

Burnout in Part-Time Postsecondary Faculty at Midwestern University

Chris Hubbard Jackson

St. Charles Community College

Patricia G. Boyer

University of Missouri – St. Louis

March 2019

ABSTRACT

Higher education institutions are relying more and more on part-time faculty, and are inclined to hire them instead of full-time tenure track faculty. It is important to retain this group of faculty therefore making it necessary to understand how teaching part-time impacts them. The purpose of this exploratory study is to examine burnout among part-time faculty at a four-year postsecondary institution. The research questions were 1. What is the level of Maslach's burnout (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment or reduced personal accomplishment) among part-time faculty at a four-year postsecondary institution? 2. What is the difference in the level of Maslach's burnout among moonlighters, freeway flyers, and auxiliary part-time faculty? Participants were 113 part-time faculty at a four-year postsecondary institution in the Midwest. Participants completed the Maslach Burnout Inventory Educators Survey, demographic questions, and open-ended questions. Overall part-time faculty experienced a moderate level of burnout, which is an indication that they experienced burnout a few times a month. Results of a MANOVA revealed a statistically significant difference in the level of emotional exhaustion between several groups of part-time faculty. Freeway flyers had significantly higher emotional exhaustion than moonlighters and auxiliary part-time faculty. See tables 1-5 for descriptive statistics and results of the MANOVAs. In the open-ended questions participants indicated that working conditions and students were the most stressful parts of working as a part-time faculty member. Conducting this study has helped to shed light on the dearth of research on non-medical part-time faculty at four-year post-secondary institutions, as well as has provided insight into how this population experiences Maslach's burnout. If part-time faculty experience burnout a few times a month then there is a stronger likelihood of the student learning environment and students being negatively affected. Thus, reasons for a moderate

burnout level need to be explored. When exploring this phenomenon, the researchers recommend starting by looking at the conditions associated with being a part-time faculty member, such as low pay, a lack of benefits, not having an office space, a lack of job security, teaching a large number of courses, etc.

Key Words: Burnout, Maslach's Burnout, Burn Out, Burned Out, Work Stress, Faculty, Part-time Faculty, Higher Education, University, Postsecondary

Introduction

During the Great Recession, postsecondary institutions saw substantial enrollment growth coupled with decreases in state funding (Ellis, 2018). Postsecondary institutions answered these uncertain financial times by increasing their use of part-time faculty. At degree-granting postsecondary institutions in fall 2009 the percentage of part-time faculty (49.3%) to full-time faculty (50.7%) was just about even (Snyder, de Brey, & Dillow, 2019). In fall 2011 it was exactly even with 50.0% full-time faculty and 50.0% part-time faculty, and in fall 2016 almost half (47.3%) of the faculty in degree-granting postsecondary institutions were part-time faculty (Snyder, et al., 2019). This continued use is seen as a trend or even “model form” for meeting higher education staffing needs (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006), and based on a 40+ year trend, it is projected to continue. Since part-time faculty are relied so heavily upon in higher education, they have become important and essential to the mission of some postsecondary institutions (Sommer, 1994). The study of part-time faculty is also important because as more part-time faculty are hired, full-time faculty take on more of the burden of institutional service (Anft, 2018). Thus, the study of part-time faculty is imperative.

Part-time faculty

Part-time faculty is an umbrella term, which refers to temporary faculty in higher education such as adjuncts, contract, or contingent faculty. Part-time faculty employment is usually characterized by a lack of benefits, very low wages, a lack of professional development opportunities, exclusion from making decisions about curriculum, a lack of promotion opportunities, and exclusion from faculty governance (Benjamin, 2002; Eagan & Jaeger, 2008; Kezar & Maxey, 2014). At some institutions part-time faculty are even denied the basic support necessary to do their jobs, such as access to copiers, having an institution provided e-mail

account, and library privileges (Kezar & Maxey, 2014). Part-time faculty treatment impacts the learning environment by limiting part-time faculty's ability to provide a high-quality educational environment and limiting the ways part-time faculty can support students (Benjamin, 2002; Kezar & Maxey, 2014). Part-time faculty have limited availability outside of class, which is one of the conditions associated with part-time faculty employment (Benjamin, 2002; Eagan & Jaeger, 2008). Interaction with faculty outside of class has been found to be one of the most important factors in program and in-class success, and since part-time faculty have limited availability many students who need this interaction are not getting it (Eagan & Jaeger, 2008).

