988). Toward a theory and a model for integrating part-time faculty into a community college humanities division. Community College Review, 16(3), 42-47.

Clark, S., & Corcoran, M. (1987). The professoriate: A demographic profile. National Forum: Phi Kappa Phi Journal, 67(1), 28-32.

Clausen, C. (1988). Part-timers in the English department: Some problems and some solutions. ADE Bulletin, 90, 4-6.

Cohen, A. M. & Brawer, F. B. (1996). The American Community College (3rd Ed.). San Francisco, CA; Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, A. M. & Brawer, F. B. (1977). Who teaches the humanities? Community and Junior College Journal, 47(5), 10-12.

Curzon-Brown, D. (1988). The gripes of wrath. Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 15(3), 195-198.

Davis, D., & Others. (1986). Comparing the achievement of students taught by part-time versus full-time faculty. Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice, 10,(1), 65-72.

Franklin, P., & Others. (1988). When solutions become problems: Taking a stand on part-time employment. Academe, 74(3), 15-19.

Hartleb, D., & Vilter, W. (1986). Part-time faculty, full-time problems. New Directions for Community Colleges, 14(1), 23-30.

Hoenninger, R., & Black, R. (1978). Neglect of a species. Community and Junior College Journal, 49(3), 25-27.

Leatherman, L. (1997). Heavy reliance on low-paid lecturers said to produce 'faceless departments'. Chronicle of Higher Education, March 28, A12.

Leslie, D., & Gappa, J. (1994). Education's new academic work force. Planning for Higher Education, 22(4), 1-6.

Mangan, K. (1991). Many colleges will fill vacancies with part-time professors, citing economy and uncertainty about enrollments. Chronicle of Higher Education, 37(47), A9-A10.

McGaughey, J. (1985). Part-time faculty: Integrity and integration. New Directions for Community Colleges, 13(4), 37-47.

Pollack, A., & Breuder, R. The eighties and part-time faculty. Community College Review, 9(4), 58-62.

Reed, B., & Grusin, E. (1989). Adjuncts teach skills courses but lack role in department. Journalism Educator, 44(2), 29-31, 37.

Selvadurai, R. (1990). Advantages and disadvantages of hiring part-time faculty in higher education. Community Review, 10(1-2), 35-36.

Tuckman, H., & Cladwell, J. (1979). The reward structure for part-timers in academe. Journal of Higher Education, 50(6), 745-760.

Tuckman, H., & Vogler, W. (1979). The fringes of a fringe group: Part-timers in academe. Monthly Labor Review, 102(11), 46-49.

Vaughan, G. (1986). Part-time faculty: Nemesis or savior? New Directions for Community Colleges, 14(1), 23-30.

Willett, L. (1980). Comparison of instructional effectiveness of full- and part-time faculty. Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice, 5,(1), 23-30.

Weis, L. (1987). Academic women in science 1977-1984. Academe, 73(1), 43-47.

Table 1: Composition of Satisfaction Scales and Overall Satisfaction Item

Constructed Satisfaction Scales	**Chronbach's Alpha**
Satisfaction with Personal Autonomy Scale (3 item scale): *Satisfaction with: (1) authority to decide course content; (2) authority to make job decisions; (3) authority to decide courses taught.*	.95
Satisfaction with Students Scale (3 item scale): *Satisfaction with: (1) time available to advise students; (2) quality of undergraduate students; (3) quality of graduate students.*	.67
Satisfaction with Demands & Rewards Scale (8 item scale): *Satisfaction with: (1) work load; (2) job security; (3) advancement opportunities; (4) time available for keeping current in field; (5) freedom to do outside consulting work; (6) salary; (7) benefits; and (8) spouse employment opportunities.*	.78
Overall Satisfaction Item *What is your overall satisfaction with your job?*	N/A

Note: All satisfaction items rated on a four-point scale with "1" being "Very Dissatisfied," "2" being "Somewhat Dissatisfied," "3" being "Somewhat Satisfied," and "4" being "Very Satisfied."

