FACULTY JOB SATISFACTION AT A PUBLIC TWO-YEAR COLLEGE DISTRICT IN TEXAS

A Dissertation

By

DENECIA NAOMI SPENCE

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies
Texas A&M University-Commerce
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
August 2017

FACULTY JOB SATISFACTION AT A PUBLIC TWO-YEAR COLLEGE DISTRICT IN TEXAS

A Dissertation

By

DENECIA NAOMI SPENCE

Approved by:

Advisor: JoHyun Kim

Committee: Jon Travis
Ava Munoz

Head of Department: David Tan

Dean of the College: Timothy Letzring

Dean of Graduate Studies: Mary Beth Sampson

Copyright © August 2017

Denecia Naomi Spence

ABSTRACT

FACULTY JOB SATISFACTION AT A PUBLIC TWO-YEAR COLLEGE DISTRICT IN TEXAS

Denecia Naomi Spence, EdD
Texas A&M University-Commerce, 2017

Advisor: JoHyun Kim, PhD

Contingent faculty include full- or part-time instructional staff on college and university campuses in non-tenured or tenure-track roles. Often, contingent faculty members do not have job security and may not be provided sufficient support services to conduct their work. However, part-time contingent faculty have reported the desire to secure full-time permanent opportunities. Duties of adjunct faculty and their full-time counterparts are fundamentally the same; however, adjunct faculty members do not receive commensurate compensation, benefits, and length of employment. Job satisfaction can be viewed from the employee or organizational perspective. Within the organizational context of job satisfaction, a relationship exists between how employees are treated and how they perform in employment settings. The purpose of this study was to examine differences in job satisfaction between contingent and non-contingent faculty and their demographic and personal characteristics of gender, race/ethnicity, academic discipline, and academic achievement at a large public 2-year college district in Texas. The researcher investigated how class (contingent vs. non-contingent faculty), gender, and race/ethnicity interacted to predict job satisfaction.

The researcher conducted a quantitative study using the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) and demographic questions to collect information about gender, race/ethnicity, academic discipline, and level of academic achievement. Findings revealed statistically significant differences between the job satisfaction scores of contingent and non-contingent faculty. Significant differences also existed between the job satisfaction scores of faculty based on academic discipline. Additionally, class and gender interacted to predict job satisfaction. These findings should clarify relationships between the personal and demographic characteristics listed above and provide policy makers and administrators with data to implement effective hiring and retention plans for diverse contingent and non-contingent faculty groups at colleges and universities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation would not have been possible without the support, love, and prayers of my family, for which I am eternally grateful. Special thanks to Dr. Kim, for embracing my strengths and finding creative ways to improve on areas of opportunity and always advocating for my success. I am especially thankful that Dr. Scott sacrificed her time and worked on this project past her retirement date; Dr. Scott has been an inspiration to me and I am grateful for our intellectually stimulating policy conversations that helped frame and refine my interests. Thank you to Dr. Travis, for understanding my unconventional way of processing information and embracing my non-linear mind. It is wonderful to be in a space where unique thoughts and ideas are allowed to flourish. To Dr. Munoz, thank you for your willingness to help every student, your dedication is amazing. I will always remember and cherish the guidance, advice, and support provided by my doctoral committee and family.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

CHAPTER

CHAPTER

CHAPTER

CHAPTER

LIST OF TABLES

TAB CHAPTER LE

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Stripling (2011) highlighted concerns among faculty on the significant decrease in tenured appointments, although this concern was not shared by most presidents at community colleges and non-selective universities. For instance, at institutions with tenure systems in place between 2011 and 2012, 49% of full-time faculty members were tenured, compared to 54% between 1999 and 2000 (Aud et al., 2013). To understand the benefits of tenure, however, one should know what the system was intended to accomplish.

According to Pfeiffenberger et al. (2014), the system of tenure and academic freedom were substantial contributions of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), which was founded in 1915. Tenure was designed to protect the academic freedom of faculty (Bowden, 2009), and as a mechanism of due process, it serves to ensure systematically that professors are dismissed for legitimate reasons and not for the content of their academic pursuits (Stripling, 2011). However, while the goal of tenure initially aimed to protect power and prestige, the connotation of tenure has changed over time, and many in the public view tenure as job security for unproductive faculty (Bowden, 2009). As changes in the political climate ushered in a period of reduced funding, non-tenure track appointments have become particularly attractive and have continued to flourish in academic environments where contingent faculty hires have fewer opportunities to empower students (Schwartz, 2014).

According to Curtis and Thornton (2013), contingent faculty can have part- or full-time instructional arrangements without tenure track appointments and can include graduate students who perform instructional duties. A popular reason given for expanding the use of full- and part-time non-tenure appointments has been to allow tenure-track employees to focus their energies

on research endeavors (Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005). However, some researchers cite an overall decline in state funding for postsecondary education and highlight the significant effect it has had on faculty and higher education in America (Carroll & Burke, 2012; Crookston & Hooks, 2012; Curtis & Thornton, 2013; Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Ochoa, 2012). For non-tenure track faculty, the realities are significantly different in that their value as academic workers is not institution specific because they must market themselves in a variety of academic spaces (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2005). Contingent faculty members do not have tenure equivalent positions and, as such, they lack job security, support services, office space, professional development opportunities, and equal compensation for their work (Johnson, 2011).

Some faculty members reject the value of being called "professor" because it facilitates the negation of important distinctions between tenured and non-tenured faculty ranks (Boe, 2011). According to Kezar (2013), non-tenured faculty members are seldom invited to participate in policy analysis, although the policies enacted by others directly influence their abilities to perform at the highest possible levels. The quality of instruction may also be influenced by the explosion of part-time faculty; however, financial realities mean this trend is likely to continue. As such, administrators should assess and adapt to foster loyalty and improve student outcomes (Hoyt, 2012).

Bartholomae (2011) discussed credentialing differences between tenure and non-tenure-track faculty by highlighting that full-time non-tenure-track faculty often possess master's degrees while tenure-track faculty more often have doctoral degrees. Halcrow and Olson (2011) focused on the range of adjunct qualifications. They described contingent faculty as holders of doctoral degrees, master's degrees, or sometimes bachelor's degrees—depending on the discipline and the institution.

It is important to understand how research and teaching are related to grasp how a system that separates these duties may undermine the stated institutional goals (Bartholomae, 2011). Halcrow and Olson (2011) asserted the need for greater equity between faculty on and off the tenure track in areas of benefits, salaries, and opportunities for personal growth. Such equity is importance because assuming greater teaching responsibilities often means fewer opportunities for scholarly engagements. Caruth and Caruth (2013) stressed the importance of adjunct faculty in higher education in the United States and called for adequate compensation, acceptance, and appreciation of the financial benefits they provide. Kezar (2013) discussed the salient nature of unsupportive faculty policies and the effect these policies have on student engagement. She concluded that these concerns are represented across academic disciplines.

While tenured faculty members with progressive sociopolitical leanings have been advocates of resistance to the decrease in funding and the marginalization of graduate students and other contingent faculty, many tenured faculty view such resistance as an exercise in futility (Schwartz, 2014). Rentz (2010) believed coalitions between contingent employees and their tenure-track peers could provide more favorable working conditions for both groups because the work environment of full-time employees is often effected by contingent realities. With existing funding challenges, it is important to formulate specific plans to integrate contingent faculty into the academic workforce; provide substantial benefits, evaluations, and recognition for their unique roles (Palmquist et al., 2011); and embrace the unique skills and insights that full-time non-tenure-track faculty contribute to the academy (Bartholomae, 2011).

Bowden (2009) discussed the complexity of understanding the professoriate and insisted that no single event could be identified as the sole cause of the decline in prestige. Rather, it is important to understand the complex nature of the academic landscape and to ensure that

employees on and off the tenure track are empowered to balance work and life and receive substantial institutional support to serve effectively (Gappa et al., 2005). The new generation of faculty is significantly different from its predecessors and has not been shy about requiring greater diversity, robust social campus environments, increased balance between academic and personal lives, and a transparent tenure process (Trower, 2010).

To understand fully how institutions may communicate multiple incongruent messages, one needs only listen to the calls for diversity from colleagues and experience the structural power that ignores marginalized voices when problems are highlighted (Duncan, 2014). Overall, minority faculty numbers may obscure larger truths of departmental segmentation where some groups are excluded completely, while others are concentrated so densely that legislative and institutional calls for diversity remain unanswered (Weinberg, 2008). Feminist theories, such as intersectionality, have rejected the Black/White binary in favor of a more complex understanding of identity that looks at how race and gender are related and at how identities operate in the workforce (Browne & Misra, 2003). For instance, when students were asked to share their perceptions on faculty diversity in an academic department at a predominantly White research institution, minority students were more likely to express dissatisfaction with the demographic composition of faculty (Lee, 2010). As the concentration of demographically diverse faculty in the contingent ranks increases, the need to understand the intersection of research, teaching, and policy making should invite considerable discussion within the academy (Bartholomae, 2011).

In a study of non-tenure-track faculty in instructional roles at 4-year institutions, Kezar (2013) found agreement among instructors that institutional policies, particularly at the departmental level, effected their abilities to create meaningful engagement with students. However, as Bartholomae (2011) noted, administrators often use the distinctions of full- and

part-time faculty to obscure the view of fundamental structural changes and stratification within the academy, where non-tenure track faculty are responsible for introductory courses.

Hart and Mars (2009) conducted a qualitative study of faculty with dual responsibilities in interdisciplinary capacities. Participants discussed the anxiety of performing current duties in light of professional uncertainty. While an aversion to discussing job satisfaction still exists, many non-compensation related concerns of faculty can be resolved at the departmental level when non-tenure-track faculty have opportunities to voice their concerns (Kezar, 2013). Hart and Mars suggested that future researchers assess social and discipline-specific concerns of academics with non-traditional appointments. While people of color and women continue to increase their representation on college campuses, higher education has not yet integrated these groups into the faculty ranks at the pace represented in the student or societal populations (Van Ummersen, 2005). Therefore, research is needed to understand fully the structural implications of full- and part-time contingent employment to ensure that current cost saving measures do not compromise the abilities of institutions to empower students in the future (Ochoa, 2012).

Statement of the Problem

As state funding for higher education decreases, institutions have adapted to function with fewer resources and rely on part-time faculty to reduce costs (Eagan & Jaeger, 2009). Tenure-track faculty and doctoral students are usually focused on producing significant research and publishing; these activities lend themselves to acquiring grants and other forms of funding. As a result, non-tenure-track faculty are often employed to teach (Caye & de Saxe Zerden, 2014). Jaeger and Eagan (2009) defined part-time faculty as those employed at or lower than 98% of a full-time appointment. According to Thirolf (2013), part-time faculty desire to secure full-time opportunities. Additionally, Seifert and Umbach (2008) found significant gaps in

research on job satisfaction, which usually failed to account for differences between academic disciplines in studies of employee satisfaction.

Cronin and Smith (2011) described the duties of adjunct faculty and their full-time counterparts as fundamentally the same without commensurate compensation, benefits, and length of employment. Significant data exists on the varying levels of satisfaction between different groups within the academy, and consistently, women and people of color have reported significantly lower levels of job satisfaction (Seifert & Umbach, 2008). Although many institutions have implemented systems to integrate new faculty effectively into their organizational cultures, many others have failed to contemplate the challenges of addressing broader societal stratification systems and the replication of such systems within the academy (Sulé, 2014). This fact is important because the demographic composition of faculty in an organization has a significant effect on job satisfaction and can be a reliable predictor of satisfaction when academic disciplines and specific demographic variables are considered (Seifert & Umbach, 2008).

Theoretical Framework

Some research has highlighted different outcomes based on gender or ethnicity; intersectionality, however, examines how these identities operate together to explain different outcomes for different intersecting identities (Browne & Misra, 2003). Multiple ways exist to describe identities that intersect, and it is not enough to consider only gender or ethnic groups (Crenshaw, 2012). Thus, intersectionality provides a framework to explore how different components of our being may be woven together to shape our identities and experiences in society (Crenshaw, 2012).

As a theory, intersectionality developed as scholars, predominantly people of color, contemplated the relationship of class, race, and gender (Browne & Misra, 2003). The changing nature of demographics should clarify the need to consider the benefits of analyzing converging identities instead of simply being a tool to plug the gap for traditionally marginalized groups (Croom & Patton, 2011). An intersectional lens allows observers to focus on how race, class, and power are embedded within policies and institutions to facilitate different outcomes for different groups (Crenshaw, 2012). Examples of intersecting identities can include African American and male, Hispanic and female, White and female (Browne & Misra, 2003). While some may focus on the binary possibilities of intersectional identities, in reality, the world is experienced in very different ways even within groups when class is considered (Browne & Misra, 2003). For example, less affluent White women do not have the same opportunities available to affluent White women (Browne & Misra, 2003).

Browne and Misra (2003) highlighted gaps in quantitative research to address the complexities of stratified, socially constructed identities. They found that many quantitative studies failed to find evidence of racial and gender differences in wages. However, these studies also did not look at how specific groups are concentrated in certain employment sectors (Browne & Misra, 2003). As such, it is important to understand the comparisons made and contemplate the method of inquiry to address the intersection of gender, race, and class adequately instead of focusing exclusively on racial and gender differences (Browne & Misra, 2003).

Significant differences exist within and between disciplines about how to include identities without oversimplifying what different categories mean in the workforce (Browne & Misra, 2003). To overcome some of the challenges observed in lower-skilled professions, higher-skilled professionals should consider how underrepresentation of women and people of

color might pose barriers of adequate mentorship (Browne & Misra, 2003). Comparative gaps in the data also exist that highlight the need for deeper understanding of how gender and race intersect to produce and reproduce class outcomes (Browne & Misra, 2003).

Because higher education, as we know it, was created by men of European decent—for their benefit—it is important to understand the challenges that non-White, non-males may face to succeed in a space that was not designed to accommodate their unique needs (Croom & Patton, 2011). Additionally, beyond race and gender, differences in class and should be considered to understand the range of employees' experiences with diminished power at institutions of higher education (Croom & Patton, 2011).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine differences in job satisfaction between contingent and non-contingent faculty and their demographic and personal characteristics of gender, race/ethnicity, academic discipline, and academic achievement at a large public 2-year college district in Texas. The researcher investigated how class (contingent vs. non-contingent faculty), gender, and race/ethnicity interacted to predict job satisfaction.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. Do differences exist in job satisfaction of faculty based on gender, race/ethnicity, class (contingent vs. non-contingent faculty), academic discipline, and academic achievement at a public 2-year college district in Texas?
2. Do gender, race/ethnicity, and class interact to predict job satisfaction?

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested for the study:

H_{1o}: No significant differences exist in job satisfaction based on gender, race/ethnicity, class (contingent vs. non-contingent faculty), academic discipline, and academic achievement at a 2-year college district in Texas.

H_{1a}: Significant differences exist in job satisfaction based on gender, race/ethnicity, class (contingent vs. non-contingent faculty), academic discipline, and academic achievement at a 2-year college district in Texas.

H_{2ao}: A significant interaction does not exist between class and gender on job satisfaction.

H_{2aa}: A significant interaction exists between class and gender on job satisfaction.

H_{2bo}: A significant interaction does not exist between class and race/ethnicity on job satisfaction.

H_{2ba}: A significant interaction exists between class and race/ethnicity on job satisfaction.

H_{2co}: A significant interaction does not exist between race/ethnicity and gender on job satisfaction.

H_{2ca}: A significant interaction exists between race/ethnicity and gender on job satisfaction.

Significance of the Study

In recent years, the numbers of faculty with non-tenure-track appointments has increased exponentially (Caye & de Saxe Zerden, 2014). Kezar and Sam (2014) highlighted the role of governance to bridge the gap between vaguely articulated policies and enacting concrete change, which would yield significant benefits for contingent faculty, their respective departments, and their institutions. Seifert and Umbach (2008) found significant gaps in research on job

satisfaction, which usually failed to account for differences between academic disciplines in studies of employee satisfaction. Leboy and Madden (2012) suggested that academic institutions consider organizational climate and contemplate implicit, structural, and operational biases. Such biases are an important consideration because they could negatively influence the ability of institutional leaders to attract candidates from underrepresented racial and gender groups (Leboy & Madden, 2012).

In a qualitative analysis of faculty identity, Thirolf (2013) reported the desire of part-time faculty to be employed full time and the frustration that emerged when opportunities to work full-time seemed unattainable. Tang and Tang (2012) suggested that college administrators and state legislators consider equity in academic compensation in relation to the broader labor market to understand how compensation disparities might influence motivation. Thus, it is important to integrate contingent faculty into the workforce to solidify professional identities, boost job satisfaction, and improve student engagement and outcomes (Levin & Shaker, 2011).

To understand the complex nature of compensation in higher education, it is important to clarify the different realities of tenured and tenure-track faculty and those with contingent faculty appointments (McGrew & Untener, 2010). Thornton and Curtis (2012) noted that faculty salaries during the 2011–2012 academic year ranged by region and institution type. Significant differences existed in salaries of full-time tenure-track faculty, which should be explained to understand the regional highs and lows and disciplinary differences in compensation (Barnshaw & Dunietz, 2015).