According to Gappa (1984) part-time faculty are defined as “anyone who (1) teaches less than the average full-time teaching load, or (2) has less than a full-time teaching assignment and range of duties, or (3) may have a temporary full-time assignment” (p. 5). Gappa as stated by Louziotis (2000) identified two types of part-time faculty: practitioners (i.e. moonlighters) and what are known today as freeway flyers or gypsy scholars. In this study moonlighters are defined as part-time faculty who obtain most of their income from means other than teaching but supplement their income by teaching *one or more* classes at *one* university. Freeway flyers are defined in this study as part-time faculty who obtain most of their income by teaching and teach *two or more* classes at *two or more* universities in a given semester. Since there are some faculty who do not fit into the moonlighter or freeway flyer categories, a third type of part-time faculty, called auxiliary, is used. In this study auxiliary faculty are part-time faculty who teach *one or more* classes at *one or more* universities in a given semester, but do not fit into the moonlighters or freeway flyers categories.

Freeway flyers and moonlighters are the focus of this study because according to a national study of part-time faculty in higher education, 66% of part-time faculty worked two or

more jobs (American Federation of Teachers [AFT], 2010). Freeway flyers are of particular importance due to the grueling conditions associated with their work such as teaching an overload of courses (two to seven courses per postsecondary institution per semester) and teaching at multiple institutions (i.e. pieced together work) (Fulton, 2000; Nutting, 2003). Pieced together work is also a factor which is unique to employment as a freeway flyer, as opposed to full-time faculty (Tillyer, 2005). When pieced together work is combined with other dismal conditions such as heavy workloads, abysmal pay, a lack of benefits, a lack of job security, and a lack of academic freedom; part-time faculty are at risk for negative effects such as burnout (Blix, Cruise, Mitchell, & Blix, 1994).

Burnout

The term burnout or burn-out was coined in a 1974 article by Herbert J. Freudenberger, in which he defined “burn-out” as a state of exhaustion characterized by fatigue, frustration, and negative/cynical attitudes. Since Freudenberger, many definitions of burnout have been developed, including Maslach and Pines (1979), Cherniss (1980), Maslach and Jackson (1981), and others. In this study Maslach and Jackson’s (1981) definition of burnout as “a syndrome of emotional exhaustion and cynicism that occurs frequently among individuals who do ‘people work’ of some kind” (p. 99) will be used. In addition to various definitions of burnout, there are also different measures of burnout. For example, Berkeley Planning and Associates (1977) created a measure of burnout. The Burnout Scale was developed by Freudenberger and Richelson’s (1980). Pines and Aronson (1988) developed The Burnout Measure, and Maslach & Jackson (1981) developed the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI).

The MBI is the most widely used measure of burnout (Corcoran, 1985; Enzmann, Schaufeli, Janssen, & Rozeman, 1998; Schaufeli, & van Dierendonck, 1993). The MBI is a 22-

item questionnaire which assesses three components of burnout: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. Emotional exhaustion is feeling one's emotional resources have been used up, and having a lack of energy (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Depersonalization is the development of negative, callous attitudes toward one's clients and a view that clients are deserving or responsible for their problems (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Reduced personal accomplishment is having a negative view toward oneself and feelings of decreased competence, especially in reference to work (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Maslach's burnout level is determined based on the combination of subscale scores: Emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996). For instance, if one has high emotional exhaustion, high depersonalization, and high reduced personal accomplishment (i.e. low personal accomplishment), one is said to be experiencing a high degree of burnout. The MBI has operational definitions and has been validated among participants from various occupational backgrounds. The MBI-Educators Survey was developed for use in studying burnout among educators (Maslach, Jackson, Leiter, Schaufeli, & Schwab, 1996).

Burnout in part-time faculty

While faculty are at risk for burnout, the research on faculty burnout is limited; and scarce at best when examining burnout in non-medical part-time faculty. To date, the most comprehensive review of studies on burnout, are Watts & Robertson (2011) and Sabagh, Hall, and Aroyan (2018), but very few if any, of the studies focus on part-time faculty. According to some researchers such as Blix and colleagues (1994), Brown (2009), Crosmer (2009), and Lackritz (2004), postsecondary faculty experience burnout which negatively impacts their faculty responsibilities. Reasons for this burnout vary from study to study, and burnout among

postsecondary faculty varies based on factors such as faculty status (full-time vs. part-time), institution type (four-year, community college, public, private), and demographic variables.