Table 2: Distribution of Full-time and Part-time Faculty, by Institutional Type, Gender, Ethnicity, Socio-economic Background, and Highest Degree Earned

Panel A: Percentage of Full-time and Part-time Teaching Faculty, by Institutional Type (n = 20,308)

	Institutional Type	
	Four Year	Two Year
Full-time	66.3	33.7
Part-time	43.6	56.4

Panel B: Percentage of Full-time and Part-time Teaching Faculty, by Gender (n = 20,308)

	Gender	
	Male	Female
Full-time	57.5	42.5
Part-time	52.6	47.4
All Teaching Faculty	55.8	44.2

Panel C: Percentage of Full-time and Part-time Teaching Faculty, by Ethnicity (n = 20,308)

	Racial/Ethnic Background				
	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian/Pacific Islander	African American/Black	Hispanic	White (Non-Hispanic)
Full-time	0.6	5.4	9.1	4.5	80.4
Part-time	0.6	3.7	8.5	4.9	82.3
All Teaching Faculty	0.6	4.8	8.9	4.6	81.0

Panel D: Percentage of Full-time and Part-time Teaching Faculty, by Composite Parental Education (n = 20,308)

	Composite Parental Education Level		
	Low	Medium	High
Full-time	47.0	48.5	4.2
Part-time	47.1	49.1	3.4
All Teaching Faculty	47.0	48.7	3.9

Panel E: Percentage of Full-time and Part-time Teaching Faculty, by Highest Graduate Degree Earned (n = 17,629)

	Highest Degree Earned		
	Masters	Doctoral	Professional
Full-time	40.5	53.5	6.0
Part-time	71.1	19.6	9.3
All Teaching Faculty	49.3	43.7	7.0

Table 3: Job Satisfaction indicators for Full-time and Part-time Faculty

Panel A: Results of Independent-Samples T-tests—Comparisons of Full-time and Part-time Faculty Members' Job Satisfaction along each Satisfaction Scale (n = 20,308)

	Faculty Status	
Level of Satisfaction with:	Full-time (n = 13,497)	Part-time (n = 6,811)
Autonomy **	3.26 (.68)	2.95 (1.20)
Demands & Rewards	2.83 (.59)	2.79 (.66)
Students **	1.80 (1.46)	1.36 (1.75)

Notes: "**" indicates significant difference at $p < .001$. Note: All satisfaction items rated on a four-point scale with "1" being "Very Dissatisfied," "2" being "Somewhat Dissatisfied," "3" being "Somewhat Satisfied," and "4" being "Very Satisfied." Standard deviations depicted in parentheses.

Panel B: Results of Independent-Samples T-tests—Comparisons of Full-time and Part-time Faculty Members' Overall Job Satisfaction (n = 20,308)

Faculty Status	*How satisfied are you with your job overall?*
Full-time (n = 13,497)	3.14 (.78)
Part-time (n = 6,811)	3.21 (.79)

Notes: Difference significant at $p < .001$. Note: Satisfaction rated on a four-point scale with "1" being "Very Dissatisfied," "2" being "Somewhat Dissatisfied," "3" being "Somewhat Satisfied," and "4" being "Very Satisfied." Standard deviations depicted in parentheses.

Table 4: Indicators of Job Commitment, by Full-time and Part-time Status

Panel A: Endorsements to the Statement, "If I had to do it over again, I would still choose an academic career" by Full-time and Part-time Status (n = 20,308)

	If I had to do it over again, I would still choose an academic career...			
	Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
Full-time	4.7	7.4	29.0	58.9
Part-time	4.4	7.5	23.1	65.0
All Faculty	4.5	7.5	25.1	63.0

Panel B: Results of Independent-Samples T-tests—Comparisons of Full-time and Part-time Faculty Members' Endorsements to the Statement, "If you were to leave your current position...how important would each of the following be in your decision?" (n = 20,308)

	Faculty Status	
Influencing Factor:	Full-time (n = 13,497)	Part-time (n = 6,811)
[Higher] salary level	2.60 (.55)	2.56 (.59)
[New position is a] tenure-track/tenured position **	2.39 (.77)	2.16 (.82)
Job security **	2.66 (.59)	2.56 (.66)
Opportunities for advancement	2.45 (.69)	2.45 (.70)
Benefits *	2.70 (.52)	2.61 (.62)
No pressure to publish	2.07 (.80)	2.07 (.80)
Good research facilities and equipment **	2.20 (.75)	2.11 (.76)
Good instructional facilities and equipment	2.63 (.57)	2.56 (.62)
Good job or job opportunities for spouse/partner **	2.20 (.83)	1.99 (.86)
Good geographic location *	2.59 (.59)	2.46 (.68)
Good environment/schools for my children	2.10 (.93)	2.14 (.92)
Greater opportunity to teach **	2.11 (.80)	2.45 (.70)
Greater opportunity to do research **	1.92 (.78)	1.76 (.75)
Greater opportunity for administrative responsibilities **	1.37 (.62)	1.47 (.68)

Notes: All items rated on a three-point scale of importance ranging from "1" being "Not Important," to "2" being "Somewhat Important," to "3" being "Very Important." Standard deviations depicted in parentheses. "*" indicates significant difference at $p < .01$. "**" indicates significant difference at $p < .001$.