O'Keefe and Wang (2013) reviewed base salaries of full-time tenured and tenure-track economics professors, and found gross salaries from $70,000 to $378,000 with rank and seniority variations. In a review of the AAUP survey for 2011–2012, Thornton and Curtis (2012) reported

overall salaries ranging from $66,564 to $113,176 for full-time tenure-track or full-time tenured faculty at public and private not-for-profit institutions. Comparatively, a review of contingent faculty compensation from the AAUP survey between 2012 and 2013 revealed median per course wages from $1,800 at public southeastern 2-year institutions, to $5,225 at private doctoral-granting institutions in New England (Curtis & Thornton, 2013). Van Ummersen (2005) contemplated the inequitable institutional practices, which made careers in higher education unattractive for women and students of color. An analysis of data on gender and tenure revealed significant differences between men and women, with larger concentrations of women in non-tenure-track positions (Caye & de Saxe Zerden, 2014).

The changing landscape of the American higher education system has created challenges that all stakeholders must address; a fragmented approach—particularly between different faculty groups—will only magnify larger looming concerns and undermine effectiveness (Weinbaum & Page, 2014). In a study of non-tenure-track appointments, Reevy and Deason (2014) highlighted the unique stressors that may be related to negative health outcomes for this growing population of the academic workforce. Palmquist et al. (2011) called for increased job security for non-tenured faculty and the implementation of policies that would include retirement and medical benefits and facilitate increased participation in department governance activities. A key finding in Kezar and Sam's (2014) study of 2- and 4-year institutions was that more similarities than differences existed related to contingent faculty interest to participate in governance activities and the benefits of such participation. Still, Seifert and Umbach (2008) found significant gaps in research on job satisfaction, which usually failed to account for differences between academic disciplines.

Increasingly diverse student populations have highlighted the need for greater faculty diversity on college and university campuses in the United States (Seifert & Umbach, 2008). Transformation of the university system requires the relationship between societal class and power be understood because these systems are replicated within academia (Schwartz, 2014). Working to bridge the gap for contingent faculty is in the best interest of the institution because students, tenure-track faculty, departments, and institutions are influenced when the needs of this group are left unaddressed (Reevy & Deason, 2014). However, political action and fragmented union leadership with different levels of representation for faculty on and off the tenure track undermine what could be accomplished with cohesive negotiations that recognize the connection between groups, instead of exploiting existing hierarchies (Weinbaum & Page, 2014). Lee (2010) called on future researchers to analyze specific demographic categories to understand how different demographic variables might influence perceptions of satisfaction with diversity.

Although women have continued to excel academically, including in science-related fields, they continue to be an underrepresented group in leadership roles (Draugalis, Plaza, Taylor, & Meyer, 2014). The number of women represented in highly skilled fields over the past four decades has increased significantly in the United States (Deutsch & Yao, 2014). As faculty numbers continue to grow, women are increasingly represented in the ranks of the academy, but gender disparities in earnings persist at both private and public institutions of higher education (Gloss, 2011). There also still appears to be a difference between gender and tenure attainment. For example, Aud et al. (2013) found that 54% of male faculty had tenure while only 41% of women had tenure designations between 2011 and 2012. As such, the increase in representation of women in skilled fields should be viewed with an understanding of the high attrition rates reported among this key demographic of skilled professionals (Deutsch & Yao, 2014). Further,

colleges and universities should understand that exclusion and marginalization of women in the academy could seriously influence women's interest to remain at an institution (Draugalis et al., 2014).

Research on funding and compensation has highlighted the increased benefits universities receive when they pay higher salaries (Jalbert, Jalbert, & Zarraga Cano, 2010). Still, as institutions of higher education become more dependent on contingent faculty, the public remains unaware that most college instructors lack the benefits and security of tenure (Mazurek, 2011). Some in the academy view the preponderance of non-tenure-track appointments as a threat to faculty and the tenure system ("Tensions," 2010). Specifically, the dilution of tenure and the increase in administrative power has facilitated reductions in academic freedom and intellectual property rights for faculty (Lester & Kezar, 2012).

Although faculty in the United States tend to prefer shared governance structures, over time, the shift has reduced faculty input and has created greater distance between faculty and campus decision makers (Leitch, 2011). According to Kezar (2013), department leaders should consider inviting and integrating insight from faculty to understand how policies effect their work. Kezar and Lester (2009) discussed leadership trends and highlighted the importance of faculty driven initiatives and the institutional characteristics that facilitate their success. Kezar and Maxey (2012) called for greater inquiry to understand the changing nature of faculty, appreciate variances in non-tenured faculty composition, clarify institutional influence, and provide policy direction. Lawrence (2014) found significant inconsistencies in practices, which highlighted gaps in the application of policies intended to foster equality and nurture collegiality.

The growing trend of non-tenure-track faculty began with community colleges and migrated to 4-year institutions with increasing frequency ("Tensions," 2010). Schuster and

Finkelstein (as cited by Kezar and Lester, 2009) discussed the challenge of remaining committed to institutional governance activities when acquiring capital beyond the academy, which has become an important part of doing business in higher education. Students at 4-year institutions may also be misled if they believe the first year of college will provide opportunities to interact with skilled researchers (Bartholomae, 2011). According to Kezar (2013), policies that have a positive effect on students are known but are seldom implemented.

Hart and Mars (2009) explored the challenges of grant-funded academic employment opportunities and the distance between those on the tenure track and those employed on a contingent basis. Increasingly, grassroots faculty leadership is needed to explore the type of strategic relationships that once provided access to powerful stakeholders and gave faculty a voice in the decision-making process (Kezar & Lester, 2009). This is important because power has increasingly become concentrated in the administrative hierarchy (Lester & Kezar, 2012).

The number of part-time faculty numbers has continued to increase (Langen, 2011; Monks, 2009). Although recently an emergence of full-time provisional appointments have opened, which provide greater participation in governance activities, increased pay, and improved benefits, these positions are usually for fixed but renewable terms (Halcrow & Olson, 2011). The last 10 years have seen the number of part-time non-tenure-track appointments increase at 4-year institutions, and this trend has gradually begun to mirror faculty hiring practices at 2-year institutions (Kezar & Maxey, 2012). The pressure to increase the volume of publications at research institutions is intense and is linked to the tenure and promotion process, which has created a vacuum in service and leadership activities (Kezar & Lester, 2009). Kezar and Maxey (2012) discussed the harsh realities of the new non-tenure-track majority in higher

education by highlighting gaps in policy, research, and practice to address the growing need to understand this part of the academic workforce adequately.

Bittner and O'Connor (2012) surveyed 226 nursing faculty, and 19% indicated an intent to leave academia within a year to achieve greater financial and more flexible scheduling opportunities to balance their personal lives. Although many faculty members desire greater flexibility to manage their time and range of responsibilities, job security often requires complex contractual obligations that weave organizational goals into the fabric of the tenure system, which include roles as decision makers (Gappa et al., 2005). According to Kezar and Maxey (2012), the number of non-tenure-track faculty has grown significantly in the last four decades, and part-time appointments are the largest segment of the non-tenure-track population.

Rentz (2010) conducted interviews with tenured and non-tenured faculty that revealed a need for institutions to connect the challenges of full- and part-time faculty to understand how their concerns are related. The array of faculty without tenure designations ranges from retired professionals returning to work to aspiring academics, and includes graduate students; as such, no single formula exists to motivate, inspire, or understand this group (Kezar & Maxey, 2012). Lawrence (2014) suggested that future institutional researchers consider the intersection of policy and practice and work collaboratively with hiring management and leadership teams to collect and analyze institutional data. It is helpful to examine job satisfaction because understanding these positions enables institutions to retain skilled part-time faculty (Hoyt, 2012). Retaining part-time faculty can also improve job satisfaction and provide better student outcomes from institutional investments in this growing segment of the academic workforce (Hoyt, 2012). The decline in overall professional status for all faculty at institutions of higher education in the United States is linked (Mazurek, 2011), and alternative engagement within or beyond the

academy is needed to increase satisfaction instead of surrendering power to a system that fosters unfavorable realities (Levin & Shaker, 2011).

The findings of this study provide greater insight into how gender, race/ethnicity, class (contingent vs. non-contingent faculty), academic discipline, and academic achievement influence job satisfaction of faculty at a public 2-year college district in Texas. The findings clarify complex relationships between intersectional identities of class (contingent or non-contingent faculty status), gender (male/female), and race/ethnicity. The researcher also explored the effects of class, gender, and race/ethnicity on job satisfaction. Findings of this study will help administrators, advocates, and legislators frame effective higher education policies. The findings will also provide insight into hiring teams in various academic departments to attract and retain candidates to meet current and emerging needs. It is important to reflect societal diversity within the academy, and greater understanding of diverse groups will help decision makers attract and retain these underrepresented groups (Seifert & Umbach, 2008).

Method of Procedure

This study was designed to examine differences in job satisfaction between contingent and non-contingent faculty and their demographic and personal characteristics of gender, race/ethnicity, academic discipline, and academic achievement at a large public 2-year college district in Texas. Additionally, the researcher investigated how class (contingent vs. non-contingent faculty), gender, and race/ethnicity interacted to predict job satisfaction.

The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) was used to collect data to meet the purpose of this study. The dependent variables were the overall JSS score and scores on the nine subscales of the JSS. The independent variables of class (contingent or non-contingent faculty status), gender (female/male), and race/ethnicity were used to understand how the overall and subscale JSS

scores were effected by combining variables for different faculty groups. Different academic disciplines (disciplines taught by faculty) and educational attainment (highest degree earned by faculty) were also included as independent variables.

Instrument

Spector (1985) used concurrent validity to develop the JSS by comparing the well-known Job Descriptive Index (JDI) to the JSS. According to Tuckman and Harper (2012), concurrent validity can be achieved by comparing results of a new or experimental instrument to an established instrument. In the development phase of the JSS, Spector administered the survey 19 times at different organizations in the human service sector to provide sufficient evidence of its reliability and validity. He also included data from one group outside of the human services sector to clarify similarities and differences between different sectors of employment. Over 3,000 participants were surveyed in 19 different samples (Spector, 1985).

Several instruments are available to assess job satisfaction; however, the JSS was developed specifically to address the unique needs of employees in the human services sector (Spector, 1985). According to Spector (1985), assessment of job satisfaction in human services was necessary because many available instruments were normed with industrial data and were not synonymous with the range of experiences found in the human services sector. To understand variations between instruments, the JSS was developed and compared with the JDI to clarify similarities and difference between the industrial and human services sectors (Spector, 1985). The review of literature related to job satisfaction yielded significant findings including nine categories of job satisfaction, which Spector used to formulate the JSS.

Verret (2012) examined factors that affect job satisfaction for science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) faculty and used the JSS and Work-Family Conflict (WFC)

scales. Tenure status, salary, rank, gender, levels of work-family conflict, whether children were living at home, and number of children living in the home were considered to understand STEM faculty job satisfaction (Verret, 2012). Verret looked at multiple variables to understand factors that may alter job satisfaction among STEM faculty. She cited an overall Cronbach's alpha of .91 on the 36-item scale and Cronbach's alphas for the four items on each of the nine subscales as follows: pay had an alpha of .75, promotion .81, supervision .87, benefits .83, rewards .88, operating procedures .62, coworkers .80, work itself .82, and communications .86 (Verret, 2012). Barrett, Gillentine, Lamberth, and Daughtrey (2002) used the JSS to assess job satisfaction of athletic trainers. They collected demographic data from participants, but did not collect information to answer questions about the relationship between race/ethnicity and jobs satisfaction.

The overall coefficient alpha on the JSS is 0.91 (Spector, 1997). Individual subscales revealed the following coefficient alphas: pay .75, promotion .73, supervision .82, benefits .73, contingent rewards .76, operating procedures .62, coworkers .60, nature of work .78, and communication .71 (Spector, 1997). Spector (1985) assessed the reliability of the JSS in a sample of 43 employees over an 18-month period. The test-retest reliability ranged from .37 to .74 for the full scale, and .45 and .37 for the pay and benefits subscales, respectively. All other subscales were over .50. The overall test-retest reliability score was .71 (Spector, 1985).

The researcher used the JSS to collect data from faculty at public 2-year college in Texas. The 36-question JSS was developed as a measurement of job satisfaction among human services staff and was tested for validity and reliability in several organizations in the United States of America (Spector, 1985). The JSS includes nine subscales, and the researcher relied on the total score to understand faculty job satisfaction. In addition to job satisfaction data collected with the

JSS, the researcher collected demographic and personal information on gender, race/ethnicity, academic discipline, and educational attainment of contingent and non-contingent faculty groups (see Appendix B).

It is difficult to decide where satisfaction ends and dissatisfaction begins, as this process is somewhat arbitrary (Spector, 1994). According to Spector (1994), when analyzing data from the full scale, scores between 36 and 108 indicate dissatisfaction, scores between 144 and 216 indicate satisfaction, and scores between 108 and 144 indicate ambivalence or undecided. Variations also exist depending on where the scale is administered; therefore, norms should be considered in the context of national labor trends and type of institution (Spector, 1994). In Chapter 3, higher education norms for the JSS in the United States are provided to add an additional layer of specificity to interpret faculty job satisfaction in a 2-year college district in Texas. Additionally, the researcher will review higher education norms on the nine subscales of pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, coworkers, nature of work, and satisfaction to understand variations between groups on particular subscales.

Selection of Sample

A purposeful sample of willing faculty included on the 2016 summer and fall district directory were asked to provide demographic information and complete the 36-item survey. Faculty participation was voluntary; neither the public 2-year college district nor the researcher required that faculty respond to the survey. Faculty members were not paid to complete the survey. A 20% survey response rate was desired, and the researcher hoped to collect data from a comparable number of contingent and non-contingent faculty members.

Institutional Review Board

Permission was granted by the Department of Educational Leadership. Next, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the Office of Thesis and Dissertation Services at Texas A&M University-Commerce (TAMUC) reviewed the proposal and granted permission to conduct the study. Finally, IRB approval was granted by a large public 2-year college district in North Texas. After all required approvals were received, an email was sent to prospective participants to elicit their participation. This email included informed consent (see Appendix E) and a link to the survey. All faculty names listed on the district directory in the final week of summer 2016 received an email. Contingent and non-contingent faculty within the large public 2-year community college district were asked to provide demographic information and complete the 36-item survey.

Data Collection Procedures

The researcher sent an email to Dr. Paul Spector who granted permission to use the JSS for this dissertation (see Appendix D). An electronic version of the demographic questions and JSS were integrated into Google Forms®, a free online survey software service. Prospective participants were invited via email, and an electronic informed consent form was available for participants to review before proceeding to the demographic questions and JSS survey. Data were collected during a 30-day period, and three weekly emails were sent to remind participants to complete the survey (see Appendix C).

Data Analysis

At the end of the 30-day period, data collected via Google Forms® were downloaded and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23.0. The researcher conducted a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine whether

differences existed in the job satisfaction scores of faculty based on gender, race/ethnicity, class (contingent vs. non-contingent faculty), academic discipline, and academic achievement. Additionally, a factorial ANOVA was conducted to clarify how different combinations of gender, race/ethnicity, and class interacted to predict faculty job satisfaction. Researchers often use the .05 or .01 alpha levels of significance to conduct studies of this nature (Ary, Jacobs, Sorensen, & Walker, 2013). The researcher used a .05 alpha level to conduct this study.

Treatment of the Data

Demographic information was collected along with the JSS via Google Forms®. This information was saved on an encrypted Universal Serial Bus (USB) drive, and a backup was saved on an encrypted USB drive to secure the data and ensure any damage to the USB drive does not render the data unusable. Participants' names were not collected for the purpose of this study, and respondents were asked to provide information about their respective 2-year public college within the district. Data on the encrypted USB drive are stored in the Department of Educational Leadership at TMAUC for 3 years after which time, the data will be deleted and the USB drive will be destroyed.

Definitions of Terms

The following terms are defined according to their use in this dissertation:

Adjunct faculty. Adjunct faculty include part-time faculty employed primarily at community colleges, often without benefits for limited periods (Caruth & Caruth, 2013).

Contingent faculty. Contingent faculty are employed part- or full-time without tenure or tenure-track protection (Curtis & Thornton, 2013).

Due process. Colleges cannot fire a tenured professor without presenting evidence that the professor is unprofessional or ineffective, or that an academic department needs to be closed because of extreme financial hardship (National Education Association [NEA], n.d.).

Full-time contingent faculty. Full-time contingent faculty instructional arrangements are those without tenure protection (Curtis & Thornton, 2013).

Intersectionality. Intersectionality is a theory that advances the premise of social constructions on a systematic, rather than individualistic level that are often embedded in institutional practices and effect different members of society and the workforce differently (Browne & Misra, 2003).

Tenure. Tenure refers to full-time instructional appointment after a 7-year probationary period. Faculty who are not selected for tenure after the probationary period are not retained by the 4-year college or university (NEA, n.d.).

Tenure-track. Tenure-track refers to a teaching position that may lead to tenure (Tenure-Track, n.d.).

Limitation

The following limitation applied to this study

1. Participants were not required to participate by the 2-year college district.
2. The success of the study depended on the willingness of full- and part-time contingent and non-contingent faculty at the public 2-year college district to complete the survey and accompanying demographic and personal questions.
3. Contact with faculty depended on the availability of current information in the institutional directory.

Delimitations

The following delimitations were applied to this study:

1. Full- and part-time contingent and non-contingent faulty at a 2-year college district in Texas will be invited to participate in this study.
2. This study will only include data from the summer and fall of 2016.

Assumptions

The following assumptions will guide this study:

1. Honest insight about faculty job satisfaction will be collected.
2. The JSS will be a useful tool to provide data for this study.
3. All respondents in this study will participate willingly and provide honest responses.
4. The JSS will provide valid and reliable information.

