

Adjunct Communication Methods Outside the Classroom: A Longitudinal Look

Anthony Serapiglia
Anthony.Serapiglia@StVincent.edu
CIS Department
St. Vincent College
Latrobe, PA 15650

ABSTRACT

The ubiquitous nature of social networking and online/electronic communication has become expected in every area of life by those students that are entering colleges and universities today. This is in direct opposition with the trend of colleges and universities to reduce support for basic infrastructure services such as school provided E-mail. The continued rise of reliance on adjunct professors as a source of direct on ground instruction has also led to a shift and reduction of the opportunities for the student to interact with their teachers. The availability of modern technology for communication has provided many new avenues for this interaction to take place. It is necessary for adjunct faculty and institutions to explore and leverage new channels of electronic and online communication to provide opportunities for timely and valuable exchanges between instructor and student outside of the classroom.

Keywords: Communication, Adjunct Faculty, Communication Technology, Social Networks, Instant Messaging, Twitter, Facebook, Out Of Classroom Communication

1. INTRODUCTION

Social Networking is the buzz topic of this moment of time of the still early 21st century. Almost every area of society is looking to leverage multiple channels of communication for profit, for presence, and for pleasure. To be considered a "Social Network" seems to mean simply to allow for bi-directional collaborative communication. In a dedicated issue, the Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication issued the following definition of a Social Network: "web-based services that allow individuals to (1) construct a public or semi-public profile within a bounded system, (2) articulate a list of other users with whom they share a connection, and (3) view and traverse their list of connections and those made by others within the system. The nature and nomenclature of these connections may vary from site to site (Boyd and Ellison, 2007)."

When fit to this definition, there is little difference between Facebook and course management systems such as BlackBoard or eCollege. Both systems allow for the creation of communication environments amongst peers and the flexibility of leveraging multiple channels to do so.

The competitive environment of the 21st century necessitates that universities develop innumerable ways to attract students. These efforts can involve technology giveaways (Carr, 2001; Finn & Inman, 2004; Lassiter, 2010), better living conditions (Woodall, 2010), and athletics (Roberts, 2010). Once enrolled, efforts in enhancing student satisfaction to increase retention of existing students are aided through increased facilities and resources made available to students. One of the most obvious and important resources offered to students is the faculty of the institution. Faculty contribute to the college experience primarily via the

classroom - through curriculum design, course content, and course delivery method. However, while the classroom may be the most obvious point of contact between faculty and students, the ability of professors to contribute to the college experience of their students does not end when class is dismissed. To highlight this extension of influential reach, research has shown that interactions between students and faculty that take place outside of the classroom have a very significant impact on students (Endo & Harper, 1982; Iverson, et al., 1984; Ku & Hu, 2001).

Unfortunately, while the teacher may be the most valuable resource to the student's education, more and more colleges and universities are relying on adjuncts to teach the predominance of their courses. The global economic recession of 2008 produced profound effects on every industry. Like every other business, education has been asked to do more with less. Higher enrollments have not led to the hiring of more teachers. Full time faculty are asked to produce more than ever before in administrative duties and larger course loads. The combined stresses of satisfying government assessment requirements, producing publishable research, learning new classroom technologies, as well as actually preparing lessons to teach classes all have led to a very full schedule for full-time faculty professors. Still, the efforts of full time faculty members will never be enough to completely fill all the multiple needs of a school. Adjunct, or part time, instructors are needed to fill the ranks of qualified instructors.

The use of adjunct faculty has been growing over the past 30 years. Three decades ago, adjuncts, both part-timers and full-timers not on a tenure track, represented only 43 percent of professors, according to the American Association of University Professors, which has studied data reported to the federal Education Department. The association says part-time faculty account for nearly 70% of professors at colleges and universities, both public and private (Finder, 2007). Other studies have shown that adjunct faculty comprise some 46% of college and university teachers overall and 65% of non-tenure teaching positions (Euban, 2006). As the use of adjuncts grows, it becomes more and more essential to study the effect they have on the quality of experience that the student has. By nature, adjuncts simply are not as available as full time faculty. Supplemental channels of communication must be developed to allow for

further contact between the adjunct and the student outside of the classroom.

The use of mobile communications by young adults as traditionally aged students, as well as working adults returning to school has exploded. Educause, an educational-technology consortium, released findings of a Spring 2010 survey encompassing 36,950 freshmen and seniors at 100 four-year institutions and students at 27 two-year institutions. In just two years, from 2008 to 2010, the percentage of students using smart phones to connect to the Internet has grown from 10% to 50% (Smith & Caruso, 2010). A Pew Internet and American Life study shows just how adoptive the college student is to new communication methods. In a December 2010 report, Twitter usage rates among college studies was found to be three times as great than other American adults (Smith & Rainie, 2010).

