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ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Long-Term Part-Time Faculty’s Professional Life at Public Comprehensive Master’s Universities in California

by

Ariadna Isabel López Damián
Doctor of Philosophy, Graduate Program in Education
University of California, Riverside, December 2017
Dr. John S. Levin, Chairperson

In recent decades, due to both contextual (e.g., resource scarcity) and internal organizational conditions (e.g., increased enrollment), universities have increased the number of nontenure-track faculty positions. As part of the nontenure-track faculty population, part-time (PT) faculty are treated as second-class faculty and conceptualized more as employees than as professionals. This view (common in both universities and in the scholarly literature) shows a partial and skewed perception of PT faculty’s work and participation in universities that does not account for this population’s own understandings of their organizational and professional roles.

This qualitative investigation uses a novel approach to a well-examined topic. Based on a non-deficit perspective, and the study of a particular PT faculty subgroup, this investigation explains the ways in which long-term PT faculty understand their work in, contributions to, and relationship with comprehensive Master’s universities and the academic profession. A phenomenological approach and fieldwork methods were employed. Data in this investigation comprise semi-structured in-depth interviews of 29
PT faculty, in three comprehensive Master’s university California, with five or more years employment. Content analysis, coding and categorizing, and document analysis processes were employed to systematize the findings of this investigation.

PT faculty conceptualize themselves as members of multiple on-campus and off-campus groups. Their membership in these groups guides their understanding and construction of their roles in their universities. Long-term PT faculty express attitudes of work engagement (job involvement, organizational commitment, and psychological empowerment) and enact work engagement behaviors (extra-role behaviors) that benefit their university and students. PT faculty’s job involvement plays a central role both in the development of a long-term work relationship with their campus and in PT faculty’s expressions of work engagement. Findings from this investigation suggest that PT faculty self-author their work and develop professional identities that help them cope with reductive and partial views of their role at universities. Findings are used to discuss implications for practice as well as to propose future venues for research.
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Chapter One
Introduction and Research Problem

Due to the decline of public investment in higher education and the increasing pressure to reduce tuition costs, postsecondary institutions are pressured to do more with fewer resources (Archibald & Feldman, 2011; Bettinger, 2004; Weisbrod, Ballou, & Asch, 2008). This condition has led to a change in the structure of higher education employment in the U. S. (Douglass, 2012). Resource scarcity has pushed universities and colleges to adopt money saving management techniques, such as increasing the number of contingent—both full-time and part-time (PT)—faculty positions (Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011; Goldstein, 2005; Weisbrod et al., 2008). This strategy has been adopted widely by higher education institutions as evidenced by the 376 percent growth in part-time appointments from 1970 to 2001 (Hearn, Milan, & Austin, 2012).

With the increase of part-time and contingent positions, universities and colleges have the flexibility to respond to growth in enrollment demand and, simultaneously, decrease institutional expenses (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Johnson & Turner, 2009; Thedwall, 2008). Reasons for PT faculty employment have been primarily economic: PT faculty positions help the institution serve more students, decrease institutional expenses, improve flexibility to respond to teaching demands, increase the time full-timers are able to devote to research, and increase the institutions’ ability to hold faculty accountable (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Banachowski, 1996; Johnson & Turner, 2009; Levin & Montero-Hernandez, 2014). Among these various reasons, the one that has resonated most is that PT faculty are of lower cost than their tenure line colleagues (Ochoa, 2011).
Although described as a successful (i.e., cost-effective) strategy from an economic point of view (Goldstein, 2005; Lefebvre, 2008; Thedwall, 2008), this strategy has received several critiques from scholars. The majority of these critiques pertain to the perception of contingent faculty positions “as negative to the higher education enterprise” (Kezar & Sam, 2011b, p. 2; see also Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011; Morrison, 2008; Ochoa, 2011; Rhoades, 2008).

PT faculty are depicted in the scholarly literature as second-class faculty who are less qualified than full-time faculty (Benjamin, 2003), who damage the integrity of academic work (Leslie & Gappa, 2002; Morrison, 2008; Rhoades, 2008), and who harm college students (Jacoby, 2006; Ochoa, 2011). Operating from what Kezar and Sam (2011b) called a deficit perspective, a substantial body of research argues that there is a positive relationship between the percentage of contingent faculty at higher education institutions and students’ underperformance (e.g., Benjamin, 1998, 2002, 2003; Eagan & Jaeger, 2008, 2009; Ehrenberg, 2005; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Umbach, 2007). Nevertheless, there is evidence that the problem may relate to a lack of institutional mechanisms that acknowledge and support PT faculty members’ work (American Association of University Professors [AAUP], 2009; Jacobs, 1998; Leslie & Gappa, 2002; Meixner, Kruck, & Madden, 2010; Wyles, 1998).

Traditionally, PT faculty members are not included in decision making or institutional activities and they do not receive sufficient professional support or institutional resources to perform their jobs (Dobbie & Robinson, 2008; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Hearn et al., 2012; Kupiec, 1991; Landrum 2009; Rhoades, 1998). Due to limited
institutional support and inclusion, PT faculty are viewed as deficient in institutional knowledge, participation, and loyalty (Jameson & Hillier, 2008; Leslie & Gappa, 2002). The conceptualization of PT faculty positions as temporal, partially committed, and focused primarily on teaching is employed at universities and colleges to justify and continue this limited institutional support (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Rhoades, 2008). This creates a vicious cycle in which the conceptualization of PT faculty as involved in a limited fashion justifies limited support, and circumstances of limited support are considered the source of PT faculty limited involvement. One element remains unattached to this cycle: PT faculty understandings of their position and their role at their institutions.

Although some PT faculty match the stereotype of overload instructor with low commitment to a single institution, there are also PT faculty for whom their work at one university is central for their professional activity (Gappa, 2000; Leslie & Gappa, 2002). Research and data from national surveys demonstrate that a substantial share of PT faculty (between 30 percent and 40 percent) have long-term relationships (over ten years of teaching) with their institution of employment (AFT Higher Education, 2010; Leslie & Gappa, 2002). In addition, less than half of PT faculty have full-time jobs outside teaching and only 17 percent teach at more than one institution (Monks, 2009). These figures portray PT faculty members as individuals who do not come into the profession lightly and do not leave it soon (Clery, 2001; Feldman & Turley, 2001; The Coalition on the Academic Workforce [CAW], 2012).
Furthermore, PT faculty not only engage in teaching practices of high quality (Gappa, 2000; Meixner et al., 2010) but also play different institutional roles outside of teaching (Clery, 2001; Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007). For example, some PT faculty participate in scholarly publications (Clery, 2001), course development (Lefebvre, 2008), and faculty meetings (Levin & Montero-Hernandez, 2014; Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, & August, 2012). In other words, there is a group of PT faculty members who work primarily at one institution, dedicate most of their productive time to that institution, rely on their faculty position as their main source of income (AFT Higher Education, 2010; CAW, 2012; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Leslie & Gappa, 2002; Monks, 2009), and do not limit their involvement at their institution to teaching (Clery, 2001; Gappa et al., 2007). Nevertheless, this subgroup of PT faculty, which I identify with the term long-term PT faculty, has been neglected in higher education scholarship.

The time period that PT faculty members have worked for the same higher education institution has been used as criterion of analysis of PT faculty in some reports but only superficially. For example, the American Federation of Teachers Higher Education (2010) in its national survey of adjunct and PT faculty used seniority at the institution to describe PT faculty members’ profile. The survey divided PT faculty into three groups: those with five or less years at the institution, those with between 6 and 10 years, and those with 11 or more years (AFT Higher Education, 2010). However, in this report, seniority was used to describe PT faculty as a group and it was not used to explore intergroup comparisons. Gappa (2000), Clery (2001), and the Coalition on the Academic Workforce (CAW, 2012) also explored seniority and found that the average length of
time that a PT faculty member is in their position is over 6 years. These figures evidence “that part-time faculty positions are typically temporary only as a matter of how a position is defined, not how long a person occupies a position” (CAW, 2012 p. 9), and depict PT faculty as able to establish long-term relationships with an institution.

Arguably, long-term PT faculty maintain a work relationship with a given campus for years, regardless of their term-by-term appointment and the limited institutional support associated with their part-time position. The lack of institutional support for this group of PT faculty, as for all faculty, may hinder their potential to perform to their fullest capacity and limit the institution’s potential to achieve its mission and goals (AAUP, 2009; Leslie & Gappa, 2002). However, long-term PT faculty’s time at the institution may enable them to counteract their lack of resources with organizational knowledge to perform their roles and functions. Although there are scholars who portray PT faculty as generally able and committed, it seems that these assertions are anecdotal claims only (Benjamin, 2002), and research on this topic has not been conducted (Kezar & Sam, 2011b). Moreover, there is no exploration of the ways in which long-term PT faculty experience and understand their institutional, personal, professional, and labor conditions and how those understandings influence their work.

**Research Problem**

The circumstances of PT faculty participation in higher education are rationalized as the source for most PT faculty’s limited loyalty and commitment to their job and institution. Recent literature on PT faculty work groups them homogenously, does not account for differences within the group (Cross & Goldenberg, 2009), and over-
generalizes PT faculty as freeway-fliers or gypsy faculty (Leslie & Gappa, 2002). That is, PT faculty are conceptualized as employees (or even labor [Bradley, 2004]) who abandon a given institution easily. Measures of student interest in a class subject, their enrollment in a class, and graduation rates are used to argue that PT faculty contribute poorly to their institutions due to these institutions’ lack of support (Ochoa, 2011). Thus, the general view in the literature that PT faculty members are damaging for higher education, and specifically for teaching, have prevailed.

Although limited institutional support may hinder PT faculty members’ performance and ability to establish a work relationship with a given university, there is evidence in scholarly literature that a share of PT faculty actually commits to an institution for long periods of time (AFT Higher Education, 2010; Clery, 2001; Gappa, 2000; Leslie & Gappa, 2002). Furthermore, research has shown that they perform high quality work not only in teaching (Meixner et al., 2010) but also in other university roles (Gappa et al., 2007). PT faculty express high levels of satisfaction with their job (Antony & Hayden, 2011), which can be even higher than full-time faculty job satisfaction (Antony & Valadez, 2002; Clery, 2001). High job satisfaction, in addition to long-term relationships with a higher education institution, indicates an individual’s commitment not only with a job but also with a given organization (Kahn, 1990; Macey & Schneider, 2008; Maynard & Joseph, 2008). Thus, the prevalent view of PT faculty as partially committed, partially loyal, and, by default, damaging for higher education is an incomplete and even erroneous depiction of PT faculty.
Research that operates from a deficit perspective (i.e., focuses on the disadvantages of PT faculty positions) [Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011] or a narrow perspective (i.e., characterizes all PT faculty as employees) limits both scholarly and practitioner understandings of PT faculty members’ contributions to higher education institutions (Kezar & Sam, 2011b). The marginalized conditions of PT faculty are more than a quality control dilemma for academic institutions (Kupiec, 1991). There is a need for explanations of the ways in which PT faculty members construct a long-term work relationship with different types of higher education institutions (e.g., research universities, doctoral universities, liberal arts colleges, comprehensive universities) and understand their role in the academic profession. Reductionist views of research on contingent faculty limit the understanding of different types of faculty off the tenure-track (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001), particularly PT faculty who have long-term relationships with their institutions. Furthermore, there is a need for research that provides a voice for PT faculty in order to enable them to participate in the definition of their profession. The limited understandings of PT faculty work have as a consequence the reproduction of practices that hinder not only PT faculty roles but also higher education institutions’ goals.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this investigation is to explain the ways in which long-term PT faculty understand their work in, contributions to, and relationship with comprehensive Master’s universities as well as the ways in which they rationalize their role within the academic profession. In this investigation, I use a theoretical framework informed by
organizational theory (Scott, 2014), work engagement theory (Macey & Schneider, 2008), and constructs of literature on the academic profession (Austin, 1990) as well as a qualitative approach based on phenomenology principles (Van Manen, 1990) and methods (Kvale, 1983). This inquiry is guided by a non-deficit perspective, that is, this investigation does not seek to prove or demonstrate that PT faculty are a negative force for higher education, but rather to explain how this population constructs meaning about their role in higher education.

In this investigation, I offer an alternate to the institution-centered definitions of PT faculty work, and focus the analysis of PT faculty work from their own perspective. Moreover, I seek to counteract the overgeneralization of PT faculty as a homogenous group with low commitment and high turnover. In order to achieve this aim, I address the specific ways in which long-term PT faculty describe their professional activities, fulfill demands from the institution, and resolve institutional obstacles that may impede their performance at three public comprehensive Master’s universities. Furthermore, this investigation explores and explains the meanings long-term PT faculty members attach to both the level of institutional support they perceive from the university and the strategies they develop to perform their job given that support or lack thereof.

**Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework for this investigation relies upon work engagement theory (Macey & Schneider, 2008; Simpson, 2009a, 2009b), organizational theory (Meyer, 2008; Scott, 2014; Weick, 1976), and on scholarly notions of the academic profession (Austin, 1990; Braxton, 2011). Work engagement theory (Macey & Schneider,
2008) frames the connection between PT faculty members’ work preferences, their understandings of their formal roles as members of the organization, and their conceptualization of their preferred-self (Kahn, 1990). Organizational theory constructs explain the cultural and structural dimensions (rules, norms, values) that influence but do not constrain rigidly PT faculty’s understandings of their roles and functions as organizational members (Scott, 2014; Weick, 1976). Finally, notions of the academic profession’s cultures and values (Austin, 1990) contextualize PT faculty’s understandings of their role and functions within the academic profession. Altogether, these theoretical constructs frame PT faculty as members of both an organization and a profession who construct a conception of their preferred self that guides their perception of the organization and their relationship with the organization.

**Research Questions**

This research follows a qualitative tradition with a phenomenological approach. As such, an open and broad research question served as the compass to guide this inquiry (Creswell, 2014; Lichtman, 2013): What are the ways in which long-term part-time faculty understand their role in their profession and in the context of public comprehensive Master’s universities? The over-arching question centered my explorations on PT faculty members’ experiences of a given phenomenon.

In addition, a group of associated questions directed my data collection towards different aspects of this phenomenon: How do PT faculty understand and explain their long-term relationship with a public university? What (personal and organizational) elements do PT faculty consider central in this relationship? How did the PT faculty
relationship with the university evolve from a temporal appointment to a long-term appointment? According to part-time faculty, in which ways does the institution support and in which ways does it hinder their work performance? How do PT faculty negotiate institutional support and obstacles? When do these obstacles become a reason to leave the institution? Together, these questions enabled me to accomplish the purpose of this investigation.

**Research Design**

For the research design, I employed qualitative research methods with a social constructivist paradigm (Bogdan & Biklen, 2011; Creswell, 2007; Lichtman, 2013; Silverman, 2011) and a phenomenological approach (Giorgi, 2009; Van Manen, 1990). The social constructivist paradigm of qualitative research methodologies facilitated my understanding and interpretation of social interactions in a particular context (Lichtman, 2013) and provided me with observations to explain the multiple and complex meanings of social reality that individuals create (Creswell, 2007). I used phenomenological methods that led to my understanding of the essential features of a phenomenon from the perspective of those who experience the phenomenon (Giorgi, 2009)—PT faculty with long-term work relationships with comprehensive Master’s universities.

In this investigation, fieldwork enabled me to have personal contact with PT faculty. During fieldwork, I achieved close proximity to the participants and the sources of data, which enabled my understanding of different participants and differences in the meanings of their situations (Patton, 1990, p. 47). The research was designed to focus the data collection process on the phenomenon of study and, at the same time, to remain open
to unexpected data collected during fieldwork (Bogdan & Biklen, 2011). During data collection, I gathered information through in-depth interview of PT faculty (Creswell, 2007; Kvale, 1983) with field notes (Lichtman, 2013) and from formal documents (Bailey, 1994) of the universities and the universities’ system.

The research was conducted during November of 2015 and March of 2016 at three public comprehensive Master’s universities in California, three members of the California State University (CSU) system. The data set included: interviews to 29 long term PT faculty participants, a group of 8 CSU system wide documents, 32 institutional documents with information about each campus as well as 18 PT faculty members’ documents. In addition, I interviewed 22 PT faculty members who did not have long term relationships with the three campus and, therefore, were not part of my studied population but who provided contextual information on the PT faculty position and enriched my understanding of the three universities.

Data were analyzed using specific processes for different data sources. I conducted document analysis, in which concepts from organizational theory served as a tool to analyze the formal and informal context of PT faculty’s work (Meyer, 2008; Tolbert & Zucker, 1996). With this analysis, I generated summary sheets to explain the organizational frame of reference of organizational members (Macey & Schneider, 2008). That is, the formal descriptions of PT faculty work, participation in the campus, and rights and responsibilities. Document analysis was conducted before and during fieldwork, and data from this analysis were used as secondary, as support to my understanding of PT faculty communications.
Interviews were analyzed with a coding and categorizing strategy. During data analysis of the interviews, I searched for regularities in the participants’ experiences (Giorgi, 2009) and for patterns that integrate data (Bogdan & Biklen, 2011; Giorgi, 2009; Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Saldaña, 2016). Theoretical constructs directed the classification and organization of data (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) and served as flexible categories to interpret and understand the phenomenon (Bess & Dee, 2008). That is, categories were modified to represent the data. This stage resulted in interpretation and reflection on the meaning of data and the generation of abstractions with explanatory power (Richards, 2009).

**Significance of the Study**

This investigation generates knowledge about a particular faculty population and a particular institutional type, both addressed in a limited way in previous research. Little is known about PT faculty within the comprehensive university context: the majority of studies on this population focuses on community colleges (Banachowski, 1996) or research universities (Henderson, 2011). Public comprehensive Master’s universities are non-selective institutions that serve an important share of undergraduate students (Henderson, 2009; 2011); they struggle with budget cuts, and have had the largest shift toward contingent labor in the first decade of this century (AFT Higher Education, 2009). By explaining PT faculty as organizational members with long-term working relationships with comprehensive universities, this investigation has the potential not only to help these institutions improve their ability to serve students and fulfill their
missions but also to enrich knowledge on how different institutional types influence work expectations for faculty (Clark, 1987).

The results of this investigation have the potential to support institutional leaders to reconceptualize PT faculty and their work (Gappa et al., 2007). Tenure is not the only strategy to promote quality in higher education (Gappa, 2000), however, tenure has been the solution explored most often in the literature. The new faculty majority’s career paths, skills, and experiences “may not be measurable in conventional terms” (Gappa, 2000, p. 84); thus, there is a need for new considerations of individuals’ contributions to their institution to eliminate status differentials and to develop just treatment of this faculty group (Gappa, 2000). This is particularly important to ensure that “academic appointments, policies, and practices match the diversity of people and tasks that characterize the profession” (Gappa et al., 2007, p. 50). That is, this investigation contributes to understand the larger issue of defining the profession of faculty in face to the multiple staffing arrangements in higher education (Kezar & Sam, 2011a).

This investigation gives a voice to PT faculty to explain their experiences at comprehensive Master’s university settings, and these explanations will enable readers to understand the ways in which institutions help or hinder the establishment of long-term relationships with these faculty group. This investigation provides a voice to PT faculty and continues the conversation on the unacceptable treatment of a vulnerable group (Abbas & McLean, 2001). That is, the results from this investigation can help PT faculty to understand their common conditions, experiences and relationships.
Overview of the Dissertation

I use the next chapter (Chapter Two Literature Review and Theoretical Notions) to explain and make my theoretical notions and argument explicit. In that chapter, I discuss the limitations of the current literature on PT faculty. Then, I conceptualize PT faculty as part of a heterogeneous and complex group, who are members of higher education organizations, who have perceptions of their work and their organization that are more similar to those of professional groups than to those of non-professional groups, who express control over elements of their work (e.g., teaching), and who develop relationships with other organizational members over time. In the last section of Chapter Two, I describe the theoretical and scholarly notions that framed this investigation.

In Chapter Three, I describe and explain the research design and methods employed in this investigation. I explain the principles of a qualitative approach with a phenomenological orientation and provide details about data collection, data collection techniques, the investigation sites, recruitment of participants, data set, and data analysis, as well as my role as a qualitative researcher. I describe qualitative research as a methodology that provides the flexibility necessary to understand and explain PT faculty professional experiences through the researcher’s firsthand contact with their everyday routines (Silverman, 2011). Finally, in this chapter, I provide details about my data analysis and my analytical framework in order to increase this investigation’s trustworthiness.

Chapters Four and Five present the findings of this investigation. In Chapter Four, I answer the secondary research questions related to the characterization of PT faculty
members’ long-term relationship with the university. First, I describe the evolution of the work relationship from PT faculty’s arrival at the institution to their current appointment. I explain both the formal (i.e., workload, rights, duties, and entitlement) and informal changes (i.e., knowledge about the department, relationship with colleagues, better position in PT faculty informal rank than originally) in PT faculty members’ work relationship with the campus that increase their sense of membership in the department. Second, I explain the organizational strategies to support, and the organizational obstacles for, PT faculty’ work performance. I explain the ways in which PT faculty navigate and reconcile the support they received and the obstacles they faced. Finally, I discuss PT faculty members’ reasons to leave and reasons to remain at their campus. I explain that the presence of organizational obstacles has an effect on PT faculty’s organizational commitment and job involvement, but these obstacles are not an automatic cause for PT faculty to intend to leave the campus.

In Chapter Five, I focus on PT faculty members’ definitions of their preferred-self and the ways in which these definitions shaped their behaviors within their campuses. In this chapter, I respond to the question, “What are the ways in which long-term part-time faculty understand their role in their profession and in the context of public comprehensive Master’s universities?” Long-term PT faculty identified themselves as part of the academic profession, as members of professional/disciplinary groups, and as members of university groups. PT faculty members constructed their preferred-self with four roles: to teach, to resolve problems, to provide professionals for their field, and to connect their university (and students) with the needs of the community. PT faculty
members’ roles included values such as responsibility toward their field, the search for new knowledge, collegiality, autonomy, and commitment to service for society. PT faculty members’ definition of their roles as professionals and the values that they attached to those roles guided PT faculty to exceed the expectations of their organizational roles and duties established formally by their universities. Thus, I argue that PT faculty members’ self-definition as professionals benefited their campuses.

Finally, Chapter Six provides conclusions derived from the findings of this investigation. In this chapter, I explain the ways in which Chapters Four and Five enabled me to answer my research questions. In addition, I discuss the advantages that the theoretical notions of this investigation provided for the understanding of the PT faculty population. This chapter also includes a summary of the contributions of my investigation derived from the collected and analyzed data, the theories used, and the epistemological orientation employed. Finally, I explain implications of my findings for theory and practice and I include recommendations for university decision makers.
Chapter Two

Literature Review and Theoretical Notions

There is an implicit notion in scholarly literature that part-time (PT) faculty are employees rather than professionals; thus, literature assumes that they behave as mistreated employees. They are viewed as victims of the circumstances (that stem from lack of organizational support) who respond with low involvement and commitment to the organization (Kezar & Sam, 2011b; Levin, Shaker, & Wagoner, 2011). In some contrast, the argument here is that there is a need for the exploration of PT faculty members' work not as that of employees in a corporation, but as professionals in a higher education organization. The conceptualization of PT faculty as professionals clarifies their work, their position, and their relationship with higher education institutions and reframes current scholarship.

I conceptualize PT faculty as both organizational actors who are directed by organizational regulations, norms, and cultures and professionals who are empowered by values of the academic profession and a given discipline. My basic theoretical assumption is that professional careers have both an organizational and a personal dimension (Braxton, 2011). Each organization provides organizational members with institutional references of behavior, role requirements, and activities (Macey & Schneider, 2008), and this also pertains to higher education organizations and faculty as organizational members. In addition, faculty members’ identification as members of the academic profession and of a given discipline provides them with values about knowledge, performance (Abbas & McLean, 2001), time use, and centrality of teaching
and research (Austin, 1990). That is, the ways in which PT faculty organize their time, conceptualize their work, and express their professional self are rooted in their self-identification as members of the academic profession, their specific discipline, and their higher education institution (Austin, 1990).

Although current literature on PT faculty has a predominantly deficit perspective and ignores PT faculty as individuals, it does provide a background to this investigation. In this chapter, I use the scholarly literature to advance my argument and to make explicit my theoretical notions (Creswell, 2007). First, I discuss in detail the theoretical and methodological limitations of the literature on PT faculty, limitations that justify the significance on this investigation. Second, I explain PT faculty as a heterogeneous group with demographic, academic, contractual, and motivational differences that modify their perceptions of their work, profession, and discipline. Third, I describe PT faculty as members of higher education organizations who express both positive and negative perceptions about the workplace and whose perceptions are more similar to those of professional groups than to those of nonprofessional groups. And fourth, I discuss PT faculty as individuals who express control (i.e., have autonomy) over some elements of their work (i.e., teaching) and whose participation in organizational activities is tied to their relationship with other organizational members, their self-conception as professionals, and their time at a given college or university.

In the last section of this chapter, I include a description of the theoretical notions that guided this inquiry: organizational theory (Meyer, 2008; Scott, 2014; Weick, 1976), work engagement theory (Kahn, 1990; Macey & Schneider, 2008), and scholarly notions
of the academic profession (Austin, 1990; Braxton, 2011). Constructs of organizational theory help me explain the context of PT faculty as members of an organization, one that is different from business organizations and that has both formal and informal structures that enable some latitude in organizational members’ behaviors (Weick, 1976). Work engagement theory helped me to explain individuals as engaged and involved with their work, their specific organization (in this investigation each university), and their professional group (Macey & Schneider, 2008). Notions of the academic profession connect PT faculty members’ understandings of their role and functions to the culture and values of the academic profession (Austin, 1990). Together, these theoretical constructs help me explain the ways in which PT faculty experience long-term relationships with their work and their workplace.

**Methodological and Theoretical Limitations of the Literature on Part-Time Faculty**

Scholarly interest on contingent faculty has grown in the last decades (Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, & August, 2012). However, current scholarly literature on PT faculty has several methodological and theoretical limitations. Methodological limitations of research on PT faculty are related to these studies’ sites, the sample of the studies, and the data employed in what are quantitative pieces primarily. From a theoretical perspective, studies on part-time faculty have used limited theoretical frameworks through which negative assumptions of PT faculty’ work predominate. These limitations indicate gaps in the literature, one of which is the topic of this investigation.

From a methodological perspective, research on PT faculty has three limitations. First, studies on PT faculty focus on their work at community colleges or at all four-year
institutions (e.g., research universities, doctoral universities, comprehensive universities, Master’s universities, liberal arts colleges) as a group (Banachowski, 1996; Meixner, Kruck, & Madden, 2010). Although some studies focus on doctoral universities (e.g., Hoyt, 2012) or research universities (e.g., Waltman et al., 2012) and some offer a comparison between universities and community colleges (e.g., Antony & Hayden, 2011; Benjamin 1998, 2003), most studies fail to explore PT faculty at comprehensive Master’s universities.

Second, research on PT faculty is primarily quantitative (e.g., Antony & Hayden, 2011; Antony & Valadez, 2002; Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011; Benjamin 1998, 2003; Bettinger & Long, 2004; Clery 2001; Cross & Goldenber, 2009; Dobbie & Robinson, 2008; Eagan & Jaeger, 2008, 2009; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Gappa, 2000; Hearn, Milan, & Austin, 2012; Langen, 2011; Monks, 2007, 2009; Toutkoushian & Bellas, 2003; Umbach & Wawrzynski, 2005) and is based on national data and surveys (e.g., Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System; National Study of Postsecondary Faculty [NSOPF], 1993, 1999, 2004). These data sets enable comparison between PT faculty and other faculty types (e.g., full-time faculty, tenure-track faculty, or full-time nontenure-track faculty) and offer a general view of PT faculty’s work that is important for the understanding of general trends in higher education. However, since these data sets have not been created specifically for the study of this population, they do not allow complex analyses of PT faculty’s work.

Finally, few studies have gathered data on PT faculty’s experiences, practices, and conditions from these actors’ perspectives (e.g., Abbas & McLean, 2001; Feldman &
The majority of studies on this population use global indicators of teaching effectiveness (e.g., graduation rates, student persistence) [Ochoa, 2011] to study the unintended negative effects of PT faculty (Banachowski, 1996; Kezar & Sam, 2011b). Although this body of research has shown consistently a negative correlation between “the increased employment of part-time faculty and educational quality” (Levin, Shaker, & Wagoner, 2011, p. 204), these studies fail to establish whether PT faculty are responsible for the negative student outcomes found in higher education institutions (e.g., low persistence or low graduation rates) and, if so, what about them explains this relationship (Ochoa, 2011). Furthermore, measurements that account for the quality of the PT faculty job, their interactions with students, PT faculty’s actual practices, or other institutional factors (such as student population traits or institutional resources) that may influence students’ outcomes are not used in most of these studies (with the exception of Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011). The methodological limitations of these studies are related to the theoretical assumptions that dominate the research on contingent faculty.

Research on PT faculty relies heavily on an academic labor market theoretical perspective, follows a positivist paradigm, and focuses on the negative consequences of the inclusion of contingent positions for the academy and the quality of teaching (Kezar & Sam, 2011b). Kezar and Sam (2011b) found that the majority of scholarly literature on nontenure-track faculty (in which they include PT faculty) is framed with economic and business theories (e.g., hygiene factors, expectance theory, social exchange theory,
morale) developed from nonprofessional groups. Through the use of these theories, contingent faculty are conceptualized as uncommitted, dissatisfied, and underqualified nonprofessionals (Kezar & Sam, 2011b), that is, as employees with high dependency on organizational structures and little agency (Benjamin, 2003; Jacobs, 1998; Waltman et al., 2012).

PT faculty are considered outsiders to the culture of the higher education organizations that hires them (Jacobs, 1998). Studies in 1990s and early 2000s overgeneralize PT faculty as free-way fliers or gipsy faculty with lack of commitment to one institution, a generalization that is not representative of the majority of PT faculty or of PT faculty freelancers (Leslie & Gappa, 2002). In addition, studies on PT faculty, assume that these individuals are in a given institution only temporarily and, thus, have limited knowledge of the institutional culture, roles, norms, values, and symbols (Abbas & McLean, 2001; Jacobs, 1998). Another argument from this viewpoint is that contingent faculty are not qualified for a faculty position (e.g., Benjamin, 1998, 2003) and that the lack of job security of individuals in these positions is considered to diminish their autonomy, academic freedom, collegiality, and participation in decision making (Eagan & Jaeger, 2008; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005). That is, the legitimacy of PT faculty as academics (Levin & Montero-Hernandez, 2014) and their membership in universities and colleges (Morrison, 2008) are called into question on a constant basis.

In the theoretical perspective prevalent for contingent faculty scholarship, PT faculty members’ working conditions are considered to have two negative, and almost inescapable, effects. On the one hand, working conditions place PT faculty in a
disadvantaged position to perform their jobs (Leslie & Gappa, 2002). On the other hand, students’ academic performance is harmed due to their contact with PT faculty (Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011; Bettinger & Long, 2004; Eagan & Jaeger, 2008, 2009; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Landrum, 2009; Ochoa, 2011; Umbach, 2007). Although this body of research does not blame individual PT faculty for the problems in educational quality, and it does suggest that institutional settings hinder their performance (Bousquet, 2008; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Jacobs, 1998; Langen, 2011; Meixner et al., 2010), it assumes that PT faculty lack the strategies, skills, or knowledge to perform professional work in an adverse context.

In sum, a large share of studies emphasizes PT faculty’s negative rather than positive effects on higher education. Theoretical notions used for the study of PT faculty conceptualize them as employees or a labor force rather than as professionals. Research on PT faculty is limited in specific institutional types, primarily universities. Literature on PT faculty conceptualized PT faculty as non-members with short-term presence at higher education institutions. There is a dearth of studies that analyze PT faculty members’ participation in other academic (i.e., research, scholarly publications) and organizational activities (i.e., committees, departmental meetings, decision-making) besides teaching. And, finally, few studies recognize the contributions of PT faculty to post-secondary institutions or include PT faculty members’ perspectives and views.

Together, the limitations in the literature indicate a need for an exploration of PT faculty that goes beyond the negative consequences of the unfair and exploitative treatment of PT faculty, and makes room for analyses of their contributions to higher
education, their professional behaviors, their expressions of membership to an institution, and that give voice to their understandings of their work, institution, and profession. Such exploration needs to take into consideration that differences within PT faculty subgroups exist, that PT faculty’s perceptions of their work, profession, and discipline vary according to personal and organizational characteristics, and that their construction of relationships with the workplace is mediated by other organizational members.

**PT Faculty as a Heterogeneous Group**

PT faculty are a heterogeneous group (Rhoades, 1998) with demographic, academic, contractual, and motivational differences that modify their perception of their work (Feldman & Turley, 2001), organization, and profession. There is diversity within the PT faculty group related to their disciplinary field (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001), the institutional type in which they work, their appointment (Thedwall, 2008), and their demographic characteristics, such as gender and ethnicity (Antony & Hayden, 2011). In addition, PT faculty have different employment preferences and personal motivations to seek a PT appointment (Gappa et al., 2007; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Levin & Montero-Hernandez, 2014; Monks, 2009). That is, the ways in which individual PT faculty members experience and perceive their work, their organization, and their relationship with colleagues differs according to individual characteristics and employment preferences.

PT faculty, similarly to full-time faculty (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006), have various disciplinary backgrounds (Gappa, 2000; Shaker, 2008) and disciplinary backgrounds shape the experiences, commitment, and plans of action of nontenure-track
faculty (Kezar & Sam, 2011a). Gappa (2000) reports that the disciplines with higher proportions of PT faculty in the 1990s were: law, fine arts, English and literature, computer science, mathematics and statistics; and the disciplines with the lowest inclusion of PT faculty were economics, political science, and biological and physical sciences. Individuals from different disciplinary fields are socialized into the behaviors and attitudes that are valued and expected in their specific field (Austin, 1990). The disciplinary field is a “dominant force” that guides an individual’s linkage to higher education organizations (Clark, 1987a, p. 25). For example, individuals from the humanities and traditional academic fields (e.g., English) are socialized to aspire to a faculty position as primary employment (Austin & McDaniels, 2006; Shaker, 2008), while individuals in vocational and professional fields may seek job positions in non-educational organizations primarily (Jacobs, 1998).

For faculty, disciplines vary in the “relationship between teaching and research, and the patterns of interaction among scholars” (Austin & McDaniels, 2006, p. 398). That is, PT faculty have different expectations of what their work is about, how they are supposed to carry it out, and how their relationships with their colleagues are supposed to occur, and these differences relate to their different disciplines. For example, faculty in the hard sciences put a heavier weight on research than on teaching as center of their professional activities (Becher, 1994). In addition, Baldwin and Wawrzynski (2011) found that there are more differences in the teaching practices of faculty from different disciplines, than among faculty from different appointment types (i.e., full-time or a part-
time). Moreover, PT faculty from similar disciplinary fields report similar strategies for teaching and of interaction with students (Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011).

When PT faculty member’s expectations of what is their role in the higher education organization matches their actual role in the workplace, they express positive attitudes and affective commitment towards the organization (Maynard & Joseph, 2008). Since these expectations are tied to PT faculty’s disciplinary background (Austin, 1990), it follows that an individual’s disciplinary background shapes not only her/his expectations but also their perceptions of their work and workplace. For example, studies on job satisfaction have found that vocationally oriented PT faculty report higher levels of job satisfaction than liberal arts PT faculty (Benjamin, 1998). Moreover, Kezar and Sam (2011a, p. 13) identified that one of the major differences noted in the literature between liberal arts and vocational disciplines is that “non-tenure-track faculty in vocational and professional areas often have other employment and are not interested in full-time employment in the academy.” Thus, PT faculty’s perceptions of the focus of their work, the academic profession, and their role in their profession differ between disciplines, and these differences merit recognition (this argument is based on Becher’s [1994] work on disciplinary differences in the academic profession).

Demographic characteristics of PT faculty (age, gender, race and ethnicity) also play a role in their experiences in higher education organizations. PT faculty are more concentrated at the ends of the age range (under 35 or over 64) than full-time faculty (JBL Associates, 2008). In addition, female and minority faculty are more represented in the academic profession than in previous years but they participate more as PT faculty
than as full-timers (AFT Higher Education, 2010; Clery, 2016; JBL Associates, 2008; Rhoades, 1998; Toutkoushian & Bellas, 2003). For example, in 2014, 59 percent of instructors and 57 percent of lecturers in higher education were women (Clery, 2016). Moreover, PT faculty at public four-year institutions in the U.S. are almost evenly divided between women and men (AFT Higher Education, 2010) and the 2004 National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) shows that the number of African American and Hispanic faculty members as PT faculty is higher than their number within faculty as a whole (Antony & Hayden, 2011).

Personal characteristics such as age, gender, race, and ethnicity modify the ways in which faculty (PT faculty included) are treated and expected to behave in higher education institutions. These personal characteristics interact in complex ways with one another (and with other characteristics such as sexuality and socioeconomic class) and form the “social location” of an individual, that is, the position from which an individual experiences and perceives the world (McDonald, 2013, p. 129). For example, young White males from a low socioeconomic background experience the world differently from young queer males who are middle class (McDonald, 2013). Studies at four-year institutions suggest that faculty jobs are institutionally gendered (Allan, 2011; Bechtold, 2008; Clark S., 1998; Lester, 2008; Martin, 1994). Female faculty are pressured to take contingent jobs due to more onerous family obligations than their male counterparts (Toutkoushian & Bellas, 2003) and incompatibility between biological and tenure clocks (Aanerud, Morrison, Homer, & Elizabeth, 2007; Martin, 1994). Moreover, female faculty are expected to have closer relationships with students than male faculty (Lester, 2008)
and are compelled to perform “smile work”—presenting themselves as always pleasing and agreeable (Gappa et al., 2007, p. 79). In addition, studies have found that faculty of color face issues of discrimination (from colleagues and students) in predominantly White institutions (e.g., Gregory, 2001; Hendrix, 2007). For example, faculty of color may face challenges to their credentials and intellect in the classroom by their colleagues (Turner, Gonzales, & Wood, 2008). That is, these personal characteristics play a role in the particular experiences of PT faculty in the workplace and, thus, in their perception of the workplace. However, these experiences are also perceived by PT faculty members through the lenses of their employment preferences.

Personal decisions, motivations, and an individual’s preference of employment on a part-time or a full-time basis and on a tenured or a nontenure-track position comprise another layer of distinction among PT faculty (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Gappa et al., 2007; Levin & Montero-Hernandez, 2014; Lefebvre, 2008; Maynard & Joseph, 2008; Monks, 2009). Gappa and Leslie (1993) identified different motivations for individuals to hold a PT appointment (and used these motivations to classify PT faculty in subgroups): interest to continue in the job market after retirement (i.e., career enders), willingness to share specialized knowledge and to form future professionals (i.e., specialist, experts, and professionals), pursuit of a full-time appointment that has the PT faculty position as a step toward this goal (i.e., aspiring academics), and preference to work in multiple organizations (i.e., freelancers). Other motivations to seek a PT faculty position include flexibility in the use of time and space, to have contact with students and faculty, to contribute to other professional activities, to have ability to manage family and other
commitments effectively, ability to keep currency in the field and discipline, and to participate in an intellectual atmosphere (Feldman & Turley, 2001; Lefebvre, 2008). In recent studies, PT faculty motivations are clustered in two groups related to whether individuals hold a PT position voluntarily or involuntarily.