Organization of Dissertation Chapters

This study is presented in five chapters. Chapter 1 included an introduction, statement of the problem, theoretical framework, purpose of the study, significance of the study, research questions, hypotheses, method of procedure, definition of terms, limitations, delimitations, and assumptions. Chapter 2 includes a comprehensive review of relevant literature related to gaps to be addressed in the current study. Chapter 3 includes the method of procedure for this study. The findings are presented in Chapter 4. A summary of the study is provided in Chapter 5 with an overview of findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for future research.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The first section of this chapter includes the nature of tenure or tenure-track faculty and the range of complex issues experienced by this group. The second section includes a discussion on the similarities and differences between contingent faculty and the nature of their work at different types of institutions. This section includes a variety of issues ranging from their representation in the academy to their working conditions and inclusion and exclusion in campus governance activities. The third section of the literature review includes a discussion on gender, race, and job satisfaction. The fourth section includes information on stratification and student outcomes related to contingent labor trends. The fifth section includes a discussion on theories related to faculty job satisfaction. The chapter concludes with an exploration of the theory of intersectionality in the context of race, gender, and class.

Nature of Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty

The tenure system was created to protect faculty members' academic freedom (Pfeiffenberger et al., 2014). The core principle of tenure is to provide job stability and ensure due process in faculty dismissals, which are unrelated to ideological differences between college administrators and political actors (Stripling, 2011). Although tenure was intended to protect faculty from arbitrary dismissal, many see the tenure system as a safe haven with protections for underperforming faculty (Bowden, 2009). Additionally, difficult financial realities and changes in the political climate have steered legislative action to reduce funding. Increased calls for accountability have also eroded the system of tenure and fostered reliance on non-tenure track or contingent faculty appointments (Schwartz, 2014).

Regional differences exist and disciplinary differences have manifested in compensation trends of full-time tenure-track faculty (Barnshaw & Dunietz, 2015). O'Keefe and Wang (2013) reviewed base salaries of full-time tenure-track economics professors within the University of California system to understand the correlation between compensation and productivity. They found gross salaries from $70,000 to $378,000 with rank and seniority variations. Thornton and Curtis (2012) analyzed data from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) survey from private and public not-for-profit institutions and found that average salaries for tenure-track faculty during the 2011–2012 academic year ranged from $66,564 to $113,176. Worrell (2009) discussed the complicated process of negotiating and measuring multidimensional roles within and beyond the academy, which often include community, alumni, and business engagement, along with instructional and research responsibilities. In their salary analysis of eight departments of economics within the University of California system, O'Keefe and Wang (2013) found that publications in prestigious journals had a measurable effect on salary. Sabharwal and Corley (2009) analyzed annual salaries and found that male faculty members within fields of health and social sciences had significantly higher household incomes than did their female counterparts.

In an analysis of 226 full-time nursing faculty members in New England, Bittner and O'Connor (2012) found that 87% of respondents were satisfied with their jobs, while 54% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with compensation. Additionally, 52% of respondents who were dissatisfied intended to leave their academic positions because of financial compensation, poor work-life balance, or career advancement. In fact, 19% of respondents indicated intent to leave academia within a year to achieve greater financial opportunities and flexible scheduling to balance their personal lives. The researchers also discussed the importance of job satisfaction to

retain nursing faculty, particularly because private sector opportunities provide better compensation and advancement options.

Kaufman (2010) reported disparities in nursing faculty salaries and in the representation of specific groups compared to the civilian workforce. Gloss (2011) reviewed full-time workers and faculty and found greater rewards before 1990, after which declines in support were manifested in reduced earnings for the public sector of higher education. Sabharwal and Corley (2009) reviewed data from the National Science Foundation (NSF) 2003 Survey of Doctorate Recipients and found that higher education job satisfaction data lagged behind that of other sectors of employment.

In an analysis of wage data from 1972 to 2007, Gloss (2011) measured the wage premium with data obtained from the Census Bureau and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and found that earning potential increased with educational attainment. Gloss further clarified that, while the benefits of a graduate degree were higher for female than male faculty, their salaries were not comparable. Women generally received higher salaries than their male counterparts by being more credentialed, which proved to be a problematic proposition at higher education institutions where both male and female candidates were required to have doctoral degrees (Gloss, 2011).

In an analysis of 223,424 full-time faculty members, Sabharwal and Corley (2009) found that male faculty members generally enjoyed higher levels of job satisfaction compared to their female peers. Additionally, among those individuals who received doctorates before June 30, 2002 and who worked full-time at 4-year institutions, males had more years of experience, and they were more increased likely to have tenure. In a cross-sectional correlational study, Gutierrez, Candela, and Carver (2012) examined institutional and individual characteristics to

understand how institutions may attract and retain nursing faculty. Others have reported that private sector competition might provide greater financial incentives for productive researchers and an alternative to engagement at public research institutions (Ryan, Healy, & Sullivan, 2012).

Nature of Contingent Faculty

In contrast to tenured faculty, contingent faculty have part- or full-time instructional arrangements without tenure-track protection (Curtis & Thornton, 2013). Ochoa (2012) defined contingent faculty as full- or part-time faculty members who perform instructional duties without institutional support to engage students effectively. Often, contingent faculty members are not provided adequate pay, health insurance benefits, and other parts of professional compensation packages that non-contingent faculty groups receive (Ochoa, 2012). Jaeger and Eagan (2009) defined part-time faculty instructors as those employed at or lower than 98% of fulltime appointments. Contingent faculty members often do not have job security, sufficient support services, office space, professional development opportunities, and equal compensation for their work (Johnson, 2011).

Stenerson, Blanchard, Fassiotto, Hernandez, and Muth (2010) described contingent or part-time faculty—also known as adjunct faculty members—as an integral part of the higher education landscape, particularly at community colleges. Cronin and Smith (2011) described the duties of adjunct faculty, the largest contingent faculty group at 2-year colleges, and their tenure-equivalent counterparts as fundamentally the same, but without commensurate compensation, benefits, and length of employment. Part-time faculty have grown steadily in number (Langen, 2011; Monks, 2009) although, recently, full-time provisional or temporary appointments have emerged that provide greater participation in governance activities with increased pay and benefits (Halcrow, & Olson, 2011). Aud et al. (2013) found that private for-profit institutions

rarely used the tenure system compared to public doctoral-granting institutions, which almost always used this system, though the number of tenured or tenure-track appointments has continued to decrease. According to Ochoa (2012), as economic realities dictate the need to conserve funds, institutions have increased dependence on full- or part-time contingent faculty, but have not demonstrated a long-term commitment to their development and empowerment within the academy.

Full- and Part-Time Contingent Faculty Numbers

In an analysis of national data that covered 35 years, Curtis and Thornton (2014) found a 23% increase in tenured and tenure-track appointments, compared to increases of 286% and 259% in part-time and full-time contingent appointments, respectively. Some researchers have explored the challenges to evaluate faculty responsibilities, particularly when research ability and productivity drive compensation and mobility at research institutions (Finkelstein & Cummings, 2012; O'Keefe & Wang, 2013; Worrell, 2009).

The overall decline in funding for postsecondary education has had a significant effect on higher education nationwide (Carroll & Burke, 2012; Crookston & Hooks, 2012; Curtis & Thornton, 2013; Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Ochoa, 2012). According to Curtis and Thornton (2013), recent tuition increases can be attributed to reductions in state appropriations. These financial trends have driven greater dependence on part- or full-time non-tenured faculty. Several researchers have highlighted gaps in the literature to connect this trend with discussions on student outcomes (Charlier & Williams, 2011; Cox, McIntosh, Terenzini, Reason, & Lutovsky Quaye, 2010; Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Fjortoft, Winkler, & Mai, 2012; Hoyt, 2012; Jaeger & Eagan, 2009; Johnson, 2011; Jolley, Cross, & Bryant, 2014; Kezar, & Sam, 2013; Kirk, & Spector, 2009; Landrum, 2009; Langen, 2011; Levin, & Shaker, 2011; Meixner, Kruck, &

Madden, 2010; Ochoa, 2012; Schutz, Drake, & Lessner, 2013). However, as institutions of higher education rely more on contingent faculty, the public at large remains unaware that the majority of college instructors lack the benefits and security of tenure (Mazurek, 2011).

Monks (2009) recommended that policy makers at institutions of higher education consider the variety of backgrounds of their faculty and enact effective policies and support services accordingly. Tang and Tang (2012) focused on individual attitudes about compensation to gauge satisfaction. Jalbert et al. (2010) ranked 500 institutions of higher education and found significant differences between cost of living adjustment rankings and raw salary reports for institutions in the United States. Sabharwal and Corley (2009) did not assess the effect of job satisfaction on retention; however, they did assert the importance of this type of inquiry for future researchers to gain a clearer understanding within and across disciplines.

A survey of 126 tenured and 77 non-tenured professors in the Southeastern United States revealed that uncertainty among non-tenured faculty caused by job insecurity prompted them to view salaries as more important than tenured faculty (Tang & Tang, 2012). Curtis and Thornton (2013) found significant differences between the pay rates of faculty members in the public sector and those of their counterparts at private institutions. Hoyt (2012) also discussed the importance of cost of living adjustments and concluded that ethical concerns related to equitable compensation should not be ignored.

Caruth and Caruth (2013) collected and analyzed 2011 data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) and found that effective hiring practices were needed to improve retention, preserve institutional image, and improve employee relations at institutions of higher education. Given the financial climate in higher education, the trend of reliance on part-time contingent or adjunct faculty is likely to continue (Caruth & Caruth, 2013).

For example, some institutions have implemented policies to ensure that adjunct faculty members do not work the hours required to qualify for employment benefits (Caruth & Caruth, 2013). This trend creates a necessity to work at multiple institutions at the same time without having access to benefits and financial compensation worthy of their academic achievements (Halcrow & Olson, 2011). Multi-campus engagements may hide the unpleasant reality of being vulnerable because of a lack of job security (Halcrow & Olson, 2011). Further, part-time contingent faculty groups are excluded even more than their full-time contingent peers (Halcrow & Olson, 2011). Although full-time contingent faculty have greater access to governance and usually receive insurance and retirement benefits as part of their full-time employment, it should be clarified that these arrangements are short-term and temporary, and they lack the job stability that other full-time non-contingent employees have (Halcrow & Olson, 2011).

Benefits and Challenges of Contingent Hiring

Halcrow and Olson (2011) highlighted the institutional benefits of hiring adjunct faculty members because of lower wages with little or no benefits. Limited resources create additional incentives for administrators and legislators to increase contingent faculty appointments because resources used to do so are concentrated in the classroom instead of being allocated to research endeavors (Ochoa, 2012). In a strategic analysis, Langen (2011) lamented the lack of incentive for institutions to reduce their reliance on part-time faculty. Some institutions, such as rural community colleges, are further challenged because of location and must confront financial realities to provide meaningful services in their respective communities (Crookston & Hooks, 2012).

Curtis and Thornton (2013) tabulated and summarized data from the 2012–2013 AAUP survey and found low pay for part-time faculty and minimal annual increases. Glover, Simpson,

and Waller (2009) explored salary disparities between metropolitan and nonmetropolitan community college campuses and found that nonmetropolitan faculty members received lower salaries. Charlier and Williams (2011) found that rural colleges experienced varying levels of difficulty in hiring adjunct faculty based on academic disciplines. They suggested that future researchers address rural, urban, and suburban hiring challenges and the relationship between labor availability and degree attainment.

With the national trend of declining state funding (Carroll & Burke, 2012; Crookston & Hooks, 2012; Ochoa, 2012), there is greater reliance on a contingent workforce depending on the type of institution and the geographic area where service is provided, which creates significant implications for rural institutions to compete for skilled labor (Charlier & Williams, 2011). Stenerson et al. (2010) discussed the growing reliance and the benefits and challenges of depending on contingent or part-time faculty. Ochoa (2012) expressed concerns that even when economic realities improve, it would seem unrealistic to expect previous numbers of full-time tenure-track positions to be restored.

Ryan et al. (2012) explored predictors of faculty intent to leave public research universities. Overall compensation is an area that warrants further inquiry, and trends reveal a need to understand the effect of financial compensation and overall job satisfaction (Bittner & O'Connor, 2012; Gloss, 2011; Glover et al., 2009; Gutierrez et al., 2012; Jalbert et al., 2010; Kaufman, 2010; Manchester, Leslie, & Kramer, 2010; McGrew & Untener, 2010; Worrell, 2009). The AAUP survey included a discussion of the implications of underpaying faculty and highlighted how low wages effect the ability of academic institutions to attract gifted candidates for graduate school who may decide to pursue nonacademic careers (Curtis & Thornton, 2013). Terpstra and Honoree (2009) reported data from 135 colleges and universities with merit-based

compensation and found a positive relationship between larger merit pay increases and teaching motivation. Glover et al. (2009) conceded that multiple perspectives illustrate about how salaries serve to motivate, but they concluded that it was less complex to agree that inadequate salaries can reduce motivation. To understand the complex nature of compensation in higher education, McGrew and Untener (2010) specified the need to clarify the different realities of faculty on the tenure-track and those who are contingent or non-tenure-track employees.

Contingent Faculty Pay at 2- and 4-Year Institutions

Although contingent faculty can be full- or part-time at both 4- and 2-year institutions, full-time contingent appointments are more common at 4-year campuses, while part-time contingent faculty appointments are far more common at 2-year campuses (Kezar, & Sam, 2013). An analysis of contingent faculty compensation from the AAUP survey for 2012–2013 revealed median per-course wages of less than $2,000 at Southeastern 2-year institutions and over $5,000 at private doctoral-granting institutions in New England (Curtis & Thornton, 2013). Caruth and Caruth (2013) examined IPEDS data of faculty from 4,436 degree-granting institutions in the United States for 2011 and found that 50% were adjunct faculty. Charlier and Williams (2011) explored the need to understand the positive contributions of part-time faculty, particularly as institutions of higher education depend increasingly on this group to meet important instructional needs. Kezar and Sam (2013) examined the need to imbed equitable practices within institutions, and they explored the challenge of institutionalizing policies and practices that would have a positive effect on contingent faculty.

Curtis and Thornton (2013) commented on the status of contingent appointments in an analysis of the 2012–2013 AAUP survey, which revealed that 76% of instructional roles in higher education were filled by contingent faculty. The Coalition on the Academic Workforce

(CAW, 2012) reported on a 2010 survey of 19,850 participants that revealed a heavy reliance on marginal pay for part-time contingent faculty. This finding was linked in part to reduced state appropriations at public colleges and universities (CAW, 2012). Curtis and Thornton (2013) found that part-time contingent annual salaries ranged from $18,000 at 2-year institutions to $30,000 at private doctoral institutions. The CAW (2012) report revealed that the median pay for three-credit courses was $2,700 in the fall of 2010 and ranged from $2,235 at 2-year colleges to $3,400 at 4-year institutions.

In a qualitative analysis on part-time faculty perceptions of institutional assessment, Jolley et al. (2014) discussed public outcry and legislative calls for accountability and the need to clarify how growing dependence on part-time contingent labor effected student outcomes. Jolley et al. (2014) interviewed 20 former and current part-time contingent faculty members and found serious disconnections between faculty members and the institutions they served. Specifically, participants reported feeling invisible and replaceable on campus (Jolley et al., 2014).

To understand how financial and policy realities effect labor trends and student outcomes, Rentz (2010) interviewed faculty members and reported three stories that revealed the erosion of tenure, which can effect quality in the classroom. As Rentz surmised from interviews with tenured and non-tenured faculty, there is a cost to both faculty and students when service and research engagements become incongruent with current labor trends.

Contingent Faculty Working Conditions

Interviews conducted by Rentz (2010) with tenured and non-tenured faculty revealed a need to connect the challenges of full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty and contingent faculty. He found that leaders at 2-year campuses were more likely than those at 4-year institutions to enact polices to facilitate integration, which often included orientation and employee handbooks

for part-time contingent employees (Kezar, & Sam, 2013). Caruth and Caruth (2013) stressed the importance of adjunct faculty for the academy after an analysis of 4,436 colleges and universities. They called for adequate compensation along with acceptance and appreciation of their role in the academy. Thornton and Curtis (2012) discussed achievements of the academic workforce and placed adjunct faculty in the top 10% of the American workforce, but without the benefits of fair compensation representative of their achievements. Although adjunct faculty have been hesitant to highlight the burdens of deplorable working conditions, they must connect the realities of the situation to their abilities to serve students adequately (Rentz, 2010). It is difficult to enact change when the academy ignores the problem or when the phenomenon remains unrepresented in the consciousness (Kezar & Sam, 2013).

Contingent Faculty Equity and Governance

Contingent faculty usually represent over 50% of the academic workforce at institutions—in some cases they represent as much as 70%; however, their role in governance is marginal at best, with fewer than 10 representatives for every 1000 (Kezar & Sam, 2014). Monks (2009) sought to understand the diverse contingent workforce to determine who would be amenable to the less-than-favorable working conditions and low compensation, which are both prevalent in the academic workforce. Kezar and Sam (2013) explored the range of differences between full- and part-time non-tenure track groups and the need to institutionalize equitable practices. Halcrow and Olson (2011) asserted the need for greater equity between full-time and adjunct faculty in the areas of benefits, salaries, and opportunities for personal growth, even when adjunct faculty assumed greater teaching responsibilities and engagements.