The purpose of this study is to continue to trace the evolution of how adjunct faculty utilizes various communication channels. Through repetition of an inventory gathering survey given to adjunct faculty at mid-sized Midwestern University after a two-year period, this project aims to answer the following research questions:

RQ1 – With a measured increase in student adoption of mobile data plans, have adjunct faculty also shown an increase in mobile data plan attainment?

RQ2 – With the measured rise in membership of social networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter, will there be a measured increase in membership of these sites by adjunct faculty as well?

RQ3 – In general, will the passage of two years show an increased tendency of adjunct faculty to communicate with their students through methods other than university provided e-mail addresses.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The following is a review of various journal articles and studies related to variables associated with this problem, adjunct faculty, electronic communication methods, and out of classroom communication.

The portrait of the adjunct in the literature is a nebulous one, but some qualities tend to be common. According to Banachowski's (1996) review of ERIC (Educational Resource

Information Center) literature on part time faculty, three main rationales institutions used when hiring adjuncts could be identified. The first was financial. Adjunct professors received a lower pay rate than full-time employees. Second, the use of adjuncts provided flexibility when student enrollment exceeded the expected number. Universities were able to provide additional classes taught by adjunct professors to meet student demand. Third, adjunct professors brought real world experiences into the classroom (Banachowski, 1996). Other studies and surveys have shown that adjunct faculty members frequently came from outside academe and provided unique perspectives to their work (Wilkinson, 2003). Many times these professors were employed full time, outside of university settings. Other part time faculty members were ending their careers or had retired. Both groups enjoyed sharing their expertise with their students (Lyons, 1999).

In 2009, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, a leading news service for the academic community, performed a survey of adjuncts teaching in the greater Chicago area. Between April and July of 2009 the study received 625 responses from 90 institutions. Some of its findings were: Only 30% of the respondents had been offered professional development; 30% were not expected to spend any amount of time outside the classroom with their students; 37% were expected to spend less than 2 hours a week with students outside the classroom; only 16% had been teaching 2 years or less; 67% were only teaching at one institution; 81% did not teach online; 60% did not have a job separate from part time teaching (Wilson, 2009). Many colleges and universities commonly have programs to support and encourage the adoption of technology for full-time instructors (Gracy & Croft, 2007; Trentin, 2006; Crawford, 2008). Examples of support for learning new technologies include ongoing Continuing Education Units (CEUs), and clock hours for attendance at seminars geared towards professional development or voluntary offerings (Felton, 2000; Gander, 2008; Neumann & Terosky 2007). Few programs exist that are geared exclusively to adjunct faculty (Glaskin-Clay, 2007; Flemming, et al, 2004). Unfortunately, adjunct faculty are most often only encouraged to participate in the same programs offered to the full-time faculty rather than required to participate. These separate standards are just the beginning of the differences between the two teacher groups.

In a qualitative study of nine adjunct professors employed by a southwestern United States University, Ritter (2007) found that separation from the main body of full-time faculty members in the department was the major concern among adjuncts. Separation between adjunct faculty and university or fulltime faculty led to isolation. Isolation, then, was named as the major cause of the challenges the adjunct professors faced. These challenges included little or no support regarding class content; choice of textbooks; and access to resources including offices, telephones, copy machines, or even computers. Obtaining computer accounts, using BlackBoard (a common online learning management system) to communicate with their students and learning to provide quality instruction, either online or in person, were the major concerns. One adjunct professor suggested a way to lessen the isolation was to use a BlackBoard virtual classroom where adjunct professors could discuss current issues. Such utilization provides a way for the adjunct professors to network with one another and with the full-time professors without physical presence being necessary. Virtual learning environments also provide a way for the adjunct professors to discuss successful teaching strategies and to help each other successfully manage the occasional problem student (Ritter, 2007).

The multichannel communication environment approach is growing. Every major online mail provider (AOL, G-Mail, Hotmail, Yahoo) also includes a synchronous instant messaging/online chat portion in addition the asynchronous e-mail functionality. Facebook has included the synchronous channel of Live Chat for years, and is only now bolting on more traditional asynchronous e-mail client in 2011. Another sign of the multichannel trend is the re-organization of the online portal for the University of Phoenix. Elements of the new platform were rolled out to business students in the Spring term of 2011 with full roll out expected in Fall of 2011. In addition to the familiar features of announcements and discussion boards, the new platform will have a much more "live" look and feel. Mr. Satish Menon, who left an executive position at Yahoo to spend two years developing the platform, says the new elements are a response to demands from the hundreds of thousands of students University of Phoenix has had in the past decade. "The driving force is live interaction. When students log in, they see recommended tasks for that day and a personalized discussion feed that resembles one

pioneered by Facebook. They can see who else is online and chat with other students and instructors... It is a very simple way to show where adaptiveness comes into the classroom" (Keller, 2011).