Klausner and Green (1984) examined Maslach's burnout among 155 dental educators at the University of Michigan. Dental educators experienced moderate burnout, with moderate emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, but low reduced personal accomplishment. Part-time dental educators (instructors) had burnout levels similar to dental educators as a whole, except they had high depersonalization (Klausner & Green, 1984). Jackson, Barnett, Stajich, and Murphy (1993) conducted a longitudinal study to assess the relationship between Maslach's burnout and demographic variables among 429 school of pharmacy faculty. Like the dental educators in Klausner and Green's (1984) study, the school of pharmacy (SOP) faculty experienced moderate burnout (Jackson, et al., 1993). The SOP part-time faculty had moderate burnout levels, which were in the same range as the SOP full-time faculty; however some part-time faculty (assistant instructors) had higher emotional exhaustion, higher depersonalization, and higher reduced personal accomplishment than all of the other faculty (Jackson, et al., 1993).

Byrne (1998) examined factors that contribute to an overall feeling of burnout among faculty from a high school and a community college in New York. Of the 73 community college adjuncts, 93% indicated they were burned out (Byrne, 1998). Contrary to previous research findings, Byrne found that student academic and disciplinary problems, and an administration which supported bureaucracy were the two main causes of burnout for community college faculty. Brown (2009) also examined burnout among community college faculty. There were 64 community college faculty in the study, and 59.4% were part-time faculty. Brown (2009) found that part-time faculty experienced low burnout levels, while full-time faculty experienced moderate burnout levels. Since the difference in Maslach's burnout, between full-time and part-

time community college faculty was not statistically significant, Brown (2009) concluded that there was no difference in burnout among full-time and part-time community college faculty.

Brewer and McMahan (2003) examined the relationship of stress and burnout in postsecondary Industrial and Technological (I/T) faculty. Most of the study participants were white, male, full-time faculty, and tenured. Overall, Brewer and McMahan (2003) found that most I/T faculty experienced moderate burnout. Results were not presented for part-time faculty independently of full-time faculty due to the low number of part-time faculty (3.8%) included in this study (Brewer & McMahan, 2003). While providing support for the occurrence of burnout in faculty, and a connection between gender and faculty, the results of this study have limited generalizability to part-time faculty because of the small number of part-time faculty which were included. More recently, Frisby, Goodboy, and Buckner (2015) examined faculty commitment, satisfaction, efficacy and burnout among 113 faculty with teaching responsibilities. Participants completed a modified version of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) and only emotional exhaustion was found to be reliable ($M = 19.50$, $SD = 7.77$, $\alpha = .71$). Based on cutoffs for postsecondary faculty (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996), faculty experienced a moderate level of emotional exhaustion. Results were not presented separately for part-time faculty.

As evidenced by the previously reviewed studies, the research on burnout in part-time faculty is sparse and inconsistent. The limited nature of the previously reviewed literature warrants the need for further study. Accordingly, the purpose of this exploratory study is to examine burnout levels in part-time faculty at a four-year postsecondary institution.

Methodology

A convenience sample of part-time faculty was identified at a degree-granting university in the Midwest, herein referred to as Midwestern University. In Spring 2011 after obtaining Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, the researchers contacted the Institutional Research Office (IRO) at Midwestern to obtain the e-mail addresses of part-time faculty currently teaching at the university. Participants were e-mailed an invitation via Survey Monkey with the survey link, requesting their participation in this study. The online survey included demographic questions such as race/ethnicity, gender, and age; as well as the 22 questions of the Maslach Burnout Inventory Educator's Survey (MBI-ES), and five open-ended questions. The open-ended questions were asked to gain insight into the conditions of working as a part-time faculty member, which could contribute to burnout.

There were two research questions posed for this study. The first question was "What is the level of Maslach's burnout (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment or reduced personal accomplishment) among part-time faculty at a four-year postsecondary institution?" The second question was "What is the difference in the level of Maslach's burnout (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment) among moonlighters, freeway flyers, and auxiliary part-time faculty?"

Results

The purpose of this exploratory study is to examine burnout among part-time faculty at a four-year postsecondary institution. Participants completed the Maslach Burnout Inventory Educators Survey, demographic questions, and open-ended questions. As indicated in Table 1, of the 113 participants, the majority (91.2%) identified themselves as Caucasian, more than half

(61.1%) identified themselves as female, and almost half (46%) indicated they were age 55 and older. Over two-thirds (69.9%) indicated they worked one or more jobs in addition to teaching at Midwestern. Almost half (47.8%) indicated their primary source of income was teaching or a combination of teaching and non-teaching jobs.

Part-time faculty were classified as moonlighters (30.1%) if they indicated that they obtained most of their income from means other than teaching, but supplemented their income by teaching *one or more* classes at *one* university. Part-time faculty were classified as freeway flyers (15.0%) if they obtained most of their income by teaching, and taught *two or more* classes at *two or more* universities in a given semester. Since there were part-time faculty who taught one or more courses at Midwestern University, who did not fit into the moonlighter or freeway flyer categories, they were classified as auxiliary (54.9%).