Voluntary part-time faculty are those individuals who self-identify as preferring part-time work, while involuntary part-time faculty are those individuals who self-identify as preferring a full-time academic position (Antony & Hayden, 2011; Maynard & Joseph, 2008)—Gappa and Leslie (1993) referred to involuntary PT faculty as aspiring academics. The proportion of voluntary and involuntary part-time faculty is not fixed; indeed, it seems to fluctuate. Antony and Hayden (2011) identify that 39% of PT faculty who responded to the NSOPF 1993 were involuntary part-timers. The 1999 NSOPF offers inconsistent figures: It indicates both that 58% of PT faculty are involuntary part-timers and that 76% prefer a part-time position (Clery, 2001). Monks (2009), using figures of the 2004 NSOPF, reports that 65% of PT faculty are voluntary part-timers and the AFT Higher Education’s (2010) survey finds that 53% PT faculty are voluntary part-timers. Although these figures vary, they show that there is an important share of PT faculty whose preference is the position they occupy. PT faculty’s personal preference of appointment plays a role in the ways in which PT faculty both understand their relationship with the university (Abbas & MacLean, 2001; Gappa et al., 2007) and perceive their universities’ organizational behaviors towards them (AFT Higher Education, 2010; Maynard & Joseph, 2008).
PT faculty members’ employment preference is tied to PT faculty’s job satisfaction and perception of the organization (AFT Higher Education, 2010; Maynard & Joseph, 2008). For example, graduate students who are aspiring academics can be less critical of their work circumstances because they perceive the poor conditions of work as a short-term “sacrifice” for a future career (Abbas & McLean, 2001). For some voluntary PT faculty, the intrinsic satisfaction of teaching is sufficient for them to have a positive perception of their university (Gappa et al., 2007). In contrast, involuntary part-timers may see their position as problematical (Levin & Montero-Hernandez, 2014) or even as a career failure, and can be more dissatisfied with their work circumstances (e.g., compensation and job security) than voluntary part-timers (AFT Higher Education, 2010; Maynard & Joseph, 2008). That is, PT faculty in the same work circumstances perceive such circumstances differently, depending in part on their employment preference—with voluntary PT faculty expressing more positive perceptions about their jobs than involuntary PT faculty (Maynard & Joseph, 2008). PT faculty members’ preference of a PT faculty position is also a central element for the expression of commitment to an organization and willingness to stay in a given university (organizational loyalty) [Hoyt, 2012; Maynard & Joseph, 2008].

PT faculty have diverse expectations and perceptions of their work, profession, relationship with colleagues, and role in higher education organizations. These perceptions are tied to personal differences and characteristics. Differences within the PT faculty population characterize PT faculty as a complex group with complex perceptions of their role as faculty. That is, for each PT faculty member, his or her disciplinary
background interacts with their employment preference and their specific experiences due to their race and ethnicity, gender, and age, and shapes their perceptions of those experiences. In addition, expectations and perceptions are likely to be similar for individuals in a given disciplinary field (Austin, 1990) and with similar motivations (Feldman & Turley, 2001; Gappa & Leslie, 1993) and employment preferences (Antony & Hayden, 2011; Monks, 2009; Toutkoushian & Bellas, 2003). The perceptions of PT faculty regarding their work share another similarity: they are analogous to those of professional groups.

**PT Faculty’s Complex Perceptions of their Work and their Workplace**

PT faculty are members of higher education organizations with simultaneous positive and negative perceptions of their work and of their universities as workplaces. That is, although PT faculty perceive their circumstances as problematical, they express positive views of their work at their organization (Gappa, 2000; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Leslie & Gappa, 2002). Research and national surveys on PT faculty’s job satisfaction provide a general view of their attitudes toward their work and their institutions. Research that has measured job satisfaction finds that PT faculty members’ perceptions of their work and their work related satisfaction are more similar to those of professional groups than to those of nonprofessional groups (Kezar & Sam, 2011b). Arguably, when PT faculty negotiate their negative and positive perceptions of their workplace, they give greater centrality to their personal interest on the work and to the campus social environment than to their employment circumstances.
Studies on nontenure-track faculty members’ job satisfaction conceptualize job satisfaction as a measure of the perception that a given individual has of their work environment\(^1\) (Antony & Hayden, 2011; Gappa, 2000; Hoyt, 2012; Waltman et al., 2012) and associate low job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction with individual faculty stress and institutional turnover (Akroyd, Bracken, & Chambers, 2011). Early studies operationalized job satisfaction as an all-embracing, general measure (Bess & Dee, 2008)—individuals were either satisfied or dissatisfied with their job as a whole. From this viewpoint, PT faculty’s dissatisfaction with any aspect of their work circumstances would push them, invariably, to leave an organization. In recent studies, this view has changed.

Current definitions of job satisfaction reflect that individuals express various levels of satisfaction with different aspects of their work life, simultaneously (Antony & Valadez, 2002; Bess & Dee, 2008; Feldman & Turley, 2001). This applies to both professional and nonprofessional groups, and to faculty, among them PT faculty, as well. For example, Gappa (2000) analyzed the 1993 NSOPF and found that PT faculty express high intrinsic satisfaction with their work and moderate satisfaction with salary, concurrently. With measures of job satisfaction that differentiate work-related from circumstances-related satisfaction, it is possible to identify that various intrinsic drivers of job satisfaction (those related to the job) and extrinsic drivers of job satisfaction (those

---

\(^1\) This definition has skewed the study of job satisfaction and the majority of measures have been made about work circumstances, what in two-factor theory (Herzberg, 1968) are called hygiene factors, while the satisfaction with the work itself, or motivators, have been studied less.
related to the job circumstances) have different centrality for PT faculty (Maynard & Joseph, 2008; Toutkoushian & Bellas, 2003).

PT faculty members express negative perceptions of their work circumstances, that is, of the treatment they receive from the university as a workplace. PT faculty express low satisfaction and even dissatisfaction with employment conditions such as job security or its lack thereof (AFT Higher Education, 2010; Clery, 2001; Feldman & Turley, 2001; Gappa, 2000; Maynard & Joseph, 2008; Waltman et al., 2012), salary (AFT Higher Education, 2010; Antony & Hayden, 2011; Hoyt, 2012; Maynard & Joseph, 2008), benefits (AFT Higher Education, 2010; Antony & Hayden, 2011; Clery, 2001; Hoyt, 2012), and advancement opportunities (Feldman & Turley, 2001). In addition, PT faculty express limited satisfaction and dissatisfaction with organizational characteristics of their job such as room set up, teaching schedule (Hoyt, 2012), and lack of opportunities to advance (Gappa, 2000; Waltman et al., 2012). These figures reflect two judgments. First, PT faculty do not consider their employment circumstances as ideal, and, second, PT faculty are critical of the organizational support they receive.

This critical view of their higher education organization and the organizational support they receive from campuses is not a surprise given PT faculty members’ employment circumstances. Salary and benefits are limited for this population. PT faculty at four-year institutions obtained a median pay per a three-credit course of $2,900, in fall 2010 (The Coalition on the Academic Workforce [CAW], 2012, p. 33), which is not enough to maintain a household (Goldstene, 2012). In addition, PT faculty members have limited access to on campus orientation or teaching development programs (Gappa et al.,
In a large number of institutions, PT faculty are not provided with office space—or have only a shared office—and have limited access to telephone, computers (Eagan & Jaeger, 2008), or institutional e-mail addresses (Meixner et al., 2010). For example, Meixner et al. (2010) found that PT faculty were given institutional e-mails but they could access them only intermittently.

Regardless of their less than ideal employment circumstances and the negative perceptions of their universities as workplaces, PT faculty members tend to express more enthusiasm for their work than is expected from a managerial perspective (Gappa, 2000; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Leslie & Gappa, 2002), and they even express higher levels of overall job satisfaction than their tenure line counterparts (Akroyd et al., 2011; Antony & Valadez, 2002; Clery, 2001; Hoyt, 2012;), who have better employment conditions. Furthermore, PT faculty express enjoyment for their work (AFT Higher Education, 2010; Antony & Valadez, 2002; Lefebvre, 2008; Meixner et al., 2010). It follows that a condition other than pecuniary remuneration is the basis of PT faculty’s positive attitudes towards their work. Donoghue (2008) suggests that a few “magic moments” in the classroom are rewarding enough to offset the constant material deprivation PT faculty experience. However, Donohue’s view disregards the positive perceptions that PT faculty have of their work itself and of the non-material circumstances of their work.

PT faculty members express positive perceptions of their work and its core activities. That is, the drivers of PT faculty satisfaction with their job stem from the work itself (Hoyt, 2012; Kezar & Sam, 2011b). PT faculty enjoy teaching (Antony & Valadez, 2002; Hoyt, 2012; Meixner et al., 2010), tutoring and mentoring students (Waltman et al.,
helping students to learn (Hoyt, 2012; Waltman et al., 2012), and keeping themselves current in their field (Hoyt, 2012; Feldman & Turley, 2001; Lefebvre, 2008). PT faculty members are engaged in the work they enjoy and that brings them satisfaction (Antony & Valadez, 2002) in part from their relationship with students (Waltman et al., 2012). The characteristics of the student population, PT faculty’s ability to work with a specific type of students (e.g., graduate students, minority students, high quality students), and their relationships with students are sources of satisfaction for PT faculty and motivation to stay in the campus (Antony & Valadez, 2002; Lefebvre, 2008; Waltman et al., 2012). That is, PT faculty express positive attitudes not only about their work itself, but also about the specific people with whom they relate when they carry out their work.

Social connections of PT faculty with colleagues, which are part of the campus social environment, are a central determinant of this group’s positive perceptions of the workplace (Antony & Valadez, 2002; Valadez & Antony, 2001; Hoyt, 2012; Waltman et al., 2012) and influence PT faculty members’ intent to stay in one university (Hoyt, 2012). Faculty report high levels of job satisfaction in organizations with a strong sense of fraternity, pride, and interdependence (Lund, 2003), that is, with a collegial social environment. For PT faculty, a sense of involvement in an institution (i.e., their relationships with faculty and chairs, participation in meetings and decision making, and long-term contracts) is the most important variable for job satisfaction (Hoyt, 2012). For some nontenure-track faculty, the ability to have social interactions with other faculty members is the primary reason of enjoyment of their position (Feldman & Turley, 2001).
In addition, colleagues’ recognition and respect play a key role in PT faculty’s sense of integration into the academic community and into campus life, and, thus, in their positive perception of the university as a workplace (Gappa, 2000; Waltman et al., 2012).

Low salary, job insecurity, and limited benefits, although problematical and sources of dissatisfaction for PT faculty, do not push PT faculty to leave an institution or to seek a new place for employment automatically (Antony & Valadez, 2002; Antony & Hayden, 2011). Indeed, the AFT higher education survey of PT and adjunct faculty, reports that the majority of PT faculty (85 percent) expect to continue working at the same institution (AFT Higher Education, 2010; see also Hoyt, 2012). The work itself and PT faculty members’ relationship with their colleagues and students motivate PT faculty to stay at the university and to perceive their work as important, recognized, and respected (Antony & Valadez, 2002; Hoyt, 2012; Waltman et al., 2012).

Studies on job satisfaction portray PT faculty as more likely to be motivated by the internal drivers of satisfaction (i.e., love of the discipline, enjoyment of teaching, positive interactions with colleagues) often important to professionals, than by extrinsic drivers of satisfaction (i.e., salary, job security, benefits) which are more central to nonprofessional groups (Kezar & Sam, 2011b). Arguably, PT faculty negotiate their negative and positive perceptions of their work, work circumstances, and workplace more as professionals with a calling than as employees in a corporation. This suggest that PT faculty members’ set plan on a long term stay at a given campus due to their personal connection to the profession, their organization, and their colleagues.
PT Faculty Members’ Work and Work Autonomy

In this section, I explore the characteristics and extent of PT faculty members’ participation in teaching and research (as the core functions of the academic profession [Braxton, 2011; Williams, 2008]), and service (as a role of academic professionals [Braxton, 2011]). I use this as a foundation to explain PT faculty as professionals who express control (autonomy) over some aspects of their work while other aspects remain out of reach for them. I use the literature on PT faculty to argue that part-timers’ participation in organizational activities is tied not only to their formal contract but also to their relationships with other organizational members, their self-conception as professionals, their personal interest, and their time at a given college or university. Finally, in this section, I explore the positive and negative implications of PT faculty members’ sense of control over their work as an aspect of their professional identity.

PT faculty roles. The academic profession at four-year higher education institutions has been associated traditionally with three functions: research, teaching, and service (Braxton, 2011; Ochoa, 2011; Reybold, 2003). Teaching and research are considered the core functions of the academic profession (Braxton, 2011; Williams, 2008) to which faculty assign most of their time and mental energy. Service is a secondary, yet important, faculty role (Braxton, 2011) that extends the reach of teaching and research beyond academe (Reybold & Corda, 2011). PT faculty take part in these three functions to different degrees.

PT faculty work in a teaching-centered position (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Gappa, 2000; Ochoa, 2011); their main function is the dissemination of knowledge
through teaching (Meixner et al., 2010). PT faculty are hired to teach a specific course (in-class, online, or laboratory) and they teach specialized knowledge, practice based and profession based educational content (Banachowski, 1996; Bettinger & Long, 2004; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Jacobs, 1998; Langen, 2011; Lundy & Warme, 1990), as well as introductory and general education courses in liberal arts fields (Bettinger & Long, 2004; Clery, 2001; Eagan & Jaeger, 2008). Teaching is a complex function that involves in-class and out of class activities as well as administrative tasks: to revise syllabus, to organize class sessions, to organize assignments, to explain content, to offer office hours, to evaluate knowledge, and to register grades (Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011; Schuetz, 2002). Thus, teaching involves interactions with students and staff, and to, a lesser degree, with other faculty members (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Although customarily, PT faculty are not included in other non-teaching related activities (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Rajagopal, 2002), some PT faculty at four-year institutions are involved in research (Eagan & Jaeger, 2008) and scholarly publication (Clery, 2001). Unless hired specifically for that, which is more common for full-time nontenure-track faculty and graduate student researchers than for part-timers (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Eagan & Jaeger, 2008; Levin & Shaker, 2011), PT faculty do not participate in research at their universities officially. Thus, universities lack formal structures for PT faculty involvement in research (Gappa & Leslie, 1993)—and there is little or no scholarly research of PT faculty involvement in research. Nevertheless, PT faculty partake in various forms of scholarly publication such as articles, books, textbooks, monographs, reports, book reviews, performances, and art exhibitions (Clery,
2001) related to their field, to the scholarship of teaching, or to their experience as academics (e.g., Burk, 2000; Kupiec, 1991). These publications, however, are not considered by higher education organizations as part of PT faculty members’ organizational roles (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Rajagopal, 2002). PT faculty’s scholarly production depends on these individuals’ disposition to work on such tasks.

Similar to research, service is not a role in which PT faculty are expected to participate in most universities. In particular, PT faculty are excluded from governance and decision making (Burk, 2000; Lechuga, 2006; Rajagopal, 2002). Regardless of a formal exclusion, in some institutions, PT faculty are allowed, informally, to attend to these activities (Burk, 2000; Levin & Montero-Hernandez, 2014; Waltman et al., 2012). PT faculty are not expected to participate in department meetings and are not eligible for committees, but their department (i.e., full-time colleagues, department heads or chairs) may both allow and invite them to attend department meetings (Levin & Montero-Hernandez, 2014; Morrison, 2008). However, they do not have a vote in the matters discussed (Burk, 2000; Donohue, 2008; Lechuga, 2006; Morrison, 2008; Rajagopal, 2002). That is, in instances in which PT faculty are allowed to participate in decision making activities, policy prevents their full participation. Scholars agree that PT faculty’s exclusion from departmental meetings and decision making prevents not only their contributions but also their integration to institutional processes (Levin & Montero-Hernandez, 2014; see also Burk, 2000). Measures of faculty participation in service are limited at best (Reybold & Corda, 2011), and there is no clear measure of PT faculty
members’ actual time usage in institutional service or external service, but PT faculty’s participation in service is a function of their active effort to be included in such tasks.

In sum, PT faculty formal work expectations are related to teaching primarily, however, they take part in the three core functions of faculty (teaching, research, service) to different degrees. PT faculty partake in research and service to a lesser degree than to teaching—a smaller number of PT faculty than full-time faculty participate in research and service. PT faculty members’ have and enact various degrees of autonomy, empowerment, disempowerment, and control over teaching, research, and service at their higher education institutions.

**PT faculty sense of control over their work.** Autonomy and academic freedom are two values related to the culture of the academic profession (Austin, 1990). These values are conceptualized as individual academics’ freedom to pursue academic activities (teaching, research) “in a manner and to an end of their own choosing” (Williams, 2008, p. 541). That is, autonomy and academic freedom imply that faculty have control over the organization of their work. PT faculty’s autonomy is limited due to their contract (Rhoades, 1998). As described above, their contract limits their participation in research and service. However, there is evidence in the literature that PT faculty express some degree of control in teaching and in their participation in other departmental activities and that this sense of control has consequences for PT faculty professional identity (Levin & Montero-Hernandez, 2014).

**Teaching.** PT faculty perceive teaching as an activity that is directly under their control (Levin & Montero-Hernandez, 2014). PT faculty not only enact autonomy to
design and deliver courses in their own special areas with their own theoretical and pedagogical perspectives (Abbas & McLean, 2001) but also they identify their own capabilities, their professional development needs (Meixner et al., 2010), and the institutional obstacles to conduct their teaching roles (Thirolf, 2012). They are not just followers of management guidelines of what to teach or how to do so, they have opinions about the courses they teach and they consider themselves capable of making contributions to the program and department (Abbas & McLean, 2001; Burk, 2000).

The teaching role is central for PT faculty’s self-definition or professional identity. Abbas and McLean (2001), Thirolf (2012), and Levin and Montero-Hernandez (2014) used professional identity theory and professionalism constructs to analyze PT faculty understandings of teaching and perceptions of self. The three studies found that PT faculty decided to teach in a higher education institution because they responded to a “calling” (Abbas & McLean, 2001; Levin & Montero-Hernandez, 2014; Thirolf, 2012). PT faculty sought to perform this activity regardless of the negative discourses associated with part-time faculty work (Thirolf, 2012) and acted it not only responsibly but also critically (Abbas & McLean, 2001; Levin & Montero-Hernandez, 2014; Thirolf, 2012). In addition, PT faculty perceived that teaching had implications beyond the classroom or class session (Meixner et al., 2010). Teaching was seen by these PT faculty as an activity that had out of the classroom implications: it was a “pathway to fight [students’] alienated states of mind” (Levin & Montero-Hernandez, 2014, p. 550). Teaching, then, provided PT faculty a basis to define themselves as effective and specialized workers who have
autonomy in the classroom and whose work has social implications (Levin & Montero-Hernandez, 2014; Meixner et al., 2010).

Teaching also enables PT faculty to create connections with the higher education institution in which they work (Abbas & McLean, 2001; Levin & Montero-Hernandez, 2014), or at least reduce their feelings of disconnection from the institution (Levin & Montero-Hernandez, 2014; Thirolf, 2012). The teaching role is considered by PT faculty as central for the institution because it is aligned with the traditional mission of higher education institutions (Levin & Montero-Hernandez, 2014). In addition, through teaching, PT faculty connect with students and create meaningful learning experiences (Levin & Montero-Hernandez, 2014). Interactions with students provide PT faculty with enjoyment and personal and professional pride—for example, students’ expressions of interest to be in a professor’s class is a form of recognition of their work (Thirolf, 2012). Levin and Montero-Hernandez (2014) argue that the relationships PT faculty establish with students help them develop a sense of connection to the institution and the institutional mission that might be absent otherwise (I explore this disconnection in the section “Lack of control over work and PT faculty’s professional identity”).

**Non-teaching activities.** There is an absence of studies that explore PT faculty members’ participation in research and service (as discussed in the first section of this chapter, the majority of studies on PT faculty focus on their teaching role). Thus, this section focuses on what current PT faculty studies indicate about their inclusion in departmental activities. In optimal circumstances, nontenured faculty receive support from their department chair to participate in departmental activities and, thus, become
valued and established colleagues in a department (Gappa et al., 2007) with some degree of control over their participation in non-teaching activities. But, this is not always the case.

Studies argue consistently that PT faculty express little or no control over their participation in non-teaching activities—in particular, in departmental matters and institutional decision making. That is, PT faculty may decide and pursue these activities but their actual ability to participate is limited by organizational structures. For example, Burk (2000) describes that her attempts to participate in departmental activities were stymied by her department’s culture and customs that positioned PT faculty as disempowered foreigners in the department. PT faculty members’ participation in departmental activities such as departmental meetings or committees depends on tenure line faculty, department chairs, program coordinators, and other mid-level administrators (Burk, 2000; Donohue, 2008; Gappa et al., 2007; Lechuga, 2006; Morrison, 2008; Rajagopal, 2002). PT faculty themselves have little opportunity to decide in hiring processes, curricular changes, program offerings, or research agendas (Abbas & McLean, 2001; Feldman & Turley, 2001; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Rhoades, 1998; Waltman et al., 2012). Moreover, nontenure-track faculty have no input or voice on the future of their career in the university (Feldman & Turley, 2001). However, given that PT faculty are not required formally to participate in departmental activities, in some cases, PT faculty can exert control over teaching activities by making the decision of avoiding to participate in non-teaching activities.
In situations in which PT faculty can participate in non-teaching activities, PT faculty may decide to exclude themselves from such activities as a survival strategy (Morrison, 2008). For example, faculty off-the tenure-track see participation in specific activities (e.g., governance) as a risk to be associated with an unpopular administrative decision (Morrison, 2008). Moreover, PT faculty may remain silent about problems in their practice related to the poor work circumstances that they experience as a strategy to protect future opportunities to work at an institution (Abbas & McLean, 2001). In these examples, self-exclusion is a result of PT faculty’s lack of job security and is a strategy to gain control over teaching. Nevertheless, other reasons for self-exclusion stem not from PT faculty members’ sense of oppression, but from their personal work preferences.

PT faculty also decide not to become incorporated fully into department life or a higher education institution based on their personal preferences of time usage, their attempt to avoid departmental problems, or due to a critical view of the culture of their department (Abbas & McLean, 2001; Morrison, 2008). Levin and Montero-Hernandez (2014) found that for some PT faculty, particularly those who were voluntarily part-timers, conditions of exclusion and institutional detachment were not experienced with resentment, and that they did not perceive that their professional value was diminished for lack of inclusion in departmental activities. Furthermore, individuals at the three institutions studied (which included a community college, a research university, and a Master’s university) self-excluded from departmental meetings and other activities as a strategy to maintain a focus on academic matters and to avoid unnecessary stressors (Levin & Montero-Hernandez, 2014).
PT faculty members’ self-exclusion from departmental activities can then become an individual’s approach to maintain autonomy and control over their work. Abbas and McLean (2001) found that participants in their study of PT faculty in Sociology departments in the U.K. expressed a critical view of their department’s organization (e.g., decisions about curriculum, values attached to sociologists, personnel decisions, political views). Thus, they avoided full participation in the department. PT faculty decided to maintain distance from departmental activities because they perceived that the culture of the department had negative effects on the course content—for example, feminism and lesbianism were topics valued by the participants but not included in their institutions’ curriculum (Abbas & McLean, 2001). Thus, participation in (and self-exclusion from) non-teaching activities can be related not only to organizational structures but also to individuals’ perceptions of the negative consequences of such participation.

In sum, PT faculty expressions of control over their work differ regarding teaching and non-teaching activities. Arguably, in a problematical organizational setting (e.g., a polarized environment), PT faculty express control over non-teaching activities by enacting their decision of self-exclusion from what seems problematical circumstances as shown by Abbas and McLean (2001) and Levin and Montero-Hernandez’s (2014) studies. However, there is evidence in these studies that PT faculty seek more control over their work and work environment through their interest in meetings and other departmental activities. PT faculty members’ sense of control and autonomy over teaching, as do the characteristics of PT faculty job satisfaction described in the previous section, position PT faculty closer to a professional than to an occupational group. In
addition, attitudes such as a sense of calling, appreciation for the occupation, responsible and critical practice, and social value of the task, are expressed by PT faculty, are associated to professionalism (Hatch, 1988) and a self-perception as member of a profession (Levin & Shaker, 2011). Conversely, the limited control that they have over their work and organizational functions and rights has negative implications for PT faculty members’ perception of a professional self and organizational membership. Levin and Shaker (2008) call this the background for the development and establishment of a professional identity. This is the topic of the following section.

**Lack of control over work and PT faculty’s professional identity.** Studies on professional identity have found that PT faculty members’ understandings of their professional self are informed by their employment circumstances at a given institution and their relationships with peers and students, as well as with their own definition of teaching (Levin & Montero-Hernandez, 2014; Thirolf, 2013). According to these studies, although PT faculty express passion, love, and appreciation for teaching (Meixner et al. 2010; Thirolf, 2013) and may perceive that they have control over this activity, low payment and organizational support may lead them to a negative perception of themselves as professionals and organizational members (Burk, 2000; Kupiec, 1991). Moreover, Gappa and Leslie (1993) report that PT faculty expressed feelings of being second-class citizens in a bifurcated academic profession in which they were at a disadvantage. Similar accounts have been voiced in more recent research pieces on nontenure-track faculty (e.g., Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Levin & Shaker, 2011; Thirolf, 2012).
Limited support and resources have an effect on the image PT faculty convey to students (Abbas & McLean, 2001; Burk, 2000). Burk (2000) and Kupiec (1991), on their analysis of their own experiences as PT faculty in a community college and a university respectively, explain that limited resources affected their sense of control over teaching as well as their relationships with students. For example, Burk (2000) argued that the lack of a personal office to meet with students created “awkward meetings” in public places in which she did not have control over the environment to make students feel safe or to help them reveal personal information. Participants in Abbas and McLean’s (2001, p. 347) study reported that the organization of space in their department (lack of offices or shared offices) limited the participants’ ability to “look in control” or maintain a “professional” image during interactions with students. That is, the lack of control over the material circumstances of their employment has an effect over faculty presentation of their professional identity (Levin & Shaker, 2011).

Lack of resources and support are experienced by PT faculty as problematical for their self-perception as organizational members (Burk, 2000; Levin & Montero-Hernandez, 2014; Kupiec, 1991; Thirolf, 2012). Participants in Thirolf’s (2012) study qualified their by-the-hour payment as a signal of their “second class citizen[ship]” at their college. Kupiec (1991) described that the limited organizational resources directed to teaching indicated to her that this activity was devalued and positioned as secondary to research in her university. PT faculty in Levin and Montero-Hernandez’s (2014) study perceived exclusion and indifference from the institution, and this had a negative influence on the ways in which they perceived themselves as professionals. That is,
deficient organizational support and a lack of inclusion into departments’ and full-timers’
activities (Rajagopal, 2002) are experienced by PT faculty as an institutional form of
disconnection and oppression (Meixner et al. 2010) and affect their identity, positioning
them as marginalized organizational members.

PT faculty members’ perceptions of their position in, and relationship with, the
department are informed by the treatment they receive from their colleagues in their
department (Abbas & McLean, 2001; Thirolf, 2012, 2013). PT faculty may experience a
“dearth of emotional connectivity” with others in the institution (Meixner et al. 2010, p.
146). Limited collegial interaction is related to PT faculty members’ feelings of lack of
respect from their peers (Burk, 2000; Kupiec 1991; Meixner et al. 2010; Thirolf, 2012),
as well as lack of institutional acknowledgement and social value (Levin & Montero-
Hernandez, 2014). PT faculty’s position in the department is a central part of their
construction of identity (Levin & Montero-Hernandez, 2014). The constant divide
between tenure line and PT faculty may deteriorate PT faculty members’ self-perception:
“From years of living with the professional understanding that I was not an equal
participant in the life of the profession, my university, or my department, I internalized
the notion that I did not yet know enough to be able to speak with any authority about any
subject” (Kupiec, 1991, p. 649). Kupiec described that daily treatment of her as “less-
than” academic by her colleagues drove her to doubt not only her own ability to write and
publish but also her actual membership in the academic profession. PT faculty’s
relationships with their colleagues are a reminder of their different status. However, PT
faculty members’ perceptions of their organization, their professional self, and their organizational role are neither rigid nor static.

Nontenure-track faculty members’ perceptions of their work, functions, and their workplace change over time (Levin & Shaker, 2011). Thirolf (2012; 2013) conducted two studies on PT faculty identity in community colleges that illustrate these changes. In her first study, Thirolf focused on the professional identity of PT faculty newcomers (Thirolf, 2012). In her second study, she examined the changes in these identities over time—one and a half years later (Thirolf, 2013). PT faculty in these studies had a “strong positive identification with teaching and interacting with students” (Thirolf, 2012, p. 276) that lessened over time (and even developed into depression and exhaustion for one participant) [Thirolf, 2013]. Furthermore, organizational obstacles for their performance increased in importance (Thirolf, 2013). In addition, participants expressed a sense of isolation that intensified over time at the institutional level as well as informal experiences and relationships with colleagues that affirmed PT faculty’s identity and sense of belonging in their college (Thirolf, 2013). Thirolf’s approach indicates that the time duration that a PT faculty has worked at a given institution influences not only the individual’s perception of the institution but also their self-conception. Arguably, the changes in these perceptions of the institution and themselves continue as the work relationship continues.

The literature on PT faculty work portrays this group of faculty as participants in some of the characteristics of the academic profession and with limitation in others (Kezar & Sam, 2011a). There is an ongoing discussion in scholarly publications about
whether or not academe is a profession (Williams, 2008). Theoretically, academe has been conceptualized as an art or craft (Taylor, 1999), a profession, (Altbach & Finkelson, 1997; Freidson, 1986), and a specialized occupation (Piper, 1994). Detractors to the view of academe as a profession argue that faculty do not meet all the (ideal) criteria of a profession (Williams, 2008). Definitions of a profession include three elements: (a) it is an occupation based on a definable body of knowledge, (b) it involves a commitment to public service that goes beyond profit, and (c) it entails independence or autonomy to define and regulate its own affairs (Hatch, 1988). In this ideal conception, a profession entails full-time dedication, requires specialized training, requires membership in a professional association, includes legal legitimation, and has a specific code of ethics (Goode, 1969). Critics of the view of academe as a profession argue that there is no concrete definition of the central function of academics as professionals, there is a lack of clarity about who are the “clients” they serve, and it is not clear what the goal of the profession is (Williams, 2008). However, scholars have used trait, functionalism, and professionalization perspectives to describe academe as a profession (Kezar & Sam, 2011a; Rhoades, 1998).

The academic profession at four-year institutions has been associated traditionally with five core values—purpose of discovery, autonomy and academic freedom, intellectual honesty and fairness, collegiality, and commitment to service for society (Austin, 1990)—and three core functions: research, teaching, and service (Townsend, 2003 in Ochoa, 2011). In addition, faculty attend annual conferences of their associations as a public arena to contact other academics (Kupiec, 1991). Furthermore, traditionally
academics are dedicated full-time to the profession (Kezar & Sam, 2011a). These values, associations, and time dedication correspond with an ideal type of a profession (Abbas & McLean, 2001; Goode, 1969). From this perspective, faculty are seen as professionals who live up to internal high standards, self-regulate, and have control over their work environment (Kezar & Sam, 2011a). Rhoades (1998) offers a different view of the academic profession based on professionalization theory. He sees professions as self-interested groups that seek to maintain monopolies of expertise in order to survive (Rhoades, 1988). With this theoretical view, Rhoades conceptualizes academe as a managed profession: faculty are both professionals and employees. That is, they operate under a different set of standards and principles from other employees or laborers. PT faculty share elements of these definitions.

PT faculty partake in the core functions (teaching, research, service) of the academic profession (Jacobs, 1998; Meixner et al., 2010), not only due to their official role (i.e., teaching) but also due to personal interest (i.e., research). During their formal education, PT faculty fulfilled the requirements of their discipline—with at least a Master’s graduate degree, but in some cases with a terminal degree—and learned its language (Kupiec, 1991). Thus, arguably, they align with professional standards and values and participate in professional associations (Kupiec, 1991). Furthermore, PT faculty express interest in the organizational aspects of their work (Burk, 2000; Gappa, 2000; Kupiec, 1991). That is, these characteristics of their behaviors, academic background, and organizational involvement, positions PT faculty closer to professionals than to employees.
Theoretical Notions

Given the current state of the literature on PT faculty, I use a theoretical framework that lead to understandings of PT faculty as both organizational members and professionals. The theoretical framework for this investigation relies upon notions of organizational theory, specifically, new institutional theory (Meyer, 2008; Scott, 2014; Tolbert & Zucker, 1996), loosely-coupled systems theory (Orton & Weick, 1990; Weick, 1976), and work engagement theory (Macey & Schneider, 2008; Simpson, 2009a; Simpson, 2009b), as well as on scholarly notions of the academic profession (Austin, 1990; Braxton, 2011). Previous studies suggest that PT faculty are both professionals and laborers (Kezar & Sam, 2011a), and thus, assumptions from these theories broaden the understanding of this population. Specific concepts drawn from these theories (i.e., institutional structure, institutional norms and regulations, institutional culture, academic culture, culture of the discipline, psychological engagement, and preferred-self) guided my exploration of PT faculty in a public comprehensive Master’s university setting, and these conceptions frame my explanations.

Professional careers have both an organizational and a personal dimension (Light, Marsden, & Corl, 1973 in Braxton, 2011). Personal engagement theory (Macey & Schneider, 2008) unravels the connection between PT faculty members’ work preferences, their understandings of their formal roles as members of the organization, and their enactment of their preferred-self (Kahn, 1990). Organizational theory constructs explain the cultural and structural (regulative and normative) dimensions that contextualize and influence the ways in which PT faculty behave as institutional
members and understand their organizational roles and functions (Meyer, 2008; Scott, 2014; Weick, 1976). Finally, notions of the academic profession’s cultures and values (Austin, 1990) contextualize PT faculty understandings of their role and functions within the academic profession. Altogether, these theoretical constructs explain PT faculty’s understandings of their everyday professional experiences as (long-time) members of an organization and a professional group.

**Organizational theory.** PT faculty are members of higher education organizations. Organizations comprise regulative, normative, and cultural-cognitive elements that provide stability and meaning to social life (Scott, 2014), as well as flexibility of action and interpretation (Weick, 1976). Scott (2014) names these the pillars of institutions and guidance for organizations. The regulative pillar emphasizes rule setting and sanctioning, the normative pillar contains an evaluative and obligatory dimension, and the cultural-cognitive pillar involves shared conceptions and frames through which meaning is understood (Powell, 2007). Regulative, normative, and cultural-cognitive institutional pillars are interrelated and are the context in which organizational actors use organizations’ resources and enact social behaviors (Scott, 2005). However, universities are loosely coupled systems, in which the system’s components and actors are not only responsive to, but also independent of, each other (Orton & Weick, 1990; Weick, 1976). That is, in addition to formal structures and stable patterns of behavior that seek to achieve objective functions (regulative and normative pillars), organizations have socially shared meanings (cultural-cognitive pillar) attached
to their formal structures (Scott, 2014 see also Meyer, 2008; Tolbert & Zucker, 1996) which guide but do not constrain organizational actors (Meyer, 2008).

Formal structures of an organization (regulative pillar) establish members’ specific roles, rights, responsibilities, and work demands within the organization (Meyer, 2008). Formal structures are a frame of reference for individual behavior (Macey & Schneider, 2008). These structures take the form of policies, rules, and explicit norms that inform organizational members (as well as outsiders) of what is expected from them (Scott, 2014). Organizational formal structures are moderators and mediators of the ways in which individuals construct and understand social-cultural patterns of their organizations (Scott, 2014; see also Montero Hernandez, 2010). That is, the characteristics of an organization’s formal structure is related to each college and university’s norms (Gappa et al., 2007) and culture (Austin, 1990).

The normative pillar of an organization has its roots in the moral and ethical systems of the organization, that is, in the informal structures that guide organizational members’ behaviors (Scott, 2014). For example, differentials in faculty appointments can be explicit in institutional policies (regulative pillar) or implicit in the treatment of faculty (normative pillar) [Gappa et al., 2007]. The normative pillar is composed of the work norms and habits that are practiced in the organization and that are reinforced by moral obligation (Palthe, 2014). That is, individuals in an organization align with the normative pillar due to a sense of duty and responsibility, not due to penalties or coercion (Scott, 2014).
Universities’ organizational cultures (the cultural-cognitive pillar) shape the normative context (normative pillar) for groups and individuals (Scott, 2014). The cultural-cognitive pillar and the normative pillar are informal organizational structures that indicate which rewards are important for the organization and what kind of work is rewarded (Bess & Dee, 2008; Scott, 2014). A university’s mission, goals, governance structure, leadership style, student characteristics, faculty characteristics, student-faculty interactions, size, location and physical environment (Austin, 1990), and institutional control (private or public) [Morphe & Hartley, 2006] are key elements of the culture of an institution. Higher education institutions of similar types tend to have similar elements, that is, similar regulations, norms, and cultures (Clark, 1987; see also Austin, 1990). Organizational culture provides a sense stability, direction, and consistency to members of the organization (Bess & Dee, 2008) that guides organizational members’ decision making (Orton & Weick, 1990). Due to accumulated experience, individuals in an organization share understandings of the legitimate statuses, boundaries, access to resources, and the nature of those resources for these individuals and other institutional actors (Colyvas & Powell, 2006). In the higher education context, a university and the department’s culture play a key role in the integration of nontenure-track faculty to the academic community and into campus life (Gappa, 2000; Waltman et al., 2012).

Together, the three institutional pillars not only determine the nature of members’ specific jobs but also contextualize the environment in which their jobs occur and influence individuals’ understandings of their role and functions (Bess & Dee, 2008). Individuals develop perceptual frames that shape the ways in which they think about the
organization and act in it (Bess & Dee, 2008, p. 14). That is, individuals’ experience the regulations, norms, and culture of an organizational environment and create subjective understandings of the environment, its expectations for them, and the ways in which they can behave in the organization to fulfill these expectations (Edwards, Caplan, & Harrison, 1998). In addition, organizational members’ perceptual frames, that is, the ways in which they construct and interpret social reality, not only vary but also overlap (Bess & Dee, 2008). Thus, although each individual (in this case each PT faculty) constructs their own perceptual frame, individuals from a given institution, department, and discipline share similar frames of reference (Abbas & McLean, 2001; Austin, 1990; Bess & Dee, 2008; Clark, 1987).