Table 5: Part-time Faculty across Institutional Types, by Gender, Ethnicity, Socio-economic Background, and Highest Degree Earned

Panel A: Percentage of Part-time Teaching Faculty, by Institutional Control (n = 6,811)

	Institutional Control	
Institutional Type	Public	Private
Four Year	44.5	55.5
Two Year	97.1	2.9

Panel B: Percentage of Part-time Teaching Faculty, by Gender (n = 6,811)

	Gender	
Institutional Type	Male	Female
Four Year	52.3	47.7
Two Year	52.9	47.1
All Institutions	52.6	47.4

Panel C: Percentage of Part-time Teaching Faculty, by Ethnicity (n = 6,811)

	Racial/Ethnic Background				
Institutional Type	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian/Pacific Islander	African American/Black	Hispanic	White (Non-Hispanic)
Four Year	0.4	3.7	9.3	4.2	82.9
Two Year	0.8	3.2	7.6	5.6	84.2
All Institutions	0.6	3.4	8.4	5.0	83.6

Panel D: Percentage of Part-time Teaching Faculty, by Composite Parental Education (n = 6,811)

	Composite Parental Education Level		
Institutional Type	Low	Medium	High
Four Year	43.4	51.9	4.4
Two Year	50.2	46.6	2.5
All Institutions	47.1	49.1	3.4

Table 6: Indicators of Job Commitment, by Full-time and Part-time Status

Panel A: Endorsements to the Statement, "If I had to do it over again, I would still choose an academic career" by Full-time and Part-time Status (n = 6,811)

	If I had to do it over again, I would still choose an academic career...			
	Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
Four Year	4.4	7.8	29.0	58.8
Two Year	5.0	7.1	29.0	58.9
All Institutions	4.7	7.4	29.0	58.9

Panel B: Results of Independent-Samples T-tests—Comparisons of Full-time and Part-time Faculty Members' Endorsements to the Statement, "If you were to leave your current position...how important would each of the following be in your decision?" (n = 6,811)

	Faculty Status	
Influencing Factor:	Four Year (n = 3,129)	Two Year (n = 3,682)
[Higher] salary level *	2.54 (.60)	2.58 (.58)
[New position is a] tenure-track/tenured position *	2.14 (.84)	2.19 (.81)
Job security *	2.52 (.68)	2.59 (.64)
Opportunities for advancement *	2.43 (.71)	2.47 (.69)
Benefits *	2.58 (.64)	2.63 (.61)
No pressure to publish	2.05 (.79)	2.08 (.81)
Good research facilities and equipment *	2.15 (.76)	2.08 (.76)
Good instructional facilities and equipment *	2.54 (.63)	2.58 (.61)
Good job or job opportunities for spouse/partner	2.03 (.86)	1.96 (.85)
Good geographic location	2.47 (.68)	2.46 (.68)
Good environment/schools for my children	2.14 (.92)	2.14 (.92)
Greater opportunity to teach *	2.39 (.73)	2.50 (.67)
Greater opportunity to do research	1.83 (.75)	1.71 (.73)
Greater opportunity for administrative responsibilities *	1.43 (.66)	1.50 (.69)

Notes: All items rated on a three-point scale of importance ranging from "1" being "Not Important," to "2" being "Somewhat Important," to "3" being "Very Important." Standard deviations depicted in parentheses. "*" indicates significant difference at $p < .001$.

Table 7: Job Satisfaction indicators for Part-time Faculty at Two- and Four-year Institutions

Panel A: Results of Independent-Samples T-tests—Comparisons of Part-time Faculty Members' Job Satisfaction along each Satisfaction Scale (n = 6,811)

	Faculty Status	
Level of Satisfaction with:	Four Year (n = 3,129)	Two Year (n = 3,682)
Autonomy*	2.97 (1.21)	2.91 (1.20)
Demands & Rewards	2.79 (.66)	2.78 (.67)
Students**	1.57 (1.71)	1.17 (1.76)

Notes: "**" indicates significant difference at $p < .001$. Note: All satisfaction items rated on a four-point scale with "1" being "Very Dissatisfied," "2" being "Somewhat Dissatisfied," "3" being "Somewhat Satisfied," and "4" being "Very Satisfied." Standard deviations depicted in parentheses.