Research Question 1 (RQ1) was “What is the level of Maslach’s burnout (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment or reduced personal accomplishment) among part-time faculty at a four-year postsecondary institution?” Means and standard deviations were computed in order to answer RQ1. When comparing the means for the participants in this study to the predetermined cutoff scores for postsecondary faculty (see Table 2 note), the part-time faculty in this study experienced a moderate level of burnout. Findings presented in Table 2 revealed a moderate burnout level, which is based on part-time faculty experiencing low emotional exhaustion ($M_{EE} = 9.68$, $SD = 9.56$), moderate depersonalization ($M_{DP} = 3.00$, $SD = 3.67$), and moderate reduced personal accomplishment ($M_{RPA} = 39.07$, $SD = 7.01$). Low emotional exhaustion means participants felt emotionally drained a few times a year or less. Moderate depersonalization means participants experienced negative or callous feelings towards students and students’ problems a few times a month. Moderate reduced personal

accomplishment means participants felt competent in their work as part-time faculty members a few times a year or less.

The second research question (RQ2) asked “What is the difference in the level of Maslach's burnout (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment) among moonlighters, freeway flyers, and auxiliary part-time faculty?” Means and standard deviations were computed in order to answer RQ2. As presented in Table 3, moonlighters experienced low burnout, as determined by low emotional exhaustion, low depersonalization, and low reduced personal accomplishment (i.e. personal accomplishment). Freeway flyers however, experienced moderate burnout, as determined by moderate emotional exhaustion, moderate depersonalization, and moderate reduced personal accomplishment. Moderate scores on all of the burnout components means that a few times a month, participants felt emotionally drained, experienced negative or callous feelings towards students and students' problems, and felt competent in their work as part-time faculty members. Like the moonlighters, auxiliary part-time faculty experienced low burnout; as determined by low emotional exhaustion, low depersonalization, and moderate reduced personal accomplishment. Thus, moonlighters and auxiliary part-time faculty experienced a low level of burnout, while freeway flyers experienced a moderate level of burnout.

Results of the MANOVA (see Table 4) revealed statistically significant differences in emotional exhaustion among the three types of part-time faculty, $F(2, 110) = 8.22, p < .001$. However for depersonalization, $F(2, 110) = 2.23, p = .113$; and reduced personal accomplishment, $F(2, 110) = 1.06, p = .351$ there was *not* a statistically significant difference among the part-time faculty types. Additionally, the amount of variance (r^2) for emotional

exhaustion was $r^2 = .13$. Accordingly, 13% of the variance in the level of emotional exhaustion was due to part-time faculty type.

Since the results of the MANOVA for emotional exhaustion were statistically significant, Bonferroni post hoc analyses were conducted. Per the Bonferroni Method, each comparison was tested using a significance level of $p = .017$. Comparisons were statistically significant for freeway flyers vs. moonlighters, and freeway flyers vs. auxiliary, both at $p = .001$ (See Table 5), but not between moonlighters and auxiliary. A confidence interval (CI) of 98.3% indicates that the population from which this sample of participants was gathered, would show the same statistically significant difference. The CI is an indication of the level of certainty that the population mean will fall within a certain range (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007, p. 147).

Based on the result of the post hoc analysis it was concluded that the significance ($p = .001$) found in emotional exhaustion is due to the freeway flyers, indicating that this group experienced a higher level of emotional exhaustion than moonlighters and auxiliary part-time faculty.

Results of Open-Ended Questions

Five open-ended questions (OEQ) were asked of participants in order to help explain the level of burnout experienced by part-time faculty and differences in burnout level for the three types of part-time faculty. The researchers analyzed the open-ended questions and identified trends based on responses to the different questions. Participants could provide more than one response for each open-ended question. The first open-ended question (OEQ1) states “Do you find part-time work satisfying? Why or why not?” Overall 85% of participants to OEQ1 indicated that they were satisfied with part-time work. Based on their part-time faculty classification, most (91%) moonlighters and (88%) auxiliary part-time faculty found part-time

work satisfying, while only 60% of freeway flyers were satisfied with part-time work. However, 75% of freeway flyers, 52% of moonlighters, and 41% of auxiliary faculty indicated that they enjoyed teaching. While differing in the level of satisfaction and teaching enjoyment, the part-time faculty in each group indicated that part-time faculty working conditions was the number one issue which caused dissatisfaction.