PT faculty, as institutional members, can act in ways that may differ from those dictated by the institutional structure (Levin & Montero-Hernandez, 2014; Meyer, 2008). I conceptualize PT faculty as organizational actors who are not only constrained but also empowered by organizational regulations, norms, and cultures (Meyer, 2008; Scott, 2014). Due to the loosely-coupled structure of universities, PT faculty, as organizational members, can neglect regulatory constraints of formal structures explicitly in order to pursue both collective and individual goals (Meyer, 2008; Montero Hernandez, 2010; Tolbert & Zucker, 1996). Furthermore, organizational members (PT faculty) may support institutional goals, but do so in ways that are personally meaningful and that go beyond the powers and benefits that institutional regulations confer upon them. Work engagement theory explains the personal traits that underlie faculty behaviors (Simpson, 2009b).
**Work engagement theory.** Employee engagement, work engagement, and personal engagement are different terms that refer to the same phenomenon: the psychological and behavioral state employees express when they are interested in their job and their organizations (Macey & Schneider, 2008). Engagement at work is determined by both an individual’s traits and organizational factors (Simpson, 2009a). For example, research has found that PT faculty tend to be engaged in their work personally because they find it intellectually stimulating (Kezar & Sam, 2011b), and they enjoy interacting with students (Kezar & Sam, 2011b; Leslie & Gappa, 2002). Employee engagement connotes commitment, involvement, enthusiasm, passion, focused effort, and energy towards a person’s job (Macey & Schneider, 2008; Simpson, 2009b). Although work engagement has been studied primarily to improve employee performance, organizational outcomes, and organizational management in nonacademic settings—for example, hospitals or architecture firms (Simpson, 2009a)—work engagement is also a useful construct with which to explore professions. Hence, this theory provides valid constructs to study PT faculty’s professional attitudes and behaviors towards their jobs and the institutions where they work.

Work engagement includes attitudinal (psychological state) and performance (behavioral state) elements (Macey & Schneider, 2008). The basic assumption of work engagement is that the psychological state of work engagement (in the vernacular, good attitudes towards the job, the organization, and the self as an organizational member) is a necessary antecedent of the behavioral state of work engagement (or behaviors of over-
performance) [Macey & Schneider, 2008]. Thus, the positive attitudes and positive performance towards one’s job are tied to one another (Leiter & Bakker, 2010).

The psychological state of engagement involves an individual’s positive attitudes towards their work (i.e., job involvement), their organization (i.e., organizational commitment), themselves in the organization, and their organizational position (i.e., psychological empowerment) [Macey & Schneider, 2008]. The expression of these attitudes changes over time (Macey & Schneider, 2008) and, for faculty, attitudes towards their work vary by their career stage (Feldman & Turley, 2001). The expressions job involvement, organizational commitment, and psychological empowerment together are considered the higher level of psychological engagement an individual can express.

Job involvement, or “dedication” (Simpson, 2009b), is the psychological positive relationship of individuals with the work they perform, and includes personal interest in performing the specific type of work. This corresponds to what professional theory identifies as an individual’s “calling” (Hermanowicz, 1998 in Braxton, 2001). This interest can be expressed during an individual’s formal education, before they perform the work, or when they perform that job in a similar institution (Macey & Schneider, 2008). Job involvement is also understood as professional commitment—the extent of individuals’ emotional investment in their chosen vocation (Feldman & Turnley, 2001). In the case of faculty, during their college education, they can identify their interest in an academic career, and, during their graduate education, they can seek socialization for faculty roles (Austin, 2002; Austin & McDaniels, 2006). As students, individuals can begin to participate in activities appropriate to academe, such as teaching or publishing
(Kupiec, 1991). In addition, during their work as professionals in an educational setting (e.g., K-12), individuals can claim interest in pursuing a faculty position at a higher education setting (Thirolf, 2012; 2013). For individuals who express job involvement, the place in which they perform a given activity is not as important as their potential to perform the activity. Job involvement is an antecedent of organizational commitment (Macey & Schneider, 2008).

**Organizational commitment**, the second attitude of the psychological state of work engagement, refers to the attachment that individuals express towards the larger organizational entity and their willingness to support the organization to help it achieve its goals (Erickson 2005 as cited in Macey & Schneider, 2008). In this case, faculty who are committed to the organization not only aspire to work in an academic environment but also report satisfaction from their work in a particular institution (Antony & Hayden, 2011). Organizational commitment can be supported by organizational structures (e.g., university norms and rules) and organizational members (e.g., staff, faculty, decision makers).

Organizations that express organizational care—organizations that promote organizational members’ best interests and value their contributions—increase the likelihood of that organizational members express sustained commitment to their organization (McAllister & Bigley, 2002). For faculty, expressions of organizational care would include recognition of their work, acknowledgement of their contributions, for example. In addition, faculty’s interactions with other organizational members over time enable these faculty to learn the norms, values, and required behaviors of a particular
higher education organization (Cawyer & Friedrich, 1998). Thus, contact with colleagues over time enables individuals to identify with (or separate themselves from) their organization (Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter, & Taris, 2008), that is, to develop organizational commitment.

Organizational commitment can also be understood as loyalty or intent to stay in the organization and commitment is related to an individual’s satisfaction with their work and work environment (Hoyt, 2012). A loyal member is conceptualized as one who seeks to contribute to the achievements of the organization and who promotes a collegiate culture (Jauch, Gluek, & Osborn, 1978). Organizational loyalty or commitment can be expressed as a recommendation of the workplace to other workers, preference for teaching at the given university, and a sense of pride with working at a given institution (Hoyt, 2012). That is, the engagement or attachment is not only to the job itself but also to the organization in which an individual performs this work.

Job involvement and organizational commitment are maintained by an individual’s psychological empowerment (Macey & Schneider, 2008)—the third attitude of psychological engagement. When individuals have a sense of purpose, competence, control, and effect on the work place, and when they assume that their efforts can make a difference, they are empowered psychologically (Macey & Schneider, 2008). Psychological empowerment stems from an individual’s perception that their work itself has meaning and that it is meaningful for the organization (Leiter & Bakker, 2010). An individual with a sense of empowerment perceives that their contributions are valuable to their organization and colleagues (Burk, 2000). Professional work entails commitment
and a source of deep personal meaning (Braxton, 2001, p. 5)—individuals conceptualize their work as tied to a greater good. In addition, psychologically empowered individuals—individuals with a sense of self-efficacy (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2009)—perceive a personal (meaningful) connection with their workplace. They consider that they are competent to meet the demands of their jobs and that they have the ability to make a difference in their workplace (Spreitzer, 1990 as cited in Chung, 2011).

Work engagement consists of a group of attitudes that are influenced by individual, interpersonal, group, intergroup, and organizational characteristics simultaneously (Kahn, 1990). An individual’s definition of self as a member or non-member of certain groups plays a role in their expressions of engagement. For faculty, their identification as members of the academic profession and a given discipline provides them with values about knowledge, performance (expert, critical, and responsible) [Abbas & McLean, 2001], time use, and centrality of teaching and research (Austin, 1990). In addition, each organization provides organizational members with institutional references of behavior role requirements and activities (Macey & Schneider, 2008). That is, the ways in which PT faculty organize their time, conceptualize their work, and express their preferred-self (Kahn, 1990) are rooted in their self-identification as members of the academic profession, their specific discipline, and their higher education institution (Austin, 1990).

Organizational theory and work engagement theory constructs discussed above are the basis of the four theoretical notions that guide this inquiry. First, individuals’
behaviors and attitudes in an organization are determined by the interaction of personal and situational factors. Second, PT faculty as members of the academic profession organize their time and conceptualize their work rooted in the values of the academic profession, their specific discipline, and the institutional type of their higher education institution. Third, PT faculty members’ preferred-self, or a conception of their ideal self, guides their perception of the organization and the ways in which the organization helps or hinders their work. Finally, individual expressions of job involvement, organizational commitment, and psychological empowerment are informed by the individual’s preferred-self as part of the organization and the profession.

Organizational theory and work engagement theory served as complementary frameworks for this investigation. Faculty career experiences are influenced by both individuals’ characteristics and their interactions with organizations. Thus, this research considered both aspects simultaneously (Kim, Wolf-Wendel, & Twombly, 2009). While organizational theory provides constructs to explain the context of PT faculty professional experiences (the organizational level), work engagement theory explains individuals’ cognitive, emotional, and attitudinal job expressions (Kahn, 1990). Together, these theories account for PT faculty as a subgroup that is part of a specific institutional context but that is not constrained totally by organizational structures. From the use of these theories, PT faculty are not seen as victims of their circumstances, but rather as active participants in institutional life who reproduce and transform institutional culture and structures (O’Meara & Campbell, 2011). These theoretical constructs guided the
analysis of the meanings associated with PT faculty roles and functions. These theories are the basis for the research questions in this investigation.

**Research Questions**

This investigation is guided by an over-arching question: What are the ways in which long-term part-time faculty understand their role in their profession and in the context of public comprehensive Master’s universities? The over-arching question was designed to avoid the narrow, deficit perspective that dominates the literature on contingent faculty (Banachowski, 1996; Kezar & Sam, 2011b) by enabling the analysis of the complexity of part-time faculty professional roles. In addition, the following associated questions directed my data collection towards the purpose of this investigation:

a) How do PT faculty understand and explain their long-term relationship with a public university? What (personal and organizational) elements do PT faculty consider central in this relationship?

b) How did the PT faculty relationship with the university evolve from a temporal appointment to a long-term appointment?

c) According to part-time faculty, in which ways does the institution support and in which ways does it hinder their work performance? How do PT faculty reconcile their perceptions of both the university’s support systems and organizational obstacles? When do these obstacles become a reason to leave the institution?
The theoretical and methodological limitations of the literature on PT faculty, my theoretical notions, and the research questions guided research design, which is the topic of the following chapter.
Chapter Three

Research Design and Methods

The purpose, theoretical notions, and research questions of this investigation required an in-depth examination of the meanings created by long term part-time (PT) faculty about their professional relationship with a particular setting. Therefore, I employed qualitative research methods with a social constructivist paradigm (Bogdan & Biklen, 2011; Creswell, 2007; Lichtman, 2013; Silverman, 2011) and a phenomenological approach (Giorgi, 2009; Van Manen, 1990) for my research design. Previous studies on PT faculty, faculty members, and higher education in general, as well as theoretical literature on qualitative methodology and research methods provided me orientation for the design and application of my research approach.

The social constructivist paradigm of qualitative research methodologies enabled me the understanding and interpretation of social interactions in a particular context (Lichtman, 2013) and provided me elements to explain the multiple and complex meanings of social reality that individuals create (Creswell, 2007). The ontological, epistemological, axiological and methodological principles of qualitative research provided me the openness necessary to understand and explain PT faculty professional experiences through firsthand contact with them (Creswell, 2007; Silverman, 2011) and to examine PT faculty as members of a group, who use, organize, and understand their environment in particular ways (Bogdan & Biklen, 2011; Silverman, 2011).

I selected a phenomenological approach because its philosophical assumptions provided the basis for a methodological design that enabled me to understand the
essential features of a phenomenon from the perspective of those who experience the phenomenon (Giorgi, 2009)—in this case, PT faculty with long term relationships with a given university. Therefore, I employed data collection and analysis methods to explore the ways in which PT faculty experienced, perceived, and made sense of the phenomenon (Van Manen, 1990). These methods include semi-structured interviews (Creswell, 2007), field notes (Lichtman, 2013), documentation (Bailey, 1994), and content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005).

The purpose of this chapter is to make explicit my personal assumptions, paradigms, and frameworks in order to provide credibility and transferability to this investigation (Creswell, 2007). Specifically, I explain the principles that guided this investigation’s data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, and research findings as well as the specific application of the methods that I employed in this investigation.

**Qualitative Research Strategy**

The phenomenon and the population in this investigation guided my selection of a social constructivist paradigm and a phenomenological approach of qualitative research. In this investigation, the phenomenon under study was a long-term work relationship (which I defined as equal or longer than a five year period) that occurred in a specific higher education setting (which were public comprehensive Master’s universities) and that was experienced by a particular faculty group (individuals in PT faculty positions). Phenomenology studies the experiences of individuals who experience a phenomenon in their natural setting (Bogdan & Biklen, 2011). In addition, the social constructivist qualitative paradigm suggests that the meanings that individuals give to their experiences
are linked to their perspectives of specific contexts (Patton, 1990). Thus, I designed this investigation to have a contact with both individuals and their contexts.

Social constructivist research assumes that individuals create context specific complex meanings about social reality (Creswell, 2007) and that these meanings are reachable through social interaction (Silverman, 2001). Phenomenology assumes that it is possible to study the essence of a phenomenon through the analysis of the commonalities in the accounts of the individuals who experience it (Van Manen, 1990). Following these epistemological assumptions, I employed fieldwork strategies that reduced my distance from the phenomenon (Silverman, 2001) through firsthand interaction with 29 PT faculty members who have developed a work relationship of five or more years with a given university. I employed qualitative interviews to collect individual accounts (Kvale, 1983) of PT faculty experiences and I collected formal documents to contextualize participants’ experiences (Bailey, 1994). Fieldwork was a central activity of this investigation (Patton, 1990). Thus, I registered my interactions with the research participants as well as the context of those interactions in detailed records in the form of field notes (Lichtman, 2013).

As recommended by qualitative researchers, my methods were fluid and inductive and I adapted them to respond to the characteristics of the field, the participants, and the data (Lichtman, 2013; Patton, 1990). For example, I modified my recruitment strategies (i.e., the content of my email invitation) to convince PT faculty to participate in this investigation. In addition, during fieldwork, I adapted my interview protocol in order to obtain detailed data of individual experiences (Kvale, 1983). The research methods that I
employed enabled me to gather and interconnect pieces of evidence in innovative forms (Bogdan & Biklen, 2011). In my case, this innovation responded to my intent to avoid the deficit perspective preponderant in scholarly literature, and to provide accounts that give voice to PT faculty’s perceptions of their work and their relationship with their higher education organizations.

Finally, I followed phenomenological and social constructivist research principles for data analysis. During data analysis, I performed an inductive process to avoid the imposition of preexistent (theoretical and personal) expectations on the phenomenon under study (Giorgi, 2009; Patton, 1990). First, I analyzed individual accounts of how each individual experienced the phenomenon to identify common experiences of the participants in this investigation (Van Manen, 1990). Subsequently, I moved from specific concrete examples of experiences to explanations and conceptualizations of the phenomenon (Lichtman, 2013) that resulted from the integration of the participants’ experiences (Giorgi, 2009). For this, the specific data analysis method that I used was content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) with a coding and categorizing strategy (Richards, 2009).

Field work, data collection, and data analysis strategies followed principles and assumptions of qualitative research through a social constructivist paradigm and a phenomenological approach. This research paradigm and approach also guided my role as researcher.
Role of the Researcher

In qualitative research, the researcher has a role in all aspects of the research design: to filter data collection, to select settings, and to perform data analysis. (Lichtman, 2013). As a systematic process, phenomenology requires the researcher to define the phenomenon of study, interact with the individuals who experience a phenomenon, obtain information on the ways in which individuals experience the phenomenon, encourage participants to reflect on their experiences, interpret those experiences, and identify the essence of those experiences (Giorgi, 2009; Moustakas, 1994 in Creswell, 2007). That is, as a qualitative researcher, I was involved in all the aspects of the design and findings of this investigation.

As a qualitative researcher, I assumed that the researcher’s subjectivity cannot be removed during the research process (Creswell, 2007; Lichtman, 2013; Peshkin, 1988). Furthermore, I accepted the premise that qualitative researchers’ values play a role in the research design (Creswell, 2007). The researcher’s values stem from the researcher’s experience, knowledge, skills, and background (Lichtman, 2013) and they interact with the participants and the settings when research is in progress (Peshkin, 1988). Thus, in this section, I follow Peshkin’s (1988) recommendation and I make explicit the configuration of my personal qualities and how these qualities shaped the research design and process.

My professional and academic experiences as well as my professional prospects influenced my decision to focus this study on long-term PT faculty at comprehensive Master’s universities (in contrast to choose other contingent faculty populations in other
institutional types in the U.S.). I worked as PT faculty in different private and public universities in Mexico, my country of origin, which was what first woke up my curiosity on the characteristics of the position in other institutions and for other individuals. In consequence, during my master’s education, I focused on expanding my scholarly knowledge on the PT faculty phenomenon in Mexico and the U.S. During my master’s thesis research, I was able to identify the problems that PT faculty face in public state universities in Mexico, as well as the general arguments present in the U.S. scholarly literature on contingent faculty. My master’s dissertation project was the foundation of my understanding of this faculty population. Later on, during my doctoral course work, I was able to point out specific limitations of the scholarly literature on PT faculty (which I have discussed in chapter one and the first section of chapter two). It was at this time that I made the decision of designing this investigation to explore an overlooked faculty population at an often overlooked organizational setting. In addition, I decided to study PT faculty because it is the largest population of contingent faculty in my country (Estévez, Martínez, & Belantrix, 2010; Gil Anton, 1994)—which would make this investigation beneficial for my future as a scholar in Mexico. Thus, the selection of this population for study responded not only to gaps in the field but also to personal interests. My previous work experience and academic background also informed my interactions with the participants.

During fieldwork, I was aware of the main issues of PT faculty in the U.S. and Mexico (e.g., work circumstances such as low wages or benefits) and I would compare the participants’ communications with my preexistent ideas, which I developed from the
literature. However, I did not assume that I would know everything that the participants would express, and I sought to put aside my own experiences and presuppositions—or what phenomenologists name bracketing (Giorgi, 2009)—in order to focus on each PT faculty member’s particular experiences. That is, my previous knowledge, epistemological notions, and theoretical notions did guide but did not limit my contact with participants and my data collection during fieldwork.

My social location or self-location—which has its roots in the interaction between my gender, race, ethnicity, nationality, age, ability, sexuality, and socioeconomic class (McDonald, 2013; Pillow, 2003)—also played a role during data collection. Social location is the foundation of the ways in which the researcher experiences the fieldwork and the interactions with participants (McDonald, 2013). In other words, my self-perception shapes the ways in which I interpret my interactions with diverse people and settings (this argument has been studied in feminist and queer studies widely). I identify myself as young, able, heterosexual, middle-class, and Latina, that is, as a person of Latin American origin and female gender. Although all the components of my social location played a role during fieldwork, my gender and ethnicity identities played more central roles during the interview process than other components of my social location.

With interviewees who identified themselves as Latinos, as non-white, or as female, my identities as women, Latina, and young enabled me to build rapport. For example, Latino/a participants would make reference to Mexican sayings or Spanish words in order to clarify meaning about a topic in the interview. In addition, I perceived that non-white and female faculty interacted with me as role-models or mentors,
providing me advice. This type of interaction would enable us to talk about their personal views on their work experiences. My relationships with these participants were asymmetrical, in the sense that I accepted that their knowledge on the topic was greater than mine, but these relationships were also non-exploitative, that is, neither the participants nor I enacted power over one another (England, 1994).

My identity as Latina also affected my perception of the participants and their expressions during the interviews. For example, when the participants of any ethnicity described Latino and Latina students positively, I detected my feelings of personal pride. In contrast, I perceived myself as critical towards the participants’ opinions when they expressed negative views towards Latino or female populations. During interviews, I had to make a conscious effort to avoid expressions of negative reactions towards the participants’ communications in order to maintain my rapport with the participants and to focus on the participants’ views and experiences. In addition, during data analysis, I carried out active efforts to scrutinize my understanding of the participants’ descriptions (Pillow, 2003) to avoid that I disregarded someone’s experiences, due to her/his negative views about populations with which I identify.

Another personal quality that played a role during the research was that I am a foreign-born student and that English is not my native tongue. My knowledge of and limitations in the English language played a role both during data collection and during data analysis. During data collection, I needed to pay close attention to what my interlocutor communicated to me in order to understand nuances, slang, initials, personal names, and names of places. I recognized that my interview performance was limited by
my knowledge of U.S. culture, and, in some cases, I needed more explanation of utterances than a domestic researcher would require. However, to decrease this problem, I revealed to participants that most of my education and formation had been in Mexico. This strategy had as its purpose that participants knew that when I asked follow up questions, probes, or asked for more details, it was not due to lack of attention but to lack of cultural context.

The elements of my subjectivity that I described above (gender, ethnicity, country of origin, and native tongue) would have different prominence in one site in comparison to another and with one participant more than with another. Through reflexivity, I was able to identify situational subjectivity (Peshkin, 1988), that is, my personal responses to the natural settings of the participants. During data collection, I wrote memos (Giorgi, 2009) to myself in which I described my own feelings, perceptions and limitations of my understandings. These memos enabled me to be aware of my own subjectivity during data analysis and enabled me to reflect on the ways in which my subjectivity could influence my interpretation of the data (McDonald, 2013; Pillow, 2003).

**Research Design**

Fieldwork was a central part of this research; it enabled me to “personally understand the realities and minutiae of daily life” (Patton, 1990, p. 46) of PT faculty. Fieldwork involved close proximity to the sources of data and enabled me “to know participants on a personal level” in order to understand different participants and differences in the meanings of their situations (Patton, 1990, p. 47). My aim with this
design was to focus the data collection process on the phenomenon and to remain open to unexpected data collected during fieldwork (Bogdan & Biklen, 2011).

For the research design, I followed Patton’s (1990) recommendation in that the research design responded to the characteristics of the problem, the purpose, and the question of the investigation. With phenomenology as a guide, I employed one primary data source—in-depth interview (Creswell, 2007; Kvale, 1983) with field notes (Lichtman, 2013)—and one secondary data source—formal documents (Bailey, 1994) during data collection. These data sources provided data on the individual experiences of participants and the context of these experiences.

The data sources that I employed enabled me to respond to my research questions. In-depth interviews provided answers to the primary question (What are the ways in which long-term part-time faculty understand their role in their profession and in the context of a public comprehensive Master’s university?). Field notes and institutional documents served as supporting data sources to respond to the subordinate questions (How do PT faculty understand and explain their long-term relationship with a public university? What [personal and organizational] elements do PT faculty consider central in this relationship? How did the relationship between PT faculty and the university evolve from a temporal appointment to a long-term appointment? And, according to part-time faculty, in which ways does the institution support and in which ways does it hinder their work performance?). The final two research questions (How do PT faculty negotiate institutional support and obstacles? and when do these obstacles become a reason to leave the institution?) were answered through comparison among the participants’ accounts.
The primary data source for the study was the perspectives of PT faculty. The data collection technique I used to gather these data were semi-structured individual interviews (Lichtman, 2013; Silverman, 2011) also named in-depth interviews (Creswell, 2007) or qualitative interviews (Kvale, 1983) [from this point on, I use the term interviews to refer to those]. The use of interviews has proved useful in the higher education field, as evidenced by the studies of Gappa and Leslie (1993), Shaker (2008), and Levin, Montero-Hernandez, and Yoshikawa (2011) who used these data collection technique, particularly to study faculty. Interviews enabled authenticity, that is, an “authentic understanding of people’s experiences” (Silverman, 2001, p. 13), in this case, the authentic understanding of PT faculty members’ professional lives.

Interviews were arranged as guided conversations (Burgess, 1995) in which I invited participants to discuss particular topics, but allowed them to express their views about their everyday professional life, institutional characteristics, and work expectations, as well as problematical situations at the institution and strategies they employed to solve them in their own terms. All of these responses were captured in the participants’ own words. I used general lines of inquiry as starting points for the conversation (see the interview protocol in Appendix A) but questions and topics varied as the interview event demanded (Bogdan & Biklen, 2011; Lichtman, 2013; Yin, 2009). I used probes to invite participants to reflect and explain more deeply and to provide more information on a topic. In addition, I asked the interviewees to situate their responses for their work in their current institution and, when appropriate, connect to their position in another institution. This interview format enabled me to both capture descriptive, specific data
and to remain open to changes in the participants’ responses during the interview (Kvale, 1983). In addition, the semi-structured interviews allowed in-deep exploration of the PT faculty members’ thoughts, the meanings they give to their environment, and their feelings related to their professional experiences based on their own accounts (Lindsay, 2005).

I considered the in-depth interview as a method not a data collection technique (Silverman, 2001). Thus, I designed and performed the interview process in considering the data analysis process. During the interview process, I started initial analysis of the data and identified general themes of each interview. The use of broad general questions in the interviews made it possible for me to identify the essential elements of each participant’s experiences (Creswell, 2007). In addition, the interview format as semi-structured enabled me to compare the responses of the different participants (Reybold, 2003), in order to integrate them and identify the essence of the experience (Giorgi, 2009), or what was common in the participants’ accounts.

As part of the ethical guidelines of this investigation, before interviews were conducted, participants signed an informed consent form (see Appendix B). For this process, I followed recommendations of both scholars (e.g., Bogdan & Biklen, 2011; Creswell, 2009) and the Institutional Research Board (IRB) of the University of California, Riverside. During this time, I informed the participants of the research purpose, the processes to maintain their privacy and anonymity, and the characteristics of data storage. Also during this time, I provided participants with a copy of the consent form signed by me, and I indicated to them where on that form they could find my
contact information. For the interview process, participants were notified when I began and finished recording the conversation, and, if they asked for it, the recorder was stopped to leave specific information out of the record.

All interviews were transcribed verbatim and kept in the form of electronic files in order to facilitate my access to the raw data (Patton, 1990). Transcriptions included the account of the verbal interchange between the interviewer and the interviewee and were used during data analysis (I explain the specific process of analysis in a following section). The transcriptions were carried out both by me (10 interviews) and by an undergraduate student (18 interviews). In this investigation, I considered the transcripts of audio recordings as “reliable records” of the interaction that occurred during the interview (Silverman, 2001). I reviewed the transcriptions that were not made by me, in order to guarantee accuracy. In addition, data analysis was performed on the transcribed text, primarily. However, I heard the audio recordings to clarify my understanding of specific nuances in the participants’ communications.

Before and after each interview, I wrote detailed field notes about my experiences in navigating the investigation sites as well as about the characteristics of the interview process. In field notes, I included descriptions of both what seemed important to the participants and what was important to me as researcher (Bailey, 1994). For the participant perspective, I included the participants’ descriptions of the organization of the space, their use of organizational resources (e.g., furniture, hardware), and their interactions with other organizational members and students. These descriptions were recorded both before and after the interview and were not recorded in the audio file. In
cases in which an unplanned event, independent from the interview, occurred during the interview process (e.g., a student’s visit or a colleague’s telephone call), I registered the event and the participants’ behaviors, as well as their comments about the event (e.g., the interaction between the participant and another PT faculty member) in the field notes.

In the field notes, I also included descriptions that correspond to what Bailey (1994) describes as what is important for the researcher. These descriptions included my perceptions of the place (e.g., campus, building, office) before the interviewee arrived, the physical characteristics of the place, the centrality/periphery of the space, and the proximity to other facilities. Descriptions of my feelings and reactions during field work were also part of my field notes. In addition, I included bracket notes about the implications of the interviewee’s answers or apparent similarities or contrasting differences with other interviewees’ responses. In this sense, field notes followed the structure of participant observation field notes (Silverman, 2001).

The purpose of the field notes was to complement my understanding of PT faculty’s everyday practices, roles, and relationships with other institutional actors as well as their use of institutional resources as presented during the interview event. These descriptions also enabled me to follow Peshkin’s (1988) recommendation of seeking out my subjectivity actively. Field notes enabled me to register my experiences during a short immersion in the surrounding environment of PT faculty. Immersion in the setting was not developed in the anthropological or ethno-methodological sense of the term but in the phenomenological one (Patton, 1990). That is, I did not perform participant observation of PT faculty, but I was immersed in their lifeworld through contact with them and their
reflections on their experiences (Van Manen, 1990). The purpose of the field notes was to keep a record of my experiences in the setting of the participants and to connect my experiences in the setting to their descriptions and understandings of the setting.

In order to protect participants and in following research ethical traditions, I used code names in the field notes while actual names and other personal information were saved in separate files protected with passwords. Later, for the analysis of the field notes, I employed pseudonyms to refer to participants. This procedure follows IRB approved procedures of my investigation. During data analysis, the field notes were used to contextualize a given interview and to provide more detail about participants’ descriptions.

The second source of data I used in this investigation was composed of both official and unofficial (or informal) documents (Bogdan & Biklen, 2011) that I collected during the interview period. I collected organizational records, that is, documents that were “materials relevant to maintenance of the organization” that were written with a purpose other than social research, and that were running records of events in the organization (Bailey, 1994, p. 294). Documentation has been included as complementary data sources in previous studies in the higher education field (e.g., Lechuga, 2006; Levin, 2006). These studies have served to inform this investigation on the techniques and process of collection and analysis of documents. The documents augment the evidence gathered in the interviews (Bogdan & Biklen, 2011; Yin, 2009) and provided factual details, corroborative information, and the universities’ official perspective (Bogdan & Biklen, 2011) on PT faculty. From my theoretical perspective, these documents served as
a frame of reference (Macey & Schneider, 2008) for me to understand the organizational expectations for PT faculty and to contextualize participants’ responses.

Qualitative research generates rich data sets (Spradley, 1980). To facilitate a systematic revision of data, I organized the data from the two different sources in an electronic archive that enabled me to access these for analysis. I recorded interview transcripts on editable text (.rtf) files and documentation was saved in its original form (e.g., jpg, pdf, and txt files). I organized the electronic files by using a systematic label strategy (Lichtman, 2013) that grouped data by campus and by participant. I identified each file by (a) the initials of the campus pseudonym (UC, UV or US), (b) two initials of the participant’s pseudonym, (c) an abbreviation that indicated the type of data source (INT = interview, DOC = documentation), and (d) a consecutive number to differentiate files from the same data source and the same individual (e.g., UV-CK-INT for interview transcript, UV-CK-DOC3 and UV-CK-DOC4 for documents). This organizational system facilitated my access to data for analysis (Bogdan & Biklen, 2011) as well as for the research report writing process.

**Data Set**

For this investigation, I carried out data collection in three public comprehensive Master’s universities in California. I included 29 long term PT faculty participants, and I gathered institutional documents with information about the campuses and CSU system regulations and organizational structure as well as personal documents. In addition, I interviewed 22 newer PT faculty members whom were not part of my studied population but provided contextual information on the PT faculty position and the three universities.
As well, conversations with these newer faculty enabled me to have a reference to compare the experiences of long term PT faculty.

**Selection of the Study Sites**

In this investigation, I chose to study PT faculty at one institutional type in order to find participants who have experienced the studied phenomenon in similar settings. This decision was based on scholarly and methodological arguments. Social constructivist and phenomenological qualitative research recommend to seek participants who share similar experiences in similar contexts (Creswell, 2007; Lichtman, 2013). Scholarship on the academic profession argue that institutional type intervenes in the culture and practice of faculty (Austin, 1990; Clark, 1987; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Moreover, Levin and Montero-Hernandez (2014) found differences in PT faculty are linked to their affiliation to research universities, comprehensive universities, or community colleges. Thus, this investigation was carried out at sites that provided a similar institutional and geopolitical context to PT faculty experiences—three public comprehensive Master’s universities in California.

I selected the research sites with consideration of the characteristics of this particular institutional type, the gaps in research on PT faculty, and the role of these institutions in California higher education. Comprehensive Master’s universities’ missions traditionally position teaching, research, and public service as equally important (Henderson, 2009) and with an applied emphasis (Henderson, 2007). Moreover, research is not the primary mission of this university type (Chan & Burton, 1995; Griffin & Hurtado, 2011; Henderson & Buchanan, 2007). That is, teaching, the primary activity of
PT faculty work, is the most important function at these institutions (Henderson, 2007). Thus, although in other institutional types (e.g., doctoral universities, research universities) the primary role of PT faculty (teaching) is secondary for the organization, in comprehensive master’s universities, PT faculty’s role is central for the institutional mission.

The limitations in the scholarly literature on PT faculty also guided my selection of this institutional type. Research on comprehensive universities in general is underdeveloped (Henderson, 2009; Rhoades, 1998), and research about PT faculty in universities has been less developed than in other institutions (Meixner, Kruck, & Madden, 2010)—for example, community colleges (Valadez & Anthony, 2001). Some studies included comprehensive universities and Master’s universities in their study of PT faculty (e.g., Antony & Hayden, 2011; Levin & Montero-Hernandez, 2014; Levin & Shaker, 2011), but no study on this population has focused on the comprehensive Master’s universities context only. Thus, I chose to study PT faculty in comprehensive Master’s universities in order to advance the knowledge of both the faculty population and the institutional type.

The demographic characteristics of the California higher education system also pointed to the significance of conducting research at these sites. Comprehensive Master’s universities were the second largest provider of undergraduate education in California, and served the greatest number of students who pursue bachelor’s degrees (Postsecondary Education Commission [PEC], 2011). In 2010 in California, there were 23 public comprehensive Master’s university campuses that served 17.5 percent of the
students in the state (PEC, 2011). In 2016, 474,571 students were enrolled in a public comprehensive Master’s university in the state (See Table 1.). In addition, public comprehensive Master’s universities relied on a large percentage of PT faculty. In California, of 25,333 faculty were employed at public comprehensive Master’s universities in 2016, fifty-one percent had part-time appointments (The California State University [CSU], 2016). This percentage was higher than the national average of PT faculty at comprehensive universities—43.9 percent in 2007 (AFT Higher Education, 2009). In the early 2000s, the CSU system set a goal to increase the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty to 75% of the total (Gappa et al., 2007, p. 112; see also Bradley, 2004). However, recent figures of faculty appointments indicate that this goal has not been achieved. These figures point to the current importance of PT faculty for comprehensive Master’s universities in the state, which will likely continue in the future.

The comprehensive Master’s university campuses that I selected for this investigation were typical sites (Lichtman, 2013)—institutions that have characteristics of the average Master’s comprehensive university campus in the state. First, the three campuses were part of the California State University (CSU) system. Second, the three universities were public institutions, with a majority enrollment of undergraduate students (80 percent or more), and a proportion of PT faculty (approximately 51 percent) that is similar to the national average (CSU, 2016). Third, these universities were not selective (Henderson, 2007) and include a large share of non-white populations—CSU enrolled only 26% white students in 2016 (CSU, 2016). Finally, similarly to the rest of the CSU campuses, the three included in this investigation are unionized environments,
which is an advantage for contingent faculty in these institutions (AFT Higher Education, 2010; Clery, 2016; The Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012). For example, PT faculty who teach two or more classes at a CSU campus have access to health insurance, and those members who have worked for over a year on a campus may sustain an entitlement for teaching a certain number of credits and have a 12 month income (California Faculty Association, 2017). This characteristic (unionization) is also common to other comprehensive universities in the U.S. given that “large state systems of comprehensive colleges and universities tend to be unionized” (Rhoades, 1998, p. 12). Finally, I excluded campuses that did not correspond to traditional academic offerings (e.g., Polytechnical and Maritime Academy). These characteristics of the study sites make findings potentially portable and transferable to similar contexts (Lather, 2001) inside and outside the state of California.

**The Study Sites**

From the 23 CSU campuses, I selected three that varied in size, in number of students, and in faculty employed. With the inclusion of different sizes, I sought to account for variance in the otherwise similar campuses. In this investigation, I refer to the three institutions by pseudonyms: Big City University, Middle Valley University, and Small Ville University. I used these pseudonyms to hide the specific campus in which PT faculty worked, to protect individual faculty, and to reflect the differences among the campuses’ surroundings. According to the institutional websites, in the 2015-2016 academic year, the year in which I conducted data collection, Small Ville University enrolled 9,727 students and employed 642 faculty members, Middle Valley University
had 20,767 students and 986 faculty members, and Big City University had 38,948 students and 2,151 faculty members. At these three campuses, between 44% and 59% of all academics were classified as part-time or adjunct academics in that academic year (see Table 1).

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Sites’ Faculty and Student Population</th>
<th>Big City University</th>
<th>Middle Valley University</th>
<th>Small Ville University</th>
<th>CSU System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>38,948</td>
<td>20,767</td>
<td>9,727</td>
<td>474,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2,151</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>25,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>N.I.</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table created with data from each campus and CSU’s website. Figures reported from the 2015-2016 academic year.

N. I. = No Information

The three campuses became part of CSU system in the 1960s. The three universities offer similar academic degrees and they offer only between one and two doctoral degrees. Two of the campuses work by academic semesters and one by quarter terms. The three campuses are described in their websites as regionally oriented—another typical characteristic of comprehensive Master’s universities in the U.S. (Henderson, 2007). In addition, the three campuses had satellite campuses. Satellite campuses offer some of the programs of the main campus, primarily undergraduate degrees, but classes include lower-division, upper-division, credential, and graduate-level courses. Students in
satellite campuses are admitted through regular admission process to the main campus. That is, student and faculty in satellite campuses are counted in the total population of the main campuses. PT faculty are registered as academics, adjuncts, part-time faculty, part-time instructors, or temporary faculty in the institutional websites and documentation. I have excluded other information about the three campuses (e.g., surrounding populations, most popular degrees) in order to further disguise the specific campuses and protect participants’ identity. These measures to protect the campus and participants’ identities were developed following IRB’s guidelines.

Recruitment of Participants

Participants in this investigation were members of a particular PT faculty subgroup. Accordingly, I used a purposeful sampling strategy (Silverman, 2011) to recruit members of this specific group and to assure that the data I collected fit (answered) my question (Howe & Eisenhart, 1990). I used three criteria to determine whether or not someone was part of the population of this research: (a) that individuals did not have a full-time lecturer appointment at the university, (b) that the PT faculty taught at least two courses per academic year, and (b) that they were at least in their fifth year working at the campus. With these criteria, my goal was to exclude PT faculty who were new in the institutional setting or whose work at the university was transient and not central to their professional life. These criteria enabled me to find individuals with common experiences (Creswell, 2007).

Additionally, I used a maximum variation sampling strategy (Patton, 1990) during recruitment in order to include variation within the faculty group and to search for shared
elements among participants from different backgrounds (Valadez, 1993). Previous research shows that there are differences in PT faculty by discipline (Bettinger & Long, 2004; Johnson & Turner, 2009) and that minorities and female faculty are better represented as part-timers than as full-timers (AAUP, 2009; Aguirre, 2000; Antony & Hayden, 2011; JLB Associates, 2008). Thus, in the sample, I sought to include variety in gender, ethnicity, and field of expertise. I was successful in the inclusion of PT faculty members from a variety of disciplines (see Table 3) and from both genders (see Table 2). However, the final sample included a small number (seven or 24%) of non-white PT-faculty.

Recruitment of participants was carried out by invitation via e-mail to PT faculty in all departments in each university. I used several strategies for recruitment of participants. First, after gaining IRB approval in each institution, I asked college deans for authorization to perform recruitment in their college or unit as well as for help to invite department chairs in their colleges. Deans of three colleges denied authorization. From the remaining colleges, only one third of the department chairs responded and agreed to invite participants themselves. From this first strategy, I was able to recruit 9 participants in the three universities.

This strategy was only partially successful for several reasons. Not all deans and department chairs responded to my invitation. Not all deans and department chairs invited PT faculty to participate in the investigation. In addition, some department chairs only invited two or three people to participate in the investigation, and most of these individuals did not respond to the invitation. For Small Ville University (SVU), this
strategy was particularly unsuccessful—only three professors responded to the invitation, and two of them indicated they were not able to participate. In this campus, SVU, I was able to recruit four participants due to my relationship with a tenure-track professor who helped me to invite her students, who were also hired as PT faculty on the campus.

I also used direct invitations to PT faculty via e-mail as a strategy for recruitment. After receiving authorization from deans and department chairs, I sent e-mail invitations to PT faculty members listed in the institutional websites of the three campuses, under the categories of instructors, lecturers, PT faculty, adjuncts, or contingent faculty. Not all the departments had a list of the academic members, which limited the scope of my invitations. In total, I sent 570 email invitations. The invitations included an explanation of the purpose of the investigation, the data collection techniques (interview), and the intended population: academics with long term PT appointments in one or more departments of the campus. During this second strategy, I also highlighted that I sought to recruit PT faculty of color—and it was during this recruitment that most participants (six) responded. From a percentage of e-mails (close to 10%), I received an automatic response of failure in the delivery which indicated that the e-mail address was either wrong or non-existent. Approximately, 25% of the invitations received responses; half of the respondents explained that they could not participate in the investigation because they did not fit the criteria of the study or due to time constraints. With this strategy, I recruited 20 more participants.