Fair work environments are particularly important because the work environments of faculty appear to effect students (Charlier & Williams, 2011; Diegel, 2013; Eagan & Jaeger,

2009; Jaeger & Eagan, 2009; Johnson, 2011; Kezar, & Sam, 2013; Ochoa, 2012). Ochoa (2012) highlighted gaps in analyses and understanding of how the growth of contingent faculty appointments affect tenured professors by requiring additional service commitments, thus expanding the workload of full-time tenure-track employees. Stenerson et al. (2010) examined the expanded role of the adjunct faculty members and suggested that institutions of higher education supervise their work and provide additional support to increase their effectiveness. Diegel (2013) conducted a phenomenological study at a community college and found that resources existed for adjunct faculty enrichment and mentoring; however, creative scheduling and faculty commitment were required to take advantage of these resources. Jolley et al. (2014) found significantly more institutional assessment and support was provided to full-time faculty compared to adjunct faculty colleagues.

Findings from the AAUP 2012–2013 faculty survey revealed that contingent faculty have continued to increase and represent three out of every four appointments with compromised academic freedom, marginal institutional support, and limited opportunities to participate in governance (Curtis & Thornton, 2013). Caruth and Caruth (2013) analyzed 2011 IPEDS data and found that 50% of faculty members at degree-granting institutions in the United States were part-time instructors. Data analysis of semi-structured interviews conducted by Thirolf (2012) at a community college revealed that limited opportunities existed for part-time faculty to interact with full-time faculty.

To address this situation, Monks (2009) recommended that policy makers consider the variety of backgrounds of the faculty population to enact effective policies and support services. In addition to general disparities between full- and part-time faculty related to salary and working conditions, disparities also exist between gender, race, and job satisfaction. The next

section includes a discussion on these demographic factors in the context of job satisfaction and academic discipline at institutions of higher education.

Gender, Race, Job Satisfaction, and Academic Discipline

Caruth and Caruth (2013) analyzed 2011 data from 4,436 colleges and universities and found that female faculty accounted for 52% of part-time instructors. Sabharwal and Corley (2009) found discipline-specific levels of job satisfaction by gender, with male faculty reporting higher levels of satisfaction in all fields except for social sciences, where female faculty members reported greater satisfaction. An analysis of stress and satisfaction of 2,904 tenured or tenure-track faculty members from the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at the University of California in Los Angeles revealed that compensation or support dissatisfaction might not be enough to cause attrition (Ryan et al., 2012).

O'Keefe and Wang (2013) collected data on full-time faculty from eight economics departments at California state institutions and found that, on average, female professors were paid $7,700 less in base salary than their male counterparts. With the exception of engineering, Sabharwal and Corley (2009) found that male faculty members were more likely than their female colleagues to have research and development as their primary responsibilities. Women are increasingly represented in the ranks of the academy and, although calls for equity have been consistent, gender disparities in earning persist at both private and public institutions of higher education (Gloss, 2011).

According to Manchester et al. (2010) Stop the Clock (STC) policies were implemented in the early 1970s to address the gender gap in academia. These policies were intended to counterbalance reductions in productivity, but were found to intensify gender pay inequalities. Stop the Clock policies provided specific allowances for female tenure-track faculty after giving

birth to ensure that they were not adversely affected by service and publishing deadlines that are an integral part of the tenure acquisition process (Manchester et al., 2010). Institutional data of 383 full-time faculty showed that 53 faculty members used STC measures for various reasons (Manchester et al., 2010). Lester and Bers (2010) suggested an expanded understanding of gender roles was necessary to comprehend fully the effect of masculinity and interpersonal dynamics on hiring decisions in the academy.

An analysis of the 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty data (NSOPF: 04) revealed regional and gender differences in science, engineering, and mathematics (SEM) and non-SEM compensation (Kelly & Grant, 2012). Specifically, female faculty members earned approximately 80% of what their male peers earned. Curtis and Thornton (2013) found variations in compensation based on regional differences, institutional type, and discipline. In an analysis of questionnaires completed by 126 tenured and 77 non-tenured professors, Tang and Tang (2012) found that differences in reported and actual earnings might be attributed to earnings beyond the academy; overall, female faculty earned 70.48% of what male faculty earned. They also found that a lack of job security was related to higher money motivation.

In an analysis of data from 980 academic institutions and 26,108 faculty members, Ashraf and Aydin (2009a) found that salary rates were 5.19% higher at unionized campuses than at nonunionized campuses. However, in a study of gender and earnings gaps, Ashraf and Aydin (2009b) found that tenure was associated with higher earnings across all institution types for males, but not for females. Jalbert et al. (2010) ranked 500 institutions of higher education and found significant differences between cost of living adjustment rankings and raw salary reports for institutions in the United States. Curtis and Thornton (2013) found significant differences

between the pay rates of faculty members in the public sector and their counterparts at private institutions.

Hoyt (2012) discussed the importance of cost of living adjustments and concluded that ethical concerns related to equitable compensation should not be ignored. One such ethical concern involves diversity in the academy. The following section includes academic stratification to clarify how increasing diversity within the academy may add another layer of complexity to contingent employment and student outcomes.

Academic Stratification

Mazurek (2011) described the fragmented stratification of the academic workforce, which called into question the tradition of affording professional class status to all college instructors. Even at a women's college with large numbers of women represented in the faculty ranks, attrition rates were significantly higher for women than their male peers and were related to issues of balancing work and family responsibilities (Deutsch & Yao, 2014). Some states seek to ameliorate the challenges of the expanding adjunct workforce with legislative hiring mandates; however, administrative interpretations of these mandates often limit their effectiveness (McNair & Hebert-Swartzer, 2012).

The California 75/25 policy limited hiring of contingent faculty to 25% of the instructional workforce (McNair & Hebert-Swartzer, 2012). According to McNair and Hebert-Swartzer (2012), this legislation was intended to reduce the concentration of adjunct faculty to increase the number of full-time faculty and improve teaching, faculty morale, and institutional reliability. The effect of this 75/25 policy was limited in part because of different administrative interpretations, the pragmatic cost-savings benefit of contingent employment, and methodological challenges of clarifying faculty teaching loads (McNair & Hebert-Swartzer,

2012). Overall, funding presented serious challenges to hiring more full-time faculty within the large 2-year college system in California (McNair & Hebert-Swartzer, 2012).

Mazurek (2011) framed the prolonged periods of part-time employment in the academy as a class issue that professional organizations had not adequately addressed and seemed unlikely to address because of narrow professional concerns. Using a stratified purposive sample of 12 department chairs from of a population of 102, Fjortoft et al. (2012), found marginalization of part-time faculty to be a major theme as participants expressed concern that part-time faculty may be undervalued. The distance between the tenure-track and part- or full-time non-tenure track presents as a class system within the academy that reveals different teaching loads and limited opportunities to engage in scholarly pursuits ("Experiences," 2010). "Experiences" (2010) referred to the American higher education system as a 3-tiered class system, with part-time faculty occupying the lowest rung of the ladder, followed by full-time non-tenure appointments, and finally the tenure-track or tenured faculty.

According to Monks (2009), the perceptions of part-time faculty as marginalized, underpaid, and exploited, have not led to effective efforts to unionize. Compared to non-unionized colleagues, those who chose not to join a union have reported greater satisfaction than those without the option to do so (Myers, 2011). In an analysis of 11,874 full-time tenure-track professors from the 2004 NSOPF, Ashraf and Aydin (2009b) found that collective bargaining had a positive effect on increased earnings. Monks stressed the importance of advocacy to provide opportunities for contingent faculty to deal with the complex range of needs and expectations for this underpaid segment of the academic workforce.

Student Outcomes and Contingent Faculty

Stenerson et al. (2010) pointed to limitations in the contingent workforce because of diminished scholarship and service requirements and expectations. The researchers also asserted the need to question the heavy reliance on contingent or adjunct faculty as colleges and universities must champion lifelong learning and nurture international economic engagements (Stenerson et al., 2010). Ochoa (2012) highlighted gaps in research on student learning outcomes to understand fully how the growing dependence on contingent or non-tenure-track faculty effect undergraduate students. Further, students from traditionally underrepresented groups reported a lack of diversity, which resulted in lower student satisfaction levels and less favorable appraisals of diversity present within academic departments (Lee, 2010).

Kirk and Spector (2009) analyzed data from 2,597 students between 1992 and 1998 using a chi square test of independence and found that student performance differed based on instructor status (i.e., full- or part-time). Specifically, performance of accounting students taught by full-time faculty was substantially higher in advanced classes than their peers taught by part-time faculty. Schutz et al. (2013) examined data from 1,559 full-time and adjunct faculty members and found that both groups agreed that rigor was important but full-time faculty reported the use of greater rigor more frequently. Jaeger and Eagan (2009) explored 2-year degree completion at 107 California community colleges and found that, on average, 48% of students were provided credit instruction by part-time faculty.

The role of full-time faculty members to mentor students and produce successful learning outcomes should not be understated; however, during times of financial difficulty, administrators often decide against full-time appointments (Stenerson et al., 2010). As state allocations decrease, college and university budgets also decrease (Carroll & Burke, 2012; Crookston &

Hooks, 2012; Curtis & Thornton, 2013; Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Gloss, 2011; Ochoa, 2012). In turn, students have fewer opportunities to interact with full-time faculty members and do not receive much needed mentorship interactions (Ochoa, 2012). Meixner et al. (2010) noted that as the number of part-time or non-tenured faculty members increases, it is important to understand that opportunities for students to be engaged or immersed in meaningful learning environments will decline. Baldwin and Wawrzynski (2011) found that face-to-face engagement within the classroom context was the most common type of interaction for part-time contingent faculty members. Ochoa (2012) suggested additional professional development opportunities to ameliorate the effects of contingent faculty staffing trends on student outcomes.

An analysis of data from 1.5 million students in the California community college system did not demonstrate a causal relationship between part-time faculty members and student transfers; however, the results suggested a negative association between transfers and part-time faculty (Eagan & Jaeger, 2009). Because of multi-campus engagements, adjunct faculty members often spend less time on a singles campuses; therefore, it is extremely difficult for them to spend significant amounts of time mentoring students and embracing organizational values (Stenerson et al., 2010). Mentorship and faculty engagement with students beyond the classroom are important drivers of student success and should not be overlooked (Cox et al., 2010; Ochoa, 2012; Rose & Rukstalis, 2008; Stenerson, et al., 2010).

Rentz (2010) analyzed findings from interviews with tenured and non-tenured faculty members and concluded that a cost exists for dehumanizing faculty that has a negative effect on students. Ochoa (2012) suggested that future researchers assess the influence of the growing number of professional development opportunities to understand how effective they have been in neutralizing the effect of the expanding number of contingent appointments. As class sizes grow

to accommodate increasing enrollment, Rentz (2010) recommended that full- and part-time faculty members resist the temptation to see their fates as insular and create coalitions to secure favorable working conditions and facilitate student empowerment. The effect of spending time in the classroom with part-time faculty becomes greater with increased exposure; as such, stakeholders should consider the influence that part-time faculty have on students and formulate strategies to increase campus engagement by these instructors (Eagan & Jaeger, 2009).

Mazurek (2011) lamented the regression in professional status afforded to faculty and articulated the concern that 25% of college faculty members were on the tenure-track. The truth about faculty working conditions must be addressed because costs are associated with marginalizing these employees (Mazurek, 2011). Stenerson et al. (2010) pointed to limitations in the contingent workforce from the lack of scholarship requirements and fewer opportunities for student engagement. Many observers of faculty academic achievement view them as privileged and protected employees; however, growing corporate structures and administrative budgets limit the resources spent to compensate the increasing number of contingent faculty on college campuses (Mazurek, 2011). To value the institutional benefits of the contingent workforce will require movement beyond discussion and implementation of policies to weave fair practices into the institutional fabric (Kezar & Sam, 2013). Accountability concerns must also be answered to determine how colleges aim to measure matriculation rates and assess student success without attending to the labor crisis that has the potential to undermine the very success that must be measured (Rentz, 2010).

This section provided a brief discussion about academic stratification, student outcomes, and contingent faculty. Stratification within the academy is discussed as a class issue in greater detail in the section on intersectionality. This discussion is framed based on the following

theories: Herzog's four-step faculty compensation model, relative deprivation theory, merit compensation systems, expectancy and equity theory, and human capital theory. The following section also includes a discussion on racial/ethnic, gender, and class concerns.

Summary of Related Theories

This portion of the literature review includes a summary of related theories in two major sections. The researcher first explored brief summaries of Herzog's four-step faculty compensation model, relative deprivation theory, merit compensation systems, expectancy and equity theory, and human capital theory. The second section includes the theory of intersectionality and connects faculty compensation trends, pay, and job satisfaction to the broader theme of contingent employment at institutions of higher education. Additionally, this section highlights the theoretical limitations to address gender, race/ethnicity, and class concerns adequately. Although other theories pose serious questions about rank, pay, and credentialing, intersectionality is used to highlight gaps that are not explained adequately by those theories and proposes a more complex systematic view of the replication of societal stratification within the academy.

Herzog's Four-Step Faculty Compensation Model

Herzog (2008) identified a four-step process to clarify the unique nature of faculty compensation. As a first step, Herzog proposed that a correlation between personal and professional attributes must be clarified to contextualize any perceived practice of discrimination. The second step to improve equity included assessing those who currently have tenure and those without tenure to predict future career advancement potential. The third step included a review of faculty rank classification errors. Here, Herzog found that the model inaccurately predicted a higher rank for faculty than their actual rank. In the fourth step, Herzog

assessed variables often subjected to selection bias after sifting through data in the previous three steps to ensure that compensation disparities were accurately identified before seeking to implement remedies.

According to Herzog (2008), data on gender disparities may be inflated when analyses exclude the length of time in a position. He also identified selection bias, which excludes variables such as productivity because of an obscured or biased researcher lens in relation to assessment of career advancement as a significant limitation in providing a robust understanding of faculty salary trends. Finally, Herzog highlighted gaps in the literature and methodological biases that excluded productivity analysis in the examination of academic work.

Relative Deprivation Theory

Crosby (1976) suggested that for relative deprivation (RD) to exist, individuals must desire something, feel entitled to it, believe another has it, consider it attainable, and decline personal responsibility for failure to possess it. Feldman and Turnley (2004) used RD to examine empirically the response of academics to contingent employment and to explore the careers of contingent faculty. They found that adjunct faculty who compared themselves to tenured or tenure-track employees experienced greater levels of RD than did those who compared themselves with other contingent faculty members. They also found that younger faculty members experienced greater levels of RD.

Feldman and Turnley (2004) surveyed 105 contingent faculty at an institution with 975 tenured or tenure-track faculty and 192 contingent or non-tenured faculty and found that 37% possessed doctoral degrees. This finding and variations in the level of RD experienced by different segments of the contingent workforce may reflect changes in expectations at different times in faculty members' careers. An example of this rationale is that individuals who moved

into contingent faculty roles after full-time employment did not experience higher levels of RD compared to those who had prior temporary roles (Feldman & Turnley, 2004).

Additionally, Feldman and Turnley (2004) revealed that adjunct faculty members who intended to be employed as contingent faculty for shorter periods experienced significantly higher levels of RD. Data from contingent faculty members and research fellows confirmed a strong relationship between reduced job satisfaction, reduced commitment to the profession, intent to leave a position, reduced citizenship behavior, and RD (Feldman & Turnley, 2004). Feldman and Turnley also explored the possibility that women may view contingent employment more positively than their male counterparts and found that gender was not related to levels of perceived RD. Overall, RD had a negative effect on job performance and career attitudes. According to Feldman and Turnley, RD explained the findings of low job satisfaction for contingent faculty members, and they called for greater equity for this growing segment of the academic profession.

Smith, Cronin, and Kessler (2008) discussed the emergence of themes of anger and sadness related to RD. Respondents reported the budget process as being offensive, which resulted in decreased employee morale. In their survey of 23 public institutions in California, Smith et al. found that collective disadvantage fostered feelings of anger and fear, particularly when the budget process was unfair or contrary to organizational policies and procedures. Smith et al. discussed the challenge for leaders to motivate faculty who choose to withdraw, and found that sadness caused by collective disadvantage resulted in reduced organizational loyalty.

Smith et al. (2008) found that the effect of individual RD was mediated by group RD. They suggested that future research was needed to manipulate varying levels of cognitive responses to understand different emotions and responses that resulted from RD. While Smith et

al. did not assess group identification in the analysis of group-related disadvantage, they suggested future researchers consider the connection between group identification and RD to understand the range of emotional responses.

Merit Compensation Systems

According to Schulz and Tanguay (2006), operant conditioning, expectancy theory, and equity theory all support merit systems of compensation. Compensation is an area that should be studied to understand the intersection of finance and overall job satisfaction (Bittner & O'Connor, 2012; Gloss, 2011; Glover et al., 2009; Gutierrez et al., 2012; Jalbert et al., 2010; Kaufman, 2010; Manchester et al., 2010; McGrew & Untener, 2010; Worrell, 2009). Merit systems of compensation drive employee performance when employees value the mode of compensation. Additionally, when performance is measured accurately, a clear relationship exists between performance and compensation and opportunities to improve exist ("Intellectual," 2001).

To understand the relationship between merit systems of compensation and faculty performance, Schulz and Tanguay (2006) sampled 486 (18.6%) faculty members at three university campuses and found that self-reported research activities were positively associated with merit pay. They found that female faculty members were less interested in merit compensation than were their male colleagues. They suggested this phenomenon may be a manifestation of distrust of the merit assessment system. Schulz and Tanguay also found that the most consistent predictive measure of merit pay was self-reported scholarly engagement.