Cox and Orehovec undertook a qualitative study in 2007 to identify the nature of faculty-student interaction outside of the classroom. Their resulting typology identified five types of interaction: Disengagement, incidental contact, functional interaction, personal interaction, and mentoring. Their analysis suggests that even non-academic interactions between students and professors can be meaningful to students (Cox & Orehovec, 2007).

Using the phrase "Cyberinfrastructure" to describe the use of instant messaging for virtual office hours, Balayeva and Quan-Haase (2009) undertook an experiment to test the effectiveness of online chat as a new possibility for facilitating out of classroom communication. The purpose of the study was to gauge student perceptions of the usefulness of IM as a tool for student faculty interactions. Participants in the study were undergraduate sociology students enrolled in a communications course at a large research-intensive university in western Canada. Out of 76 students enrolled in the course, 52 participated in the study. Office hours were offered through IM to the class one hour a week and expanded to 2 hours the week of midterm exams and finals. In their findings, Balayeva and Quan-Haase reported that 83% of the students used an IM client at least once a day, and 83% used IM for over 4 years. This number suggests familiarity and comfort with the technology, making it a good choice for a communication channel between students and faculty. Prior to the study, only six participants had used IM to communicate with a professor. In summarizing the perceptions of the participants after the semester, researchers found that students did not think that IM should be used only for social interactions, that is, to communicate with just friends and family. The majority of the students were comfortable with the idea of using IM to communicate with faculty. This suggests that, although not all students are comfortable interacting with faculty via IM, most of them feel that IM would be a good tool for offering virtual office hours. Respondents reported that the key reasons why they think the technology was a good tool for the purpose of virtual office hours are: IM was convenient to use from home, campus, or anywhere else; IM provided a

speedier form of communication; and that IM was not intimidating. The key disadvantage reported by respondents was that IM did not allow for conversations about complex matters. In addition, respondents indicated that they would be more careful about making mistakes on IM, such as grammatical errors, when communicating with faculty in comparison to their communications with friends and family. Students liked the idea of faculty offering virtual office hours with 69% of participants reporting that they liked this idea "somewhat" or "very much" (Balayeva & Quan-Haase, 2009).

3. METHODOLOGY

The investigation into current technologies in use by adjunct faculty was quantitative in nature and utilized a survey as the research methodology to gather information from current adjunct faculty of a single academic institution. The use of the survey was necessary as this instrument allowed for the gathering of responses from a large and scattered pool of respondents.

University X, a private suburban Mid-western school has a student population of approximately 5,000 Undergraduate and Graduate students that represent 29 states and 36 foreign countries. Approximately 1,000 of those students are resident, living on campus. For the academic year including Fall 2010 and Spring 2011, University X had 273 unique personnel designated as "part time" faculty.

A survey was developed to gather information in four significant areas: adjunct demographics; communication technologies in use; reasons for not using technologies; and opinions on effectiveness of technologies (See Appendix A).

The survey was designed and administered through a web service, ESurveyPro.com. The survey was evaluated for time and clarity through administration to four test subjects. The survey administered in 2011 varied only slightly from that given in 2009, one additional question was included to request which department the respondent was a part of. At that time of initial availability in 2009, a possible 394 adjunct faculty members existed, with 75 surveys being returned.

For this second administration of the inventory survey, E-mail invitations were sent to all 273 individual adjunct faculty members as

determined through their inclusion within the University's electronic E-mail distribution lists for Part Time Faculty during each respective academic session. The invitations were sent March 3rd, 2011 with one follow up reminder sent one week later on March 16, 2011. At the completion of two weeks, 50 surveys had been returned through the web collection service. Incomplete surveys were retained for results on questions that were answered, as there was no contingency between sections of the survey.

4. RESULTS

Results of the survey are presented in three sections: demographics, technologies in use, and reasons not in use. Comparisons will also be given between the results of the most recent survey (2011) and the original (2009) through simple percentages.