The second open-ended question (OEQ2) asked participants “What motivates you to work in a part-time faculty position?” Results were comparable for moonlighters, freeway flyers and auxiliary part-time faculty. Of the 141 responses to OEQ2, faculty indicated they were motivated to work in a part-time faculty position because (1) they enjoyed teaching and/or enjoyed teaching part-time (2) students- enjoy educating, interacting with, and influencing students (3) teaching part-time was a source of income (4) teaching part-time had more flexibility. From these results it was concluded that the part-time faculty in this study are motivated to teach part-time because they enjoy teaching, and educating students.

Open-ended question three (OEQ3) states “Do you have any challenges in your role as a part-time faculty member?” Over three-fourths (77.2%) of participants indicated that they faced challenges in their role as a part-time faculty member. All of the freeway flyers who responded indicated they faced challenges in their role as a part-time faculty member, compared to 77.4% of moonlighters and 71.4% of auxiliary part-time faculty. From these results it was concluded that freeway flyers face more challenges than other part-time faculty.

The fourth open-ended question (OEQ4) posed was “What are your biggest rewards in part-time work?” Among the 117 responses, 76.1% indicated the biggest rewards of part-time work were students and 16.2% indicated they enjoyed teaching/enjoyed teaching part-time. Less

than 60% of freeway flyers who responded to this question indicated that students were their biggest reward, compared to almost 90% of moonlighters and approximately 74% of auxiliary part-time faculty who responded. From these results it was concluded that while freeway flyers feel rewarded by working as a part-time faculty member, they are motivated differently than moonlighters and auxiliary part-time faculty.

The final open-ended question (OEQ5) asked “What are the most stressful parts of part-time work?” Overall, participants indicated the most stressful parts of part-time work were (1) part-time faculty working conditions (2) unprepared, underprepared, emotionally unstable, and unmotivated students (3) other things such as work-life family conflict, age related issues, and childcare. When examined by part-time faculty type, how participants ranked the most stressful parts of part-time work was different. Moonlighters ranked students first, part-time faculty working conditions second, and other as third. Freeway flyers ranked part-time faculty working conditions first, other as second, and students as third. Auxiliary ranked part-time faculty working conditions first, students second, and other third. Since the part-time faculty who responded differed based on part-time faculty type, it was concluded that what causes stress in part-time faculty work, is different based on part-time faculty type.

Conclusions

Conducting this study has helped to shed light on the dearth of research on non-medical part-time faculty at four-year post-secondary institutions, as well as has provided insight into how this population experiences Maslach’s burnout. Even since 2011 the number of studies on non-medical part-time faculty burnout is still sparse and is usually included with studies on full-time faculty. Participants in this study were similar in demographics to participants in previous

burnout research such as Anthony and Valadez (2002), Danowitz Sagaria and Agans (2007), and NEA Higher Education Staff (2007), who found that part-time faculty are typically women, Caucasian, and under age 35 or over age 64. In addition to teaching at Midwestern, the part-time faculty who responded in this study worked other jobs (both teaching and non-teaching) with approximately 70% working one or more jobs in addition to teaching at Midwestern (i.e. they worked two jobs or more). This is consistent with a national study on part-time faculty which revealed that 66% of part-time faculty worked one or more jobs in addition to teaching (American Federation of Teachers [AFT], 2010). The burnout level of the part-time faculty in this study may have been affected by the number of jobs they had, regardless if the additional job was a teaching or non-teaching job.

Since 54.9% of the participants were auxiliary faculty, the result supports the existence of additional types of part-time faculty on which little previous research has focused. With the exception of researchers such as Berret (2011), previous researchers (See Curtis & Jacobe, 2006; Hamilton, 2005; Louziotis, 2000) usually acknowledge the existence of two main types: moonlighters and freeway flyers. The reason over half of the participants in this study could be classified as auxiliary is unclear and more research needs to be conducted which looks at auxiliary part-time faculty and how they are affected by phenomena such as burnout.

Part-time faculty (moonlighters, freeway flyers, auxiliary) who responded to this study experienced a moderate level of burnout, which is an indication that they experienced burnout a few times a month. This was not surprising because it was consistent with previous research such as Klausner and Green (1984), and Jackson and colleagues (1993). If part-time faculty experience burnout a few times a month, and there are about five months in a semester (fall and spring) there is a stronger likelihood of the student learning environment and students being

negatively affected. Thus, reasons for a moderate burnout level need to be explored. Burnout level may be due to the challenges faced (OEQ3) by participants. Approximately 80% of the part-time faculty who responded to this question indicated they faced challenges such as part-time faculty working conditions and students. Challenging part-time faculty working conditions included low pay, a lack of benefits, not having an office space, a lack of job security, teaching a large number of courses each semester, a lack of institutional support, being undervalued, grading, odd work hours, and limited student interaction outside of class. However, 85% of part-time faculty who responded also indicated that they found part-time work satisfying (OEQ1). The top two reasons for this satisfaction included enjoyed teaching/teaching part-time, and students. It is possible that the moderate burnout level experienced is due more to the working conditions of the participants experienced at Midwestern, and this burnout level is not a high level of burnout because of the satisfaction experienced by educating and influencing students.