During this last strategy of recruitment, a number of PT faculty indicated their interest in participating in the research although they did not fit the selection criteria—
they had not held a PT faculty position for five years at the university or had a full-time lecturer appointment. Although these faculty members were not part of the studied population, I decided to interview several of them (22 individuals). Among these individuals there was a full-time lecturer, former CSU students, former students who were teaching assistants, and recently retired CSU full-time faculty. These interviews enabled me to gain more information about the three campuses and the differences among departments. I analyzed data in these interviews differently from the interviews of my main population (in a subsequent section I provide details on data analysis processes). In addition, I did not include data from interviews of new faculty to answer my research questions. In total, 29 long-term PT faculty and 22 new PT faculty accepted to participate in the investigation.

**Participants**

The participants included 12 PT faculty members from Big City University, 8 from Middle Valley University, and 4 from Small Ville University (See Table 2). The interviewees indicated that they belonged to twenty different departments, and three participants worked in more than one department (See Table 3). In addition, three of them indicated that they taught at a satellite campus—one PT faculty worked at both the primary campus and the satellite campus and two only taught at the satellite campus—and one participant taught primarily online. Participants in the investigation had an average of 10.5 years affiliated with their campus—2 participants had 4.5 years working at their institution, 10 had between 5 and 11 years at their campus, 12 had between 12 and 18 years at their university, and one participant worked as PT faculty in Big City
University for 29 years. The participants had various appointment types: 10 were hired on a term by term basis (semester/quarter), 5 were hired on a yearly basis, and 14 had three-year appointments. 11 participants indicated they had a unit entitlement (of between 6-15 units per academic year).

Table 2.

Participants in the Investigation by Campus and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Semitotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Ville University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Valley University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big City University</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants in the investigation had diverse academic and demographic backgrounds. The final sample included 17 women and 12 men (see Table 2). Seven participants identified themselves as people of color—two Latino, two Latina, two Asian (Filipino, Middle-East), and one African American. Most of the participants (27) had a graduate degree: 25 held a master’s degree, 12 held a doctoral degree, and 3 participants were undertaking doctoral studies. Two participants, both males, indicated that they only had a bachelor’s degree. Seven of the participants had other education and certifications (e.g., teaching credential, foreign language accreditation). Seventeen of the participants were former students (of bachelor’s, master’s, and doctorate degree) in the campus in which they worked. The diverse characteristics of the sample was a result of both my recruitment strategies and participants’ self-selection (Creswell, 2007). That is, although I
developed strategies to include variability in the participants’ background, the final composition of the group of participants depended on their willingness to participate.

Table 3.

*Long Term PT Faculty by Department of Affiliation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Administration of Justice</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Business/Public Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Philosophy/Computer Systems</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Management/Extension</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New PT faculty, who I interviewed to provide context to the participants’ views, also included a variety of disciplinary fields (see Table 4). These interviews included 22 PT faculty who had been working four years or less at the three universities (they were hired as PT faculty from between one term and four years). The average seniority of these PT faculty members was two years. Similar to my conversations with long-term PT faculty participants, I had conversations with more PT faculty at the largest campus than
at the two others campuses—11 PT faculty members were affiliated with Big City University, 5 with Middle Valley University, and 5 with Small Ville University—. The majority of these interviewees were female: 5 participants were men and 17 were women. One faculty member identified as African American and the rest as white. These PT faculty were hired on a term by term appointment and had between one and five classes per term.

Table 4.

*New PT Faculty Members by Department of Affiliation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>African American Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With both groups of participants, I used the same interview protocol. Interviews were of similar lengths (between 60 and 120 minutes) and yielded comparable information. However, data were analyzed and used differently. Interviews with new PT
faculty were used as secondary evidence. Details of my data analysis process can be found in a subsequent section.

**Documents**

Formal documents of the universities were public and available online; thus, I did not carry out formal procedures, such as institutional approval, to collect them. The formal documents I gathered included institutional manuals, lists of courses and workshops offered to faculty at the institutional level, activities directed to faculty at the department level, invitations to events, campus maps, course lists, PT faculty office hours’ sheets, institutional plans, universities’ mission statements, and campus level statistics.

In addition, I asked participants for documents that exemplified their work and communications with colleagues, or for those who provided more detail about specific situations they noted during the interviews and that were pertinent to their experience. These documents included information documents sent to PT faculty by the administration or colleagues, documents produced by PT faculty (such as e-mails), department meeting minutes, department projects designed by them, and class plans. The majority of these documents were electronic and were given to me by the participants during the interviews. However, in some cases participants asked me to email them the following day to remind them to send the information. I preserved these documents as electronic files.

One limitation of the documents provided by the participants is that I did not gather similar comparative documents from all participants. Since this documentation
was related to their personal experience, and PT faculty in different departments experience their roles differently, not all interviewees provided all types of documents. Some individuals did not provide any document at all. Notwithstanding the limitation in documents for each individual participant, I did include comparable formal documentation from the three institutions included in the investigation.

**Data Analysis**

Data from different sources and different participants was analyzed with strategies consistent with the characteristics of the data (Saldaña, 2016; Silverman, 2001). I designed different strategies to analyze interviews, secondary interviews, field notes, and documents. Interviews, as the primary source of data, took the bulk of the analytical work, while documents and field notes were analyzed as I looked for supporting evidence, primarily. The general design of the data analysis process had as a goal to facilitate the integration of data for the findings.

I analyzed interviews using both informal and formal data analysis (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014). The formal data analysis process that I carried out was content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) with a coding and categorizing strategy (Richards, 2009; Saldaña, 2016). For long term PT faculty’s interviews, I used informal and formal data analysis. Results from this data analysis answered my research questions, and I used specific quotations as evidence for my findings. Data from new PT faculty were analyzed with initial analysis (Miles et al., 2014) only and I did not include fragments of these data in the findings. However, I used data from new faculty to
contextualize the communications of long term PT faculty, as well as to support my arguments in the conclusions and implications of the investigation.

For documents and field notes, I used a non-quantitative approach to document analysis (Bailey, 1994). This analysis started early in the research process. It proved useful to make methodological decisions (for example, this analysis helped me to determine the study sites for the investigation). In addition, during data integration (Giorgi, 2009), qualitative document analysis proved usefulness to complement long term PT faculty members’ communications.

**Data Analysis of Interviews**

Data analysis was divided into an initial (informal) stage and a formal stage (content analysis). The initial stage involved an informal analysis of the interviews and was conducted during field work (Lichtman, 2013). Initial analysis enabled me to ensure that I adapted my data collection techniques to include local particularities, individual perspectives, and interpretations of the participants’ worlds during data collection (Miles et al., 2014). Initial analysis was also a conscious effort to maintain myself alert to unexpected data and responsive to the characteristics of the interview event. The primary goal of this initial analysis was for me as researcher to become immersed in the data (Elo & Kyngäs, 2007) and to ensure that I collected data that would fit my research questions (Howe & Eisenhart, 1990).

Early analyses of data consisted of five strategies recommended by Bogdan and Biklen (2011). First, I generated questions to review the data (e.g., “it is the organization of office hours common to all part-time faculty in this department?” “Does this
participant maintain a unified or a fluid sense of self?” “Why does this participant think meetings are mandatory?”). I did these questions during the interview event, and then go back and hear the interview recording with these questions in mind. Through these questions, I identified general patterns (similarities and differences) in the participants’ responses. Second, I included “observer’s comments” in the field notes to stimulate my critical thinking (e.g., “[HM] uses ‘I’ and ‘we’ for the department, and ‘they’ for the university and the system,”). Third, I wrote memos to summarize emerging themes in the data (e.g., “office hours are becoming more electronic, through the use of mail and texts,” “informal hierarchy of PT faculty”). These memos enabled me to construct a general idea of the direction of the data, the areas in which I needed further exploration, and to practice “conceptual elaboration” (Miles et al., 2014, p. 72). Forth, during interviews, I tested ideas about data with the participants (e.g., asking to participants what did they think about my perception that PT faculty make a divide between their relationship with the department, the university, and the system). This strategy enabled me to conduct an on-field “member checking” (Creswell, 2014), which gained importance as I accumulated more data. Fifth, I generated visual devices to summarize and visualize data (e.g. participants’ socio-demographic characteristics table). These devises proved to be useful tools to have an ordered and systematic display of data (Miles et al., 2014). Together, these strategies enabled data interpretation on the field (Bogdan & Biklen, 2011) and for me to reach data saturation.

I performed initial analysis during interviews of both long-term PT faculty and new faculty. Analysis in this stage remained open until data collection was finished and
continued during interview transcription. During interview transcription (when I
transcribed or reviewed a transcription), I continued informal data analysis particularly in
the form of memos with summaries of themes in the data, with visual representations of
dimensions and relationships of data (e.g., concept maps, schemes, charts), and with
bracketed notes of the meaning of data. I recorded annotations, memos, and visual
devices in the same place (notebook) than my field notes.

I continued data analysis and started the formal stage of analysis after I concluded
field work and reviewed all transcriptions for accuracy. During the formal stage of
analysis, I searched for regularities in the participants’ experiences (Giorgi, 2009). In
general terms, the process consisted of working with data, breaking these data into
manageable units, and synthetizing those units to search for patterns that integrate data
(Bogdan & Biklen, 2011; Giorgi, 2009; Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Saldaña, 2016). Such
patterns provided me inferential keys to understand how participants experienced the
phenomenon under study (Miles et al., 2014). The unit of analysis was each interview of
long-term PT faculty, and data from field notes and documents were used in connection
to the participant in each interview.

As part of the formal analysis, I generated contact summary forms (Miles et al.,
2014) for each participant. During this process, I read each interview of long term PT
faculty participants, identified the central narrative of the interview, and created a one
page summary of each interview with my own words (see an example of this form in
Appendix C). Contact summary forms or participant summary forms were constructed as
a general overview of the communications of each interviewee framed by concepts of my
Theoretical framework. The summaries included identifying information (e.g., department, year of affiliation to CSU, number of classes per term, unit entitlement, gender, age, race and ethnicity, indication of whether or not the participant was a former CSU student), academic background information (bachelor’s degree name, master’s degree name, doctoral degree name, other education), first interest on a faculty job, initial relationship with the campus (recruitment process, relationships with the institution, number of classes), current relationships with people in the institution (colleagues, staff, students, reaching out by others), activities (extra-role, in-role), work engagement attitudes (job involvement, organizational commitment, psychological empowerment, or lack of these), name given to their preferred self, names their campus gave to their position, and development of their relationship with the university. Separately, each contact summary form was a synthesis of each participant’s communication organized to (a) represent the participant’s individuality and (b) enable comparison among participants.

The creation of the participant summary forms helped me to become familiar with data and facilitated the comparison among group participants’ communications. That is, through comparison of the participant summary forms I identified commonalities and differences among the participants in terms of their academic and personal background, relationship with colleagues, terms of employment, and the names they used to identify their preferred-self. I consulted the contact summary forms constantly during the subsequent steps of data analysis.
Another step in the formal analysis of the interviews was conventional and directed content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005), through a coding and categorizing strategy. I used a coding approach that included what Richards (2009) named descriptive, topic, and analytical coding. In this stage of analysis, I considered semi-structured interviews as text that conveyed meaning (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) about participants' experiences and about participants’ perceptions of their experiences. Thus, I sought for both explicit and latent meaning expressed by the interviewees (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005).

The first two coding strategies (descriptive coding and topic coding) corresponded to conventional content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). That is, during descriptive coding and topic coding the coding categories emerged from the data and had as foundation the explicit meaning in the participants’ communications (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Richards, 2009). The third analytical strategy (analytical coding) was the process to access the latent meaning (the underlying meanings of the words) in the interviews (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Richards, 2009). Analytical coding processes were guided by directed content analysis, in which theory serves as a tool to identify the latent meaning in the data (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005).

The first analytical processes during formal analysis was descriptive and topic coding (Richards, 2009). Through these processes, I sought to identify and organize data passages into general topics common in participants’ communications. During this analysis, I generated codes that reflected the participants’ language related to their job (e.g., I love teaching, academic work, very important, day-job, hobby), their university (e.g., public institution, give back, exploitative), organizational support (e.g., internal
grants, informal rank, helpful staff, lack of resources), their relationship with colleagues (e.g., friends, lack of outreach, individualism, collegiality, hallway communication), their role as professionals (e.g., educator, specialist, practitioner, teacher, different from full-time faculty, problem solver), and the values they associated with their professional activities (e.g., autonomy, intellectual honesty, collegiality, orientation). Codes in this stage of analysis emerged from data and served as labels to identify the topic on each meaningful fragment of data (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Richards, 2009). These codes were descriptive; they did not express relationships between pieces of data. These two coding processes enabled me to immerse myself in the data and to gain a perspective of the common topics in the interviews.

Between 30 and 50 codes emerged from each interview, during descriptive and topic coding. Originally, I used participants own language to code data, which originated a long list of similar codes (e.g., “I love teaching,” “I really like my job,” “enjoy this work”). In a second moment, I reviewed the different codes that I used in each interview and generated codes that globally represented a group of codes across interviews. For example, codes such as “I love teaching,” “I really like my job,” and “I enjoy this work” became “love and appreciation for teaching;” and “invited to meetings,” “listserv for meetings,” and “I can go to meetings” became “access to meetings.” With this process, I reduced the number of codes (in each interview and across interviews) and grouped data for the following steps of data analysis.

Through analytical coding, I generated categories that went beyond description of the data, found meaning in the data, and expressed new ideas about the data (Richards,
2009). For this process, I performed directed content analysis, in which theoretical constructs directed the classification and organization of data (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) and served as categories to interpret and understand the phenomenon (Bess & Dee, 2008). However, in order to maintain an open process of analysis, I ensured that the preliminary theoretical categories were flexible (Bogdan & Biklen, 2011; Silverman, 2011) and were modified and enriched during data analysis. Analytical coding set the foundation for me to identify the relationship between and among the concepts, (categories and subcategories) to understand the interactions between organizational and individual phenomena (Bess & Dee, 2008).

I organized data into the three attitudes Macey and Schneider (2008) associate with work engagement: “job involvement,” “organizational commitment,” and “psychological empowerment.” Another category of analysis related to work engagement was participants’ descriptions of their “preferred-self” (Kahn, 1990). In job involvement, I grouped positive and negative expressions towards their job, the individuals’ initial contact with their position, and the advantages the participants associated with their job. In the category organizational commitment, I gathered positive and negative expressions towards their campus, colleagues, staff, campus organization, campus resources, and work relationships with the campus. In the category psychological empowerment, I identified individuals’ expressions of their ability to make a difference in the workplace and in the profession and their limitations to do so. In the category of preferred self, I identified descriptions of themselves and the presence of values from the academic profession (i.e., knowledge as the main purpose of higher education, pursuit of
autonomy/academic freedom, intellectual honesty, collegiality, and commitment to
service), their discipline (orientation teaching/research/vocation and participation in
professional associations), and their campus emphasis (orientation towards teaching,
undergraduate education, vocational approach, and connection to community) [Austin,
1990].

Finally, I compared and contrasted the attitudes expressed by all individuals to
identify the sources of work engagement (the job, the institution, or the psychological
empowerment, their preferred self), the sources of work disengagement (the work, the
institution), and the ways in which PT faculty made sense of their role as professionals
(preferred self). In this phase of analysis, I identified patterns in the data and considered
all long-term PT faculty participants as a group. I used visual devices and data display
strategies (Miles et al., 2014), such as synthetic tables, conceptual maps, synoptic
schemes, and concept models, to organize and integrate information, to identify
relationships among concepts, and to answer my research questions. This stage resulted
in interpretation of and reflection on the meaning of data and the generation of
abstractions with explanatory power (Richards, 2009).

**Document Analysis**

Simultaneous with data collection and interview analysis, I carried out document
analysis of institutional documents in order to generate organizational summary sheets
(Miles et al., 2014) for the CSU system and each campus. In this document analysis, I did
not include PT faculty participants’ personal documents, given that these documents did
not provide information about the campuses or the system but about the participant’s
specific work. For the analysis of formal institutional documents, I used as guides theoretical constructs of organizational theory (Bess & Dee, 2008) and to identify specific information in each organizational document. In addition, concepts from organizational theory served as a tool to identify and analyze the formal context (rules) and semi-formal context (norms) of PT faculty’s work (Meyer, 2008; Tolbert & Zucker, 1996). The goal of document analysis was not to obtain factual data about the objective organizational context (Edwards, Caplan, & Harrison, 1998) of PT faculty work in order to identify whether or not the participants were truthful in their communications and description of the organization, but to improve my understanding of PT faculty members’ communications and perceptions of their work environment.

Given that the documents in this investigation were a secondary source of data, document analysis here was primarily descriptive. The analytical process that I used here was different from other critical types of document analysis, such as discourse analysis (Gee, 2011), and from other analyses focused on the characteristics of the documents, such as structured or quantitative content analysis (Bailey, 1994; Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). That is, the goal of document analysis was not to identify the ways in which language reproduces power structures for PT faculty, as it would have been for discourse analysis (Gee, 2011), nor the quantification of the presence of specific rhetorical language, as it would have been for structured content analysis (Bailey, 1994)—an example of this methodology is Rhoades’s (1998) study of the language used in faculty contracts to identify managerial practices. The document analysis employed here can be characterized as descriptive (Bailey, 1994) in that it had a specific goal in mind: to
describe each campus to help me contextualize the participants’ communications. Thus, I analyzed documents searching for descriptive information (Bailey, 1994) of each campus as organizations and of PT faculty as organizational members.

During document analysis, I reviewed institutional and system wide documents and I sought descriptions of the system, each campus, and of the organizational structure that formally defined the PT faculty position. I reviewed documents in search for information about the CSU system and each campus “population structural composition” (Bess & Dee, 2008): faculty distribution in tenure track, nontenure track, full-time, and part-time positions; student population composition; and “mission orientation” (Austin, 1990). I sought for descriptive campus wide data related to: faculty composition (tenure-track, nontenure-track, full-time, part-time, gender, race/ethnicity), student population composition (age, gender, race/ethnicity, graduate, undergraduate), programs composition (number of graduate, undergraduate, and majors), and mission orientation (mention of teaching, research, vocational programs, commitment to the region). In addition, for each college, I sought for the normative and regulative structures (Scott, 2014) of PT faculty: job description (roles, activities, and functions), rights (benefits, programs, recognitions), penalties, reappointment process, evaluation process, and restrictions (I sought for explicit wording regarding things PT faculty members cannot do). With this data, I generated summary sheets, one for the CSU system and one per each campus (Small Ville University, Middle Valley, and Big City University), which I used to identify both similarities and differences in the treatment of PT faculty across the three campuses.
The summary sheets assisted my understandings of PT faculty’s expressions of organizational commitment. In work engagement theory, organizational commitment is expressed by individuals when they embrace extra-role activities, that is, activities that are not formally part of their organizational roles and by which they do not receive compensation, but that are central for them to perform their role in the organization (Leiter & Bakker, 2010; Macey & Schneider, 2008). Using the summary sheets as an aide, I was able to differentiate (a) those activities that PT faculty assumed were part of their functions and that were included in their job description, (b) those activities that PT faculty assumed were part of their roles but that were not explicitly described in formal documents, and (c) those activities that participants assumed were not part of their roles but were explicitly described as their roles. Thus, the identification, in the summary sheets, of the formal roles, activities, and functions of PT faculty (or the “in-role” activities as they are named in work engagement theory [Macey & Schneider, 2008]), provided me an organizational frame of reference (Macey & Schneider, 2008) to identify when PT faculty members referred to their participation in extra-role activities during analysis of the interviews.

The process of document analysis that I followed was consistent with the phenomenological approach of this investigation. During document analysis and during interview analysis, I ensured that the information from formal and official document served as supporting evidence to understand PT faculty participants and did not gain precedence over the participants’ views of their campus as organization.
Trustworthiness in Data Analysis

Throughout the description of my research design, I have described various measures that provide trustworthiness to this investigation such as making explicit my personal and theoretical assumptions (Creswell, 2007), the inclusion of multiple data sources (Bogdan & Biklen, 2011), the systematization of data for storage (Patton, 1990), the use of on-field member-checking (Bogdan & Biklen, 2011; Creswell, 2014), and the use of reflexive strategies for a continuous search for subjectivity (Peshkin, 1988). In addition to those measures, I performed specific strategies to increase data analysis trustworthiness. In order to achieve internal validity, I performed a code consistency test (Richards, 2009) and check-coding (Miles et al., 2014) to review the consistency over time of the codes and categories used for data analysis (Miles et al., 2014; Richards, 2009). I carried out these processes primarily for interviews and documents. For both strategies, I received support from another researcher.

After I finished analytical coding, my dissertation supervisor, in the role of external coder, recoded an interview that I coded earlier. We then compared the codes and categories used initially by me and used subsequently by my supervisor. I reviewed which categories we used, and which segments we coded each time. Differences in categories were used to assess the inclusiveness of particular categories, and differences in segments allowed me to evaluate whether important data were missing from the analysis (Miles et al., 2014; Richards, 2009). When there were inconsistencies, I revisited categories and codes to assure that these constituted interpretations from the participants’ perspectives (Becker, 1996). Category consistency helped me to ensure that this
investigation was not only descriptively and interpretatively valid (Maxwell, 1992) but also transferable to similar contexts (Graneheim & Lundman, 2004).

As a second strategy to increase trustworthiness, I analyzed contrary instances for each category, code, and piece of data (Silverman, 2001). I followed Silverman (2001) recommendation and analyzed contrary cases, that is, instances that were contrary or opposed to patterns in the data. Data that did not express one of the attitudes of work engagement (job involvement, organizational commitment, psychological empowerment) helped me understand differences in individual expressions of work engagement. In the findings, when appropriate, I discuss examples of individuals who expressed an attitude of work engagement in a limited fashion, or whose preferred-self did not coincide with that of PT faculty as a professional.

Together, the trustworthiness strategies that I employed in the research design, data collection, and data analysis respond to an explicit effort to embrace standards of quality for qualitative research. In particular, I sought to demonstrate that for this investigation, I aligned to criteria of trustworthiness of a social-constructivist paradigm: sufficiency of and immersion in the data, attention to subjectivity and reflexivity, adequacy of data, and interpretation and presentation of participants’ constructions of meaning (Morrow, 2005).

The methodology proposed for this investigation responded not only to a gap in the literature on PT faculty but also to the purpose, problem, and questions addressed. A qualitative socio cultural methodology enabled me to identify the meaning PT faculty gave to their profession and their universities through first-hand interaction with these.
Semi-structured interviews, document analysis, and field notes were methods that helped me to ensure the collection of rich data on PT faculty in their professional contexts. Coding and categorization as strategies of data analysis enabled me to maintain a focus on the participants’ understandings of their work and work relationship with comprehensive Master’s universities as well as to construct connections between data and theory in order to advance the latter and explain the former. Theoretical constructs in this investigation served as flexible analytical lenses for me to make sense of data without forcing data into rigid categories. In sum, these elements enabled the generation of knowledge on PT faculty’s professional lives from their own perspective and provided answers to my research questions. These answers are the content of the subsequent chapter.
Chapter Four

Part-Time Faculty as Long-Term Organizational Members

The current chapter and Chapter Five describe the findings of my investigation. These chapters portray long-term PT faculty as professionals who are organizational members in public comprehensive Master’s universities. Chapter Four explains PT faculty members’ development of a long-term relationship with their university and a sense of membership in their department. This chapter focuses on the organizational circumstances that contextualize PT faculty members’ development of organizational commitment and sense of membership. Chapter Five focuses on PT faculty members’ preferred-self: their roles, values, principles, and behaviors as members of a profession. Chapter five focuses on the influence that PT faculty members’ preferred-self and job involvement had on their expressions of psychological empowerment and organizational commitment. Together, both chapters explain my argument: long-term PT faculty members’ professional identity counteracts the problematic organizational circumstances of their positions and influences this faculty group’s behaviors.

In this chapter, I explain the origins and evolution of the long-term relationships between the participant part-time (PT) faculty members and their universities, as well as PT faculty’s perceptions of themselves as long-term organizational members. To do so, I divide the chapter into three sections. The first section explains the ways in which PT faculty members’ work relationships with their comprehensive university started, the formal and informal procedures of recruitment, and the characteristics of the initial appointments of the participants (i.e., workload, duration). I found that PT faculty gained
their initial positions in various formal and informal ways, but the most common were the informal: They were students at the university; they knew faculty in the university department where they were hired; and, they had developed professional relationships with the department members prior to their appointment as PT faculty. Thus, although there was a formal process and a formal structure for recruitment and appointment for PT faculty, these were not the critical means by which these PT faculty were hired.

The second section focuses on the evolution of the work relationship, that is, the changes in the rights, duties, and privileges of PT faculty, as well as the development of PT faculty members’ attachment to their campus and its members. This second section answers the following research questions: How did the PT faculty members’ relationship with the university evolve from a temporal appointment to a long-term work relationship? How do PT faculty understand and explain their long-term relationship with a public university? What do PT faculty consider central in this relationship (at the personal level and in the university’s organization)? The evolution of the relationship of PT faculty members and their campus was shaped by both formal structures of exclusion and inclusion of PT faculty and informal norms (e.g., rank system) for this faculty group on their campus. For PT faculty, the formal changes in rights and duties at the institutional and departmental level were fewer in number and less important for their self-identification as organizational members than the informal changes in the rights, duties, and privileges they had at the department level. PT faculty based their self-perception as long-term organizational members on the number of years of their association with their department (as PT faculty or prior to that as students), their acquired informal rights at
the department level, their inclusion in departmental matters by their colleagues, and their knowledge of their colleagues, university programs, and their department.

In the third section of the chapter, I explain the organizational structures that motivated PT faculty to continue at their campus as well as those that influenced them to consider leaving the campus. This section provides an answer to the questions: According to part-time faculty, in which ways does the university support and in which ways does it hinder their work performance? How do PT faculty reconcile their perceptions of both the university’s support systems and organizational obstacles? When do these obstacles become a reason to leave the institution? At the departmental level, the presence of at least one personal relationship with a colleague, the use of strategies of PT faculty involvement (or at least lack of rejection), and evidence of the department chair’s personal efforts to support PT faculty were central for the participants to remain at the university. In contrast, the simultaneous presence of a culture of exclusion of PT faculty in their department, a lack of supportive norms in the university, and a lack of acknowledgement as a legitimate faculty member from colleagues and administration influenced PT faculty members to leave.

Due to the precarious work circumstances of PT faculty, informal structures (e.g., norms, resource distribution practices) at the department level played a more central role for the development of the long-term relationship than formal structures. Formal structures at the university and system level (e.g., distribution of additional workload rules), although these played a peripheral role, contributed to participants’ perceptions that the campus lacked an organizational environment of care (McAllister & Bigley,
towards nontenure-track faculty—and PT faculty in specific. This suggests that social capital (Ream, 2005) plays a significant role in the beginning, evolution, and ending of the relationship between a PT faculty member and their university. As well, this suggests that the formation of a PT faculty member’s identity as an organizational member has its roots in experiences with a university or its faculty prior to an initial formal appointment as a faculty member.

**The Initiation of the Work Relationship**

Formally, the work relationship between PT faculty and their campus started the day faculty received their official appointment. However, for PT faculty, the relationship with the university as an organization began before the official appointment, when they first learned about and applied for the position or through a previous contact with the campus (as students at the university, teaching assistants, guest lecturers, or staff) and with the department (as students in the department program or as acquaintances of department members). The most common way in which PT faculty gained their initial positions was informally. That is, there was a formal process and a formal structure for recruitment and appointment for PT faculty, but these were not the process that these PT faculty identified as critical for their recruitment and hiring.

**Official beginning of the work relationship.** At the three campuses, the descriptions of the official recruitment of PT faculty did not follow the same structure and rigor as that of tenure-track faculty. The recruitment of PT temporal faculty at Big City University, Middle Valley University, and Small Ville University was described as “local,” possibly “unexpected,” and adaptable to the departments’ needs, while the
recruitment of tenure-track faculty was described as “national,” “planned,” and related to the institutional “strategic plan.” Moreover, the appointment of tenure-track faculty was authorized by the campus president, while PT faculty members’ appointment was approved by the Dean. These differences in the recruitment and appointment of PT faculty as compared to tenure-track faculty are a characteristic that the three campuses in this investigation shared with other higher education institutions. Benjamin (2003) and Gappa and Leslie (1993), for example, pointed out that the universities and colleges they studied recruited PT faculty with less rigor than that used for full-time faculty.

The official process of recruitment of part-time faculty was described with different degrees of detail at the three campuses and the process was carried out differently in each department within the three campuses. In Big City University, the process for PT faculty members’ recruitment and appointment was described in more detail and included more information for possible PT faculty candidates than in the other campuses. In Middle Valley University, there was less flexibility regarding the documents that applicants should submit as “evidence” of their experience. Finally, in Small Ville University there was near total absence of a formal description of PT faculty recruitment processes (while the recruitment of full-time tenure-track faculty was described in more length than in the other two campuses). At the three campuses, PT faculty recruitment shared two similarities. First, departments (i.e., department chairs and faculty members) had discretion to carry out recruitment and appointment processes. “The exact roles of the Department Chair and tenured or tenure-track faculty in recruiting new part-time temporary faculty may vary based on the particular needs of a Department
and the time available for the recruitment” (Big City University, Recruitment and appointment of temporary faculty, 2014, p. 2). Second, PT faculty recruitment was considered the first official contact between the PT faculty and the campus.

Officially, at the two universities that described the process of PT faculty recruitment in more length (Big City University and Middle Valley University), this process was composed of five general phases. The phases included the development of a vacancy announcement in the institutional or departmental website, the candidates’ application to the vacancy by uploading documentation (curriculum vitae or resumé and cover letter) to the institutional website, the generation of a pool of potential PT faculty by the department members, the contact of a departmental member (department chair or committee member) with the potential PT faculty for evaluation of the candidate, and the appointment of the candidate. The recruitment process at the three universities concluded with an official invitation to work as PT faculty (i.e., adjunct, lecturer, or instructor) at the university. “5. Part-time temporary faculty are considered appointed only after an appointment letter has been extended and accepted” (Middle Valley University, Academic personnel, 2016).

In the processes described, there was an assumption that candidates’ first contact with the institution began after the vacancy was announced. “1. The appointment of part-time temporary faculty is made from a pool of previously approved candidates. 2. To establish candidate pools, departments/programs, as necessary, should advertise part-time temporary positions around the local area to develop applications files” (Middle Valley University, Academic personnel, 2016). That is, formally, there was no relationship
between the individual and the campus prior to PT faculty’s application, or at least, this relationship was not recognized. Formally, the beginning of the work relationship between PT faculty and the university was indicated in appointment letters; these documents also provided other information for PT faculty.

Formal details of the participants’ initial work relationship (i.e., duration, workload, salary range/step) with their campus was reflected in the letter of appointment. For example, in Big City University the letter of appointment was considered the only notification of information such as “the beginning, and, for temporary faculty members, the ending dates of the initial appointment, classification, employment status, time base, rank, salary, assigned department, and any other special conditions of appointment” for faculty. Furthermore, the Faculty Handbook specified that “No other notice shall be provided” to indicate the end of a PT faculty member’s appointment (Big City University, Faculty Handbook 2015-2016, 2015, p. 15). Accordingly, the letter of appointment was the participants’ primary formal source of information about their appointment and expectations of the campus.

In both their official workload and period of employment, the participants started either in what they called the “normal conditions of adjunct faculty” (Down, History, BCU), or with what they identified as “special” or “unique” conditions. The norm at the three campuses for PT faculty members’ original appointment was term by term appointments with a small number of courses per term (1-2); the majority (25) of the participants had this experience. However, for three of them (Adbel, Down, Bridget), who qualified themselves as “lucky” or “unusual,” their original appointment was either for a
longer period of time (i.e., one year, three years) and for a heavier course workload than normal (i.e., three or four courses per term).

Table 5.

Formal Terms of Part-Time Faculty Members’ Original Appointment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Original Appointment</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Original Appointment</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Original Appointment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ava</td>
<td>1 S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>1 S</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alissa</td>
<td>1 S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Paulina</td>
<td>1 S</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>1 S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Roy</td>
<td>1 Q</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlize</td>
<td>1 S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>1 Q</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>1 S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>1 Q</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanna</td>
<td>1 S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>1 Q</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>1 S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Colette</td>
<td>1 Q</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine</td>
<td>1 S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elena</td>
<td>1 S</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>1 S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>1 S</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mae</td>
<td>1 S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>1 S</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Q = quarter, S = Semester, Y = Year

The initial appointment conditions of long-term PT faculty had the same characteristics (i.e., length and course load) as PT faculty at other campuses and institutions in the U.S. (The Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012). In addition, the original appointments of long-term PT faculty who participated in this investigation
were similar to the 23 newer PT faculty interviewed from Small Ville University, Middle Valley University, and Big City University. All 23 newer PT faculty at the three campuses started with a term by term appointment, and only three had more than two classes per term when they began the work relationship with their campus. Table 5 includes the details of the original contract of the long-term PT faculty participants.

Although the appointment letter provided PT faculty with information on the characteristics of their appointment, they rarely received other information on the organizational expectations for them, such as their roles, duties, and activities. “They didn’t even get me like a piece of paper saying ‘you need to cover this in your class’” (Chelsea, Administration of Justice, BCU). “This is very sad… I was never given like a set of expectations” (Josephine, Kinesiology, BCU). Indeed, the information that PT faculty received in the form of the appointment letter was incomplete, and departments did not have strategies to communicate formally the expectations of their position with PT faculty. “I think that’s very similar in a lot of institutions. They just think adjunct faculty will figure it out [what to do] because they know where to find information” (Mae, Health Sciences, BCU). Due to this lack of formal communication, participants learned about their position through interactions with departmental members (staff, department chair, other PT faculty, full-time faculty). That is, their relationships with members of the department were key for this PT faculty group not only to be recruited but also to acquire knowledge about their positions (this is explored in the following section).
Table 6.

*Participants’ Relationships with Department and Department Members Previous to their Initial Appointment as Part-time Faculty*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Former student (undergraduate or graduate)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ava (BCU), Anna (SVU), Charlize (BCU), Elena (BCU), Chelsea (BCU), Colette (MVU), Felicia (MVU), Howard (BCU), Jim (BCU), Josephine (BCU), Marguerite (BCU), Saul (BCU), Mae (BCU), Melinda (BCU), Max (MVU), Ross (MVU).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Graduate Teaching Associate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chelsea (BCU), Colette (MVU), Felicia (MVU), Melinda (BCU).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship with a departmental member</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kate (BCU), Howard (BCU), Max (MVU), Charlize (BCU).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional relationship with departmental member</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Alissa (BCU), Elena (BCU), Jonathan (MVU), Josephine (BCU), Gerald (BCU), Mae (BCU), Mike (SVU), Paulina (BCU), Ronald (MVU), Roy (MVU).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple relationships (e.g., former student and friend)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Charlize (BCU), Colette (MVU), Elena (BCU), Howard (BCU), Mae (BCU), Max (MVU), Jonathan (MVU), Josephine (BCU).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No previous relationship</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Adbel (BCU), Down (BCU), Hanna (SVU), Bridget (MVU), Jackie (SVU).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Informal origin of the work relationship. The recruitment process of PT faculty did not necessarily follow the processes described in the campuses’ formal documentation. Only three participants (Hanna, Philosophy/Computer Systems, SVU; Abdel, History, BCU; and Paulina, Nursing, BCU) followed the regular recruitment process: They applied for the position. Two participants, Bridget (Biology, MVU) and Jackie (English, SVU), were hired as part of a contractual package for their partners. But, the majority of the participants (25) were invited by a departmental member to apply for a specific teaching position. This larger group of PT faculty, described their experience as follows: A member of the department invited them to participate in an interview with the department chair; they had the interview with the department chair; the applicant and the department chair had an informal agreement on the course and the number of units assigned to the PT faculty; the department chair asked the PT faculty member to submit their documentation to the institution; and, finally, PT faculty received a formal letter of appointment.

For the participants who were invited by a department member, their relationship with the campuses did not begin when they applied for a position, but rather previously to the application. Table 6 shows the various relationships that long-term PT faculty had with their departments and department members, previously to their appointment. They had developed professional relationships with department members prior to their appointment as PT faculty: They were undergraduate and graduate students at the university or they were acquainted with full-time faculty members in the university department where they were hired. Indeed, the majority of long-term PT faculty in this
investigation were recruited and invited to teach specific courses for which they were considered to have specific skills, or practitioner expertise, or for which they demonstrated extraordinary performance as students at the same university.

My faculty advisor for my Master’s thesis contacted me because he needed me to teach a class, because they needed an adjunct faculty. So that is how I got my first teaching job [at this university]. (Anna, Psychology, SVU)

She’s a Linguistics professor [the professor who invited me]. She knew all the things that I wanted to do and that I did well in grad school. (Colette, English, MVU)

I was invited by a friend who was the department chair at the time, to teach here…The department chair had known me for a long time because I have been all over Southern California working in journalism. I worked in television. I have known him, I guess [for] 20, 25 years, and our paths crossed in education because I do a lot of speaking. I do a lot of events that cover education and involve students in them…I have a lot of work with and for students. So, he knew me. (Howard, Communications, BCU)

I had been doing guest lecturing in these classes and then I just got an e-mail [from the department], [which] said “Would you be interested in teaching this class in the fall? If you are, call the office,” which I did. And then, [I] came in and we interviewed, and, then, they offered me the job. (Alissa, Management, BCU)

Although participants’ formal work relationship with the campus began when they received and signed their appointment letter, their past experiences with the university and university members were the informal origin of, and key for, their appointment.

Both department chairs and tenure-track faculty members took part in inviting the participants to teach at the department. Furthermore, departmental members were instrumental in the appointment of PT faculty, as the experience of Chelsea, a former student at University Big City, exemplifies.

I got a class working at [a community college] and then, from there, my class was very successful and one of the faculty members [of this university] told me “Oh,
you should apply here” and I thought: “It is never going to happen,” but I just gave her my resume and she told the Dean that they had to hire me, so here I am. (Chelsea, Administration of Justice, BCU)

In contrast to the advantages provided by these informal connections to the department, the regular lanes for recruitment and appointment at the university level were problematical; indeed, there were obstacles for PT faculty.

I never go through H.R. [Human Resources]... I see H.R. as a black hole. They are like: “Turn in your application, and we will call you, if we have any openings.” And I never hear from them. But, if I go directly to the chair whom from word of mouth I know of has an opening that they have been looking for, that is always, that is at all five the campuses that I have taught at, that is exactly how I got my job. (Hanna, Philosophy/Computer Systems, SVU)

PT faculty members’ ties at the departmental level were more fruitful for them to gain a teaching appointment than it was for them to follow the university-wide level policies. In addition, for long-term PT faculty, department members were central guides for their initial adaptation to their campus.

PT faculty, primarily those who had less than ten years working at the university, did receive a formal orientation as university newcomers (i.e., “new faculty orientation”). However, these orientations offered them superficial information about the university that did not provide clarity about the expectations of their position.