Efficiency wage theory considers competitors' pay scales in an attempt to align wages with the understanding that low-wage industries benefit more from merit awards than do high-wage enterprises ("Intellectual," 2001). Schulz and Tanguay (2006) highlighted problems with

merit-based systems and the tendency to incorporate items that are easier to measure than others, which makes it difficult to improve performance for tasks and skills that are not measured. Terpstra and Honoree (2009) developed a random sample of 219 colleges and universities and found that it was difficult to be emphatic about specific types of effective merit-based pay plans in higher education. Specifically, they suggested that an abundance of faculty assessment measures, a lack of expert consensus, and scarce quantitative data about what motivates faculty were impediments to clear policy recommendations for specific merit-based compensation systems.

Expectancy & Equity Theory

Expectancy theory includes expectancy perception, which is the belief that specific levels of performance will produce certain results; individuals integrate the attractiveness of the result with expectancy perception to adjust performance after the size of combined outcomes are assessed ("Intellectual," 2001). Mudge and Swiger (2008) asserted that college graduates provide quantifiable monetary gains for societies and economies. Yining, Gupta, and Hoshower (2006) used expectancy theory as the theoretical framework to understand how faculty members in 10 different programs could be motivated to conduct research. Yining et al. (2006) considered academic discipline, faculty rank, tenure status, gender, average output over an entire career, and average output in the last 24 months. They surveyed 320 faculty members and found that untenured faculty members were motivated to publish by external rewards, and tenured faculty were motivated mostly by intrinsic rewards. According to Yining et al., no relationship existed between gender and research productivity. They also found that when institutions effectively linked research productivity to the rewards of tenure and career advancement, faculty members were motivated to behave in desired ways. Expectancy models provide cognitive explanations

about how people behave in making decisions regarding how much effort to exert on given tasks, (Yining et al., 2006).

Equity theory posits that a successful performance-based compensation system depends on how those effected view themselves compared to others ("Intellectual," 2001). Specifically, equity theory operates with the assumptions that individuals compare both financial and other forms of compensatory outcomes with the contributions and outcomes of others ("Intellectual," 2001). Thus, the way employees perceive performance and rewards of a merit-based compensation plan is as important as the actual plan ("Intellectual," 2001). This means that perceived discrepancies can alter performance even when those discrepancies do not exist ("Intellectual," 2001) and clear communication is needed to ensure employees understand expectations ("Intellectual," 2001). However, a challenge of the equity paradigm is that the merit system is woven into the fabric of the institution and is not independent of other decision-making processes ("Intellectual," 2001).

Human Capital Theory

According to human capital theory, employees should expect that individuals with the same levels of skill, experience, and academic attainment, who expend the same level of effort, receive the same reward (Park, 2012). However, human capital theory does not explain the disparity between equally qualified, experienced, and skilled candidates (Park, 2012). According to Park (2012), increased capitalism within the academy requires future researcher to assess and understand how growing consumerism will effect institutions of higher learning. Park described individual qualities or attributes as a set of strategic investments made by employees in themselves to increase their knowledge and skill.

Mudge and Swiger (2008) commented on the rising cost of education and the increase in degree attainment as being a beneficial augmentation of human capital not only for individuals, but also for society. Career growth and tenure, along with academic freedom, are hallmarks of the professional status afforded to faculty members and must be considered (Park, 2012). Traditionally, expectations have been framed to enforce the belief that personal investment in education would be worth the investment of time, resources, and effort to foster human capital formation (Mudge & Swiger, 2008). However, Park (2012) discussed disparities between gender and ethnic groups that cannot be explained after considering a range of variables and questioned the applicability of human capital theory to explain differences within the academy. He called for a longitudinal analysis to understand the disparity in compensation for faculty members, particularly for underrepresented minority groups and women to contextualize how institutional characteristics and human capital theory may explain differences. While tenure decisions differ between institutions, Park explored the preference of large research-intensive institutions to privilege publication as an integral part of the tenure process, while liberal arts institutions invest greater energy in assessing instruction. Lester and Bers (2010) suggested the need to understand gender roles to clarify the effect of masculinity and interpersonal dynamics as hiring decisions are made at colleges and universities.

Herzog's four-step faculty compensation model, RD theory, merit compensation systems, expectancy and equity theory, and human capital theory provide substantial insight into faculty pay and perceptions of job satisfaction; however, these theories do not adequately account for the replication of societal forces within the academy. To address gaps in the theories highlighted above, intersectionality is discussed to connect faculty stratification or class issues with race/ethnicity and gender. In the following sections, the researcher highlights the broader

societal forces that are often replicated at institutions of higher education and connects the challenges of contingent employment to issues of class, race/ethnicity, and gender.

Intersectionality

The theory of intersectionality emerged as scholars, predominantly of color, contemplated the relationship of race and gender to clarify how multiple demographic characteristics may affect identity (Browne & Misra, 2003). Often race/ethnicity and gender are visible and easy to identify; however, class should not be overlooked because class realities for non-White males are significantly different from those who benefit from the privileges of being White (Browne & Misra, 2003). Similarly, Black and Hispanic women experience different realities in American society from their White peers (Browne & Misra, 2003). Any theory that seeks to address these realities without grasping the complex amalgamation of identities will miss significant measurable differences in perception and expectation based on class, race/ethnicity, and gender (Browne & Misra, 2003).

Because of White male dominance in society, many institutional norms are informed by the standards of this group, and the power that results from their culture and contributions creates challenges to integrate new people and practices (Van Ummersen, 2005). Croom and Patton (2011) explored the academic careers of tenured Black women to highlight the replication of structural societal inequalities in academia and suggested that administrators reflect on how policies effect different groups of employees. Duncan (2014) discussed the importance of strategic planning to ensure that diversity programs do not undermine attempts to integrate because they that fail to account for oppressive formal and informal structures and relationships. Without a systematic analysis and honest reflection, leaders will not be able to identify oppressive institutional practices (Croom & Patton, 2011). Such transformative and reflexive

leadership can clarify how seemingly objective rules and practices may overlook the effect of racism and sexism (Croom & Patton, 2011).

Intersectionality & Class

Mazurek (2011) framed the increased reliance on contingent faculty as a class issue and highlighted the increasing reliance on full- or part-time contingent faculty as representative of an overall loss of professional status within the academy. Leboy and Madden (2012) suggested that colleges and universities consider the organizational climate and the possibility of implicit, structural, and operational biases that may negatively affect their abilities to attract and retain specific groups. Mazurek highlighted the reality of tenured/tenure-track faculty serving in supervisory roles instead of collaborating with their contingent peers. Such activities serve to clarify the distance between the contingent and tenured/tenure-track faculty and magnify the lack of equity between faculty groups (Mazurek, 2011).

Mazurek (2011) also discussed the challenges of extended periods of part-time employment for faculty who were not provided the assistance of professional organizations to improve their working conditions. Such challenges include a lack of consistent advocacy from organizations such as the American Historical Association (AHA) and the Modern Language Association (MLA), which have not always worked to benefit contingent faculty in their respective disciplines (Mazurek, 2011). Griffin, Lunsford, Baker, and Johnson (2013) explored various levels of mentorship required of faculty members, which is of particular importance at the graduate level where deeper and more substantive alliances are required to facilitate positive student outcomes (Griffin et al., 2013). Caye and de Saxe Zerden (2014) discussed the challenge of integrating adjunct faculty into the social fabric of the institution and providing consistency in course content. New faculty members often require mentoring from seasoned faculty members

to learn how to attract revenue and perform successfully; such mentorship, however, requires effective intergenerational and intercultural interactions that are seldom planned or assessed (Trower, 2010).

Intersectionality: Gender and Race

Sabharwal and Corley (2009) discussed the gap in research to explore discipline-specific reports of faculty job satisfaction. They found significant discipline-specific job satisfaction differences between men and women (Sabharwal & Corley, 2009). Specifically, male faculty reported higher levels of satisfaction in all fields except for the social sciences where female faculty members reported greater levels of satisfaction. Sabharwal and Corley highlighted the need for further inquiry to understand the effect of job satisfaction on faculty retention. Hart and Mars (2009) suggested future researchers measure how social capital and discipline-specific concerns influence faculty appointments.

Concerns voiced by women and faculty of color have prompted attempts at change by infusing some academic programs with more diverse candidates; however, these efforts often overlook the structural realities that undermine successful integration and limit opportunities for change (Duncan, 2014). Gloss (2011) noted that as greater numbers of traditionally underrepresented groups continue to enter the academy, calls for equity should continue, even as gender disparities in earnings persist. Herzog (2008) recommended that inequities related to personal attributes be identified before attempting to assess salary corrections.

Worrell (2009) discussed the complicated process of implementing multidimensional assessment tools for different roles within the academy. It is not uncommon for underrepresented groups in women's and gender studies programs at universities to be treated as representative of specific parts of the larger population without being integrated into the fabric of

the department or institution (Duncan, 2014). Duncan (2014) provided a first-person account of the difficult decision to leave the academy—even after earning tenure—because of overt and covert forms of discrimination perpetrated by a White colleague in a position of power.

In an analysis of interviews with tenured and non-tenured faculty, Rentz (2010) discussed the effect of the unarticulated cost of dehumanizing faculty, which has been normalized and overlooked when considering the negative effect on students. Mazurek (2011) lamented the erosion of faculty members' professional status, and voiced concern that less than 26% of college faculty were on the tenure-track. Thornton and Curtis (2012) discussed the extraordinary achievements of the academic workforce, where faculty and staff were more credentialed than the average American employee but did not receive the benefits or fair compensation normally expected for such achievements.

To implement effective policies, college and university leaders should reconsider what is normal and gain a better understanding of the changing workforce (Van Ummersen, 2005). This understanding will lead to effective holistic policies in hiring and retaining a skilled and diverse faculty (Van Ummersen, 2005). Departments are part of larger institutions, and it is common for institutional goals to be disconnected from departmental practices, which undermines the importance of listening to the cries for help from traditionally marginalized groups (Duncan, 2014). The implication of intersectionality as a theory is that social constructions occur on a systematic, rather than an individualistic level to become embedded in institutional practices that include the workforce (Browne & Misra, 2003).

There is no single means of describing identities that intersect; no single gender or ethnic group can be explained in the same way and, for every situation, the dynamics embedded in institutions vacillate and require vigilance to identify and analyze (Crenshaw, 2012). Although

several feminist theorists have rejected the Black/White binary in favor of a more complex understanding of identity, which considers how race and gender are related, no absolute consensus exists about how these identities operate in the workforce (Browne & Misra, 2003). College leaders should question the normative ideological underpinnings of their institutions and consider how these norms effect students, faculty, and higher education (Croom & Patton, 2011). Duncan (2014) highlighted the challenges of empowering students when individuals and institutional forces collude to perform or ignore acts of hostility within departments tasked with managing diverse staff and nurturing diverse groups of students.

Because the construction of value permeates the fabric of society, it also influences expectations and behaviors that reveal gender in the context of ethnic and racialized interpretations (Browne & Misra, 2003). Some institutions have formulated unique systems that include research engagement for contingent faculty or intermediary roles to collaborate with tenure-track faculty on research or translate findings for others (Caye & de Saxe Zerden, 2014). Such initiatives are attempts to address serious gaps in tenure-track diversity and plug gaps in institutional procedures that reveal unclear promotable attributes (Caye & De Saxe Zerden, 2014). Nevertheless, serious challenges to embed positive practices exists as institutions work to provide greater equity and integrate this growing and diverse contingent segment of the academic workforce (Kezar & Sam, 2014).

While the view of converging identities is often seen as an attempt to empower only the traditionally marginalized, intersectionality benefits everyone by highlighting permanent structural concerns, which may be obscured in daily operations (Croom & Patton, 2011). As such, Crenshaw (1989) expanded on the work of other theorists by introducing intersectionality to explore how different groupings of identities interact to allow marginalization, even among

groups struggling to overcome a limited view of discrimination. Thus, unlike critical race theory (CRT), which is useful to explore racial identities and their position within institutions and society (Croom & Patton, 2011), scholars who embrace intersectionality often seek to deconstruct the value system and thereby reveal connections between multiple identities, including but not limited to race and gender (Croom & Patton, 2011).

The current higher education rank system was created for a specific group by that group; as such, observers should not be surprised that non-White, non-males do not scale the professional ranks at the same rate as White males (Croom & Patton, 2011). Because intersectional identities do not operate in a vacuum, it is necessary to understand that the value of one group must be seen in comparison to another group to sustain the hierarchy and its manifestations within society (Browne & Misra, 2003). Politics and policy are interwoven; in higher education, the winds of change are directed by changes in the political climate and in a stratified system of governance where all voices do not have the same concentration of power (Schwartz, 2014). Therefore, it is important to understand how macro-economic policies will effect institutions of higher education and the individuals who serve within them (Schwartz, 2014).

As tenured faculty engage in rewarded activities, they may ignore the plight of their contingent peers, which is not uncommon because human behavior is influenced by reward systems, and increasingly, power has been moved away from faculty to administrators (Schwartz, 2014). As state allocations continue to shrink, colleges and universities are challenged to make difficult decisions (Carroll & Burke, 2012; Crookston & Hooks, 2012; Curtis & Thornton, 2013; Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Gloss, 2011; Ochoa, 2012). Levin and Shaker (2011) discussed the challenge of fragmented identities and the tendency to embrace the benefits of

being in a satisfying role, while working under less than ideal conditions. Still, external perceptions of faculty protection are incongruent with actual practices in higher education (Mazurek, 2011). Levin and Shaker (2011) discussed the integration of contingent faculty into the fabric of the organization as a means to create professional status for them within the academy. Nevertheless, there remains a significant gap in the body of research to understand employment outcomes fully in the context of socially constructed systems of race, class, and gender (Browne & Misra, 2003).

Summary

The literature review provided details about the complex nature of academic work on and off the tenure track and included theories to explain what may contribute to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. This dissertation will address faculty job satisfaction at a public 2-year college district in Texas. The purpose of this study is to examine differences in job satisfaction between contingent and non-contingent faculty and their demographic and personal characteristics of gender, race/ethnicity, academic discipline, and academic achievement at a large public 2-year college district in Texas. The researcher will investigate demographic and personal characteristics such as gender, race/ethnicity, academic discipline, and academic achievement to understand variations between groups and to clarify whether gender, race/ethnicity, and class interact to predict job satisfaction.

Because of the broader societal forces discussed in the literature review, contingent and non-contingent faculty status will be used to address class differences. The literature demonstrated differences in pay, power, and governance for contingent faculty compared to their non-contingent peers. The intersectional identities of race/ethnicity, gender, and class will be

represented as race/ethnicity, gender, and class (contingent/non-contingent faculty status). Chapter 3 includes a discussion on the data collection and analysis process.

Chapter 3

METHOD OF PROCEDURE

The purpose of this study was to examine differences in job satisfaction between contingent and non-contingent faculty and their demographic and personal characteristics of gender, race/ethnicity, academic discipline, and academic achievement at a large public 2-year college district in Texas. The researcher investigated how class (contingent vs. non-contingent faculty), gender, and race/ethnicity interact to predict job satisfaction. The researcher invited current contingent and non-contingent faculty in the district to complete a survey and demographic questions. Data were collected to clarify how differences between personal and demographic characteristics of class, gender, and race/ethnicity are related to scores on the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS). The JSS instrument was used to collect data on job satisfaction.

The researcher applied the theory of intersectionality to analyze data collected for this study. This analysis provided clarification on the relationships between the variables, which helped the researcher determine how they interact in the context of job satisfaction. Because complexity increases significantly with the addition of identities, researchers addressed complexity by limiting the inquiry to two or three variables to address the layers of additional complexity (Griffin & Museus, 2011). To facilitate an effective intersectional analysis, race/ethnicity, gender, and class were the focal points of this study.

Institutional Review Board

Permission to conduct this study was requested from the department of Educational Leadership. After the department of Educational Leadership granted permission to conduct the proposed study, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Texas A&M University-Commerce (TAMUC) granted permission. Next, the Office of Thesis and Dissertation Services (OTDS) at

Texas A&M University-Commerce reviewed the proposal and granted permission to proceed to the data collection phase. Finally, the approved proposal was forwarded to the IRB of the selected public 2-year college for approval. After IRB approval was granted by both institutions, the researcher sent an email to all instructional staff to elicit participation. Participants were asked to provide informed consent before proceeding to the online survey and demographic profile.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. Do differences exist in job satisfaction of faculty based on gender, race/ethnicity, class (contingent vs. non-contingent faculty), academic discipline, and academic achievement at a public 2-year college district in Texas?
2. Do gender, race/ethnicity, and class interact to predict job satisfaction?

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated for the study:

H_{1o}: No significant differences exist in job satisfaction based on gender, race/ethnicity, class (contingent vs. non-contingent faculty), academic discipline, and academic achievement at a 2-year college district in Texas.

H_{1a}: Significant differences exist in job satisfaction based on gender, race/ethnicity, class (contingent vs. non-contingent faculty), academic discipline, and academic achievement at a 2-year college district in Texas.

H_{2ao}: A significant interaction does not exist between class and gender on job satisfaction.

H_{2aa}: A significant interaction exists between class and gender on job satisfaction.

H_{2bo}: A significant interaction does not exist between class and race/ethnicity on job satisfaction.

H_{2ba}: A significant interaction exists between class and race/ethnicity on job satisfaction.

H_{2co}: A significant interaction does not exist between race/ethnicity and gender on job satisfaction.

H_{2ca}: A significant interaction exists between race/ethnicity and gender on job satisfaction.