When burnout was examined by part-time faculty type, moonlighters experienced a low level of burnout, auxiliary part-time faculty experienced a low level of burnout, and freeway flyers experienced a moderate level of burnout. The low level of burnout experienced by moonlighters and auxiliary part-time faculty is consistent with Brown (2009) who also found that part-time faculty experienced a low level of burnout. Freeway flyers experienced moderate burnout overall and had statistically significantly ($p = .001$) higher emotional exhaustion than moonlighters and auxiliary part-time faculty. This result is consistent with Azeem and Nazir (2008) who found a significant difference in level of emotional exhaustion among faculty. This emotional exhaustion may be attributed to the challenged faced working in multiple institutions, which is customary of freeway flyer work. The freeway flyers who responded in this study unanimously indicated that they faced challenges working as a part-time faculty member

(OEQ3), and 80% indicated they faced stress (OEQ5). Only 62.5% of freeway flyers indicated they were satisfied with working as a part-time faculty member, compared to 90.6% of moonlighters and 88.1% of auxiliary part-time faculty. However, 75% of freeway flyers who responded indicated that they enjoyed teaching compared to approximately 52% of moonlighters and approximately 41% of auxiliary. Thus, freeway flyers experiencing moderate emotional exhaustion could be because they are not satisfied with working as a part-time faculty member, but enjoy it none-the-less.

While there were only 113 participants in this study, the confidence interval (CI) was 98.3% which indicates that the population from which this sample of participants was gathered, would show the same statistically significant difference. The results of this study are generalizable to non-medical part-time faculty at four-year post-secondary institutions. Future studies are needed which include a larger sample size, a more diverse sample, and more than one institution. This will provide a more thorough understanding of burnout in part-time faculty at postsecondary institutions.

References

- American Federation of Teachers [AFT]. (2010, March). A national survey of part-time/adjunct faculty. *American Academic*, 2. Retrieved from www.aft.org/pdfs/highered/aa_partimefaculty0310.pdf - 2010-03-15
- Anft, M. (2018). Committed but concerned: How faculty view their work, their profession, and the leadership of colleges. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/>
- Antony, J. S., & Valadez, J. R. (2002). Exploring the satisfaction of part-time college faculty in the United States. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26(1), 41-56. doi: 10.1353/rhe.2002.0023
- Azeem, S.M., & Nazir, N.A. (2008). A study of job burnout among university teachers, *Psychology and Developing Societies*, 20(1), 51-64. doi: 10.1177/097133360702000103.
- Benjamin, E. (2002). How over-reliance on contingent appointments diminishes faculty involvement in student learning. *Peer Review*, 5(1), 4-10. Retrieved from <http://www.aacu.org/peerreview/pr-fa02feature1.cfm>
- Berkeley Planning Associates (1977). Project Management and Worker Burnout (PB-278 446). In *Evaluation of child abuse and neglect demonstration projects, 1974-1977, volume IX*. U.S. Department of Commerce National Technical Information Service.
- Berret, D. (2011, April). Separate and unequal. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2011/04/13/separate-and-unequal>
- Blix, A.G., Cruise, R.J. Mitchell, B. M., & Blix, G. G. (1994). Occupational stress among university teachers. *Educational Research*, 36(2), 157-169. Retrieved from ERIC

database. (EJ487448)

- Brewer, E. W., & McMahan, J. (2003). Job stress and burnout among Industrial and Technical teacher educators. *Journal of Vocational Education Research, 28*(2).
- Brown, P.L., III. (2009). *A comparison of burnout rates between part-time and full-time postsecondary educators at a community college* (Unpublished master's thesis). Retrieved from http://etd.ohiolink.edu/send-pdf.cgi/Brown%20Pearley%20Leroy%20III.pdf?acc_num=marietta1239389945
- Byrne, J.J. (1998). Teacher as hunger artist: Burnout: Its causes, effects, and remedies. *Contemporary Education, 69*(2), 86-91. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ564689)
- Cherniss, C. (1980). *Staff burnout: Job stress in the human services*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Corcoran, K. J. (1985). Measuring burnout: A reliability and convergent validity study. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 1*(1), 107-112.
- Crosmer, J. (2009). *Professional burnout among U.S. full-time faculty: Implications for worksite health promotion*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses: A&I. (Publication No. AAT 3367226).
- Curtis, J.W., & Jacobe, M.F. (2006). AAUP contingent faculty index 2006. Retrieved July 6, 2009, from the American Association of University Professors Website: <http://www.aaup.org>
- Danowitz Sagaria, M.A., & Agans, L.J. (2007). Career patterns in higher education. In