It was a two or three hour new faculty orientation, but it was mostly university policies. Like if you’re going to drive on campus you need to have defensive driver training... but there wasn’t… [We were not told]: “This is what your course syllabus must look like, this is where you go to get information on all of our university policies for teaching.” (Mae, Health, BCU)

In the view of PT faculty, department members were a richer source of information than a faculty orientation on the department and the department’s expectations for them and their work.
For the most, [the department chair] provided me with some materials from other instructors. They gave me [the direction]: “This is the textbook we’re using; this is the material…and this is the syllabus; this is, you know, kind of the how we do it.” It was very informal like “hey, you need to do these kinds of things, you need to yeah.” It was kind of just an informal sketch on what [the department chair] kind of explained to me, “The dos and don’ts in the classroom, and…there’s certain curriculum in there. You need to make sure you do these things because these are core to what we want; we want them to learn.” (Max, Business and Public Administration, MVU)

I started teaching in the fall semester, and I taught an online class, and I worked with a faculty member…who had created this brand-new class that was going to be offered… She asked if I would like to teach it for her because she was getting promoted… She sat down and went through all of her materials with me and helped me built the course. So, she really mentored me that first semester. (Mae, Health, BCU)

Not all PT faculty had access to this type of support from full-time faculty colleagues since the beginning of their appointment. In particular, this was not the experience of those PT faculty who did not have a relationship with the department previously to their appointment. “Here when we first started as a part-time; here you’re just ignored” (Alissa, Management, BCU). However, over time, the guidance offered by colleagues gained salience for all participants and this guidance became a central element in the evolution of the work relationship.

The Evolution of the Work Relationship

The term evolution of the work relationship refers to the changes in both the formal conditions and informal aspects (i.e., rights, duties, privileges, personal relationships) of PT faculty work relationship with a comprehensive university. In particular, this section explains the indicators of a modification from a short-term to a long-term work relationship with a department and a university, as described by the participants. The informal changes in the work relationship were more nuanced and
gradual than the formal changes. In addition, the informal changes were perceived by PT faculty as the cause of the formal changes, not vice versa. Informal changes enabled PT faculty to develop a sense of stability in the department and the university (at least partially) and provided PT faculty members with the basis to consider themselves organizational members.

The participants in this study had between five and 29 years of working at their university. During those years, the work relationship of PT faculty evolved formally at the institutional level. (Henceforth, I use participants’ seniority in their department, in addition to their pseudonym, department and campus to identify them). Officially, there were two rights that applied to all PT faculty and that were related to PT faculty re-appointment: longer contracts and entitlements. PT faculty gained the right to longer appointments over time until they would reach the maximum of a three-year appointment.

As a kind of compromise [with PT faculty], if you do the same thing as an academic lecturer, for the first six years, if you make it through the entire year, and they re-hire you the fourth year, they have to hire you for the full-year, ok? If they do that for six years running, [and] if they hire you for the seventh year, it has to be for three years. And then, you go through a review at the end of the three years. If you pass the review satisfactorily, they hire you for another three years. So, this is a sort of tenure, you get a renewable three-year contract. (Down, History, 10 years, BCU)

That is, although there was formal acknowledgement that the length of the work relationship would extend, this acknowledgement (a) did not represent the actual length of the work relationship, (b) did show the length of the relationship for the future only, and (c) extended the length of the work relationship only by three-years. “In eleven years
here, my official category is ‘Part-time, temporary.’ You like that? Part-time temporary…” (Down, History, 10 years, BCU).

PT faculty recognized they had the right to move from term contracts, to yearly contracts (“AY: Academic year” contracts), to three-year contracts. However, the details of the process and the time periods to move from one type of contract to the next was not clear for all PT faculty.

If you’re part-time faculty for 6 years you’re up for a three-year contract, which are then... I believe things are renewed. You only renew every three years and it’s more stable. And that’s definitely something that I am highly interested in earning, assuming that I’m still here. (Josephine, Kinesiology, 5 years, BCU)

For Josephine, who was a former student at BCU and used to work as Teaching Assistant previously to her position as PT faculty, the need to understand the institutional rights of PT faculty was necessary due to her interest to continue to work as a PT faculty.

Josephine’s limited knowledge of PT faculty rights was common among all participants who did not have three-year contracts. Moreover, the majority of the participants who did have three-year appointments were not able to identify when their contract changed from a one-year to three-year contract.

Along with longer contracts, PT faculty in the three campuses and in the whole CSU system also obtained entitlements over time. That is, they acquired the right to be re-appointed in subsequent academic years with a number of credits similar to those in the previous terms.

I started with one full quarter and it was a three-quarter class, meaning: automatically, I would get a full-year contract, which is good for me…and they offered me two classes [more]... I think, I was in a very fortunate position to be offered these classes… [because] you can be given one class and if there’s no
class available you will not get another class and that’s the only entitlement that you will get for the following year. (Colette, English, 5 years, MVU)

PT faculty members perceived entitlements as an institutional guarantee that their workload would remain constant over time and from contract to contract. “They say [that] once you establish yourself as teaching three classes a semester, and that’s your routine, you get that, for the most part” (Jim, Communications, 17 years, BCU).

As a positive consequence of the longer contracts and entitlements, if these were accompanied by a larger number of classes, other conditions of PT faculty’s appointments improved. “I was offered a one year contract with at least 50% load and that was important because that was the minimum that’s required to get benefits” (Bridget, Biology, 12 years, MVU). The improvements of PT faculty conditions included that PT faculty would receive health insurance (which became less expensive and discounted directly from PT faculty salaries for academic year), PT faculty members’ salary changed from a nine month to a twelve-month distribution, and PT faculty members’ retirement benefits improved.

I do [have health benefits]. I have health, dental, and vision benefits through [SVU], so long as I am here teaching six plus units at the semester, that is, two or more classes at the semester. When I started teaching in 2004 to 2008, I would not qualify because I have only one class. But it was when I started teaching more than two classes that I became eligible for it. And obviously, when I first learned [and was told] “You are eligible for benefits,” I jumped on it. But I need to maintain my contract with the university consistently…When you disconnect from the university, you also disconnect from the benefits. (Hanna, Philosophy/Computer Systems, 11 years, SVU)

Similar to Hanna, the majority of the PT faculty learned about these additional benefits and rights once they obtained these rights. Thus, most participants—primarily those PT faculty who had worked at these campuses since before these rights were gained by the
union—had not developed plans or strategies to obtain such benefits. However, once they obtained the benefits and additional rights, they developed an interest in learning more about their institutional rights, as noted by Josephine: “[T]hat’s definitely something that I am highly interested in learning, assuming that I’m still here” (Josephine, Kinesiology, 5 years, BCU).

Entitlements as well as one-year contracts and three-year contracts provided PT faculty with more security regarding their workload and duration of appointment, but this security was limited. Three-year appointments did not guarantee PT faculty would actually work every term in those three years.

If you teach semester by semester for up to three years, then you’re now automatically given a three year contract. It doesn’t mean that you teach every semester for those three years… It just means that you don’t have to turn in an evaluation portfolio until that third year. (Mae, Health, 6 years BCU)

In addition, entitlements did not guarantee to PT faculty that they would have the opportunity to teach with the consistency they expected. “Actually, this year even though I have an annual, year contract, I don’t have any classes for next quarter” (Bridget, Biology, 12 years, MVU).

It’s not guaranteed…last year they offered me a couple of extra classes, then I had a fairly open schedule at the time, so I took it. So, one semester I taught five classes here, and I was thinking “Oh, nice. Extra money.” And the next semester, I got two [classes] instead of three, and I was like “but I thought that [I would have three]” Because of the entitlement, I’ve been fortunate to teach steady three classes per semester but every now and then, like I said, [they] bring it down to two and you just have to tighten your belt and do what you need to do... (Jim, Communications, 17 years, BCU)
That is, although entitlements and longer contracts, (as well as salary year-distribution, and benefits) were formal rights, these did not provide absolute certainty to PT faculty about their appointments.

The uncertainty in PT faculty members’ teaching load had its basis in that entitlements were yearly but departments organized PT faculty teaching loads based on contingent needs of the department on a term by term basis. Over time, department chairs could offer PT faculty additional courses or new classes but to a “15 units or less” yearly limit, which was an established practice system-wide (Big City University, Academic Personnel, 2016). Periodically, the changing nature of the departments’ needs worked to the benefit of PT faculty members who would be able to teach an additional class.

This new group of [International] students [arrived]... [And the department] needed to have them go through what we call our “Stretched Composition Class,” and at that time the timing was off, so, they didn’t want them to wait until next year to start the class. So, they opened up special sections for spring. So, I ended up working Spring, Summer, and Fall [on that]. (Colette, English, 5 years, MVU)

However, when PT faculty accepted additional classes in a term, similar to that related by Jim above, this could affect their teaching load in a subsequent term—they could teach fewer classes than what they expected in that term. Thus, in order to gain certainty, it became an added task for PT faculty to have a control over their teaching load both in a term by term basis and on a yearly basis. “The unit conversion from term to year is complex, you need to keep track of your max units for the academic year” (Melinda, Communications, 12 years, BCU).

Together, the formal changes in the appointment of PT faculty (i.e., additional rights and additional teaching load) provided them with a rather limited sense of job
security and formal acknowledgement of their permanence in the university and the university (CSU) system. None of these individual formal changes in their appointment helped PT faculty to develop a sense of belonging to the university or the department. Furthermore, the formal changes in their appointment were not the reason for PT faculty to characterize their relationship with the department and university as a long-term relationship but an indicator that PT faculty had already developed a long-term relationship with the university. The source of PT faculty’s sense of belonging and the indicators that they had a long-term relationship with the university were their elevated position on an informal rank system for PT faculty; PT faculty members’ knowledge of their campus, department, and programs; and, PT faculty members’ personal relationships and their inclusion and participation in departmental activities.

**Informal rank system.** Within campuses and departments, there was a faculty hierarchy, and, that in this hierarchy, PT faculty as a group were at the bottom level, which could be beneath teaching assistants. PT faculty at the three campuses were treated differently to “the real people, the ones that are there the whole time” (Jonathan, Kinesiology, 12 years, MVU). “There is definitely a distinction here, at this campus, between full-time and part-time” (Melinda, Human Communications, 12 years BCU). As a consequence of this hierarchy, PT faculty were the final people to be offered classes, were given offices that were inferior to those of full-time faculty, and were omitted from official communications more frequently than tenured and tenure-track faculty.

I don’t know how it’s like in other departments but in my department the lecturer is at the bottom of the total, absolutely at the bottom…It is full-time faculty, tenured, then, there’s full-time that aren’t tenure, not tenure but full-time, they
have to be filled, and then, teaching associates [and] grad students get their classes, and then, what’s leftover I get. (Jim, Communications, 17 years, BCU)

All the full-time faculty are in one hallway, on one wing of the building. All the part-time faculty are scrounged up in offices in the far back side of the building…and there is no “cross contamination” between the full-time and the part-time. (Jackie, English, 6 years, SVU)

I feel like there’s ways that we [PT faculty] could be connected and kept connected that are not really utilized. I think part of it is that our department chairs are expected to provide service to your tenured faculty [and] to your tenure-track faculty, which is a very different relationship, and then, to your adjunct that [the department chair] don’t really see very often. (Mae, Health, 6 years, BCU)

This treatment of PT faculty in relation to full-time and tenure-track faculty was an initial impediment for PT faculty to develop a sense of their status as members of the university and their department. “In our department, you’re either full-time or you’re an adjunct. And it’s almost like having a secret society, you know?” (Roy, Communication, 15 years, MVU). “[It] is kind of frustrating that we are not treated the same way that tenured faculty are treated, we are treated as second class citizens in my opinion. I do not like that” (Howard, Communications, 10 years, BCU).

The hierarchy that places PT faculty (and all nontenure-track faculty) as lower status in comparison to tenured and tenure-track faculty, as well as the negative effects this hierarchy has on PT faculty, has been both discussed and documented widely in scholarly literature (e.g., Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Deem, 1998; Gappa, 2000; Kezar & Sam, 2011b; Kupiec Clayton, 1991; Levin, 2006; Levin, Shaker, & Wagoner, 2011; Ochoa, 2011; Shaker, 2008; Welch, 2000). However, PT faculty at Small Ville University, Middle Valley University, and Big City University were also part of another hierarchy, one that provided long-term PT faculty advantages based on the time that they
had worked at the campus. “[I]n the department there is kind of hierarchy of adjunct faculty] and the longer you work, the higher up on the department list that you get...

Every department has, whether they admit it or not, that kind of ‘adjunct list’” (Hanna, Philosophy/Computer Systems, 11 years, SVU). This hierarchy worked as an informal rank system for nontenure-track faculty. For those PT faculty with long work relationships with the campuses, this informal rank system counteracted the rejection they experienced due to differential treatment in relation to tenure-track faculty.

Higher ranked PT faculty would obtain additional rights related to teaching, primarily. These rights included being offered a specific class first (e.g., an upper division course), being able to choose courses before other nontenure-track faculty, and being offered new classes before other PT faculty.

I am the senior member here. I have been here longer that most of the people in the department…They [the department] come to me first when they need [someone to teach]. When all of these class requirements have been met by the [tenured] faculty, then, they come to me first, and then they would trickle down to people [PT faculty] who are under me. (Ava, Special Education, 18 years, BCU)

[T]hey have adjuncts that they would call first, as opposed to those adjuncts who might be new that they call last, or at the last minute, when they find out that they are going to lose a full-time professor for the semester... (Hanna, Philosophy/Computer Systems, 11 years, SVU)

PT faculty with more seniority in the department also gained “rights” over a specific class. As long as they demonstrated good quality performance, did not receive complaints from students, and had taught a given class before, PT faculty would be able to teach a specific course multiple times.

I do have preference over people that maybe have just taught one year. So, let’s say for example, I’m teaching this Drugs and Society class. Let’s say that someone who just started teaching here last year said: “Oh, I want to take that
Drugs and Society class that [Mae] teaches on Wednesdays.” They [the department] could give it to that person, but I have some power behind me to go back and say: “Why did you take that class away from me? I’ve been teaching that class for three years.” And they would need to base that on something; so, like that my SOQ’s [Student Opinion Questionnaires] weren’t high, or [that] they had a student complaint, or something like that. And they don’t generally do that. (Mae, Health, 6 years, BCU)

The length of time that PT faculty worked in their departments enable them to gain a level of privilege, and they perceived that, although their position was not completely secure, their role would be to some degree respected.

The offering of additional classes (illustrated by Ava’s and Hanna’s quotations) matched the descriptions of the process used to organize “additional temporary work” stated in the collective bargaining agreement between CSU’s Board of Trustees and the California Faculty Association (California Faculty Association, 2017). Yet, PT faculty did not identify this advantage as an institutional right that they obtained through the union, but as an informal department-level norm and a consequence of their permanence at the department. Furthermore, PT faculty grouped these teaching related rights with other informal recompenses gained over time.

As PT faculty were re-hired continually term after term they would gain other advantages that were not part of the formal norms and regulations of the campuses or the CSU system. These additional informal rights obtained by PT faculty included their ability to use or chose additional office space, obtain supplementary materials or resources that were not directed to PT faculty customarily, and obtain information about the department and the university. “I have my own office, you know? I guess I’m senior now [I] got my refrigerator, [and] microwave [in the office]” (Adbel, History, 16 years,
BCU). Due to the informal nature of this informal rank system, tenure-track departmental members and staff were instrumental in PT faculty’s receipt of these additional advantages. Down (History, 10 years) and Charlize (Human Development, 13 years), both from BCU, indicated that they obtained better office space due to both their longer time in the department than other PT faculty and their relationship with other department members. For Down, the department staff were the ones who put him in a special position among PT faculty.

Downstairs, it is a big room. It is all divided into cubicles, like an office space…So, a lot of the guys only have one class…and they share a room with a bunch of other people. I started out there [and] there is no reason why I am not still there, except the people that are the actual office people… [They] have me sharing an office with a guy who comes once a week… So, I fulfill the requirement of sharing an office, but you know, they personally think, that at my age… I should be treated as tenured faculty. (Down, History, 10 years, BCU)

Thus, Down’s conditions were not better than or equal to those of tenured and tenure-track faculty, but they were better than those of his fellow PT faculty in the department.

For Catherine, her relationship with faculty colleagues (full-time faculty and the department chair) enabled her to enjoy, although momentarily, an individual office space.

The office I’m in right now is a full-time faculty persons, who’s on a sabbatical and luckily, because I know her, she allowed me to come in to her office while she’s not here because there were 4 people in the part-time faculty office that I was in last semester…The chair asked the faculty member if I could use the office and she said “Yes.” (Charlize, Human Development, 13 years, BCU)

The relationships that PT faculty had with colleagues and with staff, which were developed overtime, provided PT faculty access to the advantages of the higher levels of the informal rank system. That is, this informal PT faculty rank system worked through the conscious and active effort of departmental members.
PT faculty had both positive and negative perceptions of their departments’ informal rank system used for PT faculty. On the one hand, PT faculty enjoyed the advantages that they obtained due to their seniority.

The longer that I have taught, the more connected that I have become with the different departments and the chairs. And the higher I have gotten into that hierarchy list, the more comfortable that I am earlier in the year, with my schedule for the coming semester. (Hanna, Philosophy/Computer Systems, 11 years, SVU)

On the other hand, PT faculty were troubled by knowing that their newer colleagues did not enjoy these advantages and they themselves were in that disadvantaged position. PT faculty were conscious of the fragility and unpredictability of these advantages.

There’s supposed to be a hierarchy of some sort which it [the department] still follows...So there’s a pool of people who have been here for over 7 years and they have 3 year contracts, right? And then, there’s a pool of people [who have] been here for just one year... and then, we have quarter to quarter [people], right?... So, right now, the issue here, I think, is [that] we have people who have had a year to year contract, which is good, but still have [only] one class to teach...and then, it doesn’t help that they [the university] keep hiring new people either. So, last year we had a group of 6 new hires when we have a ton of people here who have to work at 5 universities... because they only have one class here, and one class there, and one class there. (Colette, English, 5 years, MVU)

With teaching for PT faculty subject to privileges or advantages for the acquisition of contracts, the hierarchy among PT faculty reminded them that they were part of a group that was looked down and not acknowledged as “the real people” to use Jonathan’s terms (Kinesiology, 12 years, MVU). Due to the informal character of the rank system and of the rights it provided them, PT faculty members’ additional advantages and improvement in treatment that they obtained depended on their colleagues and were not guaranteed institutionally. Thus, although the informal rank
system did not indicate the university’s organizational care for PT faculty (McAllister & Bigley, 2002), it did represent FT faculty colleagues’ respect for PT faculty.

**One of the group.** One of the main sources for the development of a sense of membership for PT faculty was the personal relationships that they developed at the department level. Among PT faculty, only 13 used the words “friend” or “friendship” to refer to someone on their campus. “I am very blessed to have great friends in here; they are family” (Ava, Special Education, 18 years, BCU). However, all participants indicated that they had developed professional/personal relationships with people in their departments. PT faculty both made a stronger connection with a department member that they already knew prior to their appointments and developed new relationships with members they met after their appointments. Relationships with faculty in the department were more usual than those with people in the campus in general. “I don’t really interact with other colleges aside from Health Science” (Josephine, Kinesiology, 5 years, BCU). In addition, these relationships were vital for PT faculty members’ sense of connection to the department and the campus.

PT faculty members’ primary interactions in terms of frequency, or everyday common interactions, occurred with “department support staff.” PT faculty would see, talk to, and email these department members periodically for their everyday needs.

I e-mail our department support staff and they would make copies and leave them for me. (Anna, Psychology, 9 years, SVU).

[For] assigning of classes, they will call and say, “Can you do this?” [referring to my] availability, any textbook orders or those sorts of things, signing contracts. We give it to them, to [the] staff. (Melinda, Human Communications, 12 years, BCU)
Over time, these daily interactions in which staff provided support and information to PT faculty lead to a sense of stability for PT faculty as members of the department.

I am pretty close to the staff because I go there all the time. I am always...“Can you please print this; can you please do this?” So, they are very nice. I get along very well with them. I once had a luncheon with them. (Chelsea, Administration of Justice, 5 years, BCU)

They [staff] are very helpful. Everything from making copies of exams, checking information on a variety of things like adding students, dropping students, changing grades’ pretty much anything that we just don’t know as far as: where we can find this, what form do we need to fill [out]? (Saul, Sociology, 10 years, BCU)

PT faculty members’ relationships with staff enabled them to carry out the activities they were expected to perform and to comply with the administrative tasks that the department needed from them. That is, staff assisted PT faculty to perform “in-role behaviors” (Macey & Schneider, 2008). However, the relationships with staff alone were not a central aid for PT faculty involvement in the department.

Relationships with faculty and full-time faculty, in particular, provided PT faculty with a sense of legitimacy as members of the department, the college, and the university. These relationships were more significant for their sense of membership than those that they had with staff.

I interact very well with most Kinesiology faculty. I mean, most of the tenure faculty, the full-timers are very welcoming and supportive of what I do, and I talk with them frequently and I would consider many of them like good friends. And some are my mentors because I studied under them. And, of course, there’s a couple that are either ambivalent to my presence... I’m sure there are the classic tenure-track professors that look down on lecturers... [But] I’ve never heard anything; I’ve never been told anything, nothing like that. (Josephine, Kinesiology, 5 years, BCU)
Although the lack of relationships with colleagues was problematical for PT faculty, the presence of these relationships increased PT faculty comfort as well as their sense of that they were a department member as valued as any other member.

Whether PT faculty members’ personal relationships included all faculty, to constitute a “friendly environment,” or relationships were with specific individuals—“We hang out, for fun. I consider her my friend” (Chelsea, Administration of Justice, 5 years, BCU)—these relationships provided PT faculty with non-pecuniary benefits. From these relationships, PT faculty received support, motivation, and the sense that they were not just transient or provisional in their department.

This department that I’m in, we’ve a very collegial and team-focused; and even though I’m not part of the tenure-track group, I feel like we are respected as part of the department. So, within reason, within their capabilities our needs as part-timers are considered. (Kate, Geology, 13 years, BCU)

Through these relationships, PT faculty members perceived that their work was connected to the work of their colleagues and that full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty did not reject them.

Personal relationships with faculty were beneficial not only in that they helped PT faculty to develop positive feelings about their work but also, and potentially, to “perform better” and to participate in additional activities related to their work. “I think that was the case. I think [that] if you have a sense of community, you feel more welcomed there [and] you’re more likely to probably perform better” (Max, Business and Public Administration, 17 years, MVU). PT faculty were able to participate in special programs and grants in their universities due, in part, to their relationship with other faculty members.
My [PT] colleagues and I have written a couple of little [BCU’s internal] grants to pull money out of that grant. It’s 300 dollars, 400 dollars here and there. So, we’ve been part of that trying to get little moneys to revamp our classes and make little changes here and there…There have been some grants that have required a PhD or tenure-track PI. We write it and they put they name on it, and that’s the system that works pretty well. It’s imperfect because you [PT faculty] were really the ones running it, but on the other hand, in our positions, or having a PhD, I am shackled in some ways. But we found ways around it and have colleagues that will help facilitate these things. (Kate, Geology, 13 years, BCU)

In experiences such as Kate’s, participants observed that their tenure-track colleagues respected them and trusted them to the degree of allowing PT faculty use their name in official documentation. It was due to their personal relationship that full-time faculty accepted to support PT faculty.

PT faculty’s personal relationships with faculty colleagues developed because PT faculty members attempted to develop these relationships. “Here it [i]s just like you’re slowly included” (Alissa, Management, 5 years, BCU). Departments, colleges, and campuses lacked strategies to provide PT faculty with formal opportunities to establish meaningful relationships with other faculty. “I’ve been affiliated with this university for a long time…as an adjunct faculty member and... I don’t even know some of our tenure-track faculty in our department because there’s just not been a formal connection” (Mae, Health, 6 years, BCU). Thus, over time long-term PT faculty became proactive in this regard.

I decided that I could get out and meet my colleagues more. I’ve been here for 5 years. So, I should know the people... I do have a couple of colleagues I talk to, here. We went to had lunch last week; then, I see them in the hallway. One of the other colleagues also belongs to the Project Management Institute [and] I’ll see him at meetings, stuff like that. It’s not a regular interaction but kind of casual... I think that’s the one thing I find lacking for part-time faculty; we don’t get enough interaction with everybody else. We’re kind of isolated. That’s what I feel. So,
for us to get involved we have to kind of like force ourselves into it. (Alissa, Management, 5 years, BCU)

This lack of connection to other faculty was stronger for PT faculty members in the large campus and in large departments. For example, participants at Big City University stated on numerous occasions that they viewed themselves as a “face in the crowd” and that they had to make a strong effort to relate to their colleagues, both full-time and PT faculty. Melinda, with experience at two CSU campuses, compared both experiences and found that it was more difficult to establish relationships at BCU, the largest campus which had the largest program, than to the other campus. “[In the other campus] it’s a smaller program…It is a much more inclusive feeling [there] than it is here. We are invited to all faculty meetings there. We have holiday socials, gatherings. We interact with one another” (Melinda, Human Communications, 12 years, BCU). However, for PT faculty at the three campuses, their relationships with other faculty were a product of their own interest, and required them to invest additional time and effort.

Among the personal relationships of PT faculty with other faculty members, of most importance and greater constancy in the everyday practices of PT faculty was that with the department chair. A positive relationship with the department chair improved PT faculty opportunities for a reappointment. “They can give you nothing if they want it. Fortunately, I think he [the department chair] likes me. I’ve been able to secure [classes] for a couple of years now” (Josephine, Kinesiology, 5 years, BCU). In addition, PT faculty’s ability to remain connected with the department chair on a constant basis was also an advantage for their job performance. “One thing that I appreciate very much [about] the chair of the department is [him] giving me advice on my course, giving me
feedback on it” (Mike, Sociology, 5 years, Online teaching at SVU). Correspondingly, problems with department chairs could involve negative consequences for PT faculty.

They [department chairs] have so much authority it’s unbelievable. There was somebody with 35 years in [BCU]. He was a really nice man, and they just fired him. I think he got into some friction with the chair but that wasn’t an excuse. (Adbel, History, 15 years, BCU)

Their relationship with the department chair, would set the tone for PT faculty’s sense of welcome or rejection in the department. However, this sense was different for participants based on whether or not they knew the department chair prior to their appointment. If not, then they viewed the department chair as “the boss.”

Whether PT faculty’s relationship with the department chairs started as a personal relationship previous to their appointment or as a professional relationship subsequent to their appointment, department chairs were a source of support for PT faculty to perform their roles.

If there is an issue with a student, I go with my department chair. If I can’t resolve it, she would just say, “Let me know if you need my help, these are suggestions [of what you can do].” But, if it was really critical, she would take care of it. There is a very good support system here, I feel. (Ava, Special Education, 18 years, BCU)

Department chairs were the primary source of help that PT faculty needed when they faced new challenges related to their work. As such, department chairs were PT faculty members’ dependable person whenever they needed to know how to behave in a new or challenging situation.

For PT faculty who had a personal relationship with the department chair preceding their initial appointment, the relationship was perceived as “friendly” by participants and it did not alter over time. For those PT faculty, whose relationships with
the department chair started when they were appointed, the relationship was incremental, in that interactions became more frequent and more personal. Department chairs at the three campuses changed every three to five years; thus, long-term PT faculty had experiences with more than one department chair and were able to identify differences in the personal practices and views of these department chairs, as well as the ways in which department chairs’ views had effects on the department’s behaviors towards PT faculty.

Whether old or new, department chairs were key actors in the inclusion or exclusion of PT faculty in departmental activities. Furthermore, department chairs’ behavior had both formal and informal implications for PT faculty involvement at the department level. They were able to develop and enact strategies to integrate PT faculty in activities such as department meetings, projects, grants, or committees.

I have to say that our department chair is very good about keeping the lecturers, the part-timers, informed…He said, “When I came here, I was a lecturer, I understand.”… [This is] his personal attempt; [it] is something that is important to him and he is making the move on his own. He is not getting a course release for it. Nobody is telling him to do it, [it] is just something that he feels is important to do. (Jackie, English, 6 years, SVU)

Not all department chairs made an effort to integrate PT faculty. But there was a shift in the three colleges: newer department chairs were more willing to invite PT faculty to participate in non-teaching activities. “[The] culture has changed because the new chair now sends out invitations: all welcome to attend but you don’t have to. So, there has been a shift in that culture” (Elena, Education, 29 years, BCU).

Invitations to faculty meetings were one of the primary changes that PT faculty identified during their time on the campuses. “We have a new chair this year and he’s extremely welcoming. Like for the first time, I’ve been invited to faculty meetings”
Customarily, invitations to meetings were impersonal for all PT faculty. “[They usually send an] open invitation: ‘By the way, nontenure (that’s us) are invited, but not required to attend.’ That is how we know: ‘By the way,’ ‘PS’” (Howard, Communications, 10 years, BCU). However, for long-term PT faculty who had specialized in a class or topic over time, these invitations became personal and an indication that they were valuable to the department.

One of the times I was asked to present some information to them because of my work with the online courses. So, a lot of the online courses in our department are taught by the part-timers, and are been developed by the part-timers. And so, we’ve had opportunities to go in [the meetings] and teach the full-timers things. (Marguerite, Biology, 10 years, BCU)

Furthermore, in some departments, department chairs developed special faculty meetings for PT faculty. These meetings were adapted to PT faculty’s schedule “We had options of which time we could go [to the meeting]” (Mae, Health, 6 years, BCU) and addressed topics of importance for PT faculty members.

We do have a monthly part-time faculty meeting. Not every department on campus has these regular meetings for part-time faculty. So, within our department that kind of keeps us in the loop as to policy changes at the university or something is coming up that we should be aware of, or [if] they’re interviewing a new faculty member or a dean, they’ll share that information to try to get us to provide input and feedback on that process. So, that kind of brings everyone together once a month. (Marguerite, Biology, 10 years, BCU)

Meetings directed to PT faculty members signaled them that PT faculty work was considered important to their colleagues. In addition, invitations to all faculty meetings, when they were personalized, indicated to long-term PT faculty that they were considered full departmental members where their opinions were valid and respected by their colleagues.
At the three campuses, department chairs played a central role for PT faculty to maintain a work relationship with their department, not only because department chair hired them but also because department chairs performed other informal actions to increase the participation and support that PT faculty received from the university.

“Lately our chair, for example, because there’s no money for us [PT faculty], the department chair would say, ‘You know? TRC [Teaching Resource Center] has money, if you guys want to go.’ You know, [he] will kind of forward information” (Colette, English, 5 years, MVU). These actions did not alter the universities’ formal structures of exclusion of PT faculty, but provided PT faculty with additional support for their work.

The evolution of PT faculty members’ personal relationships with colleagues that started with limited, informal, sporadic, interactions with a few members and moved to constant, close, official, and nonofficial interactions with a collective of department and organizational members provided PT faculty with a sense that they were part of a community.

So, there’s a faculty member in our department who coordinates it [seminar]. It’s incredibly varied, it could be completely new research, it could be a job talk, it could be more soliciting students in internships but the idea is to bring in people from outside the department to share something that they’re doing; and, in my mind is doing so [to] create a community within our department. (Kate, Geology, 13 years, BCU)

Relationships with staff and colleagues were a source of emotional support as well as work-related support for PT faculty. Relationships with staff were superficial but provided stability. Relationships with tenured and tenure-track colleagues were complex for PT faculty. “It’s a weird kind of relationship because they were our professors, also they ended up becoming friends and now colleagues but also kind of our bosses, right?”
(Colette, English, 5 years, MVU). But these relationships provided PT faculty with a sense of membership in a group in the university. Finally, relationships with department chairs increased PT faculty members’ perceived security in their reappointment and improved formal and informal structures of inclusion for this population. These relationships were both a cause and a consequence of PT faculty’s long-term relationships with their department: They provided PT faculty with the connections to continue working at the university, and they improved PT faculty’s ability to be hired and re-hired.

**Organizational knowledge.** Long-term PT faculty had organizational knowledge about their department, their university, and the university’s programs, which they gained over time due to their experiences on campus and through their relationships with department members. This knowledge pertained to ways to help their students as well as to address matters of PT faculty work, to the operations of the department, and to PT faculty members’ rights at the institutional level. PT faculty had acquired some of this knowledge prior to their appointment as PT faculty, during their undergraduate and graduate education. However, during the prior period, this information was limited and these PT faculty acquired more information over time. “Some things I’ve known since I was a student, other things I’ve learnt more about as a faculty member… over time. I built my knowledge of what’s offered and available to help support students” (Marguerite, Biology, 10 years, BCU). Information about the campus and their work provided PT faculty with knowledge that enabled them to respond to job demands and carry on their activities to the standards of their profession. As well, this knowledge
conveyed to them that they were organizational members who could contribute to the department and, thus, to the university.

As newcomers, distinct from their position as long-term faculty members, PT faculty lacked knowledge, and this was an obstacle for them to seek participation in departmental activities. For example, although departments invited PT faculty to attend to meetings, PT faculty prevented themselves from attending to such meetings, due to their perceived lack of knowledge about the department matters.

I don’t know why. I just felt uncomfortable going [to the meeting]. [I felt] like I didn’t belong in that group. I didn’t know any of those people. I didn’t really know what they would be discussing, the subject matter [of the meeting]. (Alissa, Management, 5 years, BCU).

Over time and as PT faculty gained knowledge about the department and their university and developed personal relationships with their colleagues, long-term PT faculty increased their participation (or, at least, their willingness to participate) in non-teaching activities.

Lack of knowledge about a specific aspect of the work (e.g., departments’ preferred teaching tools, use of formats, software, procedures to obtain didactic materials, support programs for students) was a motivator for PT faculty to seek information and educate themselves about the campus and its requirements. For example, participants who taught online or in a hybrid format (such as Paulina, Mae, Max, Mike, Roy, Marguerite, and Hanna who had at least one course with an online component) experienced limited knowledge about the specific technology used in their campus and the departments’ preferred teaching tools. “The content and the actual coursework is not a problem, but it is the additional technology and I embrace technology. But like with
anything, it takes a while to understand the technology and the nuances of the technology” (Paulina, Nursing, 6 years, BCU). In response, PT faculty sought information and trained themselves. “I was kind of learning at the same time as the students were about this program and how to use [it]” (Paulina, Nursing, 6 years, BCU). “I was on the job training: I was teaching and training [myself]” (Roy, Communication, 15 years, MVU).

For PT faculty, to be able to manage information about their campuses’ teaching tools and programs was of central importance to perform their work to their own standards. “I guess, I have compulsion to understand…I want to make sure we are all engaged in the same platform and be able to answer the [students’] questions” (Paulina, Nursing, 6 years, BCU). PT faculty members’ initial lack of information or knowledge was an impediment to their performance and thus it was a necessity for them to inform themselves.

I feel like if you just say “I don’t know” that does not help them [the students]. And, I don’t know a lot of the time, but I can google, and I can call people, and I can ask people. I know enough people in this campus to say, “Let me find the answer for you.” Because they [students] get so frustrated, if I say, “Go talk to financial aid,” they walk out of here and they are like “Forget it. I am too tired; I am too lazy; I am too frustrated. I don’t know how to do that.” (Felicia, English, 5 years, MVU)

PT faculty did receive organizational information officially, through email, in meetings at the beginning of the year or the term, through department chairs’ personal communications, and through committee chairs’ communications. Official information pertained to the services and programs that the campuses offered to students and faculty as well as special events organized by the university or the department. Among the
different conduits through which PT faculty received information, the PT faculty preferred face-to-face, personal communications. Moreover, long-term PT faculty perceived that not all channels of communication were adequate for them.

One example of information dissemination was electronic mail. Emails sent through listservs were used as an institutionalized strategy to provide immediate, general, and constant information to PT faculty at the three campuses. Superficially, this strategy provided vast information and some participants viewed it as adequate. “I receive a lot of emails from the administration, from the union, for different faculty members who have different activities going. I feel like I am nicely informed” (Mike, Sociology, 5 years, Online teaching, SVU). However, this strategy of communication was inefficient. “They [the department] send too much crap out” (Jonathan, Kinesiology, 12 years, MVU). PT faculty suffered an email overload that, rather than provide them information, had as consequence a sense of inadequacy. “You don’t have time to read everything], opening every email that I get. Honestly, it’s just impossible.” (Adbel, History, 16 years, BCU). In addition, regardless of the overflow of information, PT faculty did not receive all the information that matter to them.

I feel like I get a lot of emails… [But] There are some things I don’t get. I know there was an email that was send out by the dean of our college that was about advising practices that I did not get… I wonder what emails I don’t get. (Jackie, English, 6 years, SVU)

PT faculty accessed more accurate and significant information through their experience at the university and from their colleagues.

For PT faculty who had staff positions at the university in addition to their PT faculty positions (i.e., Mae and Elena [BCU] and Felicia [MVU]), these positions enabled
them to identify, that as PT Faculty, they did not receive all the information available for other organizational members. Staff positions enabled PT faculty to obtain information that helped them to perform both roles, as faculty and as staff.

Some students would come to my office and say, “This other professor is terrible; they made us clean the floor.” A student told me this, last week. I said, “Ok, here is what you do; here is how you file a complaint. Don’t tell me who the professor is; I don’t want to know, but you go and file the correct paperwork, through the correct channels.” So, I think that a lot of that training came from working as a staff here. I know how many resources there are for students [because of it].
(Felicia, English, 5 years, MVU)

Due to their staff positions, Mae, Felicia, and Elena had access to additional resources that were useful to serve students for academic and non-academic matters. This made it more evident the need for universities to use new forms to distribute information in addition to emails. “We, as faculty, are encouraged to use updated technology. So, I feel like there’s ways that we could still be connected and kept connected that are not really utilized” (Mae, Health, 6 years BCU).

When PT faculty needed to obtain information, they employed their connections to other faculty both tenure-track and PT faculty as well as to the department chair. This information included technical aspects of their work, theoretical implications of their work, and career questions.

I'm in contact with my colleagues at [MVU] that I worked with for 15 years. If I have a question, we discuss something… [for example,] putting something in the syllabus, so they have special programs, should my students be aware of them? We discuss basic time sets and theories…We argue about content and philosophy of teaching, etcetera. Yeah, I interact quite a bit with them…maybe three or four times a week at the most. (Roy, Communication, 15 years, MVU)

I have asked very complicated career questions to him [a colleague] as well, watching him going from faculty to chair, to director of general education, to now, assistant provost, just kind of asking about his experience, and seeking out
that information from him. (Hanna, Philosophy/Computer Systems, 11 years, SVU)

PT faculty who needed information from their colleagues used all their resources at hand to be able to communicate with them. “Sometimes, I have to Skype a meeting with my colleagues” (Roy, Communication, 15 years, MVU).

When department members were not a helpful source of organizational information, PT faculty sought help from other organizational members, who had administrative positions.

Once I had a student who had a personal issue going [on]... [And] I had to deal with it... [Not only] from a professor perspective I had to address that but also as a woman and as a professional, [I] had to make sure that she was getting the care that she needed. So, I contacted a friend of mine here in the Women’s Center. They work with title IX. I checked with my colleagues; I checked with the chair. The chair didn’t know what to do. So, I had to figure out what to do, and so, [later] I had to connect with the chair to tell her “This is what we’ve done, this is where we’re at.” (Elena, Education, 29 years, BCU)

Given that colleagues not always provided the information that PT faculty members needed, PT faculty’s success finding specific information depended on their own willingness to continue looking. PT faculty members’ willingness to seek information that helped their students in academic and nonacademic matters was not a paid responsibility but a professional responsibility; something PT faculty needed to do to perform their work to their own standards.