Demographics:

In Question 1, 50% of the respondents fell in the over 50 year old age range (25 of 50). This is slightly higher, percentage wise, than 2009 where 48% fell in this category. The Under 40 age bracket was equal in both years at 28%. In Question 2, the ratio of terminal degree holders to Masters degree holders remained relatively the same. In 2011, 68.75 reported a Masters degree, as did 66.2% in 2009. Level of experience in Question 3 showed some turnover. In 2011, 48% reported to having taught over 6 semesters for the University, while in 2009, 65.7% had claimed 6+ semesters. Question 4 was similar in nature but more specific in asking the number of classes taught. Again, the over 6 category was high in both years (58.6 in 2009 and 49% in 2011). However, a shift did occur in the lower end. In 2009 only 17% chose 2 or less, while in 2011 31% chose 2 or less years. In Question 5 requested which department the respondent was a member of, the predominant response was the School of Communication and information Systems (20 of 50) with Education (7) and administration tied for second (7). Only one respondent claimed the School of Business. In terms of overall years teaching at any school, Question 6 showed little change. In the 2011 survey, 64% reported over 6 years, while 69% reported the same in 2009. As for teaching at other institutions in Question #7, both years reported that 48% did not teach anywhere else. A similar percentage reported 1 other school t 28% (2009) vs. 26% (2011), respectfully. Another small shift was seen in online

experience in Question 8. In 2011, 38% reported having taught an entirely online course, while 32% had reported the same in 2009. A slight decrease in outside employment was shown in Question 9. In 2011, 32% reported having a job outside the University, a small drop from the 35.7% reported in 2009. In Questions 10 and 11, an increase was seen in the number of adjuncts who reported possessing a phone capable of receiving E-mail and browsing the Internet. In 2009, only 46% reported this, in 2011, a full 60% reported having such a device.

In Questions #12 and #13, respondents were asked if they held regular office hours and if so, how many students per class contacted them during those hours. A percentage increase was seen with 42% reporting that they held office hours in 2009 and this number climbing to 50% in 2011. Even, though, was the number of reported students attending. This held comparatively steady, 63% (2009) to 64% (2011)

Technologies In Use:

| | 2009 | | 2011 | |
|----------------------|-------|--------|------|--------|
| | Have | Shared | Have | Shared |
| University E-Mail | 100% | 100% | 98% | 98% |
| Private E-Mail | 94% | 47% | 98% | 34% |
| Work E-Mail | 70.5% | 27% | 48% | 4% |
| IM | 27.3% | 3% | 28% | 6% |
| Social Net | 45.5% | 10% | 78% | 6% |
| Twitter | 12.3% | 4% | 16% | 2% |
| Personal Web | 25.4% | 10% | 8% | 2% |
| Presentation | 12.9% | 6% | 26% | 6% |
| Online Collaboration | 13% | 7% | 28% | 8% |

Table 1: Comparison of communication technologies in use and shared.

Question 14 of the survey asked which technologies the respondent had utilized and shared with their students. Nine technologies were listed, and an allowance was made for write in answers. More than one answer was allowed. Each respondent to this question included University E-mail as a method of out of class communication, 50/50 (100%). Second in popularity was a personal E-mail address, 9/50 (18%), and third was Blackboard 3/50 (6%). Only four other technologies received even one vote, Phone, Personal web Site, and Hosted

Presentation Service (Go To My PC). This was down from 11 different technologies that received votes in 2009 (Table 1).

Details of each of the nine listed technologies from Question 14 expanded upon if the communication method had been shared, utilized and if it had improved communication. Outside of E-mail, and especially University E-mail, none of the technologies had great use. Private E-Mail led again, but with decline in use. Most notable in drop off was the sharing of a work E-mail address which dipped from 27% to only 4%.

Reasons Not In Use:

As in 2009, the reasons given for not utilizing or sharing the various channels of communication fell mainly into three categories: wanting to channel all communications through one method, privacy concerns, and unsure how to use/unfamiliar with the technology. Record keeping continued to be a concern for some, with this reason appearing as the steady fourth choice as to why respondents had chosen not to utilize a particular channel.

Open responses were also allowed when providing reason why a channel was not in use. Some of these highlight that lines are being drawn between personal and public/classroom availability. One response to Social Network sites stated, "inappropriate to being dealing with students in this fashion. There is an important distinction between the student-teacher relationship and a personal/friend/purely social relationship." Another expressed concern about ethical and legal issues in posting class content to Facebook. Finally, one comment seemed to sum up the leading response of needing to channel communication rather succinctly, "It gets to all be too much."

5. DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to continue to trace the evolution of how adjunct faculty utilizes various communication channels. At the outset, the following research questions were proposed:

RQ1 – With a measured increase in student adoption of mobile data plans, have adjunct faculty also shown an increase in mobile data plan attainment?

RQ2 – With the measured rise in membership of social networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter, will there be a measured increase in membership of these sites by adjunct faculty as well?

RQ3 – In general, will the passage of two years show an increased tendency of adjunct faculty to communicate with their students through methods other than university provided e-mail addresses.