- Gender and Education: An Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from http://www.credoreference.com.ezproxy.umsl.edu/entry/abcge/career_patterns_in_higher_education
- Eagan, M.K., & Jaeger, A.J. (2008). Closing the gate: Part-time faculty instruction in gatekeeper courses and first-year persistence. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 115, 39-53. doi 10.1002/tl.324
- Ellis, L. (2018). How the great recession reshaped American higher education. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com>
- Enzmann, D., Schaufeli, W.B., Janssen, P., Rozeman, A. (1998). Dimensionality and validity of the Burnout Measure. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 71, 331-351. Retrieved from <http://www.bps.org.uk/publications/journals/journaltitles/joop.cfm>
- Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff burn-out. *Journal of Social Issues*, 30(1), 159-165. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.1974.tb00706.x
- Freudenberger, H. J., & Richelson, (1980). *Burnout: The high cost of high achievement*. Bantam Books.
- Frisby, B.N., Goodboy, A.K., & Buckner, M.M. (2015). Student's instructional dissent and relationships with faculty members' burnout, commitment, satisfaction, and efficacy. *Communication Education*, 64(1), 65-82. doi: 10.1080/3634523.2014.978794
- Fulton, R.D. (2000). The plight of part-timers in higher education. *Change*, 32(3), 38-43. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ609961)

Gall, M.D., Gall, J.P., & Borg, W.R. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction (8th ed.)*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Gappa, J. M. (1984). *Part-time faculty: Higher education at a crossroads*. Washington, D. C.: Association for the Study of Higher education.

Hamilton, K. (2005). Getting off the burnout track? *Diverse: Issues in Higher Education*, 22(20), 26-31. Retrieved from <http://diverseeducation.com/article/5089/>

Jackson, R.A., Barnett, C.W., Stajich, G.V., & Murphy, J.E. (1993). An analysis of burnout among school of pharmacy faculty. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 57, 9-17. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ461435)

Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (2014). Troubling ethical lapses: The treatment of contingent faculty. *Change*, 34-37. doi: 10.1080/00091383.2014925761

Klausner, L. H., & Green, T. G. (1984). What does professional burnout mean to the dental educator? *Journal of Dental Education*, 48(2), 91-94. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ295439)

Lackritz, J. R. (2004). Exploring burnout among university faculty: Incidence, performance, and demographic issues. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(7), 713-729. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2004.07.002

Louziotis, Jr., D. (2000). The role of adjuncts: Bridging the dark side and the ivory tower. *Review of Business*, 21(3), 47-52. Retrieved from find.galegroup.com. (Gale Document No. A73183469)

Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal*

of Occupational Behavior, 2, 99-113. doi: 10.1002/job.4030020205

Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (1996). *Maslach burnout inventory manual* (3rd ed.).

Mount View, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Maslach, C., Jackson, S.E, Leiter, M.P., Schaufeli, W.B., & Schwab, R.L. (1996).

Maslach Burnout Inventory – Educators Survey (3rd ed.) [Survey Instrument].

Mind Garden, Inc. Retrieved from

<http://www.mindgarden.com/products/mbi.htm#Sample>

Maslach, C., & Pines, A. (1979). Burn-out: The loss of human caring. As cited in

Perlman, B., & Hartman, E.A. (1982). Burnout: Summary and future research.

Human Relations, 35(4), 289. doi:10.1177/001872678203500402

NEA Higher Education Staff. (2007, September). Part-time faculty: A look at data and issues. *NEA Update*, 11(3). Retrieved from

<http://www2.nea.org/he/heupdate/images/vol11no3.pdf>

Nutting, M.M. (2003). Part-time faculty: Why should we care? *New Directions for*

Higher Education, 123, 33-39. doi: 10.1002/he.118

Pines, A.M., & Aronson, E. (1988). *Career burnout: Causes and cures*. New York: The Free Press.