Long-term PT faculty also acquired departmental knowledge that was beneficial for themselves directly as organizational members. Through time, knowledge about the ways in which their departments functioned (e.g., informal rank system, decision making, class scheduling procedures) served PT faculty not only to carry out their work better but
also to protect themselves from the uncertainty of their jobs (i.e., job insecurity, workload variability).

[A]s an adjunct you are always afraid of not getting enough classes and not being able to support yourself. And, so, in the last couple of years…I have been very clear about what my schedule is every semester, what I can and cannot accept, and been very clear and open with the chair, and for that matter with every administrative assistant. I have realized they have far more power than the chair to set up schedules and what not. (Hanna, Philosophy/Computer Systems, 11 years, SVU)

Knowledge about the departments’ logistics served long-term PT faculty to develop personal strategies to adapt to the department and to improve their ability to obtain the results they expected (in this example, the teaching load she expected).

Long-term PT faculty also gathered organizational knowledge that was useful not only for them but for the department as a whole. This was particularly evident among PT faculty who had worked for over 15 years on the campus. “Adjunct faculty do not advise. However, since I was a lecturer, and I had 15 years of experience, and the full-time faculty trust me, I do it, but I don’t get paid for that” (Roy, Communications, 15 years, MVU). Ava’s experiences illustrated this as well. She was not only the PT faculty with more seniority but also had the PT faculty who worked at the department longer than her tenured and tenure-track colleagues. “[My colleagues] were my professors when I was here. They’re gone. They’ve retired.” (Special Education, 18 years, BCU). As the more experienced faculty member, both inside and outside the department, Ava was consulted on a regular basis by both students and faculty.

I feel very honored, and I feel that my wisdom, my experience, my passion for what I do [is valued]…and I am valued…I am able…to not only deal with my students here but with my faculty as well. I’m very well respected and I like that. I really appreciate that. (Ava, Special Education, 18 years, BCU)
Long-term PT faculty members’ departmental knowledge provided them with additional formal and informal unpaid roles (e.g., advisor, new program design committee, advisor during program’s certification processes). “In our department, the chair of the department has always asked my opinion or other adjunct faculty’s opinion.” (Roy, Communications, 15 years, MVU). These roles validated their membership to the department.

As a disadvantage for PT faculty members, in their pursuit of information, they directed the least amount of effort, time, and energy to obtaining information that would help them validate their rights as campus employees. For example, the majority did not know that they had the right to obtain “salary adjustments” due to their degree and seniority, or that there were work assignment rights associated with their seniority. These rights were stated in institutional documents about temporary faculty and adjunct faculty which were open and accessible to them. However, the participants were unable to describe or carry out these processes.

Ali’s experience exemplifies the extreme to which PT faculty members’ lack of knowledge about their organizational rights could harm them.

It’s funny well it’s really stupid... I’ve had my PhD for 15 years... I got this job when I was still finishing my Master’s [and] was working on my PhD... They [BCU] didn’t have my PhD [registered in the system], and for 14 years, I was paid as if I had a Master’s degree [only]. I don’t know how much less I was getting paid. It was me, I should have gone and check[ed, but] I was just too busy… So they said. “Oh, sorry, yeah, you should have received [payment as] PhD but you [only] got [payment] for Master’s degree.” So, I said, “What can we do?” They said. “Oh, we can pay you the last 6 months.” I only got 6 months… I mean, I should have been more careful, but I thought [that] somebody is checking that you got the PhD (Adbel, History, 16 years, BCU)
For PT faculty, it was more important to obtain information that would help them perform a better job than to seek information that would help them to obtain more benefits as employees. Thus, in their attempt to become valuable organizational members, PT faculty would place information to improve their rights as employees as a secondary priority.

Three central conditions motivated PT faculty to develop strategies to acquire information about their campus. First, PT faculty members learned that that they had limited knowledge about their university and their department. Second, they experienced their universities’ inadequate official channels of communication. Third, and finally, they possessed and maintained a sense of responsibility for their work. For PT faculty, department members were a more important source of information about the department and the department’s expectations and norms for them. Departmental members—FT faculty—were more legitimate sources of information on the roles and rights of PT faculty, more so than the official channels of communication within the university. Organizational knowledge enabled PT faculty to develop strategies to adapt to their department’s needs and procedures and to increase their probability of reappointment.

Additional workload, increasing duration of appointments, additional health benefits, development of personal relationships with departmental members, acquisition of organizational knowledge, and priority for additional workload were indicators for long-term PT faculty of the evolution of their work relationship. Simultaneously to the evolution of the work relationship among PT faculty and their universities, there were changes in the organization. These changes included the appointment of new department
chairs, the implementation of strategies of inclusion of PT faculty in departmental activities, and alterations to collective agreements with additional rights for nontenure-track faculty. Due to these changes, during the work relationship, PT faculty members continued their acquisition of new information, the development of strategies to improve their likelihood of reappointment, and their participation in departmental life. Long-term PT faculty perceived themselves as organizational members with a past in the university, which connected them to the department and enabled them to respond to changes at their campuses. Their past affiliation with their department also influenced long-term PT faculty’s organizational commitment.

**Long-Term PT Faculty Members’ Organizational Commitment**

Long-term PT faculty perceived themselves as organizational members who had proved their value to the university. Their continual appointed indicated to PT faculty that they met organizational standards of performance and requirements for reappointment.

When I first started, a lot of the people didn’t fit the professional qualifications as part-timers and so they’ve not asked back…. You have to have some level of academic standing and then you have to have professional standing too… I had to meet certain criteria. (Max, Business and Public Administration, 17 years, MVU)

I have gotten pretty good reviews… There is a committee of people and… they look at: is my class to hard? Is it too easy? Does it cover what it is supposed to cover? And I don’t get any real problems. Nobody has ever said that what I am covering is inappropriate or anything like that. (Chelsea, Administration of Justice, 5 years, BCU)

Long-term PT faculty did acknowledge that their contracts were fixed, that they faced job insecurity, and that their campuses did not provide them with a “permanent faculty” status. However, with the exception of three participants (Howard and Elena from BCU and Felicia from MVU), other PT faculty qualified their work relationship as a long-term
work relationship that was going to continue in the future. PT faculty who wanted to continue to work at their current campuses expressed high levels of job involvement and organizational engagement. These PT faculty indicated that their work conditions were not ideal and that at times they reduced PT faculty’s motivation to work; however, they found reasons to remain at their campuses that were stronger than reasons to leave. In contrast, the three participants who expressed their intentions to leave their campuses exhibited low levels of organizational engagement and lack of job involvement.

PT faculty faced work circumstances that made it difficult for them to perform their work; their campuses supported them in a limited fashion. The payment that PT faculty received for their job did not match the number of hours expended in the performance of their work. They had no control over the distribution of their workload, and their class assignments were not communicated to them in a timely way. As a consequence, PT faculty worked intensively over short periods of time. Finally, officially, PT faculty were not part of their departments’ decision making. Some of these problematical circumstances were common to all PT faculty (e.g., unfair payment), but not all PT faculty experienced all these circumstances. Regardless of organizational obstacles (i.e., lack of institutional formal strategies for PT faculty integration on campus), the majority of participants expressed an intent to continue to work at the campus and they enacted organizational commitment and work engagement behaviors (e.g., PT faculty directed additional time and energy to identify basic information of their work, roles, rights, and resources). Long-term PT faculty members’ intent to stay at the
university increased due to informal support structures for PT faculty at their departments.

Reasons to stay. Long-term PT faculty expressed organizational commitment. As an attitude of work engagement, organizational commitment involves an individual’s interest in the organization’s ability to fulfill its goals, the individual’s work towards those goals, and the individual’s attachment to the organization (Macey & Schneider, 2008). That is, from a theoretical standpoint, an individual’s intention to continue a work relationship with a given organization relates to the individual’s organizational commitment (Macey & Schneider, 2008). For long-term PT faculty, the three campuses were not only a place to work that provided them an income, but also an organization with a goal that they supported and adopted as their own. PT faculty members’ attachment to, or intent to stay, at their particular university—also conceptualized as organizational loyalty (Hoyt, 2012)—was driven by their perception that they were valid members and could provide input to their departments.

PT faculty’s sense of membership in their department increased with the aid of three conditions at their campuses. First, departments had strategies for PT faculty involvement in departmental activities and decision making. Second, PT faculty developed personal relationships with department members. And third, department chairs made personal efforts to include PT faculty as members of the department. Alone, each of these conditions indicated that PT faculty as a group were not rejected at the department level to the same degree that they were excluded at the university level. Together, these
three conditions indicated to PT faculty that they were valued members of the department (organizational members), and that as individuals they had a future in the department.

Within each campus, departments had different levels of inclusion of PT faculty in departmental activities. PT faculty members’ involvement in departmental activities and decision making was more likely to occur when they had personal relationships with department members and the department chair. For example, most PT faculty were invited to meetings and several of the participants attended these meetings (Chelsea, Adbel, Jonathan, Roy, Josephine, Kate, Marguerite, Jim, Elena). “[In] department meetings... I always feel respected by my colleagues, there’s no really discrimination against part-timers by them. That’s a good thing about it, they respect us, and they take us in count” (Adbel, History, 16 years, BCU). In contrast, a smaller number of PT faculty—those with more seniority and those who had professional relationships with several colleagues—were invited to partake and took part in activities such as a search for a new full-time tenure-track faculty member (Kate), PT faculty committees related to teaching or course design (Colette, Ava), meetings with other faculty who taught the same class (Charlize, Ronald, Ross, Howard, Melinda), and evaluation of laboratory content (Ronald, Ross). Inclusion in these departmental activities depended on the personal effort of faculty. “Personally, I think our colleagues try to be very helpful, but institutionally, [MVU] doesn’t really provide that kind of collaborative relationship” (Colette, English, 5 years, MVU).
Participation in non-teaching departmental activities required (from PT faculty) members’ creativity, specialized work, and professional opinions. Thus, invitations to these activities signaled to PT faculty that their opinions and work mattered.

This one [faculty position] affected us directly…. several of us said, “When we revamp these classes, when these classes get redesigned, we want to be part of that.” And we said, “We would like the person who is doing this, the person in charge, to be someone we could work with, be part of a team with.” So, because of those discussions, they included us [PT faculty] in the search [for the new tenure-track faculty member]. (Kate, Geology, 13 years, BCU)

In addition to signaling that PT faculty opinions were taken into consideration at the department level, their participation in formal and informal decision making activities and committees indicated to long-term PT faculty that they had the ability to influence the future of their departments’ programs.

We’ve got to a little after hours, happy hour gathering just [a] get together and then, talk about the course. A bunch of us got together at somebody’s house, and we all brought some nachos, and we had a meeting about the intentions of this strand and how the goal is to get preschool teachers to take these courses in order and how are we going to help facilitate that. (Charlize, Human Development, 13 years, BCU)

Participation in these activities and the attitude of their colleagues towards their participation helped PT faculty perceive their work as not temporary or contingent, but connected to the future of the department (and its programs) and the future of the students. That is, this participation stimulated PT faculty members’ “psychological empowerment” (Macey & Schneider, 2008)—an attitude that suggested high levels of organizational commitment.

Department chairs’ personal practices were key for PT faculty to counteract the university’s practices of exclusion. Department chairs’ enactment of informal strategies
of inclusion of PT faculty communicated to PT faculty that they were not excluded or unprotected at the department level. Furthermore, due to the administrative character of their position, department chairs’ behaviors legitimized PT faculty.

Our department chair… he is concerned for the lecturers here, and he is protective of us, and he will go to battle for us. He would step up for whoever. I mean, when this thing was happening with the professional development, that was what the first meeting was about, fall 2014, the dean was making waves… The dean didn’t like how our evaluations only say satisfactory or non-satisfactory and [he said] “We need more, there needs to be more that we can evaluate…” [And] at [other] department some of the part-time faculty were creating these tenure binders, they were like five inches tall the stuff that they were trying to put together to be evaluated on, and my chair was like: “No. That is not happening with my faculty, with my staff. I am not allowing that to happen.” He really tried that year to get our perspective on things and we decided this in groups and talked things out… and he’d listened to us. You could tell that he was really trying to figure out something that he could do to help. (Jackie, English, 6 years SVU)

Department chairs’ attempts to change formal and informal structures to facilitate PT faculty work and to include PT faculty in departmental life provided PT faculty members a sense of welcoming and protection at the department level that counteracted campus-wide structures of exclusion.

For individual PT faculty members, each one of the conditions that increased their sense of membership in the department had a different centrality or importance in their willingness to remain in the organization. That is, PT faculty prioritized, in different ways, their personal relationships with department members, departmental strategies for PT faculty’s involvement, and department chairs’ personal efforts to include PT faculty. However, for all PT faculty, the personal aspect of these three conditions were central for their willingness to stay at the university. Personal relationships with colleagues were a source of organizational commitment in that these relationships enabled them to reduce
organizational-level exclusion, to develop a sense of inclusion in the department, and to
develop a sense of membership in an organizational group. Long-term PT faculty
members’ relationships with colleagues made the negative conditions they experienced
bearable. In addition, colleagues and department chairs’ informal efforts to support and
involve PT faculty as department members indicated to PT faculty that departmental
members did not agree with the organizational treatment of PT faculty, and that they
considered this treatment unjust and inappropriate.

Long-term PT faculty did not idealize their positions. PT faculty were aware of
the organizational obstacles and the consequences that such obstacles placed in their
work. Nevertheless, their relationship with colleagues and the department chair, as well
as the department channels of PT faculty inclusion, released some of the discomfort of
their position. For two participants (Felicia and Howard), the discomfort induced by these
organizational structures was strong enough for them to decide to leave the organization.

**Reasons to leave.** PT faculty members intended to leave the institution due a lack
of interest in the faculty profession (lack of job involvement) or because organizational
conditions were unbearable and prevented PT faculty to develop organizational
commitment. Negative conditions at the campuses and negative structures associated
with the PT faculty position were common at the three campuses. Negative working
conditions diminished in importance and number over time due to PT faculty members’
attempts to reduce these conditions (e.g., by increasing their knowledge about the
university) and due to the three conditions described in the previous section (i.e.,
departmental strategies for PT faculty involvement in departmental activities and decision
making. PT faculty’s personal relationships with department members, and department chairs’ personal efforts to include PT faculty). But, negative working conditions became more influential when these conditions occurred simultaneously and if they increased in number over time.

In their final term as PT faculty, Howard (Communications, 10 years, BCU) and Felicia (English, 5 years, MVU) would leave their campuses to work at a different organization: Howard in a teaching position and Felicia in a non-teaching position. Elena (Education, 29 years, BCU) preferred to retire. Felicia’s experiences (English, 5 years, MVU) illustrate a lack of job involvement as a cause for PT faculty to leave their university. Howard’s experiences illustrate that negative organizational conditions that are simultaneous and incremental through time have a negative effect on PT faculty members’ sense of membership and organizational commitment. This leads PT faculty to leave a campus. (I employ Felicia and Howard’s experiences as the basis for the following section. I use statements of other participants to clarify or exemplify a point and to provide further data on a specific finding).

**Lack of identification with the faculty job.** Job involvement is an attitude of work engagement that characterizes and individual’s interest in performing a specific activity, job, or profession (Macey & Schneider, 2008). Job involvement is the first necessary attitude for an individual to express work engagement (Macey & Schneider, 2008). Correspondingly, an individual who does not express job involvement would not express work engagement. PT faculty expressed job involvement: They were interested in teaching since their undergraduate or graduate education, or even before that time period.
“I always knew that at one point I would be in a helping profession, and I definitively thought I would be teaching” (Anna, Psychology, 9 years, SVU). In contrast to other PT faculty, Felicia did not express job involvement during her formal education. Moreover, her PT faculty position at Middle Valley University enabled her to choose another profession: a student affairs profession.

Felicia began working as PT faculty in Middle Valley University as an evolution from her position as teaching associate in her alma mater. “They [the department members] had already seen me teach[ing] here as teaching associate, and I already knew how the program worked. So, it [the PT faculty job] was more [like] being offered [new] sections.” Felicia did not experience a “calling” to the faculty position (Braxton, 2001); she carried out this work to “pay the bills.” In order to improve her income, Felicia complemented the PT faculty position at Middle Valley University with teaching positions at other campuses.

The real down of dirty of my story is that you don’t make very much as a part-time lecturer; there is lack of consistency; there is an abundance of grading, especially as an English instructor; [and, there are] many things to juggle. At one point, I was on 3 campuses, teaching 5 classes. That got old really fast. I was very tired, just exhausted mentally, [and] emotionally from having that many students, that many campuses, that many policies, emails, websites, papers to grade, syllabi. It was just horrendous… At the beginning of 2014, I just told myself, “I got to get out of this. I got to figure something else, I got to figure it out.”

Felicia experienced the difficulties attached to a “freeway flier” (Gappa & Leslie, 1993) PT faculty position. Neither the pecuniary nor the non-pecuniary benefits of the PT faculty position were sufficient for her to develop job involvement.

In her search for a better quality of life, Felicia sought to increase her marketability through graduate education. “I walked over to the college of education and
say, ‘What degrees do you have? I need something else.’ And I started an Ed D program, an Educational Doctorate program.” The search for a doctoral degree was a strategy for Felicia to find a non-teaching position. “I really want[ed] to switch out of teaching and more into like administration, or helping college students.” Although Felicia did not finish the program, the degree she chose led her to a staff position.

I met this gal in the [EdD] program and she said: “I am getting a new position on campus, are you interested in my old position?” I went like: “Yes. I would love a staff position, something that is 8 to 5, consistent pay, no grading, [and with] health benefits.

The initial attraction for Felicia to seek the staff position included the pecuniary benefits of a full-time appointment, benefits that the PT faculty position lacked. However, Felicia’s need for additional income, as well as her attachment to her department, motivated her to continue in the PT faculty position.

That [the staff position] was not very much money still. So, there was an opportunity to piece the 40 hours with the 4 units that I was able to teach. Also, I love the English department here. I am in love with them. They are amazing. They just know their stuff; they are well renowned; they are brilliant, they are wonderful to work with. And so, I didn’t want to stop teaching English. So, that is why I keep my four units: because I could, essentially.

As Felicia gained experience in the staff position, she became more involved in the student affairs position than in the PT faculty position. “Now, that I have discovered that I can continue [helping students] outside of the classroom, I am happier, because I don’t have to spend the hours planning classes, [or] grading.”

In the staff position, Felicia developed her abilities to serve students and to administer programs. “My position coordinates a program for undergraduate studies. One of my support program helps students with extra tutoring… [And] during the summer,
they offered me a different coordinator position where I coordinated an entire summer
bridge program.” Her initial limited job involvement in the PT faculty position continued
to decreased when Felicia developed a high level of job involvement for her staff
position. When the opportunity arose, Felicia took another student affairs position in a
different institution. “Just last month, I was offered a position with the [Name] Initiative,
to be a manager, a regional manager… as staff, [with] no teaching component.” This new
position fulfilled Felicia’s expectations for a job: it did not focus on teaching; it served
students; and, it provided her a better income. “For the first time in five years, I will have
one job only. And I feel good. I am excited.”

Felicia’s intentions to leave the campus were not caused by lack of friendships or
personal relationships, or due to rejection of PT faculty by her tenure-track colleagues. “I
love the English department so much here because they do treat you equally regardless of
your status. I never felt like the little guy. I never felt like… ‘Oh you are just a lecturer.’”
In addition, Felicia accepted the mission and goals of the department. That is, as a PT
faculty member, Felicia developed attitudes of organizational commitment: She wanted
the department (and the university) to achieve its goals.

The English department here is doing a fantastic job… of making the curriculum
more like an introduction to university literacies, to prepare students for the kinds
of things that they will read and write and think about in their college English
class.

However, Felicia developed limited organizational commitment. She would leave the
campus due to her limited self-identification as faculty and move toward her interest to
advance her student affairs career. “This is not my stopping point [the staff position at
MVU], you know? I am capable of a lot more, I was kind of [in] a lower position [here], and this [new job] would be a great opportunity [for me].”

Felicia’s development of a work relationship differed from that of long-term PT faculty in two aspects. First, by the time Felicia reached five years as PT faculty in MVU, the work relationship as PT faculty had started to decrease in importance; Felicia directed less time in her teaching role at MVU than before. She moved from three courses per term, to one course each term. Second, Felicia expressed job involvement for a position different to that of PT faculty. She sought a non-teaching position to which direct her time and energy.

As a PT faculty member, Felicia expressed low job involvement in the PT faculty position, and, as student affairs professional, she expressed low organizational commitment to the university. Felicia expressed low job involvement because she viewed the PT faculty work not as a calling but as an employment and a source of income. Although as PT faculty, Felicia experienced informal inclusion and validation by her department members and department chair and she gathered knowledge about her campus and department, Felicia did not develop a strong identity as a faculty member. In contrast, Felicia did develop high job involvement to the student affairs profession, and the inadequate salary that she received from the university was not sufficient to maintain her organizational commitment to the campus. Thus, Felicia decided to leave Middle Valley University. The story of Felicia is not that of a PT faculty member who departed from campus, but that of a PT faculty member who removed herself from the profession.
Exclusion cocktail. Negative organizational behaviors increase an individual’s intent to leave an organization (Feldman & Turnley, 2001). Individuals with lack of organizational commitment and low organizational commitment are willing to abandon an organization and seek a different place of employment (Macey & Schneider, 2008). PT faculty experienced working conditions associated with low organizational commitment: low salary, exclusion from participation in campus matters, limited communication, lack of or limited benefits, low status as professionals, and limited organizational support to perform their duties. For long-term PT faculty, these negative working conditions decreased over time due to both formal and informal structures of inclusion (as described above). But, when these negative conditions increased over time, PT faculty sought new places of employment in which they could carry out the same type of job. Furthermore, when multiple negative working conditions occurred simultaneously, PT faculty questioned their role in the university and their membership as part of their department. They increased their intent to leave the campus. Howard’s experience illustrates the conditions that pushed long-term PT faculty to leave a university.

The evolution of the relationship between Howard and BCU was similar to that of other long-term PT faculty. Howard was invited to teach in the Communication department due to his professional relationship with the department chair. Over time, his workload increased. “I started with one class and now I got three.” He had a 12 unit entitlement, a three-year contract, and gained health benefits. In addition, he developed relationships with colleagues, although these were superficial. Through informal
interactions with colleagues, Howard gained organizational knowledge about the department (i.e., its mission and goals). He expressed organizational commitment attitudes: Howard responded to the needs of the students in the department and tried to carry out the goals indicated by his colleagues. “A lot of the faculty used to mention that writing was a big weakness of the students coming into us, so now… I pay more attention to it. Now, I am more trying to fix that when they [the students] come in.” However, in his final years at BCU, Howard’s conditions began to worsen in comparison to previous years, and he faced additional obstacles to his work and membership in the department.

Howard’s relationships with department members and the department chair became more distant due to a change in the culture of the department. The department grew in the number of PT faculty members and there were fewer strategies implemented for the inclusion of this faculty group. In particular, the designation of a new department chair reduced the inclusion of PT faculty in departmental matters.

They [faculty] try to be decent, they try to be nice, but… a few years ago… the person who hired me was challenged for the chairmanship of the department. They [tenured faculty] become very fierce with the nontenured faculty. We [PT faculty] had no input at all… He [the previous department chair] was here my first four [or] five years, and there has been four [years] since [he left].

The current department chair did not support either formal or informal strategies for inclusion of PT faculty. This lack of support had as consequence that Howard perceived that the limited inclusion of PT faculty at the campus-wide level intensified.

The department chair… is part of why I am leaving, I do not need this kind of crap. He does not understand how to administer people, he is not a good leader... So, that is fine, that is not my problem; but I have to deal with it? No thanks... But I got to say, one of the problems is [that] the system in place does not help them. So, there needs to be a better system.
With the current department chair, Howard had less ability to participate in departmental matters; he did not express “psychological empowerment.” In this Big City University’s department, the shift in the culture of inclusion of PT faculty took the opposite direction to other departments on the campus as it was expressed by other members of this department (Jim, Melinda). But, for Howard, this shift brought more negative consequences than for other PT faculty.

Due to lack of rapport with the new department chair, Howard did not gain control over his work and workload and had little say on the courses he would teach. As a consequence, Howard found himself expending more time to perform his work in order to maintain the level of quality he expected.

They didn’t ask [if I wanted more laboratory classes]. It has been a problem. In fact, I can’t devote the kind of time required for three labs. So, I would probably be leaving here next semester... I just do not have the time to do that kind of work; it takes too much time… We [PT faculty] do not get in any way compensated, it is very discouraging.

The discomfort about his position was aggravated due to new course structures that provided tenure-track faculty with better payment for fewer hours of teaching.

We redesigned this [courses] about 4-5 years ago. [Now we have] split-classes. They have lectures online and the person responsible for the class teaches it, prepares those lectures... 1.7 portions of the pay goes to the lectures; 1.3 goes to the labs [instructors]. Tenured faculty get 1.7. They get a bigger piece of that. I mean [this] is fine, but do not ask me to do all that part: It is too much work… [and] I do not get compensated for that difference…They’d worn me out.

Given that compensation for PT faculty was tied to the number of units in a course and that laboratories counted for fewer number of units than classes, Howard’s pay was stable but his workload increased (he taught more laboratories and more students with no increase in his compensation).
Unfair payment, increased workload, and limited support from the department chair intensified due to limitations in departmental communication. Lack of departmental communication towards PT faculty and the department’s lack of interest in PT faculty participation in departmental issues damaged Howard’s image about his role in the university. Howard did not receive official information about departmental expectations, goals and priorities. “That is my question, ‘What are the expectations? What do you expect when the students walk out of here?’ [The department] expectations… are not shared, not to the extent that I am satisfied, no. It is kind of frustrating.” In addition, Howard’s departmental members did not seek out PT faculty for their views about departmental matters. “They really don’t care what we say or do, no input of any value, the tenured faculty does not, and certainly the dean’s office [neither].” On the occasions in which PT faculty were consulted or included in collective work (e.g., meetings) in Howard’s department, He perceived that the goal of such consultation was to control PT faculty’s work. “[The meeting] was a few of us get together, those of us who are part-time, with the professor whose class that is, and the department chair. It was not a dialogue… They wanted to make sure we were in the same track, and we were.”

Howard’s departmental member behaviors indicated that PT faculty were used to “plug holes” and were treated as commodities with no control over their work. Departmental members’ efforts to control PT faculty positioned PT faculty as employees rather than as professionals.

Although over time Howard had established personal relationships with departmental members, these did not help him to develop a sense of inclusion or
membership in the department. “The part-timers are at the bottom, at least here, at least in this department.” Moreover, Howard was not recognized as a full departmental member. “It is just something too obvious, like they have your name that they don’t put it in the program.” In addition to this treatment, Howard experienced personal rejection.

We had a delegation of journalists from Cuba... They were here for most of a week and they wanted me to do a presentation [to them]. They said, “here, we would give you a stipend.” And, I never got the stipend... It was pretty clear for me why I did not get the stipend: Those people don’t like me so… I am not going to get rich out of it… I was just surprised, this kind of thing… they could [do it], so they did. Olvidalo [forget it].

Personal rejection was an additional condition to the already existent behaviors of institutional exclusion. Thus, although Howard had achieved the maximum rights he could obtain, he decided to leave the campus. “I am in a three-year contract… but this is enough, basta. [no more]”

Howard’s limited departmental support and the department’s lack communication, lack of personal relationships, and direct rejection from departmental members became a condition of mistrust towards the department. “There were a few times, years ago, when I though they were monitoring me and try[ing] to keeping me below certain level [of units] so I was not entitled to have benefits.” Howard decided to leave BCU when he realized that he had worked at the university for a long period of time during which his conditions did not improve.

I did not realize, somebody put it in my Facebook, “Congratulations on ten years” Jesus. I had no idea. And then, I realize, it was ten years. It has been fun because I had treated it that way, but now [it] is frustrating. So, it is time to put that frustration away… Personally, [I] will make sure that people that I care about will know [I am leaving].
Howard expected fair treatment and recognition as a departmental member. “I mean, the whole point is being treated fairly and equally based on what we are. I do not expect to be treated like a full-time but I do expect to be brought in for better communication. And that is, what are we looking for.” In addition, he expected recognition from his department. “My point of frustration is not being recognized [for] all the work [I put] in all of these classes, to do them well.” However, he received neither fair treatment nor recognition. Thus, in his perception, his only alternative was to leave the university.

Howard was an extreme case of a long-term PT faculty who experienced several negative conditions associated with PT faculty work. Howard’s work relationship with BCU evolved positively and then it deteriorated. As a consequence, he experienced additional organizational obstacles to his work and his sense of membership than in previous years. Although Howard expressed organizational commitment attitudes (i.e., interest in the department goals and performance of activities to support the department goals), the continual mistreatment and rejection that he experienced fed his intentions to leave the campus.

Long-term PT faculty who experienced numerous organizational obstacles to their work also expressed low levels of organizational engagement, but not to the degree that they would attempt to leave the organization. “I was offered fewer, and fewer classes [by the Biology department], and there were… reasons but the[y] were… not very good reasons… Now I’m a part-time lecturer for the College of Natural Sciences” (Bridget, Biology, 12 years, BCU). PT faculty members were ambivalent in their feelings of membership on the campus. They expressed simultaneously their willingness to continue
in their position (“I like it here; I will continue if they have me” [Paulina, Nursing, 6 year, BSU]) and their ability to leave the campus. “I like teaching; I can teach no matter where” (Paulina, Nursing, 6 year, BSU). PT faculty expressions of willingness or ability to work on other campuses was a coping strategy to avoid feelings of rejection by the campus’ organizational behaviors towards them. With the exception of Howard, no other participant initiated actions to pull away from their campus. For long-term PT faculty members, their sense of membership in their department became commitment to their campus.

Due to the precarious work circumstances of PT faculty, informal structures (e.g., norms, resource distribution practices, informal PT faculty rank system) at the department level played a more central role for the development of the long-term relationship than formal structures at the department and university level. In addition, the lack of these informal structures was critical for long-term PT faculty members’ low organizational commitment and intent to leave the university. However, not all PT faculty members experienced disengagement at work due to their precarious job circumstances. Over time, long-term PT faculty developed a sense of membership in a department due to their personal relationships with colleagues and staff, their knowledge of their department, and departmental informal strategies for PT faculty inclusion. Thus, long-term PT faculty expressed a willingness to help the department achieve its goals. PT faculty were ambivalent about their membership in the university. They considered themselves members of the university because they were members of the department. However, PT faculty rejected their membership in the university (and instead recognized
themselves as members of the department, primarily) in order to protect themselves from isolation and feelings of exclusion. Long-term PT faculty expressed higher organizational commitment to the department than to the university. Nevertheless, they expressed higher levels of organizational commitment than what is expected and expressed in the scholarly literature. Long-term PT faculty were willing to maintain their work relationship with a given campus but this willingness could be weakened by the deterioration over time of their working conditions. The working conditions of PT faculty became a critical element in employment persistence and for satisfaction when job involvement was either not developed or eroded.

Long-term PT faculty’s expressions of work engagement relate to their sense of belonging to a profession (faculty), their sense of belonging to an organization (university) and their sense that they have the ability to make a difference in society. In this chapter, I explored long-term PT faculty’s development of a sense of belonging to an organization and to a specific group in that organization (their department). In the following chapter, I use the other two attitudes of work engagement (i.e., job involvement and psychological empowerment) to explain long-term PT faculty members’ understandings of their role in the profession and on the campus.
Chapter Five

Long-Term Part-time Faculty Members’ Preferred-Self

The previous chapter explained part-time (PT) faculty members’ development of a long-term relationship with a university and a sense of membership in their department. I described the organizational circumstances that aided and those that hindered both the development of this relationship and PT faculty members’ sense of membership. In that chapter, the focus was on the organizational circumstances that had affected PT faculty’s organizational commitment, or PT faculty’s willingness to remain in their university.

This chapter takes a different approach. In this chapter, I focus on PT faculty members’ definitions of their preferred-self and the ways in which these definitions shaped PT faculty’ behaviors within their campuses. I explain the definitions that guided PT faculty in the enactment of activities and values that were consistent with professional groups. Finally, I explain the ways in which PT faculty members’ definitions of self influenced their expressions of psychological empowerment and organizational commitment.

In this chapter, I respond to the question, “What are the ways in which long-term part-time faculty understand their role in their profession and in the context of public comprehensive Master’s universities?” To do so, I explain PT faculty members’ preferred self (Kahn, 1990). That is, the definitions that long-term PT faculty constructed about themselves in their role (Kahn, 1990) in the academic profession, their specific discipline, and their higher education institution (Austin, 1990), as well as the implications that these definitions had on their enactment of their work.
Long-term PT faculty identified themselves as part of the academic profession (as educators), as members of professional/disciplinary groups (such as a journalist, psychologist, geologist, biologist, or communicator), and as members of university groups (such as adjunct faculty and temporal faculty). PT faculty members’ construction of their role comprised the responsibilities of teaching, educating the future professionals in their field, and connecting their university (and students) with the needs of the community. PT faculty members’ self-definition as professionals guided their practices and behaviors within their universities through values associated with professional groups rather than occupational groups.

PT faculty members’ roles comprised values of the academic profession, their particular fields, and the particular institutional type of their campus (public, comprehensive, Master’s, non-selective universities). These values included responsibility to educate future professionals, search for new knowledge, collegiality, autonomy, and service for society, and they guided PT faculty members’ in-role self (Kahn, 1990). PT faculty members conceptualized their work as connected to a social need, not just to a personal economic need. Thus, in their roles, they expressed a commitment to service for the benefit of society: PT faculty educated caring professionals; their work helped students’ social mobility; they provided quality education to disadvantaged populations; and, they improved the university’s connection to the community and region. This definition of PT faculty members’ roles as professionals and the values attached to those roles guided PT faculty to embrace extra-role behaviors. That is, PT faculty members’ self-definition as professionals benefited
their campuses because this definition exceeded PT faculty’s organizational roles and duties established formally in their universities.

This chapter is organized as follows. First, I explain the four roles that long-term PT faculty identified as their responsibility as professionals in comprehensive Master’s universities: educator, problem-solver, generator of new professionals, and responsible person to connect the campus to the community. In each of these sections, I also elucidate the values that PT faculty subscribed to and which guided their behaviors and attitudes associated with each role. Finally, I explain the ways in which PT faculty understood the connection between these four different roles and how they navigated their membership in multiple groups. I argue that the connection among PT faculty roles worked to the benefit of their campuses.

I identify participants through three categories: Quotations from participants are accompanied by their pseudonym, their department, and their campus’ pseudonym (Big City University [BCU], Middle Valley University [MVU], and Small Ville University [SVU]). I do not include their seniority on their campuses, because I did not find evidence of substantial differences in PT faculty members’ definition of their roles due to the duration of their working relationship with their campus.

**PT Faculty Members’ Roles**

The central roles that long-term PT faculty identified as components of their profession were shaped by their preferred-self. PT faculty expressed affinity with on-campus and out of campus groups. Their understanding of their roles was influenced by the tasks and values that PT faculty adopted (and considered important) from each of the
groups with which they associated as members. Three of the roles focused on PT faculty members’ responsibilities and tasks as members of each group: their role as educators focused on their responsibility as members of faculty; their role as problem-solvers focused on their responsibility as members of the university; and, their role as generators of new professionals had an emphasis on PT faculty’s responsibility towards their field or discipline. Finally, PT faculty defined their role as liaisons to the community as their responsibility towards the local community and region. Service to their community was their responsibility as faculty, members of their discipline, and as university members.

Regardless of their discipline or field of expertise, long-term PT faculty members understood their role as professionals in connection to the academic profession, their discipline, and the needs of their campus and society. PT faculty expressed psychological empowerment within their campus due to the benefits that their role provided to their profession, to the students, and to the community. This connection to the “bigger picture” counteracted PT faculty’s limited control over their organizational circumstances and increased their sense of control over their work.

**Role as educator.** PT faculty members understood the academic profession as connected to teaching, publication, and research, as well as to community and institutional service. The terms “professor,” “full-time faculty,” and “tenure-track faculty” named the professional who carried out these academic activities and the term “PT faculty” named those academics who focused on teaching and service to the community (the latter is explained in a different section). “I would say [that] I’m expected to do almost everything a full-time faculty member is expected to do, except for
research and committee work” (Melinda, Communication, BCU). PT faculty members’ role as educators helped their universities to achieve their “primary mission:” to teach undergraduate students. As educators, PT faculty could focus on one academic activity—teaching—and carry it out with high quality as well as provide students at the university with specialized knowledge.

PT identified themselves as members of the academic profession whose primary role was to educate students. For this, PT faculty subjected their teaching tasks to the same standards and values required by their university for full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty. “[I] follow the rigor, and the regulations, and the curriculum... I would say probably no different than a full-timer” (Saul, Sociology, BCU). PT faculty focused on teaching not due to their inability to carry out other academic tasks but due to a personal preference and to a need of the academic profession and their universities for expert educators. “This is a very important position because we do most of the teaching and people who are part-time faculty must be highly qualified for this job” (Charlize, Human Development, BCU). In their view, their ability to perform this role with high quality validated PT faculty as organizational members and as members of the academic profession.

PT faculty members perceived that their ability to focus on teaching enabled them to perform this activity similar or better than full-time faculty. The multiple demands placed on tenured and tenure-track faculty was perceived by PT faculty as an impediment for them to focus on teaching. “[Full-time faculty,] they are very busy people. They all are doing ‘important research,’ or they are on sabbatical… They don’t teach that much…
They come a couple of times a week to teach their three hours class” (Jackie, English, SVU). In addition, full-time faculty used these competing demands to disguise their willingness to abandon their teaching tasks. “Tenure and tenure-track people are released from their teaching duties to be on a committee... [But] these committees do not meet that often, maybe never” (Down, History, BCU). In contrast to full-time faculty, long term PT faculty focused on teaching, appreciated this focus, and organized their activities to teach appropriately—to fulfill the requirements of their courses and the needs of their students, as well as to meet their own expectations and standards for teaching.

Although in their role as educators, PT faculty’s primary activity was teaching, they also participated in other activities of the academic profession (e.g., research, committees, workshops) in addition to teaching. Officially, the three campuses did not pose expectations for PT faculty to participate in non-teaching activities. Those long-term PT faculty who carried out these activities did so due to their own interests, even if they had to use their own resources. “There’s no funding for lecturers to go to conferences... [or] to do research. I pay for it” (Bridget, Biology, MVU). PT faculty performed non-teaching activities because these activities enabled them to update their ability to educate and to serve students.

[I need] to keep [myself] current in the field of study: so, either writing papers, conducting some research perhaps, attending conferences in my specific area of study. I [also]... have professional development throughout the year in terms of teaching, pedagogy, stuff for the classroom. (Melinda, Communication, BCU)

That is, the role as educator had a focus on teaching but this focus did not prevent PT faculty to express (and enact) their interests in other academic activities. “Research is not requirement of my job position and my priority is on the teaching aspect but I’ve been
involved in research to improve the teaching” (Mariane, Biology, BCU).

PT faculty members’ specialization in teaching enabled them to perform this academic activity with the quality it required to respond to students’ needs. PT faculty prepared and updated courses, designed assignments and class activities, taught, communicated with students on a daily basis, provided feedback, invited guest lecturers, and sought organizational information to support students academically.