For RQ1, the 2011 results show that of the respondents to the survey, the percentage that do have data plans on their mobile devices has increased by 14% to a level of nearly two thirds. This number remains above the 2010 mark of incoming students measured at 50%, but the two year percentage growth is terribly behind. The percentage growth of 400% in just a two year period shows the trend clearly in the incoming student category, a trend that is not expected to slow down until near total saturation in that market demographic. The growth in faculty mobile data plans is encouraging.

The ubiquitousness of Facebook and Twitter in everyday life has not completely taken over the academic world. While it might be the constant battle of an adjunct to keep their students from being online while in class, it has certainly not become a priority to meet them on these channels outside of the class. RQ2 surprisingly turns up a decline in use of what would be generally accepted as social network technologies. Percentage declines in use by adjuncts were shown in Instant Message use, Social Networking sites (Facebook, MySpace), and Twitter in sharing these channels with their students. Private use has increased in all three. The bridge simply has not been made to integrate these channels into a holistic educational approach.

The specifics of RQ2 go a long way to answering the more general RQ3. Taken as a whole, the 2011 results of the adjunct faculty communication method inventory show a disturbing trend. Across the board, through all of the nine communication technologies/channels listed, there has been a trend towards less inclusion of new methods of communicating. With so many ways in which to continue student teacher interaction outside of the classroom today, this is simply unacceptable. In the light of Diffusion of Innovations theory (Rogers, 1962),

adjunct faculty in general, through these results, show to be technical laggards.

It is important to note, however, the environment of both the survey and the adjunct in general. As noted in the introduction and lit review, adjunct faculty is notoriously under supported. Even when colleges and universities do provide educational technology centers and support staff, these services are rarely utilized by the transitory adjuncts. The 2011 survey results included several responses that inferred that they respondent simply was unaware that the service was available through the school. University X has no distinct program for adjunct orientation or support. There is no mandate from the school in general, nor specific departments for adjuncts to even hold office hours. No second form of communication is required, only the school issued E-mail address. There simply is no outside motivation for the adjunct in this environment to take on the extra burden of learning a new technology or method.

The initial survey in 2009 was administered directly after the spring semester. The timing of the 2011 survey was moved forward to take advantage of the session still being in progress. However, this movement in timing had little effect and the number of returns decreased overall. However it is recommended that the further iterations of this survey also be conducted mid-term as well. A mitigating factor of survey fatigue may have contributed to the lowered amount of responses. University X was conducting several faculty surveys concurrently in preparation for Middle States accreditation review. In the future, this will not be in conflict.

Suggestions for future study include a more qualitative approach. Focus groups that are inclusive of representatives from several schools and departments can provide a more intimate dialog on the true feelings of the faculty in several areas. From the results, it appears that current adjuncts continue to be concerned most by security, privacy, and management of multiple channels. For security and privacy concerns, much of the fears could be allayed with simple education and training. Ignorance of the features might be the deterring factor. For instance, on first glance Instant Messaging "conversations" appear ephemeral, disappearing when logging out and back in. Most common IM clients do contain an archiving feature that can hold these strings for reference with just a simple click. Most clients also include the ability to encrypt, which would quickly alleviate most

security concerns. The management of multiple channels of communication is an individual, personal, task. Any of these technologies inherently offer the choice to turn it off. Allowing the channel to be open during limited windows of time can be utilized to allow for "virtual office hours" and enable some level of control to the teacher on when they can be contacted. In the end, personal time management skills, technology aside, are essential.

Unfortunately, the main roadblock to adoption of various communications techniques and technologies continues to be time. Of the reasons provided for not using the several technologies in the survey, a commonality is that they all could be overcome with the application of time. The time to spend in learning the technology, time to spend in becoming familiar and comfortable with the technology, time to spend in organizing the implantation of the technology into their lives in and out of the classroom. Too many adjuncts feel that their time is already stretched to the maximum, and that there is no more room for anything new. It is here where a strong mandate by the University, department head, or even accreditation organization could be used to set the lead and require ongoing training and exploration of new tools and methods. As shown in the online education world, where electronic communication needs to overcome the lack of face to face interaction, necessity is the mother of invention. The similarities in the best online platforms, whether it be the new portal being developed by the University of Phoenix or the myriad of add-ons and modules offered in Blackboard, and the multifaceted approach of the most popular social networking sites is striking. Blending multiple channels and reaching beyond the normal hours of classroom instruction is essential in providing the best learning opportunities today and being ready for the future.