Sabagh, Z., Hall, N.C., & Saroyan, A. (2018). *Antecedents, correlates and consequences of faculty burnout*. *Education Research*, 60(2), 131-156. doi:

10.1080/00131881.2018.1461573

- Schaufeli, W. B., & van Dierenonck, D. (1993). The construct validity of two burnout measures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14*(7), 631-647.
doi: 10.1002/job.4030140703
- Schuster, J.H., & Finkelstein, M.J. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins
- Sommer, B. (1994). Recognizing academe's other faculty. *Planning for Higher Education, 22*(4), 7-10. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ486683)
- Snyder, T.D., de Brey, C., & Dillow, S.A. (2019). *Digest of Education Statistics 2017* Table 315.10: Number of Faculty in Degree-Granting Postsecondary Institutions, by Employment Status, Sex, Control, and Level of Institution: Selected Years, Fall 1970 through Fall 2016. National Center for Education Statistics. Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC.
- Tillyer, A. (2005, July-August). Educating technology and "Roads Scholars." *Academe Online, 91*(4), 49-52. Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/>
- Watts, J., & Robertson, N. (2011). Burnout in university teaching staff: A systematic literature review. *Educational Research, 53*(1), 33-50. doi:
10.1080/00131881.2011.552235

Table 1 **Demographics of Part-Time Faculty at Midwestern University**

Variable	Number	Percent
Race/Ethnicity		
Caucasian	103	91.2
Non-White	9	8.0
No response	1	0.9
Gender		
Male	42	37.2
Female	69	61.1
No response	2	1.8
Age		
20-39 years	28	24.8
40-54 years	32	28.3
55 years or older	52	46.0
No response	1	0.9
Other Jobs		
None	34	30.1
One	48	42.5
Two	21	18.6
Three or more	10	8.8
Primary Income Source		
Teaching	34	30.1
Non-teaching	37	32.7
Combination	20	17.7
Retired	22	19.5
Part-Time Faculty Type		
Moonlighters	34	30.1
Freeway Flyers	17	15.0
Auxiliary	62	54.9

Note. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding. For primary source of income, Combination = a combination of teaching and non-teaching.

Table 2 Maslach's Burnout Subscale Scores for Part-Time Faculty

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Level
Emotional Exhaustion (EE)	9.68	9.56	Low
Depersonalization (DP)	3.00	3.67	Moderate
Reduced Personal Accomplishment (RPA)	39.07	7.01	Moderate

Note. The predetermined cutoff scores for postsecondary faculty are:
 Low EE is mean ≤ 13 , moderate EE is mean 14-23, high EE is ≥ 24 ,
 Low DP is mean ≤ 2 , moderate DP is mean 3-8, high DP is mean ≥ 9 ,
 Low RPA (i.e. high personal accomplishment) is mean ≥ 43 , moderate RPA is mean 42-36, high RPA is mean ≤ 35 (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996).

Table 3 Burnout Subscale Scores by Part-Time Faculty Type

Part-Time Faculty Type	<i>n</i>	EE <i>M(SD)</i>	DP <i>M(SD)</i>	RPA <i>M(SD)</i>
Moonlighters	34	7.56 (6.57)	2.59 (3.06)	38.35 (6.49)
Freeway Flyers	17	17.76 (11.48)	4.71 (3.67)	37.47 (8.49)
Auxiliary	62	8.63 (9.39)	2.76 (3.90)	39.90 (6.85)

Note. The predetermined cutoff scores for postsecondary faculty are:
 Low EE is mean ≤ 13 , moderate EE is mean 14-23, high EE is ≥ 24 ,
 Low DP is mean ≤ 2 , moderate DP is mean 3-8, high DP is mean ≥ 9 ,
 Low RPA (i.e. high personal accomplishment) is mean ≥ 43 , moderate RPA is mean 42-36, high RPA is mean ≤ 35 (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996).

Table 4 MANOVA for Differences in Burnout Levels Among Part-Time Faculty

Variable	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>r</i> ²
Part-Time Faculty Type						
EE	1,332.62	2	666.31	8.22	.000***	.130
DP	58.86	2	29.43	2.23	.113	.039
RPA	104.01	2	52.01	1.06	.351	.019
Error						
EE	8,911.91	110	81.02			
DP	1,453.14	110	13.21			
RPA	5,405.42	110	49.10			
Total						
EE	20,836.00	113				
DP	2,529.00	113				
RPA	178,007.00	113				

Note. $p < .05^*$; $p \leq .01^{**}$; $p \leq .001^{***}$.

Table 5 Bonferroni Post Hoc Comparisons for Differences in Emotional Exhaustion for Part-Time Faculty

Variables	Mean	Std. Error	Significance	98.3% CI	
				LB	UB
Freeway Flyers vs. Moonlighters	10.21	2.67	.001***	3.59	16.60
Freeway Flyers vs. Auxiliary	9.14	2.46	.001***	3.38	15.33
Moonlighters vs. Auxiliary	-1.07	1.92	1.00	5.45	3.96

Note. $p < .05^*$; $p \leq .01^{**}$; $p \leq .001^{***}$. LB = Lower bound. UB = Upper bound.