Design of the Study

This quantitative study was designed to examine differences in job satisfaction between contingent and non-contingent faculty and their demographic and personal characteristics of gender, race/ethnicity, academic discipline, and academic achievement at a public 2-year college district in Texas. The researcher investigated how class (contingent vs. non-contingent faculty), gender, and race/ethnicity interact to predict job satisfaction. The following section provides details on the research methods used in this study.

Participants

The researcher solicited participants using faculty information collected from the online directory for the selected community college district. An email with informed consent, a link to the JSS, and demographic questions was sent to all current contingent and non-contingent faculty in the summer/fall directory for whom information was available. Participants were not required to participate and they were not compensated for their participation in the study. The sample population included all instructional staff at the 2-year community college district. A sample population is a group from which researchers hope to collect data and gain insight that adequately represents the entire population (Tuckman, & Harper, 2012).

The researcher used a purposeful sample of faculty teaching in the summer and fall of 2016 to collect data to understand differences between job satisfaction of contingent and non-contingent faculty. The population was broadly defined as instructional staff to assist with generalizability and increase the external validity of the study to understand variations between contingent and non-contingent faculty groups. According to Tuckman and Harper (2012), a population with a broad definition increases generalizability and improves external validity, while a narrow definition of the population limits application to a population beyond the group being studied. The researcher sent an initial email to the 1,946 available address and weekly reminders were sent after the initial email invitation distribution to ensure faculty members are able to complete the survey within the allotted 30 days. This study posed minimal risks to faculty who volunteered to participate. Faculty members could choose to cease participation at any time during the process. The information provided in this study allowed faculty to contribute vital data to help administrators improve job satisfaction for current and future employees.

Instrumentation

Spector (1985) developed the JSS to assess jobs of individuals engaged in the human services sector. The JSS has 36 items and nine subscales intended to assess job satisfaction in terms of pay, communication, supervision, benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, co-workers, promotion, and nature of work (Spector, 1985). Job satisfaction can be viewed from the employee or organizational perspective, and the human component of job satisfaction is concerned with how employees are treated in the workplace (Spector, 1997). Within the organizational context of job satisfaction, Spector (1997) found a relationship between how employees are treated and how engaged they are at work as related to job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction can be seen as an overall feeling about the job and a range of feelings associated with different parts of the job (Spector, 1997). For instance, it is quite possible for an individual or individuals to love the professional activities they have been hired to complete within an organization and dislike other aspects of the job, such as peer relationships or pay (Spector, 1997). Spector (1997) developed the JSS to examine a range of job satisfaction indicators to understand overall job satisfaction and job satisfaction based on nine subscales that range from pay to communication (Spector, 1997). The JSS is a Likert-type scale with response items ranging from 1 (extreme disagreement) to 6 (high agreement) (Spector, 1997).

At least one item on each subscale is negatively worded; these items should be scored in reverse before being added to acquire the overall JSS score (Spector, 1997). Writing some questions in reverse is important because it provides researchers with a means of countering the propensity of participants to respond without contemplating the questions to which they are responding (Spector, 1997; Tuckman & Harper, 2012). This procedure will be the same for all negatively worded items on the JSS (Spector, 1997).

Questions 2, 11, 20, and 33 address issues on the promotion subscale; Question 2 is the only question on that subscale that is reverse scored (Spector, 1997). Questions 3, 12, 21, and 30 address the supervision subscale; Questions 12 and 21 are reverse scored (Spector, 1997). Questions 4, 13, 22, and 19 address the fringe benefits subscale; Questions 4 and 29 are reverse scored (Spector, 1997). Questions 5, 14, 23, and 32 are used to collect data about contingent rewards; all questions on this subscale, with the exception of Question 5, are reverse scored (Spector, 1997).

Operating conditions are addressed with Questions 6, 15, 24, and 31; all questions, with the exception of Question 15, are reverse scored (Spector, 1997). Questions 7, 16, 25, and 34

address the coworkers subscale; Questions 16 and 34 are reverse scored. The nature of work subscale has one negatively worded question (Question 8), which is reverse scored. Questions 17, 27, and 35 address the nature of work subscale and are positively worded (Spector, 1997). Questions 18, 26, and 36 address the communication subscale and are negatively worded, thus, are reverse scored. Question 9 also addresses this subscale and is positively worded (Spector, 1997). While manual scoring of the instrument is possible, software can be used to include the appropriate formula to reverse score negatively worded items (Spector, 1997). For the purpose of this study, the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23.0 was used to score items on the JSS.

Reliability and Validity

Spector (1992) discussed the differences between single questions and rating scales with multiple items, and highlighted the increased reliability of data collected from multi-item rating scales. According to Spector, complex ideas or issues require significant effort to understand variations and record responses consistent with participants' intentions. Spector (1985) compared the instrument to the Job Descriptive Index (JDI)—an established and widely used instrument—to ensure that the JSS met the rigorous standards for reliability and validity. The assessment of correlational validity between the sub categories on the JSS and JDI instruments revealed strong correlations between .61 and .80 (Spector, 1985).

Statistical tests should be consistent. To achieve consistency, the test should be administered to the same group on multiple occasions and be absent of any significant intervening occurrences (Tuckman & Harper, 2012). During the developmental phase, researchers should verify reliability prior to the study or during the course of the study to clarify how consistency was achieved (Tuckman & Harper, 2012). According to Tuckman and Harper

(2012), concurrent validity can be achieved by comparing results of a new or experimental instrument to an established instrument. Spector (1985), administered the JSS 19 times at different organizations in the human service sector to provide sufficient evidence of the reliability and validity of the new instrument.

Spector (2011a) outlined the higher education norms for the JSS and provided the total mean, nine categorical means, the weighted means, and the standard deviation of the sample mean. He included 14 groups in the higher education norms with an overall sample size of 3,764 (Spector, 2011a). Because the JSS is a 6-point scale and each subscale has four questions, scores may range from 4 to 24 (Spector, 1997). The salary mean for higher education was 11.9, the promotion mean was 11.5, the supervision mean was 18.9, the benefits mean was 15.3, and the contingent rewards mean was 14.1 (Spector, 2011a). Additionally, the conditions mean was 13.6, the coworkers mean was 18.1, the work itself mean was 19.7, the communication mean was 14.6, and the total mean was 137.2 (Spector, 2011a). The overall standard deviation (SD) was 8.1. On the nine subscales, the SD ranged from 1.1 for working conditions to 1.8 for salary (Spector, 2011a). The overall weighted mean for the higher education norms of the JSS was 137.2 (Spector, 2011a).

Verret (2012) used the JSS and the Work-Family Conflict Scale to understand science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) faculty job satisfaction in an online survey. According to Verret, significant gaps in the literature did not adequately explain the relationship between gender and job satisfaction. Thus, research is needed to understand how contingent or non-contingent employment status, compensation, family dynamics, rank, and work-life balance interact to effect reported differences in faculty job satisfaction (Verret, 2012). Verret suggested that future researchers consider how disparities in the tenure system may have discipline specific

implications and may foster gender-specific underrepresentation in STEM related disciplines for women.

Theoretical Framework

The researcher used the theory of intersectionality outlined in Chapter 2 to analyze the findings of the study to understand variances between the job satisfaction scores of contingent and non-contingent faculty groups. The researcher sought to clarify how personal and demographic characteristics of class (contingent or non-contingent faculty status), gender, and race/ethnicity effect job satisfaction/dissatisfaction of faculty at a large public community college in North Texas. It is common for underrepresented groups to be treated in the academy as they are within the broader societal context (Duncan, 2014). As such, the theory of intersectionality was an important tool to understand the unique and shared experiences of contingent and non-contingent faculty groups.

Data Collection

Data collection included information about faculty demographics (see Appendix B) and JSS (see Appendix A). Data were collected using Google Forms©, a free online application. An email invitation (see Appendix C) was sent to faculty at a large community college district in Texas at the beginning of the third week of school in fall 2016. There were 1,946 faculty emails in the district directory, and 281 of those addresses were no longer active. Weekly reminders were provided to allow faculty time to complete the survey during the 30-day data collection period. Each email contained a link to complete the survey and an attached informed consent document (see Appendix E). The third reminder was sent to 1,663 instead of 1,665 email addresses because one faculty member was concerned about being identified by the institution and requested not to be included, and one faculty member, who was new to the institution, also

requested to be excluded. At the end the data collection period, the researcher had responses from 364 of the 1,665 faculty. Of the responses received, 363 were faculty members. Overall the survey response rate was 21.8%.

Data Analysis

When conducting a survey study, Tuckman and Harper (2012) recommended contacting non-respondents after 14 to 30 days. For the purpose of this study, the researcher provided weekly reminders to encourage faculty participation. This additional contact is important to increase survey participation; as such, if fewer than 80% of prospective participants respond, the researcher should contact 10-15% of the non-respondents (Tuckman, & Harper, 2012). The researcher hoped to generate at least a 15% response rate from the faculty population.

After data were collected, information provided was downloaded from Google Forms® for analysis. Statistical software, SPSS version 23.0, was used to analyze demographic and JSS data. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to answer Research Question 1 to determine differences in faculty job satisfaction in terms of gender, race/ethnicity, class (contingent vs. non-contingent faculty), academic discipline, and academic achievement. The total JSS was used along with the nine subscales of the JSS to answer Research Question 1. Next, a factorial ANOVA was conducted to answer Research Question 2 and test the three hypotheses. Specifically, Hypothesis 2a addressed the significance of interaction effects between class and gender on total job satisfaction, and Hypothesis 2b addressed the significance of interaction effects between class and race/ethnicity for total job satisfaction. The third hypothesis (2c) addressed the significance of interaction effects between the independent variables of race/ethnicity and gender, and the dependent variable of total job satisfaction.

Ary et al. (2013) recommended; therefore, the alpha level of significance for this study will be set at .05. The researcher also considered the effect size to determine how wide differences are between groups, or contemplate the influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable (Pallant, 2016). According to Pallant (2016), Cohen considered .14 to be a large effect size, .06 to be a medium effect size, and .01 to be a small effect size. Effect size provides specificity by clarifying the size of the differences between groups (Coe, 2002). Cronbach's alpha reliabilities for the instrument were conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The internal consistency of the instrument was determined to be .86, which indicates good internal consistency (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006).

Treatment of the Data

Google Forms®, a free online application was used to collect demographic data and job satisfaction data on the JSS. At the end of allotted time, responses were saved on an encrypted Universal Serial Bus (USB) drive, and a backup was saved on an encrypted USB drive to secure the data and ensure any damage to the primary USB drive did not render the data unusable. Names were not collected for this study, and participants were not asked to provide information about a specific campus within the college district or the college district as a whole. Data saved on the encrypted USB drive will be stored in the department of educational leadership at TAMUC for 3 years, after which time, data on the USB drive will be destroyed. The USB dive will also be destroyed after data are deleted. The principal investigator and co-investigator had access to data during the study.

Summary

This chapter provided details of data collection, analysis, and storage. Chapter 4 includes the results and analysis. Chapter 5 includes a summary of the findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for further study.

Chapter4

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The findings of this study are presented in Chapter 4. The researcher sought to examine differences in job satisfaction between contingent and non-contingent faculty groups. The researcher collected data on faculty members' demographic and personal characteristics of gender, race/ethnicity, academic discipline, and academic achievement at a large public 2-year college district in Texas to understand differences in reported job satisfaction scores (JSS). The researcher also investigated how class (contingent vs. non-contingent faculty), gender, and race/ethnicity interacted to predict job satisfaction.

Faculty Job Satisfaction Overview

This study was undertaken to answer two research questions:

1. Do differences exist in job satisfaction of faculty based on gender, race/ethnicity, class (contingent vs. non-contingent faculty), academic discipline, and academic achievement at a public 2-year college district in Texas?
2. Do gender, race/ethnicity, and class interact to predict job satisfaction?

To answer the first question, the researcher conducted one-way analysis of variances (ANOVAs) to determine whether significant mean differences existed in total JSS and JSS on the nine subscales by gender, race/ethnicity, class, academic discipline, and academic achievement. The dependent variables were total JSS and scores on the nine subscales of satisfaction on pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, coworkers, nature of work and communication. The researcher added these subscales to determine the total JSS. The independent variables were class (contingent vs. non-continent faculty), gender (male vs. female), race/ethnicity (non-White vs. White), academic achievement (bachelor's, master's,

and doctoral/professional), and academic discipline (transfer/core, vocational/technical, and continuing/developmental). The following section includes the descriptive statistics and results of the one-way ANOVAs, which aimed to examine group differences on the overall JSS and on the nine subscales. Differences by class (contingent/non-contingent faculty status) are presented in the next subsection.

Class and Job Satisfaction

The sample consisted of 363 faculty with 86 (23.7%) full-time tenured, 69 (19%) full-time on tenure-track, 169 (46.5%) part-time/adjunct, 14 (3.9%) full-time/temporary, and 25 (6.9%) designated as other. The 25 faculty members who selected 'other' for their teaching role, but met the institutions' guidelines for contingent or non-contingent faculty were grouped accordingly. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to examine the effect of faculty class (contingent and non-contingent) on job satisfaction. Participants were divided into two groups; contingent (198; 54.6%) and non-contingent (165; 45.5%). The non-contingent faculty group consisted of 86 (23.7%) full-time tenured faculty, v 69 (19.0%) tenure-track, and 10 (2.8%) faculty who identified as other, but were not serving in full-time temporary or adjunct roles. The contingent group consisted of 169 (46.5%) part-time/adjunct faculty, 14 (3.9%) full-time/temporary faculty, and 15 (4.1%) faculty members who identified as 'other' but were not tenured or on the tenure-track. Three participants identified themselves as full-time permanent but not tenure eligible. These respondents selected 'other" on the description line provided. This distinction is important because the selected institution has a salary listing with a clinical track, which is distinct from the tenure/tenure-track. Because clinical-track faculty are not usually eligible for tenure, but are not temporary appointments, they were classified as non-

contingent for this study. Table 1 includes descriptive statistics on the JSS for faculty by class, with mean and standard deviation.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics on JSS by Class (Contingent and Non-Contingent)

	Non-Contingent		Contingent		Total	
Job Satisfaction	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Number	165		198		363	
Pay	15.22	4.90	11.82	5.50	13.36	5.50
Promotion	13.18	4.85	10.23	5.15	11.57	5.22
Supervision	19.68	4.84	21.15	4.09	20.48	4.50
Fringe Benefits	16.94	4.29	11.94	5.40	14.21	5.51
Contingent Rewards	15.66	5.21	14.62	5.58	15.09	5.43
Operating Conditions	13.27	4.03	16.33	4.14	14.94	4.36
Coworkers	19.30	3.88	20.68	3.58	20.05	3.78
Nature of Work	21.18	3.00	21.38	3.17	21.29	3.09
Communication	15.04	4.80	16.88	4.88	16.05	4.92
Total **JSS**	149.47	29.36	145.02	30.40	147.04	29.36

The Levene's *F* test revealed that the homogeneity of variance assumption was not met on the subscales of pay ($p = .02$), supervision ($p = .01$), and fringe benefits ($p = .00$). As such, the researcher conducted a Welch's *F*. Table 2 provides the one-way ANOVA by class on the JSS results. The one-way ANOVA for faculty job satisfaction by class revealed statistically

significant differences between contingent and non-contingent faculty on the subscales of pay, $F(1, 359) = 38.77$; promotion, $F(1, 361) = 31.14$; supervision, $F(1, 322) = 9.57$; fringe benefits, $F(1, 36) = 96.75$; operating conditions, $F(1, 361) = 50.17$; coworkers, $F(1, 361) = 12.28$; and communication, $F(1, 361) = 13.01$].

Table 2

One-way ANOVA by Class on JSS

College	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	*F* Value	*p*-Value
Pay	1040.40	1040.40	38.77[a]	.00**
Promotion	782.42	782.42	31.14	.00**
Supervision	195.20	195.20	9.57[a]	.00**
Fringe Benefits	2250.00	2250.00	96.75[a]	.00**
Contingent Rewards	98.18	98.18	3.35	.07
Operating Conditions	840.28	840.28	50.17	.00**
Coworkers	169.84	169.84	12.28	.00**
Nature of work	3.71	3.71	.39	.53
Communication	305.17	305.17	13.01	.00**
Total Job Satisfaction	1779.39	1779.39	2.07	.15

[a] Denotes use of Welch's test for Robust Tests of Equality of Means
* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$.

Although several subscales reached statistical significance, the effect sizes varied considerably—effect size was calculated using eta squared. The results revealed a large effect size for fringe benefits ($\eta^2 = .21$); medium effect sizes for pay ($\eta^2 = .10$), promotion ($\eta^2 = .08$), and operating conditions ($\eta^2 = .12$); and small effect sizes for supervision ($\eta^2 = .03$), coworkers

($\eta^2 = .03$), and communication ($\eta^2 = .04$). The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis on the subscales of contingent rewards, nature of work, and total job satisfaction because no statistically significant differences existed. On the subscales of pay, promotion, fringe benefits, operating conditions, supervision, coworkers, and communication, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis because statistically significant differences existed.

Gender and Job Satisfaction

The current study included 230 (63.4%) female faculty and 133 (36.6%) male faculty. Table 3 includes a summary of descriptive statistics based on gender and includes mean and standard deviation on the nine subscales and total job satisfaction.