6. REFERENCES

- Balayeva, J., & Quan-Haase, A.. (2009). Virtual office hours as cyberinfrastructure: the case study of instant messaging. *Learning Inquiry*, 3(3), 115-130. Retrieved July 15, 2010, from Research Library. (Document ID: 1931492001).
- Banachowski, G. (1996). Perspectives and perceptions: A review of the literature on the use of part-time faculty in community

- colleges (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED398943).
- Boyd, D. M. & Ellison, N. B. (2007), Social Network Sites: Definition, History, and Scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13: 210–230. doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00393.x
- Carr, S. (2001). U. of South Dakota Will Give Freshmen Wireless Hand-Held Computers This Fall. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. May 18, 2001.
- Cox, B. & Orehovec, E. (2007), "Faculty-Student Interaction Outside the Classroom: A Typology from a Residential College." *Review of Higher Education*, Vol. 30, No. 4, pp. 343-363.
- Crawford, K. (2008). Continuing Professional Development in Higher Education: The Academic Perspective. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 13(2), 141-146.
- Endo, J. and Harper, R. (1982). "The Effect of Student-Faculty Interaction on Students' Educational Outcomes." *Research in Higher Education*, 16(2), 115-136.
- Euban, D. (2006, June 16) Legal contingencies for contingent professors. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. B8 – B10.
- Felton, Geraldene. (2000). Perspectives on faculty development. *The Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing*, 31(2), 83-7.
- Finder, Alan (2007, November 20) Decline of the Tenure Track Raises Concerns. *The New York Times*.
- Finn, S. and Inman, J.G. (2004). Digital Unity and Digital Divide: Surveying Alumni to Study Effects Of a Campus Laptop Initiative. *ISTE (International Society for Technology in Education)*. 36(3).
- Fleming, S., Shire, J., Jones, D., Pill, A., & McNamee, M. (2004). Continuing Professional Development: Suggestions for Effective Practice. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 28(2), 165-177.
- Gander, L. (2008). About Us: Reflection and Dialogue on the Purpose of University Continuing Education in Canada. *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education*, 34(1), 17-26.
- Glaskin-Clay, B. (2007). Part-Time Instructors: Closing the Quality Loop. *College Quarterly*, 10(3), 1-11.
- Gracy, K., & Croft, J.A. (2007). Quo Vadis, Preservation Education? A Study of Current Trends and Future Needs in Continuing Education Programs. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 51(2), 81-97.
- Iverson, B., Pascarella, E. & Terenzini, P. (1984), "Informal Faculty-student Contact and Commuter College Freshmen." *Research in Higher Education*, 21(2), pp. 123-136.
- Keller, J. (2011, January 23). As the Web Goes Mobile, Colleges Fail to Keep Up. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Kuh, G. & Hu, S. (2001), "The Effects of Student-Faculty Interaction in the 1990s." *The Review of Higher Education*, 24(3), pp. 309-332.
- Lassiter, Jill. (2010, March 30). Seton Hill to Offer iPads to Full-Time Students. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Lyons, R. (1999). Achieving effectiveness from your adjunct faculty. American Council on Education Department Chair Online Resource Center.
- Neumann, A., & Terosky, A. (2007). To Give and to Receive: Recently Tenured Professors' Experiences of Service in Major Research Universities. *Journal of Higher Education*, 78(3), 282-310.
- Quan-Haase, A. (2008). Instant Messaging on Campus: Use and Integration in University Students' Everyday Communication. *The Information Society: An International Journal*, 24(2), 105-115.
- Ritter, C. (2007). The Challenges and Rewards of Adjunct Professors Who Teach in Educational Leadership Programs. <http://cnx.org/content/ml14560/latest> Retrieved June, 20, 2009.
- Roberts, S. (2010, October 25). You can win for losing. *Sports Illustrated*, Retrieved from,

- <http://sportsillustrated.cnn.com/vault/article/magazine/MAG1176117/index.htm>.
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations*. New York: Free Press.
- Smith, S. & Caruso, J. B. (2010). The ECAR Study of Undergraduate Students and Information Technology. Boulder, CO: EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research. Retrieved from http://www.educause.edu/Resources/ECARS_tudyofUndergraduateStuden/217333.
- Smith, A, & Rainie, L. Eight Percent of online Americans use Twitter . Pew Internet & American life project, December 9, 2010, Retrieved from <http://www.pewinternet.org/Reports/2010/Twitter-Update-2010.aspx>.
- Trentin, G. (2006). The Xanadu Project: Training Faculty in the Use of Information and Communication Technology for University Teaching. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 22(3), 182-196. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Wilkinson, S.L. (2003, January 6). The plight of part-time faculty. *Chemical & Engineering News* (81)1, pp. 34-37.
- Wilson, R. (2009, October 18). 'Chronicle' Survey Yields a Rare Look Into Adjuncts' Work Lives. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*
- Woodall, C. (2010, July 15). California univ. finishing 18-year plan. Pittsburgh Post Gazette, Retrieved from, <http://www.post-gazette.com/pg/10196/1072769-58.stm>.