[Not] everybody learns the same way… We should teach at parallel to that, how people learn... If everyone fails my class that means that I am a bad professor. That doesn’t mean the kids are stupid. That means that I didn’t get the information to them. Or I didn’t do something right. That is my job. (Jonathan, Kinesiology, MVU)

In this role, PT faculty focused on their responsibility to serve and help students, to support their learning achievements, and to ensure that students did not miss learning experiences. In addition, long-term PT faculty sought to enact these responsibilities regardless of organizational or personal limitations.

PT faculty members directed time and energy to their job on the campus. PT faculty employed large periods of out-of-class time to prepare their teaching tasks—“I spent my winter break reading and making new assignments” (Melinda, Communication, BCU)—or to respond to students’ e-mails, to communicate to them, and to clarify class related inquiries such as deadlines, additional sources of information, or assignments details. “Even if 5% of the students send you an email each week that’s still a lot of people... I spend several hours a week for sure just answering emails” (Bridget, Biology, MVU). These activities were not mandatory for PT faculty or compensated by their university, and they received little or no support (resources) to carry out these activities.
However, PT faculty members invested themselves in these activities because they saw their role as educator as influential in students’ lives. “I’m not just teaching a bunch of theories that you can… forget about… I’m giving you essential tools for life. As soon as you walk out of the classroom, you can go home and use them immediately” (Jim, Communication, BCU). PT faculty use of time and energy was driven by what they saw as their responsibility as professionals.

Long-term PT faculty members established personal teaching standards which were not the same as their campuses’ standards. The three campuses lacked descriptions of teaching expectations or teaching philosophies that were adequate in the view of PT faculty.

They’ll say, “We appreciate you; you’re a good teacher.” [I asked,] “How do you know that?” And the main reason was “no one comes to complain.” Is that good criteria? You’re a good teacher because nobody complains about you? And I am like, “Really?” They [said,] “Yeah. We know people that they’re here for a semester or two and there’s a line out the door of people complaining about this professor who makes racist comments… and nobody comes to complain about you. So, we assume you’re a good teacher.” (Jim, Communication, BCU)

In response to their campuses’ deficient teaching guidance, PT faculty set high standards for teaching and used those standards to guide their behaviors. That is, their role as educator was comprehensive: It included to teach to the degree that was expected from their campus and to the best of their ability. Their seniority as PT faculty on their campuses facilitated the attainment of these standards.

Long-term PT faculty acquired organizational knowledge that enabled them to respond to the teaching needs of their particular campus. Over time, long-term PT faculty gained expertise in teaching in specific settings (e.g., classrooms, online courses) on
their campus. “Generally, at this school, they have World History. It’s two segments... this is what I’ve been teaching like 90% of the time” (Abdel, History, BCU). “I teach big classes” (Jim, Communications, BCU). PT faculty sought, planned, and carried out strategies to teach in those specific settings (i.e., class type, class size, upper and lower divisions). “In terms of engaging the students more there’s different methods that I have to come up with and adapt for the bigger class” (Bridget, Biology, MVU). Students’ preferences indicated to PT faculty that they were fulfilling their role. “I don’t want to brag about it but the students love me; they love the class” (Abdel, History, BCU). Long-term PT faculty considered themselves the professional educators that their universities needed: focused on the quality of teaching, interested in students’ learning, and able to carry out their campuses’ specific courses. PT faculty’s definition of their role responded to, and was in accord with, their values as professionals and as organizational members. That is, in their role as educators, PT faculty expressed both job involvement and organizational commitment.

PT faculty characterized themselves as able to improve the quality of the education at their universities given their professional expertise and expert knowledge. PT faculty who had previous careers outside of academia, or who had a career outside academia simultaneously with their PT faculty position, and those who had a doctoral education and research experience perceived that their experiences were a critical to complement to the education offered at their campus. “I think that that is definitely an advantage, having a person like myself, or colleagues of mine, who are practitioners. It’s really an advantage for students” (Anna, Psychology, SVU). “When I was in [other
university], I was doing research… then, when we moved here I did a postdoc at [another university]… that benefits them [students]” (Bridget, Biology, MVU). PT faculty members’ experiences in both academic and non-academic settings enriched students’ in-class experience, and with their non-academic experience, they provided guidance and knowledge otherwise not accessible to students.

According to PT faculty, their professional expertise counteracted the limitations in the contents that full-time faculty provided to students. PT faculty in professional and vocational fields (e.g., Education, Business, Nursing, Kinesiology, Physical Education, and Psychology) shared a view of themselves as carriers of specialized knowledge that was needed on their campuses and that enriched the education offered by tenure-track faculty.

I am in the trenches. I go to work every day and then I can go to the students [and say,] “Let me tell you about my day.” When you are up here [in a university], you are theoretical. I am a practitioner. There is a difference. I see that difference all the time with professors. They are too wrapped up in the theory and the lesson plan. You don’t do that in the real world… I really get excited because I can bring to the table what really is necessary in the classroom and to work with these [special needs] kids. (Ava, Special Education, BCU)

For PT faculty members, their role in the university included to offer a complement (specialized practical knowledge) to the (theoretical) knowledge offered by full-time academics. In this way, they characterized their teaching responsibilities as important for the university as those of full-time faculty. Specialized knowledge legitimized PT faculty’s work.

Long-term PT faculty had a mix of professional and academic experiences that enriched students’ experiences. “My practice is what I preach... It’s really different... I
have written books. Anything I teach you, I have done” (Jonathan, Kinesiology, MVU).

In their view, due to these experiences, PT faculty were able to innovate in the classroom and offer a different approach to the curriculum than full-time faculty.

I match my résumé with most of these full-time faculty members. The thing that I have that they don’t have is that I got practical experience. I can tell my students, “Look when I was… this is what happened.” I taught about Crisis Communication; I’ve been through it. That’s the difference. They can teach from a textbook… I’m not knocking them as teachers but I can give them [students] the practical experience. (Roy, Communication, MVU)

Every class is different… There is a hands on component… I taught them that they have to know how to do fundraising… There is written, and there is test, and all that stuff… If you lecture and you are done is not going to work... We all sit in group projects, because people need to know how to work together. (Jonathan, Kinesiology, MVU)

Whether they taught upper division or lower division courses, specialized courses or general education courses, PT faculty employed their knowledge and experience to improve the curriculum of their classes. In their perception, PT faculty members’ teaching enriched the campuses.

In PT faculty members’ view, specialized, practical knowledge also enabled them to make a difference for the students by providing information that PT faculty themselves did not have access to during their graduate and undergraduate formation.

One of the classes that I am teaching this semester is Behavioral Assessment, and I realize when I took that class as a grad student, it wasn’t really being taught in a way that would have helped me the very first year, when I had to actually do behavioral assessment. That class didn’t prepare me for that. I really had to learn how to [do] that on my own. (Anna, Psychology, SVU)

PT faculty used their own experience as students and as professionals to determine the balance between theory and practice. Specialized, practical, experience-related knowledge was constructed and updated by PT faculty on a constant basis, and they
organized their classes following these updates.

PT faculty were able to organize their activities according to their personal preferences and enrich students’ classroom experience with the activities and assignments they selected.

In terms of developing the class, there was… guidance. [But,] I don’t think I’ve ever felt like I had to do it the same way that someone else did it. I always felt completely free to make it my own class and to cover what I wanted to cover within the class description. (Bridget, Biology, MVU)

In their role as educators, long-term PT faculty had autonomy and control (to which participants referred to with the terms “autonomy” and “academic freedom”) over their primary task. Autonomy and control signaled to PT faculty that they were recognized as professionals within the campus context.

Long-term PT faculty were not micromanaged in their role as educators. “The kind of highly annoying micromanaging that you get in a lot of jobs in which you are not respected for what you can do, that is essentially missing here” (Down, History, BCU).

The control and freedom that PT faculty had over their teaching tasks were partly what attracted them to the profession. As members of the faculty, PT faculty were able to behave as professionals rather than as employees within the university.

I didn’t go to school to do as what I was told. That’s why I selected the academic side because you have a lot of academic freedom, and, besides, I like doing that [teaching]. You get to really work with students and influence them in their learning and everything else, and their development. On this [staff] side, you still do that too, but there are too many restrictions; [it is] just too political. It really wasn’t what I wanted to do. (Elena, Education, 29 years, MVU)

PT faculty had and enacted autonomy in their teaching role. The freedom that PT faculty had in the educator role was a double edged sword: Although PT faculty had control over
their work, they could also be “blamed” for problems in their courses (which could lead to them not being reappointed). However, due to their personal expertise and experience, PT faculty qualified their freedom, autonomy, and control as indicators of their status as professionals at (and not employees of) the university.

The definition of PT faculty members’ role as educators avoided the characterization of a teaching focus as a disadvantage for students and made this focus a strength for them. PT faculty perceived that a focus on teaching enabled them to serve students in a way that helped students to obtain the best education they could. This definition of their teaching role elevated PT faculty and helped them gain a sense of legitimation as faculty members. The limited support that long-term PT faculty received from their campuses required this faculty group to direct more time and effort to carry out their activities. PT faculty performed in-role and extra role activities that were necessary for them to carry out teaching both to the expectations of their campuses and to their own expectations. Given their focus on teaching and their professional qualifications, PT faculty identified a second role they played at public universities: to solve their campuses’ problems in order to offer the education that their students deserved.

**Role as universities’ problem-solvers.** Long-term PT faculty members tied one of their roles to the resolution of organizational problems and the needs of their campuses. Long-term PT faculty members saw themselves as “self-sufficient” professionals. Their sense of self-efficacy guided them in the solution of obstacles that they faced in the performance of their direct duties as well as to clear obstacles that their department faced due to limited resources at the campus. The role of PT faculty as
problem-solvers included support for the institution and the students by removing obstacles to both teaching and non-teaching tasks.

Small Ville University, Middle Valley University, and Big City University faced problems associated with limited resources. As a consequence of the Great Recession of 2008 (Zumeta, 2010), state support suffered cut backs and the three campuses did not receive sufficient funds to improve or maintain their facilities (e.g., classrooms, laboratories) or to increase faculty salaries. This condition began to change in 2014-2015. “They just started to put money back into it, so the lab that was before wasn’t very good, now is really good. They just added some money to it, and it is really nice now” (Jonathan, Kinesiology, MVU). However, long-term PT faculty experienced limited resources during the majority of their time at their CSU campus. For them, it was their responsibility as professionals to employ their professional qualifications, skills, and connections to solve organizational problems related to limited resources.

PT faculty encountered limited resources on a regular basis. The most salient problem that PT faculty faced included deficiencies in classrooms and classroom equipment. “Classrooms have stuff that isn’t working… like internet” (Jonathan, kinesiology, MVU). These problems were not faced by PT faculty only. Full-time faculty used the same facilities. Thus, PT faculty did not perceive the presence of deficient facilities as an attack to them as a group. Moreover, they saw these deficiencies as organizational circumstances which they could overcome. “It is not personal, we all have [problems]… The university can’t fix it, I need to [do it]” (Mae, Health, BCU). PT faculty developed strategies to avoid a situation where deficient facilities and equipment
prevented them to perform their duties and where students suffered as a consequence.

That [problem] happens to anybody. Occasionally, our projector, gets frozen [in] the classroom; so, you just call tech support; you figure out what to do until they arrive. But when it does not work, I do other activities… Be creative, you can’t depend on technology… You can’t stop the class. (Josephine, Kinesiology, BCU)

As problem-solvers, PT faculty’s role at the university was to ensure that the students could carry on with a course regardless of any space, time, or technological limitations. In this sense, PT faculty members’ preferred-self included responsibilities towards their work, their students, and their campus.

Another consequence of limited funds that PT faculty faced was that at the three campuses classes included larger number of students than in previous years. “I used to teach 35 students [per class] now classes have 80 students. I’m teaching 160 students in just 2 classes” (Abdel, History, UBC). Larger classes had as a consequence that periodically PT faculty had groups of students that did not fit in a given classroom. “[We had] eighty people in a room for forty” (Hanna, Philosophy/Computer Systems, MVU). Thus, PT faculty needed to adapt their class plan and resources in order to enable students to access both course content and activities.

PT faculty members’ goal was to have time, attention, and interactions with faculty available for students. “[In] a very large group students… It’s hard to be very personal” (Ronald, Geology, MVU). PT faculty connected their role as problem-solvers with their role as expert educators and adapted their classes to be able to serve students regardless of the size of the class, while responding to students’ needs in different courses.
I’m changing the kind of exam questions. In the classroom, my approach has changed a lot too because classes are so huge. I try using clickers, which are like personal responders so I can ask questions… In the really big classes, I feel like that really helps the students to feel more like they’re participating… A lot of students said, “I’m usually too shy to speak up in class, but using the clicker, I feel like I’m still participating.” And, I think for students who might be kind of on the line about it and so like in a small class they might speak up, but in a big class they’re not going to, this is helpful. (Bridget, Biology, MVU)

As problem-solvers, PT faculty designed strategies to decrease problems associated with large classes and to teach those classes in a way that matched the quality of education that students received in smaller classes.

Their commitment to teaching and to their students motivated long-term PT faculty to solve problems that otherwise would hinder their ability to teach. Departments made decisions that challenged PT faculty members’ ability to perform their educator role (for example, increase the number of students per class, or change the textbook for a course), but PT faculty identified that the “professional thing to do” was to carry on with their work and to ensure that these issues did not affect students. PT faculty would also help students to solve problems that did not relate to their course or course activities.

Students faced non-teaching or non-course related problems, which usually were a consequence of inefficient processes at the campuses (e.g., inefficient communication with students, limited clarity in explanations of requirements). Long-term PT faculty employed their position as organizational members and the advantages that they had acquired due to their long-term relationship with the campus to help students in these matters.

As student, I find that processes are not always as easily resolved. So, if you have an issue, you may get bounced back and forth between several people, but if you are a faculty member, you tend to get issues resolved pretty immediately and they
are a little bit nicer to you. They do not act like you are taking all of their time. (Anna, Psychology, SVU)

PT faculty members used their knowledge of on-campus resources to meet students’ needs and support their in-class and out-of-class needs. For example, Jackie (English, SVU) informed students about a first-generation support program that would close in her campus and assisted a group of students to structure a plan to request for an extension of the program. PT faculty included in their role as problem-solvers a responsibility to enable students to receive information about the university, the department, and their own status as students. That is, PT faculty characterized themselves as organizational members with the ability to solve problems that were not related directly to their official roles in the campus.

PT faculty also considered that part of their problem-solver role was to counteract limitations of their departments even if these limitations did not affect PT faculty directly. Long-term PT faculty recognized the needs of their department due to their seniority on campus and used their professional connections outside the campus to help the department reduce their limited resources. For example, Jonathan (Kinesiology, MVU) found a program that offered educational models (valued at a thousand dollars) to universities for free and informed his department about this opportunity in a department meeting. Chelsea (Administration of Justice, BCU) obtained two five hundred dollars grants for students in her department to participate in a study abroad program. Alissa (Management, BCU) sought discounts in membership fees for students and members in her department in a professional organization in which she was a member. Hanna (Philosophy/Computer Systems, SVU) used her connections to local businesses to find
internships for students in her department. Long-term PT faculty employed their connections with business, non-governmental organizations, and professional associations to improve the departments’ programs. For PT faculty, they had the possibility to support their department because of their membership in several groups outside the university and their ability to identify the needs and weaknesses of their department.

In order to solve their campuses and departments’ limitations, PT faculty also relied upon their personal resources. Claims such as “I look for information at home,” “I print at home,” and “I bring my own computer to campus” were expressed repeatedly by long-term PT faculty at the three campuses (newer faculty also vocalized similar claims). PT faculty members’ use of their personal resources became challenging when they added up all the resources they used. “You do a lot of things at home and you use your own cartridges for the ink, and your printer, you use your own office resources, and [that] can get expensive” (Charlize, Human Development, BCU). When campuses provided the resources, PT faculty preferred not to use their own materials for their work. “If I can help it, I don’t do anything at home. I’ll do it all here” (Charlize, Human Development, BCU). Nevertheless, if PT faculty employed only the resources their campuses provided them, their work faced limitations.

The use of personal resources was not only necessary for PT faculty to be able to perform their role to their own expectations but also had become normalized in their everyday work. Furthermore, PT faculty considered that not needing a campus’ resources was evidence of their professional aptitudes and efficiency. “I need access to [a]
computer, [for] which I just use my personal laptop, [and] access to blackboard. I don’t need a whole lot actually… [For] textbooks, I typically will contact the publisher… I am pretty self-sufficient” (Anna, Psychology, MVU). In their view, to be able to perform their work without support from the university was a PT faculty’s aptitude that indicated their professionalism. In addition, when PT faculty were able to solve organizational issues with their resources at hand, they expressed psychological empowerment and viewed themselves as valid professionals and organizational members. Nevertheless, their psychological empowerment had limits.

PT faculty members’ institutional role as problem-solvers was hindered by their limited ability to change university wide circumstances or solve their university’s problems. “We try to participate… but there’s only so much that we can participate in” (Colette, English, MVU). In particular, the problematic organizational circumstances that surrounded PT faculty members’ position were out of the reach of PT faculty. PT faculty were able to control and improve teaching and student related circumstances, but they did not have the same degree of control over their own working circumstances. “I set up the [laboratory] class the way I think it should be done… But the lab tech policy, I don’t know, I can’t change it” (Rick, Geology, MVU). This limited control over university-wide problems affected PT faculty members’ psychological empowerment negatively.

In work engagement theory, psychological empowerment refers to an individual’s belief that they have personal control and the ability to influence their organization; that is, that their efforts can make a difference in the workplace (Spreitzer, 1995 in Macey & Schneider, 2008). PT faculty members had limited ability to change the institution itself,
as well as their own conditions at the institution: they had limited control over their own work circumstances. However, this condition did not prevent them from attempting to help their university and their department.

The limitations in long-term PT faculty members’ ability to change the campus were counteracted by their view that their role was significant (i.e., important or transcendent) outside of the campus. PT faculty understood their job as central for the future of the practice of their disciplinary field and, thus, significant beyond their institution.

**Role as generator of new professionals.** The role as generators of new professionals connected PT faculty’s sense of membership in a profession outside the university with their sense of membership in the faculty profession at their university. Long-term PT faculty had experience both as university employees and as professionals in their various fields, and their experiences shaped PT faculty members’ view of their role as generators of new professionals. For PT faculty members, teaching was part of their preferred-self: They taught because they were interested in this activity and because this activity was part of their professional identity and their responsibilities as members of their discipline, profession, or field. Long-term part-time faculty’s role as generators of new professionals included responsibilities that they had within the academic profession and toward their field of expertise.

PT faculty members’ role as responsible to provide a new generation of professionals in their specific fields included two tasks. The first task comprised the attraction of students to the field and the provision of guidance to students during their
selection of the field and their education for practice. This task related to PT faculty responsibilities as member of the academic profession. The second task emphasized PT faculty members’ responsibility towards the discipline, field, or profession outside of academe. This task consisted of providing the field with professionals who had the intellectual tools (i.e., knowledge, abilities, skills, attitudes) necessary to maintain and improve the field and its practices.

In their role as generators of new professionals, PT faculty guided students in the selection of their own field or subfield of study. “[Students] who are undecided; they would take my class… [and] I can inspire them” (Ava, Special Education, MVU). This role included to identify those students with the attitudes necessary in the field and to indicate to these students the path to form as proper professionals. “There have been students over the years that feel comfortable with me to seek professional advice: What can they do with their degree? How did I get to where I am?” (Melinda, Communication, BCU). PT faculty identified those students who showed interest in their subfield and acted as representatives of their field to introduce students to the expectations of their field and the requirements to be able to pertain to the profession.

PT faculty established close relationships with students (such as mentor-mentee) as part of their role as generators of new professionals. In order to increase students’ knowledge about the professional field and the work environment, PT faculty found formal and informal internships for students, facilitated spaces for students to practice their skills, and established continual mentorship for students.

I have them do internships. Either here [my clinic outside MVU] or … [in] football games and stuff… If someone gets hurt in the field, then they come with
me and we do evaluations... We didn’t have internships when I was in school. But now they are imperative. (Jonathan, kinesiology, MVU)

PT faculty offered guidance to students about ways in which they could get in touch with the profession and other professionals in the field. In addition, they sought to serve as role models for these students and help them to establish professional networks.

Their responsibilities as representatives of their field motivated PT faculty to seek (search for and construct) new knowledge to include in class. PT faculty valued the constant search for knowledge. “I feel it’s my responsibility to put that extra time in and learn...I can’t be teaching what was [current] two years ago” (Charlize, Human Development, MVU). In addition, they saw themselves as participants in the generation of new knowledge associated with their practice. “Many of us who do practice also come up with our own theory on the bottom” (Colette, English, MVU). In their view, it would be irresponsible towards their students and towards their field to educate professionals with dated knowledge and skills. That is, the responsibility toward their discipline that they expressed in their role as creators of new professionals benefited their role as educators. In their role as generators of new professionals, PT faculty carried out activities that were not expected and not compensated by their campuses but that they considered central for the education of the next generation of professionals.

PT faculty members characterized their role as generators of new professionals as focused on PT faculty’s responsibility towards their profession. PT faculty were responsible for providing the professionals that their field needed. “Now they are getting ready for the outside, which is the job. So, that is why I push it really hard” (Jonathan, Kinesiology, MVU). In this role, the responsibility of PT faculty was with their
colleagues outside the university, including their professional field, other practitioners, and other workplaces (either academic or non-academic) in which the future professionals would work. “So, it’s kind of me paying it forward… I want to help education bringing the most qualified teachers” (Charlize, Human Development, BCU). PT faculty had a sense of responsibility toward their field and those who would be served by their students after graduation. PT faculty perceived that they could influence their field and this increased the importance of their work at the university.

Different from their role as educators which focused on PT faculty’s responsibilities toward students, PT faculty’s role as generators of new professionals focused on their responsibility to the field. PT faculty membership in their field, profession, or discipline motivated them to provide students with the ability to learn and develop the skills and abilities that the field needed. “I like preparing the next generation of practitioners. I think is critical in our profession because there is just very few of us. So, that is why I do it” (Anna, Psychology, SVU). PT faculty members’ current students would become their colleagues. Thus, they needed to prepare students to execute their work to the standards of the profession and to be capable colleagues. PT faculty members considered their classes as the primary source of students’ access to this type of education. “We don’t have a lot of training programs” (Anna, Psychology, SVU). Thus, PT faculty could make the difference in whether or not the field received qualified practitioners.

As part of their responsibility to the field, PT faculty viewed themselves as in charge of educating professionals who innovated in the field and improved the quality of
the services that their field offered. PT faculty did not consider their fields as static. Thus, for them, it was necessary to develop professionals who did not limit themselves to follow orders or behave as “money followers.” Instead, PT faculty sought to develop practitioners who guided themselves by professional values such as innovation and respect, values to which PT faculty themselves subscribed.

I tell my students [that] they have to come up with a project. And I tell them, “Whatever you do, if you don’t put it together within a year, I will steal it...” The trick is to come up with new ways [to treat patients] because the old ways are over. I have residents to come here all the time, practice residents, and their whole medicine is, “You will get better in two weeks,” which is BS, and they’ll give you some meds… [But] I teach them [my students] how give the patient ownership. (Jonathan, Kinesiology, MVU)

By educating students to become responsible “team players” and innovative and respectful professionals, PT faculty sought to provide their field with well-rounded professionals who would advance their field and help it evolve. This responsibility did not end when students graduated.

PT faculty continued their communication with students after graduation and functioned as mentors and as colleagues of former students. Moreover, they provided guidance and support to former students in their new jobs. “I meet with them again, and they have jobs. And they call me, and they would say, ‘[Ava] I am in trouble, can you help me?’ And I do” (Ava, Special Education, BCU). PT faculty members’ involvement in their profession and commitment to their students motivated them to continue their role as both educators and generators of new professionals once students left their university. “I extended myself beyond the classroom, after they got their credential, and they make their first job” (Ava, Special Education, BCU). Given their affinity to
university and professional groups off campus, PT faculty extended their role as
generators of new professionals beyond the limits of their university.

Similar to their role as educators, PT faculty’s role as creators of new
professionals was connected to teaching, but this role provided them with an additional
meaning to this activity. While in their role as educators, PT faculty characterized
themselves as responsible for the quality of education, in their role as creators of new
professionals, PT faculty focused on providing the field with people who would be
responsible professionals and who would advance and improve the field. For PT faculty,
their role was not focused on enabling students to obtain high returns over their degrees,
but on ensuring that current students became future professionals who enacted
professional values.

For long-term PT faculty, their perception that they could influence their
profession and their disciplinary field served as motivation to perform their job fully
(regardless of organizational obstacles). Their self-perceived influence as members of
multiple professional groups increased PT faculty psychological empowerment and
counteracted the disempowerment they experienced due to their limited influence in
university wide matters. PT faculty defined themselves as in charge of another role that
also increased their perception that they could influence the university. This was their
role as connectors of the university and the community.

**Role as universities’ liaison to the community.** PT faculty expressed their
responsibility to their region or community as members of the academic profession, their
disciplinary field, and their campus: to employ their professional skills and resources to
serve as a liaison between the community and the university. PT faculty performed activities that connected their departments and the university with other education institutions and local groups. This connection sought to provide advantages to both the university and the community. Through these activities, PT faculty endeavored to increase the presence of campuses in the communities and to ensure that members of disadvantaged populations had access to advanced knowledge and the university.

The three campuses had programs to support projects that involved collaborative work among departments and other educational institutions (high schools, community colleges). “I applied for an internal grant... from the Community Based Research Program and that is the program that supports working with community partners to do research” (Bridget, Biology, MVU). PT faculty participated in activities that connected their campus with high schools and other postsecondary education institutions because they saw these activities as a method to extend their expert knowledge to the benefit of the community. “I’ll be working with teachers and students at the [name] school, which is a high school in [neighbor community name] and doing basically the same project but doing it with them” (Bridget, Biology, MVU). With these activities, PT faculty, as organizational members, were representatives of their university within the community, were able to perform activities that they enjoyed (in Bridget’s example, research), and shared the knowledge created at the university with the larger community.

In their role as liaison with the community, PT faculty conceptualized themselves

\[\text{In comparison to the previous three roles, this role was more nuanced. Only a small number of participants (4) vocalized this role openly, but most participants articulated views that supported the articulations of those four participants.}\]
as responsible for helping new students to adapt to and survive college life. “That is how I identify myself, like the person that receives the new people on campus, the new students who do not know what is going on” (Jackie, English, SVU). This role involved reaching out to students before they started college and continuing to support them when they enrolled at the campus.

I am most interested in trying to help students who need help to be successful on campus… Next semester, I will be teaching one class, a college level class at a Continuation High School in town. So, there is an alternative high school, kind of on the edges of town, and I am going to go and teach a college level class there next semester. (Jackie, English, SVU)

With these activities, PT faculty sought to fulfill various goals. They helped students by increasing their likelihood to be accepted in their university; They provided the university with better entry-level students; and, they helped students to persist in college.

PT faculty members’ background also influenced their participation in these activities. PT faculty identified themselves with their students at a personal level. Students at the three campuses were not highly privileged students and faced challenges such as limited resources, need to provide support to their family, and limited cultural capital. Half of the participants described experiences similar to their students. “They have to eat, and they are not living at home, most of the kids I know work, and I did [as well]. I had three jobs in college… So, I like those kids” (Jonathan, Kinesiology, MVU). PT faculty conceptualized their service work as a form of support to local populations of students. They considered that this participation was particularly important for those students with limited cultural capital and limited understanding of college life (students who “do not know what is going on,” as Jackie stated).
Activities such as conducting research and teaching in the community fulfilled responsibilities that PT faculty embraced as members of a profession and as members of their campus. These activities were part of the service mission of their campuses as regional oriented universities. Thus, these activities were a responsibility of PT faculty as members of the faculty. In addition, these activities were necessary for the development of the community; thus, they were PT faculty members’ responsibility as professionals. PT faculty were not expected to carry out these activities, and, in most cases, they sought information about these projects by themselves (they did not receive an official invitation to participate). Nevertheless, they sought to carry out these activities due to their self-identification not only to professional and organizational groups but also to the community. PT faculty’s decision to perform these activities was a result of their sense of membership in multiple groups.

**PT Faculty Roles as Complementary**

Long-term PT faculty expressed authorship in the conceptualization of their roles. In these conceptualizations, they employed terms that indicated their membership in different groups and represented their preferred-self. These terms described what they did as professionals at a university. PT faculty selected terms that deemphasized the negative connotations associated with PT faculty work circumstances. “I try not to use the word adjunct but I try not to use the word professor either… [Sometimes] I don’t say I’m a part-timer. I am faculty. I say, ‘I teach,’ that’s what I do” (Colette, English, MVU). In their construction of their preferred-self, long-term PT faculty were not limited by organizational restrictions. The terms they associated with their roles were not those
focused on their official appointment at the university (i.e., adjunct faculty) but those that represented their view of themselves as professionals (i.e., faculty).

The roles that long-term PT faculty constructed and enacted were part of their professional identities. PT faculty connected their professional-self—professionals, experts, educators, role models, members of the community, members of the department—with what they did, their roles as PT faculty. They embraced teaching, problem solving, providing professionals to their field, and connecting their university with the community as part of their preferred-self. These roles and the tasks that these roles involved were consistent with PT faculty’s complex value set which included values of professional groups, and, among these the academic profession. PT faculty considered the four roles described above as fundamental to the type of professionals to which they aspired.

Long-term PT faculty conceptualized themselves as experts in their field who had extensive knowledge of their discipline, their campus, and their profession. PT faculty constructed their roles as professionals with the use of a complex mix of responsibilities within as well as outside their campus. “I’m a life coach that writes books, teaches classes, and [does] motivational speaking. And all my motivational speaking and my classes are about life coaching, about being positive, and about living the best life that you can live” (Jonathan, Communication, BCU). PT faculty’s roles were a construction of PT faculty’s perceived responsibilities as members of the academic profession, their field, their university, and the community.
PT faculty members understood their roles as complementary to one another. Thus, although PT faculty expressed preference for one role over other roles—“I just wanted to focus on teaching… That’s the focus I want my focus to be. I don’t want to have to deal with all these other noises outside” (Marguerite, Biology, BCU)—this preference did not prevent them from enacting the other roles or from fulfilling other non-teaching academic activities. “I’ve been involved in educational research… [about] how do we improve students’ success” (Marguerite, Biology, BCU). Furthermore, PT faculty understood their roles as simultaneous, and they perceived that the performance of one role affected and was connected to the other roles. For example, teaching affected PT faculty’s influence on their discipline, and problem-solving affected their teaching. That is, for PT faculty, these four roles neither competed nor were in conflict with each other, rather they complemented one another.

PT faculty perceived that their memberships in multiple groups, their various responsibilities as members of these groups, and their roles attached to these memberships were a strength for their professional identity and performance. PT faculty enacted their self-in role (Kahn, 1990) connecting the diverse skills and knowledge that they developed as members of these groups.

I do identify as both [PT faculty and staff]. I really think that my faculty experience here has helped my staff position… [and] my staff position provides real life access to what is like to do the work that students are studying in the classroom… So, I feel like it’s kind of the perfect relationship for me… I get the teaching experience and the relationship with students, and I still feel I can help them on a broader level. (Mae, Health, BCU)
PT faculty’s membership in various groups did not limit their actions and behaviors as organizational members; instead, it did satisfy PT faculty members’ interests and preferences and, subsequently, benefited their universities.

The ways in which PT faculty conceptualized their roles and enacted their preferred-self had consequences for them as individuals and for their universities and departments. For PT faculty as individuals, their definition of their preferred-self provided them psychological empowerment. PT faculty’s psychological empowerment was tied to their ability to improve the quality of education at their campus and led to positive consequences from their teaching for their disciplinary fields and society. Long-term PT faculty members’ roles inside and outside the university provided them with a sense that their work mattered and that it was connected to a greater good.

Long-term PT faculty members’ perceptions that they could influence their profession, their disciplinary field, and their local community had positive consequences for their departments and universities. PT faculty’s conceptualization of their roles served them as a motivation to deal with organizational obstacles that could impede them to fulfill their mandatory roles. Furthermore, they carried out roles that were not part of their job description. PT faculty’s job involvement both with the faculty job and their disciplinary field job had a positive influence on their expressions of organizational commitment: PT faculty established long-term relationships with their campuses. “I stayed because I do like what I do” (Colette, English, MVU). In addition, PT faculty carried out extra-role behaviors (e.g., research, participation in faculty meetings, participation in conferences, curriculum updates, student mentorship, and new PT faculty
mentorship) that provided the campus with additional services and support for which PT faculty did not receive compensation.

Long-term PT faculty’ conceptualization of their preferred-self had another benefit for their expressions of organizational commitment. In their idea of the evolution of their preferred-self, PT faculty sought to continue to perform their roles as PT faculty and they aspired to remain at their current campus. “I can see myself here in 5 years” (Marguerite, Biology, BCU). “I am going to continue to do this [work as practitioner and PT faculty] until I retire from there and I’ll just do this part-time, in the future” (Max, Business and Public Administration, MVU). Long-term PT faculty members’ preferred-self included both expressions of both job involvement and organizational commitment which extended to the future.

PT faculty’s affinity to each one of the groups with which they identified as members had different ranking. Some PT faculty saw themselves as faculty first, others as non-faculty professionals first, and others as members of the campus first. However, for all PT faculty in this investigation, their membership in any of these groups had a positive effect on their work at, and their relationship with, the university. Their identification as members of the university, which they developed as a consequence of their long-term relationship with their departments, enabled them to diminish their less than ideal work circumstances. Their identification as members of a profession enabled them to develop a sense of psychological empowerment and to express commitment, involvement, enthusiasm, passion, focused effort, and energy towards their job (Macey & Schneider, 2008; Simpson, 2009b). For PT faculty, their position at their university
fulfilled a personal interest in the job (job involvement) and for their specific university (organizational commitment). When their conditions at the university limited their ability to perform their job and their status as organizational members was low or limited, PT faculty anchored themselves in the larger implications that their work had for their discipline and both community and society to carry out what they understood as their professional responsibilities.
Chapter Six

Conclusions

In this investigation, I proposed an over-arching open question (What are the ways in which long-term part-time faculty understand their role in their profession and in the context of public comprehensive Master’s universities?) accompanied by six associated questions. My research questions guided this investigation by providing a non-deficit approach to study a particular population’s role in a specific higher education institutional type. With these questions as a guide, I explored the ways in which long-term part-time (PT) faculty (PT faculty with a five year or longer seniority on a given campus) understand their role in their profession and in the context of public comprehensive Master’s universities. The associated questions focused on organizational, group, and personal aspects of PT faculty’s experiences as professionals with long-term relationships with a specific campus. My research questions had three implicit assumptions: PT faculty conceive themselves as professionals; they are organizational members; and, they conceptualize their work in connection to their memberships in professional groups and organizational groups in the university.

Work engagement theory (Kahn, 1990; Macey & Schneider, 2008; Simpson, 2009a; 2009b) and notions of new institutional theory (Meyer, 2008; Scott, 2014; Tolbert & Zucker, 1996), loosely-coupled systems theory (Orton & Weick, 1990; Weick, 1976), and academe as a profession (Austin, 1990; Ochoa, 2011; Rhoades, 1998) enabled me to explain the complex understandings of PT faculty about their role in public comprehensive Master’s universities in California. The aim of this investigation was to
counteract the oversimplified view of PT faculty as teaching-only centered, disengaged employees with low commitment and poor performance.

My empirical data enabled me to answer my research questions, respond to my research purpose, and advance the higher education field with the use of a novel theoretical framework. My findings indicate that PT faculty’s understandings of their role in the university is complex and formed by their responsibility as members of the university, members of the faculty, members of a profession or discipline, and members of the community. Their personal definition of their role includes more than formal elements of their job description (teaching). Second, my findings indicate that although organizational conditions do not stimulate organizational engagement, long-term PT faculty express this attitude which has positive effects on their behavioral expressions or work engagement. Finally, my findings indicate that PT faculty construct understandings of themselves in-role as a form to cope and resolve negative organizational conditions. My findings provide evidence that the current “deficit perspective” that guides studies of PT faculty presents a limited view of this population (Kezar & Sam, 2011b), a view that does not account for PT faculty members’ ability to oppose to structural obstacles in their campus and to control their contributions to higher education.

**Summary of the Findings**

Chapters Four and Five answer my research questions. In Chapter Four, I analyzed PT faculty’s development of a long-term relationship with their campus. I explored PT faculty development of membership in their department. In Chapter Five, I discussed PT faculty’s conceptualization of their role as members of a profession. With
these two approaches, I explained long-term PT faculty as professionals who express work engagement: job involvement to faculty work, organizational commitment to their campus, and psychological empowerment due to their role as professional in their campus. In addition, in these chapters, I presented data that indicated that PT faculty conceptualize their work in ways that surpass the organizational definitions of their positions in their campuses and the definitions developed in scholarly literature.

In Chapter Four, I answered the secondary questions of this investigation: How do PT faculty understand and explain their long-term relationship with a public university? What (personal and organizational) elements do PT faculty consider central in this relationship? How did the PT faculty relationship with the university evolve from a temporal appointment to a long-term appointment? According to part-time faculty, in which ways does the institution support and in which ways does it hinder their work performance? How do PT faculty negotiate institutional support and obstacles? When do these obstacles become a reason to leave the institution? In this chapter, I focused on PT faculty members’ perception of themselves as organizational members and their interactions with other organizational actors and organizational structures (Scott, 2014).

In Chapter Four, I discussed five findings. First, the origin, evolution, and the termination of the relationship between PT faculty and their campuses have both formal and informal indicators. Second, the informal indicators of the origin and evolution of the work relationship (which were part of the cultural and normative pillar [Scott, 2014]) were more significant for PT faculty than the formal indicators of the work relationship (regulative pillar [Scott, 2014]). That is, informal changes in their work and their
relationship with colleagues were central for PT faculty’s understanding of their roles, rights, responsibilities, and work demands. Third, long-term PT faculty members’ relationship with their campus had an origin that preceded their official appointment at the university. Long-term PT faculty were familiar with their campus, department, and department members. This familiarity increased their sense of welcoming in the department. Fourth, the conditions of PT faculty improved over time, thus, long-term PT faculty faced fewer obstacles for their work, lower job insecurity, and received more benefits than newer PT faculty. However, the improvement of these conditions was informal, and it was likely to disappear. Finally, negative working conditions did not suffice for this PT faculty group to leave their campus. Long-term PT faculty and departmental members developed strategies to counteract the negative organizational conditions tied to PT faculty appointments. The findings in Chapter Four connect to a larger argument: PT faculty members’ expressions of organizational commitment do not match their organizational conditions; these expressions are sustained by department level informal strategies to support and include PT faculty.