The Levene's *F* test revealed that the homogeneity of variance assumption was violated on the subscales of promotion ($p = .03$), fringe benefits ($p = .04$), and operating conditions ($p = .00$). The researcher conducted a Welsh's *F* test to assess significance on these subscales. Table 4 provides an overview of the one-way ANOVA conducted to understand differences between male and female faculty job satisfaction. The one-way ANOVA revealed no significant differences between male and female faculty on the nine subscales or for overall job satisfaction. As such, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis for job satisfaction based on gender on all subscales and for overall job satisfaction. In the next subsection, results on the differences by race/ethnicity were provided.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics on JSS by Gender

Job Satisfaction	Female		Male		Total	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Number	230		133		363	
Pay	13.8	5.3	12.7	5.7	13.4	5.5
Promotion	11.7	5.0	11.3	5.5	11.6	5.2
Supervision	20.6	4.3	20.3	4.8	20.5	4.5
Fringe Benefits	14.5	5.3	13.7	5.8	14.2	5.5
Contingent Rewards	15.4	5.4	14.6	5.5	15.1	5.4
Operating Conditions	14.7	4.6	15.3	3.8	14.9	4.4
Coworkers	20.0	3.8	20.1	3.7	20.1	3.8
Nature of Work	21.3	3.3	21.2	2.7	21.3	3.1
Communication	16.1	5.1	16.0	4.7	16.1	4.9
Total Job Satisfaction	148.0	29.4	145.4	28.7	147.0	29.4

Table 4

One-way ANOVA by Gender on JSS

College	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	*F* Value	*p*-Value
Pay	105.67	105.67	3.52	0.06
Promotion	13.30	13.30	0.47 [a]	0.50
Supervision	4.34	4.34	0.21	0.64
Fringe Benefits	47.42	47.42	1.49 [a]	0.22
Contingent Rewards	42.85	42.85	1.46	0.23
Operating Conditions	27.41	27.41	1.60 [a]	0.21
Coworkers	1.72	1.72	0.12	0.73
Nature of work	0.44	0.44	0.05	0.83
Communication	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.98
Job Satisfaction	561.34	561.34	0.65	0.42

[a] Denotes use of Welch's test for Robust Tests of Equality of Means
* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$.

Race/Ethnicity and Job Satisfaction

The study included 101 (27.8%) non-White faculty and 262 (72.8%) White faculty members. Table 5 includes an overview of the descriptive statistics for faculty based on race/ethnicity with mean and standard deviation scores for White and non-White faculty on the nine subscales and the total job satisfaction.

Table 5

Descriptives on JSS by Race/Ethnicity

	Non-White		White		Total	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Number	101		262		363	
Pay	13.07	5.53	13.48	5.49	13.36	5.50
Promotion	11.77	5.28	11.49	5.20	11.57	5.22
Supervision	19.43	5.24	20.89	4.12	20.48	4.50
Fringe Benefits	14.33	5.75	14.17	5.43	14.21	5.51
Contingent Rewards	14.71	5.34	15.24	5.47	15.09	5.43
Operating Conditions	14.68	4.56	15.04	4.29	14.94	4.36
Coworkers	19.46	4.26	20.28	3.55	20.05	3.78

The Levene's *F* test revealed that the homogeneity of variance assumption was violated on the subscales of supervision ($p = 0.00$) and coworkers ($p = 0.02$). The researcher conducted a Welsh's *F* test to assess significance on these subscales. Table 6 provides an overview of the one-way ANOVA to understand differences between faculty job satisfaction scores based on race/ethnicity. Significant differences existed between non-White and White faculty on the supervision, $F(1, 150) = 6.37$, and coworkers, $F(1,157) = 3.00$, subscales with small effect sizes for both supervision ($\eta^2 = .02$) and coworkers ($\eta^2 = .00$).

On the subscales of supervision and coworkers, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis because significant differences existed between White and non-White faculty. The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis for overall job satisfaction and the other subscales

because no significant differences existed between White and non-White faculty on JSS. Results on the differences by academic achievement are provided in the next subsection.

Table 6

One-way ANOVA by Race/Ethnicity on JSS

College	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	*F* Value	*p*-Value
Pay	12.12	12.12	0.40	0.53
Promotion	5.87	5.87	0.22	0.64
Supervision	156.15	156.15	6.37[a]	0.01*
Fringe Benefits	1.84	1.84	0.06	0.81
Contingent Rewards	20.00	20.00	0.68	0.41
Operating Conditions	9.19	9.19	0.48	0.49
Coworkers	49.86	49.86	3.00 [a]	0.09
Nature of work	2.34	2.34	0.24	0.62
Communication	1.45	1.45	0.06	0.81
Total Job Satisfaction	577.47	577.47	0.67	0.41

[a] Denotes use of Welch's test for Robust Tests of Equality of Means
* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$.

Academic Achievement and Job Satisfaction

The researcher collected data in three categories for academic achievement (see Appendix B): 39 (10.7%) faculty held bachelor's degrees, 227 (62.5%) held master's degrees, and 97 (26.7%) held doctoral or professional degrees. Table 7 provides an overview of the

descriptive statistics by academic achievement on the JSS with mean and standard deviation scores.

Table 7

Descriptives on JSS by Academic Achievement

	Bachelor's		Master's		Doctoral		Total	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Number	39		227		97		363	
Pay	15.23	5.21	13.18	5.58	13.05	5.31	13.36	5.50
Promotion	11.85	5.33	11.34	5.19	11.99	5.26	11.57	5.22
Supervision	20.44	4.97	20.52	4.53	20.40	4.28	20.48	4.50
Fringe Benefits	15.54	5.25	14.00	5.52	14.19	5.57	14.21	5.51
Contingent Rewards	15.59	5.76	15.22	5.35	14.58	5.51	15.09	5.43
Operating Conditions	15.82	4.82	14.92	4.44	14.64	3.96	14.94	4.36
Coworkers	19.92	3.87	20.13	3.70	19.92	3.95	20.05	3.78
Nature of Work	21.77	2.63	21.35	2.96	20.94	3.53	21.29	3.09
Communication	14.74	5.66	16.50	4.75	15.51	4.91	16.05	4.92
Total Job Satisfaction	150.90	31.69	147.16	29.67	145.21	27.78	147.04	29.36

Although differences existed between the mean and standard deviation scores of faculty with bachelor's, master's, and doctoral/professional degrees, the differences were not statistically

significant. The Levene's *F* test revealed that the homogeneity of variance assumption was not violated on the overall JSS or on any of the nine subscales (see Table 8).

Table 8

One-way ANOVA by Academic Achievement on JSS

College	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	*F* Value	*p*-Value
Pay	153.38	76.69	2.56	0.08
Promotion	32.15	16.07	0.59	0.56
Supervision	1.11	0.55	0.03	0.97
Fringe Benefits	79.32	39.66	1.31	0.27
Contingent Rewards	39.35	19.68	0.67	0.51
Operating Conditions	39.14	19.57	1.03	0.36
Coworkers	3.86	1.93	0.14	0.87
Nature of work	21.85	10.92	1.14	0.32
Communication	141.77	70.89	2.96	0.05
Total Job Satisfaction	909.95	454.97	0.53	0.59

[a] Denotes use of Welch's test for Robust Tests of Equality of Means
* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$.

The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis because no significant differences existed between faculty with bachelor's, master's, or doctoral/professional degrees on the overall JSS or any of the nine subscales. Results on the differences by academic discipline are provided in the following subsection.

Academic Discipline and Job Satisfaction

The researcher collected data on 13 categories based on institutional data (see Appendix B). These categories were grouped to three general concentrations for analysis. Group 1 included transfer/core disciplines $n = 225$ (62.0%), Group 2 included technical/vocational faculty $n = 62$ (17.1%), and Group 3 included continuing/developmental education faculty $n = 76$ (20.9%). Table 9 provides an overview of descriptive statistics by academic discipline on the JSS.

The researcher conducted a one-way ANOVA to understand the effect of academic discipline on job satisfaction. The Levene's F test revealed the homogeneity of variance assumption was violated on the supervision ($p = .00$) and contingent rewards ($p = .02$) subscales. The researcher conducted a Welsh's F test to assess significance on these subscales. The one-way ANOVA for faculty job satisfaction by academic discipline revealed statistically significant differences between transfer/core, technical/vocational, and continuing/developmental education faculty on the following subscales: pay, $F(2, 360) = 5.68$; promotion, $F(2,360) = 6.64$; supervision, $F(2, 142.94) = 9.35$; fringe benefits, $F(2, 360) = 6.28$; contingent rewards, $F(2, 136.96) = 6.53$; operating conditions, $F(2,360) = 4.48$; coworkers, $F(2, 360) = 4.62$; nature of work, $F(2, 360) = 3.23$; communication, $F(2, 360) = 4.65$; and total job satisfaction, $F(2, 360) = 7.92$ (see Table 10). Effect sizes were small for the subscales of pay ($\eta^2 = .03$), promotion ($\eta^2 = .04$), supervision ($\eta^2 = .03$), fringe benefits ($\eta^2 = .03$), contingent rewards ($\eta^2 = .03$), operating conditions ($\eta^2 = .02$), coworkers ($\eta^2 = .03$), nature of work ($\eta^2 = .02$), communication ($\eta^2 = .03$), and job satisfaction ($\eta^2 = .04$).

Table 9

Descriptives on JSS by Academic Discipline

	Transfer Core		Technical Vocational		Continuing Developmental		Total	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Number	225		62		76		363	
Pay	12.6	5.5	14.9	5.1	14.3	5.5	13.4	5.5
Promotion	10.8	5.1	12.2	4.6	13.2	5.7	11.6	5.2
Supervision	20.0	4.7	20.1	4.6	22.1	3.3	20.5	4.5
Fringe Benefits	13.5	5.6	15.9	5.0	15.1	5.2	14.2	5.5
Contingent Rewards	14.5	5.5	15.3	5.5	16.8	4.6	15.1	5.4
Operating Conditions	15.0	4.4	13.7	4.0	15.9	4.4	14.9	4.4
Coworkers	19.8	3.9	19.7	3.8	21.2	3.0	20.1	3.8
Nature of Work	21.0	3.2	21.6	2.6	22.0	2.9	21.3	3.1
Communication	15.8	4.9	15.2	4.9	17.5	4.7	16.1	4.9
Total Job Satisfaction	142.9	29.7	148.4	27.5	158.1	27.2	147.0	29.4

The one-way ANOVA for faculty job satisfaction by academic discipline revealed statistically significant differences between transfer/core, technical/vocational, and continuing/developmental education faculty on the following subscales: pay, $F(2, 360) = 5.68$; promotion, $F(2,360) = 6.64$; supervision, $F(2, 142.94) = 9.35$; fringe benefits, $F(2, 360) = 6.28$; contingent rewards, $F(2, 136.96) = 6.53$; operating conditions, $F(2,360) = 4.48$; coworkers, $F(2, 360) = 4.62$; nature of work, $F(2, 360) = 3.23$; communication, $F(2, 360) = 4.65$; and total job satisfaction, $F(2,360) = 7.92$. Effect sizes were small for the subscales of pay ($\eta^2 = .03$),

promotion (η^2= .04), supervision (η^2 = .03), fringe benefits (η^2 = .03), contingent rewards (η^2 = .03), operating conditions (η^2 = .02), coworkers (η^2 = .03), nature of work (η^2 = .02), communication (η^2 = .03), and job satisfaction (η^2 = .04).

Table 10

One-way ANOVA by Academic Discipline on JSS

College	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	*F* Value	*p*-Value
Pay	334.31	167.16	5.68	0.00**
Promotion	350.61	175.31	6.64	0.00**
Supervision	249.43	124.71	9.35 [a]	0.00**
Fringe Benefits	370.59	185.30	6.28	0.00**
Contingent Rewards	315.34	157.67	6.53[a]	0.00**
Operating Conditions	167.21	83.60	4.48	0.01*
Coworkers	129.04	64.52	4.62	0.01*
Nature of work	60.97	30.49	3.23	0.04*
Communication	220.74	110.37	4.65	0.01*
Total Job Satisfaction	13154.47	6577.23	7.92	0.00**

[a] Denotes use of Welch's test for Robust Tests of Equality of Means
* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$.

The researcher conducted a post hoc analysis to understand which pairs of respondents differed significantly. The Tukey HSD test was used to clarify differences between transfer/core, technical/vocational, and continuing/developmental education faculty on the JSS where the homogeneity of variance assumption was not violated, while the Games-Howell test was used where the homogeneity of variance assumption was violated. On the pay subscale,

significant differences ($p = 0.00$) were observed between transfer/core ($M = 12.62$, $SD = 5.47$) and technical/vocational ($M = 14.85$, $SD = 5.14$) faculty. Specifically, those in technical/vocational disciplines were more satisfied than their peers in transfer/core academic disciplines. On the promotion subscale, significant differences ($p = 0.00$) existed between respondents in transfer/core ($M = 10.84$, $SD = 5.08$) and continuing/developmental education ($M = 13.22$, $SD = 5.70$) academic discipline clusters. Faculty members in continuing/developmental education disciplines were more satisfied with their promotion opportunities than were their transfer/core colleagues.

The data analysis revealed significant differences ($p = 0.00$) between transfer/core ($M = 20.04$, $SD = 4.72$) and continuing/developmental education ($M = 22.09$, $SD = 3.31$) faculty on the supervision subscale. As a group, continuing/developmental education faculty were more satisfied on the supervision subscale than their transfer/core peers. A significant difference also existed between technical/vocational ($M = 20.11$, $SD = 4.56$) and continuing/developmental education ($M = 22.09$, $SD = 3.31$) faculty. Again, continuing/developmental education faculty, were the most satisfied of the two groups on the supervision subscale.

Significant differences ($p = 0.00$) were observed on the fringe benefits subscale between transfer/core ($M = 13.45$, $SD = 5.62$) and technical vocational ($M = 15.94$, $SD = 4.97$) faculty. Faculty in technical/vocational disciplines were more satisfied than were their transfer/core peers on the fringe benefits subscale. The analysis of the contingent rewards subscale revealed significant ($p = 0.00$) differences between transfer/core ($M = 14.46$, $SD = 5.55$) and continuing/developmental education ($M = 16.80$, $SD = 4.64$) faculty. Continuing/developmental faculty were more satisfied than transfer/core faculty on the contingent rewards subscale. Additionally, significant differences were observed on the operating conditions subscale ($p =$

0.01) between continuing/developmental education (M = 15.87, SD = 4.38) and technical/vocational (M = 13.66, SD = 4.03) faculty. In this analysis, faculty members in continuing/developmental academic disciplines were more satisfied compared to their technical/vocational education colleagues.

Significant differences existed between faculty groups on the coworkers subscale (p = 0.01). Transfer/core (M = 19.76, SD = 3.94) faculty were less satisfied than continuing/developmental education (M = 21.21, SD = 3.01) faculty. Specifically, the analysis revealed a 1.46 difference between these groups on the coworkers subscale. Significant differences (p = 0.04) existed on the nature of work subscale between transfer/core (M = 20.98, SD = 3.24) and continuing/developmental education (M = 21.97, SD = 2.875) faculty. Those in continuing/developmental education departments yielded greater satisfaction mean scores than did those in transfer/core fields. A significant difference existed between transfer/core (M = 15.81, SD = 4.93) and continuing/developmental education (M = 17.49, SD = 4.65) faculty on the communication subscale (p = 0.01). A significant difference also existed between continuing/developmental education (M = 17.49, SD =4.65) and technical/vocational (M = 15.15, SD = 4.94) faculty. Of these two comparisons, continuing/developmental education faculty were the most satisfied group on the communication subscale. Overall, total job satisfaction analysis based on academic discipline revealed significant differences (p = 0.00) between transfer/core (M = 142.93, SD = 29.69) and continuing/developmental education (M = 158.07, SD = 27.19) faculty groups. Specifically, continuing/developmental education faculty members were more satisfied than faculty in transfer/core academic disciplines. Finally, significant differences existed between the job satisfaction levels of faculty on the JSS based on academic discipline. As such, the null hypothesis (H_{1o}) was rejected.

Gender, Class, Race/Ethnicity and Job Satisfaction

The researcher conducted a series of two-way ANOVAs to answer Research Question 2, which asked whether gender, race/ethnicity, and class interacted to predict job satisfaction. The results in this section provide an understanding of the effect of gender, class, and race/ethnicity on overall job satisfaction scores. Total job satisfaction was calculated by adding the results of the nine subscales of pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, coworkers, nature of work, and communication. The subsections that follow report the possible interaction effects of class and gender, class and race/ethnicity, and gender and race/ethnicity on total job satisfaction.

Class, Gender and Job Satisfaction

The researcher conducted a two-way between-groups ANOVA to explore the effect of the independent variables of gender and class on the dependent variable of total job satisfaction. Participants were divided into two groups for gender (1 = female, 2 = male) and two groups for class (1= non-contingent, 2 = contingent). Table 11 provides an overview of mean and standard deviation scores for total job satisfaction. The Levene's *F* test revealed that the homogeneity of variance assumption was met ($p = 0.25$).

Table 11

Total Job Satisfaction by Gender and Class

Gender	Class	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Female	Non-Contingent Faculty	147.55	29.71	110
	Contingent Faculty	148.38	29.96	120
	Total	147.99	29.78	230
Male	Non-Contingent Faculty	153.29	23.90	55
	Contingent Faculty	139.85	30.54	78
	Total	145.41	28.67	133
Total	Non-Contingent Faculty	149.47	27.97	165
	Contingent Faculty	145.02	30.40	198
	Total	147.04	29.36	363

Table 12 includes the two-way ANOVA results. An alpha of .05 was used to assess significance of the interaction effect between gender and class on total job satisfaction. The effect size was calculated using partial eta squared. A significant interaction effect existed between the gender and class of faculty for total job satisfaction, $F(1, 359) = 4.94$, $p = 0.03$. Partial eta squared revealed a small effect size ($\eta_p^2 = 0.01$). A significant main effect existed for class, $F(1, 359) = 3.86$, $p = 0.05$; however, the effect size was small ($\eta_p^2 = 0.01$). The main effect for gender, $F(1, 359) = 0.19$, $p = 0.66$, did not reach statistical significance. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis for class and gender because a statistically significant interaction effect existed between male and female, contingent and non-contingent faculty for total job satisfaction on the JSS.