Appendix A:**Survey Questions (*possible responses in italics*)****Page 1. Personal background**

1. Please indicate your age group: *20-25; 26-30; 31-35; 36-40; 41-45; 46-50; over 50*
2. What is the highest degree you have earned to date: *Masters; Doctorate*
3. How many sessions (semesters) have you taught for University X: *1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6 or more*
4. How many classes have you taught for University X: *1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6 or more*
5. What school within the University are you a part of?: (OPEN)
6. Overall, how many years of teaching experience do you have: *1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6 or more*
7. How many other institutions do you teach at: *0; 1; 2; 3; 4 or more*
8. Have you taught an entirely online course: *Yes; No*
9. Are you currently employed in private industry outside of the Education field: *Yes; No*
10. Do you own a cell phone capable of receiving e-mail: *Yes; No*
11. Do you own a cell phone capable of browsing the internet: *Yes; No*

Page 2. General interactions

12. Do you hold set regular office hours: *Yes; No*
13. If you have set office hours, approximately how many students per class contact you during those set office hours: *1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6 or more*
14. Of the following list of forms of communication, please check any that you are required to have an account, or presence, in and share with your students. (School can be one other than RMU. Please check all that apply.) *In-person office hours; University e-mail; Personal e-mail (Gmail, Hotmail, Yahoo, etc.); Work e-mail; Instant messaging (AOL, Yahoo, ICQ, etc.); Social Network Site (Facebook, MySpace, etc.); Twitter; Personal Web Site; Online Presentation Service (Go to Meeting, etc.); Online Collaboration Service (Google Docs, etc.); Other (Please Specify)*

Page 3. Method 1 - University E-Mail

15. Do you use your University X issued e-mail address: *Yes; No*
16. Have you shared this address with your students: *Yes; No*
17. If you have shared this address, have any of your students communicated with you through that address: *Yes; No*
18. If you have shared this address, how has contact through this method improved interaction between you and the student: *1-7 rating (1 low, 4 no change, 7 greatly improved, 8 not applicable)*

Page 4. Method 2 - Private E-Mail

19. Do you have a private e-mail address (G-mail, Hotmail, Yahoo, AOL, etc.): *Yes; No*
20. Have you shared this address with your students: *Yes; No*
21. If you have shared this address, have any of your students communicated with you through that address: *Yes; No*
22. If you have shared this address, how has contact through this method improved interaction between you and the student: *1-7 rating (1 low, 4 no change, 7 greatly improved, 8 not applicable)*
23. If you have not shared this address with your students, please check any reasons why you have not: (check all that may apply): *Personal privacy concerns; School policy disallows this; Control/funnel student communication through other channel; Concerns about archiving and keeping record of contact; Copyright/restricted materials distribution concern; Security concerns; Unaware technology existed; Unsure of how to use this technology*

Page 5. Method 3 - Work E-Mail

24. Do you have a outside work e-mail address: *Yes; No*
25. Have you shared this address with your students: *Yes; No*
26. If you have shared this address, have any of your students communicated with you through that address: *Yes; No*
27. If you have shared this address, how has contact through this method improved interaction between you and the student: *1-7 rating (1 low, 4 no change, 7 greatly improved, 8 not applicable)*

28. If you have not shared this address with your students, please check reasons why you have not: (check all that may apply): *Personal privacy concerns; School policy disallows this; Control/funnel student communication through other channel; Concerns about archiving and keeping record of contact; Copyright/restricted materials distribution concern; Security concerns; Unaware technology existed; Unsure of how to use this technology*

Page 6. Method 4- Instant Messaging

29. Do you have an Instant Messaging account (AOL, Yahoo, ICQ, etc): *Yes; No*

30. Have you shared this address with your students: *Yes;*

31. If you have shared this address, have any of your students communicated with you through that address: *Yes; No*

32. If you have shared this address, how has contact through this method improved interaction between you and the student: *1-7 rating (1 low, 4 no change, 7 greatly improved, 8 not applicable)*

33. If you have not shared this address with your students, please check reasons why you have not: (check all that may apply): *Personal privacy concerns; School policy disallows this; Control/funnel student communication through other channel; Concerns about archiving and keeping record of contact; Copyright/restricted materials distribution concern; Security concerns; Unaware technology existed; Unsure of how to use this technology*

34. Would you be interested in exploring this technology more: *Yes; No*

35. How effective do you feel this technology could be in augmenting your communication with your students: *1-7 rating (1 low, 4 no change, 7 greatly improved, 8 not applicable)*