Panel B: Results of Independent-Samples T-tests—Comparisons of Part-time Faculty Members' Overall Job Satisfaction (n = 6,811)

Faculty Status	*How satisfied are you with your job overall?*
Four Year (n = 3,129)	3.19 (.80)
Two Year (n = 3,682)	3.22 (.79)

Notes: Difference not significant. Satisfaction rated on a four-point scale with "1" being "Very Dissatisfied," "2" being "Somewhat Dissatisfied," "3" being "Somewhat Satisfied," and "4" being "Very Satisfied." Standard deviations depicted in parentheses.

Table 8: Preliminary Model of Part-time Faculty Global Job Satisfaction

Socio-demographics

Race *(White versus Minority)*

Gender *(Male versus Female)*

Social Class: Parents' Level of Education *(1 = Low, 2 = Medium, 3 = High)*

Year Began Faculty Position

↓

Training & Preparation

Graduate School Merit Scale *(composite of number of scholarships, fellowships, academic awards, TA and RA appointments received)*

↓

Appointment Characteristics

Tenure Status *(1 = tenured, 2 = Tenure Track, 3 = Not on Tenure Track, 4 = No Tenure Track Available)*

Appointment Type *(1 = Regular, 2 = Temporary)*

↓

Institutional Responsibilities & Workload

Scholarship Scale *(composite of cumulative scholarly activity over career)*

Composite: Average Weekly Student Contact Hours

↓

Characteristics of Employing Institution

Institution Type *(1= four year, 2 = two year)*

Average Self-rating: Quality of Facilities & Resources

Average Self-rating: Adequacy of Professional Development Funds

Institutional Control *(1 = Public, 2 = Private)*

Total Institutional Enrollment

↓

Satisfaction Sub-scales and Indicators

Agreement: If I had to do it over again, I'd still chose an academic career *(1 = Strongly Disagree, 4 = Strongly Agree)*

Satisfaction with Autonomy

Satisfaction with Demands & Rewards

Satisfaction with Students

↓

Global Satisfaction

How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with: "My job here, overall" *(1 = Very Dissatisfied, 2 = Somewhat Dissatisfied, 3 = Somewhat Satisfied, 4 = Very Satisfied)*

Table 9: Initial Regression of Global Job Satisfaction (n = 6,811)

Variable Description	r	β at Entry into Model	Final β after Satisfaction Composites
Block 1: Socio-demographics			
Race *(1 = White, 0 = Minority)*	.05	.05***	.03***
Gender *(1 = male, 2= female)*	-.03	-.02	.04***
Social Class: Parents' Level of Education *(1 = Low, 2 = Medium, 3 = High)*	-.06	-.05***	-.01
Year began this Faculty Position	-.07	-.06***	.01
Block 2: Training & Preparation			
Graduate School Merit Scale *(composite of number of scholarships, fellowships, academic awards, TA and RA appointments received)*	-.16	-.15***	-.03***
Block 3: Appointment Characteristics			
Tenure Status *(1 = tenured, 2 = Tenure Track, 3 = Not on Tenure Track, 4 = No Tenure Track Available)*	-.04	-.03***	.02
Appointment Type *(1 = Regular, 2 = Temporary)*	-.03	-.03*	.02
Block 4: Responsibilities & Productivity			
Scholarship Scale *(composite of cumulative scholarly activity over career)*	.00	.01	.02
Composite: Average Weekly Student Contact Hours	-.01	-.01	.01
Block 5: Institutional Descriptors			
Institution Type *(1= four year, 2 = two year)*	.02	.02	.02
Average Self Rating: Quality of Facilities & Resources	.34	.32***	.10***
Average Self Rating: Adequacy of Professional Development Funds	-.08	-.05***	-.02*
Institutional Control *(1 = Public, 2 = Private)*	.03	.03*	.00
Total Institutional Enrollment	-.06	-.05***	.00
Block 6: Satisfaction Indicators & Sub-Scales			
Agreement: If I had to do it over again, I'd still chose an academic career *(1 = Strongly Disagree, 4 = Strongly Agree)*	.22	.09***	.09***
Satisfaction with Autonomy	.23	.07	.07***
Satisfaction with Demands & Rewards	.70	.65	.65***
Satisfaction with Students	.10	-.02	-.02*
R^2 for Overall Model	**.53**		

Note: "*" indicates significance at $p < .05$; "**" indicates significance at $p < .01$; "***" indicates significance at $p < .001$.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS

☒ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket) form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").