In Chapter Five, I answered my primary research question regarding long-term PT faculty members’ understandings of their role in their profession and in the context of public comprehensive Master’s universities and I advanced the argument that due to these understandings, PT faculty carry out extra-role behaviors (Macey & Schneider, 2008) that benefit their campus. In this chapter, I discussed three findings. First, as the preferred-self conceptual framework suggested (Kahn, 1990), long-term PT faculty identified themselves as members of both in-campus (faculty, staff) and off-campus
groups (community, disciplinary field, academic profession). Second, long-term PT faculty identified four roles that connected their membership to all these groups and that benefited their campus—Educator, Problem-solver, Generator of new professionals, and Liaison with the community. Third, in the definition of their roles, PT faculty included descriptors that scholars (e.g., Goode, 1969) associate with the ideal conception of a profession: their role required specialized training and membership in a professional association, included legal legitimation, and had a specific code of ethics. Fourth, PT faculty conceived these four roles as complementary rather than competing with one another. Thus, the activities that they performed in any of the roles supported the rest of the roles and benefited the university, the students, the community, and their disciplinary or professional field.

The findings in this investigation contribute to the understanding of the long-term PT faculty population. My empirical data and theoretical approach enlighten the ways in which PT faculty conceptualize their role and cope with organizational conditions that are negative to their practices. In conjunction, the empirical findings described in Chapters Four and Five explain that: (a) PT faculty members’ expressions of job involvement or organizational commitment benefit their campus; (b) PT faculty’s long-term work relationships develop in part due to PT faculty’s expressions of organizational commitment and in part due to fortuitousness; (c) Long-term PT faculty members cope with negative circumstances through compartmentalization of these circumstances in institutional level and department level conditions; (d) PT faculty members’ self-definition as professionals counteracts the negative connotations of the organizational
definitions of their position; and, (e) PT faculty’s participation in non-teaching activities is an expression of control over their work. These overarching findings are discussed in more detail below.

**PT Faculty Members’ Job Involvement and Organizational Commitment Benefit Their Campus**

My findings show that organizational commitment and job involvement are two personal attitudes that occur simultaneously but independently from one another. As suggested by my theoretical framework (Jauch, Glueck, & Osborn, 1978; Simpson, 2009a), PT faculty may express only one and not the other, both, or neither one of these attitudes. In contrast to the other two attitudes, psychological engagement is connected to both organizational commitment and job involvement: if PT faculty expressed job involvement or organizational commitment they expressed as well psychological empowerment. I found that long-term PT faculty expressed these three attitudes as well as behavioral work engagement. However, the expression of either job involvement or organizational commitment alone was beneficial for PT faculty’s behavioral expressions of work engagement.

PT faculty members’ long-term seniority in a university increased their intent to remain at the campus; this expression of organizational loyalty increased over time. However, other expressions of organizational commitment (e.g., interest in the achievement of organizational goals, sense of pride for working at the university) were connected to their definitions of themselves as professionals (as argued by Kezar and Sam [2011a, 2011b]), and were present regardless of their long-term work relationship
with a campus. Thus, PT faculty members who expressed attitudes of job involvement but did not express organizational commitment nonetheless expressed behaviors of work engagement (i.e., high dedication of time and energy toward their organization). Furthermore, regardless of PT faculty’s decision to leave the organization (as illustrated by the cases of Felicia and Howard), their expression of work engagement behaviors continued. This finding contradicts the scholarly depiction of PT faculty as disengaged from their university.

Attitudinal expressions of job involvement alone or accompanied by attitudinal expressions of organizational commitment were the basis of long-term PT faculty members’ behavioral expressions of work engagement. PT faculty’s focused effort and energy towards their work at their university were rooted in either their interest in, enthusiasm for, or identification with their job (i.e., job involvement), or in their identification as members of the department, their interest in the achievement of departmental goals, and their intent to remain working at the campus (i.e., organizational commitment). Thus, PT faculty members carry out extra-role behaviors whether their primary source of engagement is with their job or with their organization. Extra-role behaviors help their departments to serve students and to connect to professional groups outside the university.

**Long-Term Work Relationships Develop in part due to PT Faculty’s Expressions of Organizational Commitment and in part due to Fortuitousness**

The evolution of PT faculty members’ work relationship with a university included both formal and informal changes in PT faculty appointments. Officially,
regardless of their seniority at a given campus, PT faculty did not lose their formal classification as temporal workers. However, PT faculty recognized informal indicators that they were long-term members of their department with a past and a future in the department. Long-term PT faculty maintained their work relationship with a campus because they were re-appointed. In addition, they sought to be re-appointed in those departments that showed respect for them and their role. Thus, PT faculty members’ development of a long-term relationship with a campus depends on both organizational and individual behaviors.

PT faculty developed active strategies to increase their likelihood to be re-appointed. These strategies included their performance of their work to completion (i.e., in-role behaviors), completion of their work regardless of organizational obstacles, and performance of tasks that surpass their official roles and help the department (i.e., extra-role behaviors). With the performance of extra-role behaviors, PT faculty show their skills, abilities, and willingness to help the department. PT faculty carried out extra-role behaviors in order to perform their mandatory duties and become necessary personnel within their department. Long-term PT faculty were re-appointed with equal or better formal contracts (e.g., heavier workload, higher rank) than originally, or even with formal recognition of their extra role behaviors (e.g., designation as laboratory coordinator, stipend for non-teaching activities). However, their efforts were not always acknowledged by departmental members, and PT faculty members’ expression of organizational engagement did not guarantee that they would be re-appointed.
Departmental resources (i.e., funds for teaching) and teaching needs as well as departmental members’ availability to teach and willingness to support PT faculty have an effect on PT faculty re-appointment. Departmental teaching needs are the first but not the most important condition for PT faculty re-appointment. In the development of a long-term working relationship for PT faculty, departmental members’ perceptions of an individual PT faculty played a central role in that individual reappointment. Long-term PT faculty are fortunate if their expressions of organizational commitment are detected by departmental members, if departmental members consider these expressions important, and if they had the ability and willingness to act in favor of PT faculty. In addition, department chairs’ personal views of PT faculty populations were key for PT faculty to develop long-term relationships with their department. Long-term PT faculty were able to maintain their re-appointment due to the incidence of multiple conditions, the majority of which were out of their control and seem fortuitous.

**Long-Term PT Faculty Members Cope with Negative Circumstances Through Compartamentalization**

Long-term PT faculty committed to continue at their university perceived departmental behaviors and organizational behaviors in qualitatively different ways. PT faculty perceived themselves as marginalized within (and excluded from) their campus, but included within their department. PT faculty coped with negative circumstances by characterizing these as generalized campus-wide, not directed to them personally, and as a consequence of larger economic trends that affected the campus (e.g., decreasing resources for public universities). In contrast, these faculty held a positive image of their
departments: PT faculty’s inclusion and participation were possible due to department-level initiatives. Thus, their departments’ behaviors (i.e., formal and informal inclusion of PT faculty) served as a buffer that protected PT faculty from organizational marginalization and reinforced their intention to remain at the campus.

Long-term PT faculty experienced fewer negative circumstances in comparison to their original circumstances and to the circumstances of newer PT faculty colleagues. PT faculty personal efforts as well as departmental strategies helped to improve their working conditions. In colleges and departments, PT faculty experienced informal strategies for their participation; there was an organizational subculture of inclusion that counteracted the formalized exclusion of PT faculty at the university-level. Norms and values associated with the view of PT faculty as valid members of the department were created by organizational members who acted independently from the formal regulations and policies of the university. Long-term PT faculty characterized their positive circumstances in the department as a consequence of their colleagues’ behaviors; their department members acted deliberately to involve PT faculty in departmental life.

The characterization of negative conditions as university-wide and positive conditions as department-specific was a coping strategy that decreased PT faculty members’ sense of rejection and enabled them to establish personal relationships with their colleagues and departmental staff. PT faculty viewed exclusion, marginalization, and limited support as circumstances that occurred for all PT faculty as a group. In addition, they perceived inclusion, invitation to participate, and support as conditions applicable to them individually and due to their professional behaviors and performance.
By compartmentalizing their perception of negative organizational conditions, PT faculty reduced their discomfort and augmented their sense of belonging to their department.

**PT faculty Members’ Self-Definition as Professionals Counteracts the Negative Organizational Definitions of their Position**

Formally, the work of PT faculty was defined as an occupation. The campuses defined PT faculty as subordinated to department chairs and full-time faculty. It followed that their wages were associated with classroom and campus work. PT faculty’s institutional identity (Gee, 2000) was associated with the partial nature of their overall work, and this limitation shaped their treatment as employees. They had specific tasks for which they received the minimum financial benefits, and they were expected to perform those tasks on campus in a timely matter. This definition positioned PT faculty closer to staff than to faculty. However, the organizational definition of the PT faculty job represented only a partial view that PT faculty had of their work and their role at the university, which encompassed their preferred-self. The organizational definition of PT faculty members’ roles did not match PT faculty members’ preferred-self.

Long-term PT faculty members’ preferred-self comprised more than the performance of their mandatory tasks within their campuses. PT faculty constructed their understandings of their roles with a composite mix of responsibilities, values, tasks, and activities of several in-campus and off-campus professional groups. The definition that campuses constructed for the PT faculty position was a starting point for PT faculty members’ understanding of their job, but it did not limit PT faculty’s conceptualization of their roles. PT faculty defined their roles and their work with characterizations of
themselves as more than employees. PT faculty defined themselves as professionals, who in their work behaved according to professional values (as described by Abbas and McLean [2001] and Goode [1969]).

By defining themselves as professionals, and by enacting professional behaviors, PT faculty counteracted the organizational depiction of them as employees. PT faculty guided their understanding of themselves with their understanding of professionals groups. Accordingly, PT faculty’s value was not bestowed upon them by their campus but by their profession, their disciplinary field, and the social implications of their work. PT faculty members’ professional identity did not focus on their deficits (e.g., their limitations to perform their work or their partial membership on campus). On the contrary, they focused on those characteristics that made them ideal for the job. In their definition of their professional-self, PT faculty members deemphasized the negative connotations associated with the PT faculty position and emphasized their characteristics as members of a profession: they served a greater good in that they performed an activity that had a salient effect in the community and in society; and, they expressed control over this activity. With this emphasis of themselves as part of a profession, their low wages, limited support, and negligible organizational recognition lost centrality in the definition of PT faculty work and their professional role.

**PT Faculty’s Participation in Non-Teaching Activities is an Expression of Control over their Work**

Long-term PT faculty members participated in non-teaching activities on a regular basis. These activities included research, institutional service, and service to the
community. Long-term PT faculty participated in one or more of these activities; their involvement in any of these activities was an expression of their preferred-self. PT faculty members’ ability to decide whether or not they participated in these non-teaching activities increased their sense of control over their work. They involved themselves in activities that they considered central to their roles as professionals and detached from those activities that gave them stress or that distracted them from their primary goals and preferences. These findings support Levin and Montero-Hernandez’s (2014) findings. In addition, these findings are evidence that PT faculty do not conceptualize themselves as limited by their organizational circumstances and that they express agency in the enactment and conceptualization of their work and their role in public comprehensive Master’s universities.

In addition to answers for my research questions, this investigation provided insights into topics that were not, originally, part of this investigation but presented themselves during data collection and data analysis. Several of my findings indicate the need for further research, and others indicate the need for subsequent rounds of data analysis to my current data set. This group of findings is described later in the chapter (In the section “Future Research”). The focus next is on those unexpected findings that provided more light on the PT faculty phenomenon and on the particular circumstances of long-term PT faculty at public comprehensive Master’s universities. These findings were not part of the original aim of this investigation.
Communications Technology increases PT Faculty Members’ Participation in Campus Matters

Participants in this investigation (both long-term PT faculty as well as newer PT faculty) maintained constant communication with students and colleagues through information and communication technologies. E-mail and cellphone were typical channels of communication between PT faculty and students. Although PT faculty held office hours every week, students reached them primarily over e-mail, through text messages, and to a lesser degree in the classroom before or after class. PT faculty responded to e-mails and answered calls or called students back constantly. In addition, they arrived early to class and remained after the class was over to advise students. These behaviors contradict the common argument in scholarly literature that due to their partial appointment, PT faculty are not available for students (e.g., Benjamin, 2003; Eagan & Jaeger, 2008, 2009; Ehrenberg, 2005; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005). In addition, through information and communication technologies, PT faculty were reachable, and they responded to students’ academic and nonacademic inquiries.

The use of information and communication technologies (e.g., e-mail, programs such as Skype) also enabled PT faculty to participate in departmental activities with colleagues. PT faculty obtained information about programs and projects at their campus through the campuses’ websites and through direct e-mail inquiries to the person responsible for programs and projects. Information and communication technologies facilitated PT faculty participation in committees and research projects, helped them find information about their department, and enabled information exchange with colleagues.
Although institutional websites were not optimal, PT faculty relied upon these to carry out their work. PT faculty used these and other sources of information to become more aware of organizational resources and to interact with colleagues and students.

These data support the scholarly argument that due to technology (information and communication technologies) the structure of PT faculty work and that of the university as a whole had altered over the last decade (e.g., Altbach & Finkelstein, 1997; Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2010). PT faculty members’ limited physical presence on campus does not mean that they are absent from campus life. The views that PT faculty carry out defective or partial work do not account for the use of technology on campuses or for students’ increasing use of information and communication technologies. As PT faculty work is carried out largely off-campus and online, their work remains invisible and their participation in campus matters unrecognized. Although PT faculty participate in campus matters, their participation remains invisible as characterized by Gappa and Leslie (1993), but for reasons different from those offered by Gappa and Leslie. Research on the use of communication and information technology by PT faculty that includes the ways in which these technologies are employed outside the classroom have the potential to contribute further to the understanding of PT faculty members’ role in universities.

There is an Ongoing Change in the Values Associated to PT Faculty Members’ Work at Public Comprehensive Universities in California

During the period of the appointment of long-term PT faculty, there was a change in the three campuses’ formal structures of support for and inclusion of PT faculty. In addition, organizational members’ efforts to include PT faculty increased over the past
decade. PT faculty with more than ten years at their CSU campus, indicated that the working conditions of all PT faculty improved, that the image of PT faculty within the universities had lost some negative connotations, and that departments reduced the levels of formal exclusion of PT faculty and offered more inclusive environments. The values associated with PT faculty’s work changed from a view of the growth of PT faculty positions as a temporal measure of universities to the normalization of PT faculty as responsible for the bulk of the universities’ teaching load. The changes in organizational behaviors suggest that the organizational culture of the CSU regarding PT faculty altered.

Changes at the university level and at the department level responded to diverse circumstances. Organizational documentation from the three campuses and the CSU system justified the improved (although limited) support and rights of PT faculty as necessary due to the increasing number of PT faculty at each campus and at the CSU system as a whole. System-wide and campus-wide policy documents altered and reflected scholarly literature and reports on PT faculty than evidenced the exploitative practices suffered by this faculty group (e.g., CAW, 2012; AFT Higher Education, 2009, 2010). Although formal documentation continued to depict PT faculty as a subordinate group, PT faculty members’ working conditions had improved in comparison to previous decades. The interviews with PT faculty indicate that at the center of these changes were the efforts of the faculty union.

The CSU campuses are unionized environments (with special unions for faculty and administrative staff). The faculty union (i.e., the California Faculty Association) played a central role in the development of policies that protected PT faculty and
included them in organizational activities. New policies institutionalized PT faculty’s membership in their universities. Whether PT faculty were active members of the union or not, they benefited from protective policies that other public universities in the United States do not offer (e.g., three-year appointments, health benefits, unit number entitlements, twelve-months salaries). CSU campuses, as unionized environments (CAW, 2012), are protective of PT faculty. Thus, PT faculty who are newcomers have better entry working conditions that those that long-term PT faculty faced at their first appointment. In some departments, however, the changes in the organizational culture regarding PT faculty were stronger than in others.

At the department level, the background of current department chairs who had experience as nontenure-track faculty motivated them to promote the participation of PT faculty in departmental affairs. The findings in this investigation point out that the diversification in the pathways of academic professionals had the potential to alter the culture of departments. Department chairs’ nontraditional career pathways (which included experience as PT faculty) shaped their views of PT faculty work. These department chairs developed strategies of inclusion of and support for PT faculty in their department. New career pathways of faculty may be a source of new practices in academic management. However, department chairs and deans with no experience as PT faculty also developed some personal policies for the inclusion of PT faculty. Thus, my findings point out the need for further research on changes in organizational culture regarding PT faculty and the role of department chairs in these changes.
Both the expected and the unexpected findings of this investigation provide insights into PT faculty that have been overlooked in previous scholarship. The contributions of this investigation were possible due to the use of a theoretical framework that has been employed rarely in higher education and that has no antecedent for the study of PT faculty.

**Theoretical Framework: Its Implications and Contributions**

The theoretical framework of this investigation included notions of organizational theory, work engagement theory, and notions of the academic profession. This framework accounts for the complexity of PT faculty members’ construction of their roles and sense of membership in diverse groups. Work engagement theory has the openness necessary to consider individuals as members of multiple groups (Kahn, 1900)—professions, occupations, or organizational positions—which are not fixed in this theory. Thus, work engagement theory enables the conceptualization of PT faculty as more than mere employees. In addition, the notion of academe as a profession was necessary to explain PT faculty members’ preferred-self. The theoretical notions of the academic profession enabled the analysis of PT faculty’ subscription (or lack thereof) to this profession. Finally, new institutional theory and loosely-coupled systems theory explained PT faculty as members of organizations that guide, but do not determine rigidly, their behaviors (Meyer, 2008; Orton & Weick, 1990). Together, these theories explain PT faculty as individuals with professional and organizational roles. With work engagement theory, and particularly with the notion of preferred-self (Kahn, 1990), PT faculty were conceptualized as organizational members with a sense of belonging to
multiple in-campus and off-campus professional groups, who express self-authorship, and who may experience involvement, engagement, or marginalization at work during different work experiences (Kahn, 1990). Thus, this theoretical framework allowed me to set aside the prominent scholarly assumption that all PT faculty experience disengagement at work due to their precarious job circumstances.

In this investigation, I conceptualized PT faculty not as de facto failing organizational members, but as individuals who had the ability to express interest in their university and their profession. My empirical data support this theoretical notion. Long-term PT faculty expressed the three positive attitudes associated to work engagement: job involvement, organizational commitment, and psychological empowerment (Macey & Schneider, 2008). Furthermore, the expressions of these attitudes were accompanied by descriptions of PT faculty members’ behavioral expressions of work engagement: they carried out extra-job behaviors (Macey & Schneider, 2008), activities that they considered central to their work and which did not include compensation. Long-term PT faculty expressed these attitudes since their initial appointment. Although they doubted their ability to influence their university (that is, their psychological empowerment decreased temporarily), their positive attitudes toward their university and their work became stronger over time. That is, the theoretical framework of this investigation contributes to the reconceptualization of PT faculty as able to express positive attitudes towards their workplace and to carry out non-mandatory activities.

My findings support the theoretical assumption that organizational commitment and job involvement are two personal attitudes that occur simultaneously, that do not
compete with each other, and that are beneficial for an organization (Jauch et al., 1978). Early studies on faculty conceptualized organizational loyalty (organizational commitment) and professional commitment (job involvement) as two competing attitudes between which faculty had to choose: organizational loyalty guides the individual to contribute to the organization while professional commitment focuses the individual on personal productivity (Jauch et al., 1978). Current definitions of organizational commitment and job involvement suggest that individuals who are committed to their work can be committed to, and care for, their organization and vice versa (Jauch et al., 1978). This notion of organizational commitment and job involvement as not competing but complementary attitudes is the basis of my argument: job involvement is a source for PT faculty members’ behavioral expressions of organizational commitment. Thus, PT faculty members do not limit their behavioral and attitudinal expressions of job involvement and organizational commitment due to their organizational circumstances. They guide their behaviors with their self-image as professionals to contribute to their university and department. Thus, work engagement theory has explanatory power of PT faculty’s attitudes and behaviors towards their work.

Data in this investigation extend work engagement theory. In particular, my findings extend the understanding of the origin and development of organizational commitment. In work engagement theory, organizational commitment (that is, attachment to an organization, organizational loyalty, and attempt to stay in a given organization) develops as the individual works at a specific organization (Macey & Schneider, 2008). In addition, in this theory organizational commitment is conceptualized as a result of a
workplace’s expressions of organizational care (McAllister & Bigley, 2002). However, for the majority of PT faculty in this investigation, their attachment to the university began before their official appointment at the university. For example, during their undergraduate and graduate studies, PT faculty expressed interest in working at their specific campus—this differs from full-time faculty who are more likely to work at a university different to the one in which they carried out their graduate studies (Austin & McDaniels, 2006). In addition, as professionals, the student and teaching oriented goals of the university guided PT faculty members’ intentions of working at the university and provided them with a sense of pride when they identified themselves as university members. This early development of organizational engagement is likely related to the interaction of the individual with the university as well as to an individual’s perception of the public comprehensive university as a positive enterprise. My findings suggest that individuals with more than an employee relationship with an organization would be more likely to develop attitudes of organizational commitment, attachment, and loyalty. Examinations of multiple relationships with the workplace and the influence of these multiple relationships in organizational commitment need to be addressed and accounted for in future research that employs work engagement theory for the study of professionals in higher education and other fields.

My investigation also contributes to the theoretical understanding of the relationship between the behavioral and the psychological states of work engagement. From a theoretical standpoint, the attitudes of the psychological state of work engagement are a necessary antecedent of the behavioral state of work engagement...
(Macey & Schneider, 2008). My findings indicate that some attitudes of work
engagement are more important than others and these are sufficient for the enactment of
work engagement behaviors. For PT faculty with considerable interest in and attachment
to their job, and strong identification with their roles, job involvement attitudes suffice
for their behavioral expression of work engagement. With the development of
organizational commitment, behavioral work engagement (extra-role activities)
continues, but high levels of organizational commitment are not a necessary antecedent
for PT faculty members’ performance of extra-role behaviors. Work engagement theory
suggests that the three attitudes are necessary to be expressed for an individual to express
work engagement (Macey & Schneider, 2008). This theoretical assumption did not
explain PT faculty’s behavioral expressions of work engagement. This suggest that
members of professional groups enact work engagement to a different extent than
members of occupational groups. My findings provide a baseline for the use of work
engagement theory for the study of other faculty subgroups (e.g., full-time nontenure-
track faculty).

My theoretical framework also enabled me to explain the complexity of PT
faculty members’ reasons to leave a campus (the extreme expression of absence of
organizational commitment). The notion of universities as loosely-coupled systems
(Weick, 1976; 1982) explains that formal structures of exclusion of PT faculty are
counteracted by staff, faculty, and department chairs’ discretion in the enactment of
formal rules and in the development of norms. That is, university members expressed
organizational care (supported academic work and involvement of PT faculty) even if
their universities lacked formal structures of organizational care. Thus, PT faculty sought to terminate their work relationship with a campus when they did not identify themselves with the work (lack of job involvement) or when they experienced both formal and informal expressions of lack of organizational care (McAllister & Bigley, 2002).

Work engagement theory explains PT faculty commitment to the organization (or lack thereof) as more complex than a simple cause and effect between formal mistreatment and lack of organizational commitment. On the one hand, job involvement or professional commitment which was the basis of PT faculty members’ definitions of preferred-self provided them an initial reason to work on campus (Macey & Schneider, 2008). When involvement with the faculty job ceased their attachment to the university also was affected. On the other hand, personal relationships and departmental members’ efforts to include PT faculty were the basis of PT faculty members’ organizational loyalty or intent to remain at the university (Macey & Schneider, 2008). When multiple expressions of formal exclusion were accompanied by multiple expressions of informal exclusion, individuals’ organizational commitment was affected.

My theoretical framework contributes to the understanding of PT faculty roles and the definition of this population as members of multiple groups, among them faculty. Thus, the use of this theory, in conjunction with theoretical notions of the academic profession, advances the understanding of PT faculty as members of the academic profession. My empirical data support theoretical claims of previous studies on work engagement and advances the theory by using it in a field not used previously (higher education) and for a population not used previously (faculty).
Implications of the Research Findings

My findings have implications for practice. My findings indicate that the relationship between the university and PT faculty is unbalanced. There is a lack of congruency between the time and dedication that PT faculty direct to their campuses and the resources and support they receive from their university. PT faculty perform extra tasks, use additional time for their job, and employ their own equipment and office supplies for their work at their universities. However, they do not receive formal acknowledgement for these behaviors. Although there is a limitation of resources in public universities, universities can develop ways to support PT faculty with the resources at hand and acknowledge PT faculty members’ contributions to the university’s mission. New ways to support PT faculty do not require additional resources necessarily, but they do require a different distribution of current resources and a modification in the conceptualization of PT faculty members’ work and needs.

One example of a possible change relates to the distribution of information within universities (about non-teaching activities, institutional research grants, and other programs, for example). Current distribution of information within campuses is based on the taken-for-granted assumption that PT faculty are not willing to participate in non-teaching and governance activities. Thus, invitations to these activities are partial and do not convey an actual interest from the campus to include PT faculty in such activities. However, these policies do not take into consideration that PT faculty do participate in non-teaching activities and that due to limited communication strategies they have to direct more effort, time, and energy to obtain information about these activities than what
is ideal. New strategies for distribution of information that directs precise information to PT faculty have the potential to facilitate their participation in non-teaching activities. In addition, such behaviors would serve as an expression of organizational care.

Universities can develop formal strategies to convey organizational care. Scholars argue that one of the main problems for PT faculty is their compensation. In this argument, PT faculty members’ low compensation causes low organizational loyalty and low organizational engagement. In addition, previous studies suggest that low satisfaction with salary increases stress and decreases quality work (Akroyd, Bracken, & Chambers, 2011). My findings suggest that low compensation is not a direct cause of low organizational commitment because PT faculty do not perceive low compensation as a personal attack, but a general measure universities need to carry out due to limited resources. However, other forms of limited organizational support do indicate to PT faculty that their universities hold low esteem for their job. Usually, organizational support for PT faculty has been conceptualized as a strategy to improve their performance and likelihood to remain in an organization. A new conceptualization of this support is required. Organizational support needs to be conceptualized as a strategy of organizational care: measures to indicate to PT faculty that their participation is valuable, held in high regard, and useful.

The development of formal strategies that express organizational care has the potential to benefit not only PT faculty members but also the campuses that adopt such strategies. For example, the inclusion of PT faculty in department level decision making can lead universities to make well-informed decisions. According to Goldstein (2005),
the involvement of different university stakeholders in institutional planning facilitates decision makers to obtain information about their campuses’ needs. This argument pertains to the inclusion of PT faculty. If rarely PT faculty have the opportunity to participate in such activities or to share their point of view with their colleagues, campuses miss relevant information about teaching facilities, students’ needs in a class, equipment conditions, and off-campus professional expectations for students. Furthermore, that missing segment of information may hinder the campuses’ ability to establish priorities and make informed decisions, by “leaving for later” problems that impoverish the campuses. Thus, strategies that conceptualize PT faculty’s work different from conventional conceptions (as not just teaching centered, partial, and subordinated) can enrich universities and enhance their ability to achieve their missions.

**Future Research**

The findings of this investigation indicate possible routes for future research. This research could involve further analysis of my current data set, as well as the development of new projects that require a new data set and alternate theoretical frameworks. The richness of my data set suggests two venues for future research: differences by gender on long-term PT faculty’s definition of their professional roles and PT faculty’s participation in service. These topics fell out of the original realm of this investigation and require additional theoretical frameworks. In addition, these topics need a point of reference, which is provided by the findings of this investigation. Thus, it is sensible to approach those topics after the conclusion of the current investigation.
The academic profession is a gendered profession (Lester, 2008). However, gender differences among PT faculty has not been explored in depth. Initial analysis of my data revealed differences in the expressions of work engagement attitudes and behaviors as well as the differences in PT faculty’s perceptions of the treatment of their department related to the participants’ gender. A comparative analysis of PT faculty members’ communications using a theoretical framework informed by feminist theories and gender theories would provide further explanations of the challenges that this complex faculty group face. This could as well result in a new conceptualization of the profession. Feminist theories and gender theories have explanatory power to understand differences in the professional-self of PT faculty.

A second topic to be studied in my current data set is long-term PT faculty members’ participation in service. Scholars argue that the increasing number of PT faculty positions endangers the academic profession due to PT faculty’s limited participation in decision making and governance (e.g., Benjamin, 2002, 2003). However, my findings indicate that PT faculty do participate in institutional and community oriented service. In this investigation, I conceptualized service activities as extra-role behaviors and expressions of work engagement. The details of PT faculty’s participation and understandings of service activities require further analysis, for example, PT faculty’s experiences in institutional services, their understandings of their participation those activities, and the consequences of their participation for them and for their departments and universities. Such research has the potential to provide higher education decision makers information to develop strategies to support this participation.
Future research also needs to address other populations and subgroups of PT faculty, for example, new comers. As part of this investigation, I interviewed 21 PT faculty with less than four years working at a campus and who expressed work engagement attitudes. Thus, a consequent step of this investigation is to analyze data from these new PT faculty with the use of a similar theoretical framework. Such analysis would enable me to explain PT faculty’s experiences in comprehensive Master’s universities, their expressions of work engagement, and the differences of their expressions in comparison to long-term PT faculty, as well as the ways in which they understand their role in the profession and at their campus. Such research would expand the use of the theoretical framework of this investigation, the understanding of the PT faculty population, and the understanding of differences in their expressions of work engagement.

Finally, more research is needed to explore the interactions among department chairs and PT faculty from the perspective of both actors. Department chairs as mid-level administrators can provide information about the policies related to PT faculty and the ways in which these policies are carried out (for example, appointment and reappointment of PT faculty). Such research would illuminate the changes in departmental and university policies regarding PT faculty, department chairs’ different approaches to the treatment of PT faculty, and changes in the patterns of inclusion of this faculty group.

This investigation contributes to the field of higher education in special ways. First, this is the only qualitative investigation on PT faculty that includes participants
from three different campuses of the same institutional type and system in one state. As such, the investigation illuminates similarities among campuses. Second, this investigation includes rich data (in-depth interviews), with a robust number of interviewees (29); this investigation provides sufficient data to support its findings and arguments. Third, this investigation focuses on a specific subpopulation of PT faculty. This approach has not been carried out by other scholars sufficiently, with the exception of Thirolf (2012) who studied three new PT faculty at one community college. Fourth, I included the perceptions of PT faculty who had decided to leave the institution and were in their last term at the university. This provided data not available from other studies on PT faculty (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007). Finally, my theoretical orientation has been used rarely in higher education (e.g., Jauch et al., 1978), and it has never been used for the study of PT faculty. Thus, in this investigation, I expand the use of the theory in the higher education field and I approach the study of PT faculty in a way that complements and expands the current knowledge on PT faculty.

PT faculty are not only an integral part of U.S. universities but also professionals who can and should be members of the university’s faculty body with participation in departments and senates as voting members. Particularly noteworthy is the engagement of long-term PT faculty with their university: They are legitimate members of the university’s faculty; their work is not simply limited to teaching but comprises service, student development, and organizational development. Long-term PT faculty are not subordinates to full-time tenure-track faculty but active members of their universities who take initiative in and control over their work.
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Appendix A.
Interview Guide

Graduate School of Education

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE

Part-Time Faculty at Comprehensive Universities

INTERVIEW GUIDE

These are guides, and follow-up questions will be asked.

1. Preliminary issues.
   - Researcher’s self-introduction.
   - Explanation of the research project (general characteristics and objectives).
   - Questions or concerns expressed by participants before starting the interview.
   - Signing consent form.

2. Identifying information. Could we start with and introduction of yourself, your background and your position?
   - Occupational status.
   - Years of experience in the institution and at present position.
   - Educational/disciplinary background.
   - Workload.

3. Part-time faculty practices. Can you tell me about your role as PT faculty?
   - Everyday activities: in the classroom, outside the classroom.
• Time usage in professional activities.
• Preferences: activities, spaces, organization.

4. **Organizational characteristics.** What is formally required from you to do as PT faculty?
• Work expectations: Formal roles, informal roles.
• Institutional support: salary, resources at disposition.
• Relationship with others: individual activities, activities with others (faculty, administrative members, students).

5. **Problematic situations.** Could you describe any challenges that you face and how do you face them?
• Challenges or conflict: types of challenges, sources of those challenges.
• Solution of problematic situations: personal and institutional resources employed to solve challenges.
• Outcomes of challenges.
• Change of problematic situations over time.

6. **Closing the interview.**
• Participant’s self-identification.
• Is there something else that you could tell me that would help me understand your experience as PT faculty in this campus?
CONSENT TO ACT AS A HUMAN RESEARCH SUBJECT

Part-time faculty at comprehensive universities
You are being asked to participate in this study because you are a part-time faculty member in a higher education institution. Participation in this research study is completely voluntary and you may withdraw your participation at any time. Please read the information below and ask questions about anything that you do not understand before deciding if you want to participate.

INVESTIGATOR
- PhD. Candidate Ariadna I. López-Damían, University of California, Riverside, Graduate School of Education

PURPOSE OF STUDY
This study sets out to address one major question on part-time faculty members who have long-term relationships with one comprehensive (master’s) university and who invest most of their productive time in that particular institution, but who are not full-time non-tenure-track faculty.

This question reads as follows:
- What are the characteristics of the professional life of part-time faculty at a comprehensive university?

The purpose of this investigation is to explain part-time faculty work and part-time faculty contributions in comprehensive (Master’s) universities as well as their understandings of their participation in these contexts. I focus on the specific ways in which part-time faculty perform their professional activities, fulfill demands from the institution, and resolve institutional obstacles that may impede their performance. Furthermore, this investigation explores the meanings part-time faculty members attach to both the level of institutional support they perceive from the university and the strategies they develop to perform their job given that support or lack thereof. This investigation will provide insights on one of the part-time faculty subgroups that has been neglected by scholars (part-time faculty whose primary job is at one institution).

PROCEDURES
The time and place for the interviews will be negotiated with each participant. Participants will be requested to sign a consent form. They will be assured anonymity in public reports. The dimensions to explore during the interviews will involve (1) contract information (e.g., position, years in position), (2) everyday professional practices, (3) institutional characteristics and work expectations, and (4) problematic situations at the institution and strategies to solve them. Number of participants in the interviews: forty faculty members.
Audio recording — With the participant’s permission, the interview will be audio recorded. Following the interview, participants have the right to view their transcripts, correct any errors, and adjust any quotations or information.

Total Time Involved — The participant will be involved in this study during one day to participate in an individual interview. The interview session will last between 1 to 2 hours.

RISKS
Participation in this study entails two potential risks. The first risk refers to a break in confidentiality/anonymity, with possible consequences of a social, financial, legal, or political nature. I will minimize this risk by assigning pseudonyms to all participants and keeping all study records, including digital audio files and transcripts in a secure, password-protected computer. My dissertation supervisor and I will be the only ones with access to said records. The second risk involves experiencing some degree of emotional distress before, during, or immediately after the interview. However, previous studies and research experiences suggest that semi-structured interviews will not cause long-term emotional harm or distress for participants.

BENEFITS
To the Participant
Participants may benefit from this study since their interactions with the researchers will enable them to reflect on their professional practice and to develop a more comprehensive understanding of themselves, their institutional context, and their profession.

To Others or Society
Higher Education scholars and practitioners will benefit from the new knowledge generated by this investigation. This investigation will enrich knowledge about a particular population and a particular institutional type, both addressed in a limited way in research. Results from this investigation can help policy makers in higher education institutions reconceptualize part-time faculty and their work as well as to develop new ways to support part-time faculty members’ work that also results in benefits for the institution in times of economic constraints. By explaining part-time faculty as organizational members with long-term working relationships with comprehensive universities, this investigation has the potential not only to help these institutions improve their ability to serve students and fulfill their missions but also to enrich knowledge on how different institutional types influence work expectations for faculty.

WITHDRAWAL OR TERMINATION FROM STUDY
You are free to withdraw from the study at any time. If you choose to withdraw from the study, you can communicate your decision immediately to the researcher without any negative consequences. If you stop your participation in the study, the researcher will destroy any data received from you, including audiotapes and transcripts.

CONFIDENTIALITY
Data Storage
All research records, including the audio recording, documents, and computer-based data, will be stored in a locked cabinet and in a password-protected computer.

Data Access
The principal investigator and the dissertation supervisor will be the only people who will have access to the study records to protect your safety and welfare.

UC RIVERSIDE
Institutional Review Board
IF I HAVE QUESTIONS?

Contacts:
- Ariadna I. Lopez-Damian, Graduate School of Education
  **Daytime Phone:** (951) 827-5984 or 951-347-8604 (cell) **Email:** alope052@ucr.edu
- John S. Levin (dissertation supervisor). Graduate School of Education.
  **Daytime Phone:** (951) 827-5984. **Email:** john.levin@ucr.edu

If you have any comments or questions regarding the conduct of this research or your rights as a research subject, please contact the UCR Office of Research Integrity by phone at (951) 827-4811 or (951) 827-5549, or to contact them by email, please use HRRBI@ucr.edu.

PLEASE CHECK ONE OF THE FOLLOWING

☐ I agree to have this interview audio recorded

☐ I do not agree to have this interview audio recorded

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION STATEMENT

I understand that participation in this study is voluntary. I may refuse to answer any question or discontinue my involvement at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I might otherwise be entitled. My decision will not affect my future relationship with UC Riverside. My signature below indicates that I have read the information in this consent form and I consent to participate.

__________________________________________
Printed name, institutional affiliation, and position of participant

__________________________________________  _________________
Signature of the participant  Date

__________________________________________
Signature of the investigator
Ariadna I. Lopéz-Damían

___________________________
Date
Appendix C

Summary Form Example.

MVU-BT-Biology

General story
Bridget relationship with the university started moving in the opposite direction to what she expected. She took action to change her participation and activities in the university and to increase her role in the college. Her relationship with the university started to improve when she moved to a different department. (She does not depend on the money she makes as PTF for survival.) She is interested in performing research and she does it even if she does not receive a payment or support from the institution, but she is applying for small grants. Lack of communication is one of the primary obstacles for Bridget to feel like she knows the institution. She does not feel like she has complete information about the campus and the possibilities in it. She uses a lot of time searching for resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department: Biology</th>
<th>Started: 2006</th>
<th>No Classes: 3 classes</th>
<th>Entitled: 1 class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Woman</td>
<td>Age: 35-38</td>
<td>R/E: White</td>
<td>Former student: no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Biology</td>
<td>Master’s NA</td>
<td>PhD Biology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recruitment:**
Invited to the program as part of his husband position as FTF.

**Relationships with the institution**
Part-time faculty member only

**First interest on the job**
She had a tenure-track position in another university
Interested in science
[not enough info]

**Relationships with people**
Primarily associate dean of faculty
Almost none with other faculty (FT and PT)

**Reach out to her by others**
Only the regular listserv mails, impersonal

**Activities Extra-role**
Respond emails to students
Research (lab)
Trial of clicker—provide more information than the one asked in the original project
Meetings-no
Office hours—did not have an office but fund a place to have meetings with students anyway

**Activities In-role**
Teaching
Office hours
Design scantron exams

**Work engagement attitudes**
She expresses job involvement she wanted to be faculty member before she came to this institution
Institutional commitment is related primarily to her husband working in the same institution.

She seeks extra resources on campus to maintain her work relationship
Psychological empowerment: It does not seem that she struggles with the university, but she has accepted what she can actually do.

**Preferred self:**
she identifies as organic farmer, her job as PTF is not the basis of her identification. (It seems that she would like to be a Biology researcher)

**Names for her position:**
part-time lecturer, lecturer B

**Reason for the relationship to develop:**
She started with one year contract (not normal) with the Biology department but the relationship was forced. Little by little her units were changing towards the college and now she has been offered more classes than before.