Page 7. Method 5 - Social Networking Sites

36. Do you have a Social Networking website account (Such as Facebook or MySpace): *Yes; No*

37. Have you shared this address with your students: *Yes; No*

38. If you have shared this address, have any of your students communicated with you through that address: *Yes; No*

39. If you have shared this address, how has contact through this method improved interaction between you and the student: *1-7 rating (1 low, 4 no change, 7 greatly improved, 8 not applicable)*

40. If you have not shared this address with your students, please check reasons why you have not: (check all that may apply): *Personal privacy concerns; School policy disallows this; Control/funnel student communication through other channel; Concerns about archiving and keeping record of contact; Copyright/restricted materials distribution concern; Security concerns; Unaware technology existed; Unsure of how to use this technology*

41. Would you be interested in exploring this method of communication more: *Yes; No*

42. How effective do you feel this technology can be in augmenting your communication with your students: *1-7 rating (1 low, 4 no change, 7 greatly improved, 8 not applicable)*

Page 8. Method 6 - Twitter

43. Do you have a Twitter account: *Yes; No*

44. Have you shared this address with your students: *Yes; No*

45. If you have shared this address, have any of your students communicated with you through that address: *Yes; No*

46. If you have shared this address, how has contact through this method improved interaction between you and the student: *1-7 rating (1 low, 4 no change, 7 greatly improved, 8 not applicable)*

47. If you have not shared this address with your students, please check reasons why you have not: (check all that may apply): *Personal privacy concerns; School policy disallows this; Control/funnel student communication through other channel; Concerns about archiving and keeping record of contact; Copyright/restricted materials distribution concern; Security concerns; Unaware technology existed; Unsure of how to use this technology*

48. Would you be interested in exploring this method of communication more: *Yes; No*

49. How effective do you feel this technology can be in augmenting your communication with your students: *1-7 rating (1 low, 4 no change, 7 greatly improved, 8 not applicable)*

Page 9. Method 7 - Advanced web site features

50. Do you have a personal web site: *Yes; No*

51. Have you shared this address with your students: *Yes; No*

52. If you have shared this address, how has contact through this method improved interaction between you and the student: *1-7 rating (1 low, 4 no change, 7 greatly improved, 8 not applicable)*
51. If you have not shared this address with your students, please check reasons why you have not: (check all that may apply): *Personal privacy concerns; School policy disallows this; Control/funnel student communication through other channel; Concerns about archiving and keeping record of contact; Copyright/restricted materials distribution concern; Security concerns; Unaware technology existed; Unsure of how to use this technology*
53. Would you be interested in exploring this method of communication more: *Yes; No*
54. How effective do you feel this technology can be in augmenting your communication with your students: *1-7 rating (1 low, 4 no change, 7 greatly improved, 8 not applicable)*

Page 10. Method 8 - Hosted presentation services

56. Have you ever utilized online presentation services, such as "Go To Meeting", or "Adobe Connect": *Yes; No*
57. If you have used such technologies, where have you used online presentation services, such as "Go To Meeting" or "Adobe Connect": *Work; School; Both Work and School; Not applicable*
58. If you have utilized this technology, how has contact through this method improved interaction between you and the student: *1-7 rating (1 low, 4 no change, 7 greatly improved, 8 not applicable)*
59. If you have not utilized this technology with your students, please check reasons why you have not: (check all that may apply): *Personal privacy concerns; School policy disallows this; Control/funnel student communication through other channel; Concerns about archiving and keeping record of contact; Copyright/restricted materials distribution concern; Security concerns; Unaware technology existed; Unsure of how to use this technology*
60. Would you be interested in exploring this method of communication more: *Yes; No*
61. How effective do you feel this technology can be in augmenting your communication with your students: *1-7 rating (1 low, 4 no change, 7 greatly improved, 8 not applicable)*

Page 11. Method 9 - Online apps

62. Have you ever utilized online collaboration services, such as "Google Docs": *Yes; No*
63. If you have experienced such technology, where have you used online collaboration services such as "Google Docs": *Work; School; Both; Neither*
64. If you have utilized this technology, how has contact through this method improved interaction between you and the student: *1-7 rating (1 low, 4 no change, 7 greatly improved, 8 not applicable)*
65. If you have not shared this address with your students, please check reasons why you have not: (check all that may apply): *Personal privacy concerns; School policy disallows this; Control/funnel student communication through other channel; Concerns about archiving and keeping record of contact; Copyright/restricted materials distribution concern; Security concerns; Unaware technology existed; Unsure of how to use this technology*
66. Would you be interested in exploring this method of communication more: *Yes; No*
67. How effective do you feel Online collaboration services such as Google Docs can be in augmenting your communication with your students: *1-7 rating (1 low, 4 no change, 7 greatly improved, 8 not applicable)*

Page 12. Most Common

68. What is the form of communication that has been MOST used by your students to contact you outside of the classroom? (Open Text Response)