Table 12

Two-way ANOVA: Total Job Satisfaction by Gender and Class

Source	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*Sig.*	η_p^2
Corrected Model	6431.34[a]	3	2143.78	2.52	0.06	0.02
Intercept	7165679	1	7165679	8414.96	0.00	0.96
Gender	161.99	1	161.99	0.19	0.66	0.00
Class	3286.68	1	3286.68	3.86	0.05	0.01
Gender * Class	4207.07	1	4207.07	4.94	0.03	0.01
Error	305703	359	851.54			
Total	8160612	363				
Corrected Total	312134	362				

a. R Squared = .021 (Adjusted R Squared = .012)

Class, Race/Ethnicity and Job Satisfaction

A two-way between-groups ANOVA was conducted to understand the effect of the independent variables of class (1= non-contingent, 2 = contingent) and race/ethnicity (1 = non-White, 2 = White) on the dependent variable of total job satisfaction. Table 13 shows the means and standard deviations for total job satisfaction.

The Levene's *F* test revealed that the homogeneity of variance assumption was met (p = .65). No significant interaction effect existed for class and race/ethnicity, $F(1, 359) = 2.23$, p = 0.14 (see Table 14). No significant main effect existed for class, $F(1, 359) = 0.36$, $p = 0.55$ or for race/ethnicity, $F(1, 359) = 0.91$, $p = 0.34$. The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis

(H_{2bo}) because no significant interaction effect existed between class and race/ethnicity for overall job satisfaction on the JSS.

Table 13

Total Job Satisfaction by Class and Race/Ethnicity

Class	Race/Ethnicity	Mean	SD	N
Non-Contingent Faculty	Non-White	143.27	29.01	44
	White	151.72	27.36	121
	Total	149.47	27.97	165
Contingent Faculty	Non-White	146.35	32.45	57
	White	144.48	29.64	141
	Total	145.02	30.40	198
Total	Non-White	145.01	30.88	101
	White	147.82	28.78	262
	Total	147.04	29.36	363

Table 14

Two-way ANOVA: Total Job Satisfaction by Class and Race/Ethnicity

Source	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*Sig.*	η_p^2
Corrected Model	4223.02[a]	3	1407.67	1.64	0.18	0.01
Intercept	6169412.26	1	6169412	7193.04	0.00	0.95
Class	310.89	1	310.89	0.36	0.55	0.00
Race/Ethnicity	777.77	1	777.77	0.91	0.34	0.00
Class * Race/Ethnicity	1912.66	1	1912.66	2.23	0.14	0.01
Error	307911.36	359	857.69			
Total	8160612.00	363				
Corrected Total	312134.38	362				

a. R Squared = .014 (Adjusted R Squared = .005)

Race/Ethnicity, Gender and Job Satisfaction

The researcher conducted a two-way between-group ANOVA to determine the effect of race/ethnicity (1 = non-White, 2 = White) and gender (1 = female, 2 = male) on total job satisfaction. Table 15 provides an overview of the means and standard deviations for total job satisfaction.

Table 15

Total Job Satisfaction by Race/Ethnicity and Gender

Race/Ethnicity	Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Non-White	Female	143.08	30.40	64
	Male	148.35	31.84	37
	Total	145.01	30.88	101
White	Female	149.88	29.41	166
	Male	144.27	27.44	96
	Total	147.82	28.78	262
Total	Female	147.99	29.78	230
	Male	145.41	28.67	133
	Total	147.04	29.36	363

Details of the two-way ANOVA are presented in Table 16. The Levene's *F* test revealed that the homogeneity of variance assumption was met ($p = .82$). No statistically significant differences existed for the interaction effect between race/ethnicity and gender, $F(1,359) = 2.33$, $p = 0.13$; the main effect for race/ethnicity, $F(1, 359) = 0.15$, $p = 0.70$; or the main effect for gender, $F(1, 359) = 0.00$, $p = 0.96$. The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis (H_{2co}).

Table 16

Two-way ANOVA: Total Job Satisfaction by Race/Ethnicity and Gender

Source	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*Sig.*	η_p^2
Corrected Model	3142.790[a]	3	1047.60	1.22	0.30	0.01
Intercept	5802801.56	1	5802801.56	6741.95	0.00	0.95
Race/Ethnicity	125.28	1	125.28	0.15	0.70	0.00
Gender	1.90	1	1.90	0.00	0.96	0.00
Race/Ethnicity * Gender	2004	1	2003.90	2.33	0.13	0.01
Error	308991.59	359	860.70			
Total	8160612	363				
Corrected Total	312134.38	362				

a. R Squared = .010 (Adjusted R Squared = .002)

Summary

The researcher presented the findings of the current study in this chapter. In Chapter 5, a summary of the findings is provided along with conclusions, implications, and recommendations for future research and policy.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine differences in job satisfaction between contingent and non-contingent faculty, and the influence of their demographic and personal characteristics of gender, race/ethnicity, academic discipline, and academic achievement on job satisfaction at a large public 2-year college district in Texas. The researcher also investigated how class (contingent vs. non-contingent faculty status), gender, and race/ethnicity interacted to effect job satisfaction. Data were collected from a large public 2-year community college district in Texas during the 2016 fall semester. Chapter 5 includes a summary of findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations. The theory of intersectionality is not addressed in an independent section; rather, it is included throughout Chapter 5 to represent the intricate connective tissue of identity adequately in the context of faculty job satisfaction. Intersectionality provides a framework to explore how different aspects of our being may be woven together to shape our identities and institutional/societal experiences, and it may result in different outcomes for different individuals and groups (Crenshaw, 2012). A complex reading of intersectionality is required to highlight significant findings, address the limitations of this study, and make recommendations for future research and policy.

Summary of Findings

This section includes a summary of findings which address the research questions and provide additional insight from extant literature related to the influence of class, gender, race/ethnicity, academic achievement, and academic discipline on job satisfaction. Table 17 includes an overview of normed mean scores on the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS). These data provide insight into job satisfaction in the United States across service sector industries and

higher education. The differences between the overall U.S. service sector and higher education are used to discuss the findings of the current study. According to Spector (1994), when interpreting data from the full scale, scores between 36 and 108 indicate dissatisfaction, scores between 144 and 216 indicate satisfaction, and scores between 108 and 144 indicate ambivalence. Additionally, when interpreting data on the subscales, scores between 4 and 12 indicate dissatisfaction, scores between 16 and 24 indicate satisfaction, scores between 12 and 16 indicate ambivalence (Spector, 1994). However, it is important to know that variations exist depending on where the scale was administered; thus, norms should be considered in the context of broader trends and institution types (Spector, 1994).

Table 17

U.S. Service Sector and Higher Education JSS Means Comparison

Dependent Variable	*Total U.S. Means.	*Education Means	Score Range
Number of Participants	40, 618	3764	
Pay	12.5	11.9	4-24
Promotion	12.2	11.5	4-24
Supervision	18.8	18.9	4-24
Fringe Benefits	14.7	15.3	4-24
Contingent Rewards	13.9	14.1	4-24
Operating Conditions	13.5	13.6	4-24
Coworkers	17.9	18.1	4-24
Nature of Work	18.9	19.7	4-24
Communication	14.7	14.6	4-24
Job Satisfaction	**138.7**	**137.2**	**36-216**

*U.S. norms (Data collected from 148 samples) Education (Data collected from 14 samples) (Spector, 2011a; Spector, 2011b) ©

Class and Job Satisfaction

Findings from the current study revealed significant differences between contingent and non-contingent faculty on the job satisfaction subscales of pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, operating conditions, coworkers, and communication. Although no statistically significant differences existed for contingent rewards, nature of work, and total satisfaction, the analysis revealed a range of differences between contingent and non-contingent faculty. These differences are consistent with previous concerns highlighted in the literature review related to how the nature of contingent work within the academy may affect job satisfaction (Caruth & Caruth, 2013; Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012; Curtis & Thornton, 2013). Based on total job satisfaction scores, non-contingent faculty (M = 149.5) were more satisfied than contingent faculty (M = 145.0), although both groups reported scores above the 144 needed to be defined as satisfied (Spector, 1994).

Gender and Job Satisfaction

Caruth and Caruth (2013) assessed faculty across 4,426 institutions in the United States and found that female faculty accounted for 52% of part-time instructors. Women who received higher salaries than their male colleagues were often more credentialed (Gloss, 2011). This disparity in salary created equity challenges at institutions where faculty members were required to have doctoral degrees (Gloss, 2011). In this study, no statistically significant differences existed in the job satisfaction levels between male and female faculty. The analysis of the mean revealed that both male and female faculty were satisfied, although male faculty (M = 145.4) reported being less satisfied than female faculty (M = 148.0). This finding differs from previous studies. For instance, Sabharwal and Corley (2009) cited several studies that indicated higher job satisfaction levels among male faculty.

Lester and Bers (2010) discussed an increased level of gender equity achieved in salaries at community colleges, which differed from trends observed at 4-year institutions. In the current study, female faculty (*M* = 13.8) reported more satisfaction with pay than male faculty (M = 12.7); however, both groups fell within the ambivalent range regarding pay. Additionally, both female (*M* = 11.7) and male (*M* = 11.3) faculty were dissatisfied with promotion opportunities, and both male and female faculty reported lower mean scores for promotion (*M* = 12.2) than did Americans in the service sector. However, female faculty in this study reported slightly higher mean scores (*M* = 11.7) than higher education norms (*M* = 11.5) on the promotion subscale (Spector, 2011a).

Race/Ethnicity and Job Satisfaction

Bartholomae (2011) outlined the importance of understanding the effects of the concentration of demographically diverse faculty among contingent faculty. Such understanding can be derived from research and policy making efforts within the academy (Bartholomae, 2011). In the current study both White and non-White faculty were satisfied, although non-White faculty (*M* = 145.0) were less satisfied than their White colleagues (*M* = 147.8). This finding suggests that non-White faculty in the district experience academic work differently from their White peers. Additionally, because the supervision subscale revealed significant differences between non-White (*M* = 19.4) and White faculty (*M* = 20.9), it may be important to understand the demographic composition of leadership teams to clarify this finding. Browne and Misra (2003) pointed out that it may also be necessary to know more about faculty than their race and gender to understand different faculty groups.

Academic Achievement and Job Satisfaction

Bartholomae (2011) highlighted credentialing differences between tenure and non-tenure-track faculty and noted that that full-time non-tenure-track faculty often held master's degrees while tenure-track faculty often held doctoral degrees. Contingent faculty members may have doctoral, master's, or bachelor's degrees, depending on the academic discipline and the type of institution (Halcrow & Olson, 2011). In this study, academic achievement was not a statistically significant indicator of job satisfaction. The analysis of total job satisfaction by academic achievement revealed similar mean differences between groups. Job satisfaction scores for faculty members were as follows: bachelor's (M = 150.9), master's (M = 147.1), and doctoral/professional (M = 145.2). Although the mean scores suggest satisfaction at all levels, a trend of decreasing satisfaction was observed as level of education increased.

Academic Discipline and Job Satisfaction

Academic disciplines were not examined individually because data were collected using 13 discipline clusters (see Appendix B) and the responses across clusters were inadequate for analysis. Verret (2012) used total mean scores on JSS to assess the job satisfaction levels of science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) faculty and found that they were satisfied (M = 150.0). According to Sabharwal and Corley (2009), male faculty reported higher levels of satisfaction in all fields except social sciences where female faculty members reported greater levels of satisfaction. In an analysis of full-time faculty in nursing departments, Bittner and O'Connor (2012) found that 87% of respondents were satisfied with their jobs, while 54% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their compensation. On the promotion subscale of the current study, faculty in transfer/core disciplines (M = 10.8) were dissatisfied, while faculty in technical/vocational (M = 12.2) and continuing/developmental disciplines (M = 13.2) were

ambivalent. Transfer/core faculty were less satisfied than Americans in the service sector (*M* = 12.2) and higher education employees (*M* = 11.5). Overall, continuing/developmental faculty members were the most satisfied (*M* = 158.1), followed by technical/vocational faculty (*M* = 148.4). Transfer/core faculty were ambivalent (*M* = 142.9) about their jobs, although their mean scores were higher than those in the U.S. service sector (*M* = 138.7) and higher education norms (*M* = 137.2; Spector, 2011a; 2011b). This finding is interesting because all three academic discipline clusters yielded scores of 21 or greater on the nature of work subscale, which means other factors, such as promotion and pay, may account for lower overall scores.

Gender, Class and Job Satisfaction

Research Question 2 asked whether gender, race/ethnicity, and class interacted to predict job satisfaction. The following sections report the findings used to answer this question. The findings revealed that gender and class interacted to predict job satisfaction ($p = .03$) on the JSS. While no significant main effect existed for gender ($p = .66$), a significant main effect was found for class ($p = .05$). Additionally, female contingent and non-contingent faculty revealed that they were satisfied with their jobs, although female non-contingent faculty members (*M* = 147.6) were slightly less satisfied than their contingent counterparts (*M* = 148.4). The analysis also revealed that male non-contingent faculty members (*M* = 153.3) had the highest mean JSS while male contingent faculty members (*M* = 139.9) were the least satisfied. Although the mean scores for higher education and service sectors were similar to the male contingent faculty mean scores, the mean score for male contingent faculty (*M* = 139.9) was outside the range of 144 to 216, which is indicative of job satisfaction (Spector, 1994). As such, male contingent faculty members were not satisfied.

Assessing intersectional identities in organizational contexts is often viewed as an attempt to realign the social order by empowering traditionally marginalized groups, when in fact it highlights structural concerns that affect dominant groups with marginal demographic characteristics (Croom & Patton, 2011). For example, Caye and de Saxe Zerden (2014) highlighted the concentration of women in non-tenure-track positions. The current study included were more women than men. Additionally, non-contingent male faculty (M = 153.3) yielded the highest JSS while contingent male faculty yielded the lowest (M = 139.9) scores. Also, female non-contingent faculty (M = 147.6) were less satisfied than female contingent faculty (M = 148.4) although this difference was small. These trends highlight the importance of examining how different demographic characteristics affect perceptions and experiences at work (Browne & Misra, 2003).

Class, Race/Ethnicity and Job Satisfaction

Croom and Patton (2011) suggested looking beyond race and gender to consider how differences in class might affect employees' experiences. In the current study, no interaction between class and race/ethnicity existed to predict overall job satisfaction on the JSS. Specifically, no significant main effects existed for class (p = .55) or race/ethnicity (p = .34). In terms of overall job satisfaction non-White non-contingent faculty members (M = 143.3) were ambivalent (108 – 144) about their jobs, while, White non-contingent faculty members were satisfied (M = 151.7). A fascinating finding was that non-White contingent faculty members (M = 146.4) were more satisfied compared to White contingent faculty members (M = 144.5). It is also interesting to note that non-White, non-contingent faculty were the least satisfied (M = 143.3) faculty group.

Race/Ethnicity, Gender, and Job Satisfaction

Seifert and Umbach (2008) indicated that female faculty and faculty of color are typically less satisfied with their jobs than are White male faculty. In the current study, race/ethnicity and gender did not interact to predict overall JSS ($p = .13$). Neither the main effects for race/ethnicity ($p = .70$) nor gender ($p = .96$) were statistically significant. Although race and gender did not interact to predict job satisfaction, it is important to note that non-White female faculty ($M = 143.1$) were ambivalent while White female faculty ($M = 149.9$) were the most satisfied. An unexpected finding in this analysis was that non-White male faculty ($M = 148.4$) were more satisfied than White male faculty ($M = 144.3$). These findings partially confirm those of previous scholars; specifically, that non-White faculty and women color are often less satisfied with their jobs than are White male faculty (Seifert & Umbach, 2008). The current findings also highlight the value of looking beyond race and gender to identify differences between faculty groups when assessing job satisfaction (Croom & Patton, 2011). Based on the race/ethnicity and gender analysis, all faculty groups were more satisfied than typical higher education professionals ($M = 137.2$) and Americans in the service sector ($M = 138.7$; Spector, 2011b).

Conclusions

While it is encouraging to know that faculty members on and off the tenure track were satisfied with their jobs, it is worth noting that this study revealed layers of complexity regarding faculty job satisfaction. The series of one-way ANOVA revealed that only transfer/core faculty fell outside the 144 to 216 range, which would be indicative of job satisfaction (Spector, 1994). However, when variables were combined, three groups fell outside the range for job satisfaction. These findings highlight the importance of intersectionality to explore different outcomes based

on converging identities within organizations and society (Crenshaw, 2012). It is important to note that although transfer/core, non-White/female, male/contingent, and non-contingent/non-White were not satisfied, they also were not dissatisfied. In fact, all four groups fell within the ambivalent range (108-144; Spector, 1994). Thus, it would be a mistake to be overly optimistic or pessimistic about faculty job satisfaction at this 2-year college district until more is known about the effect of ambivalence on job performance.

Additionally, even satisfied faculty groups were marginally satisfied and on the lower end of the 144-216 range (Spector, 1994). This finding indicates opportunities for institutions to improve the faculty job experience for all demographic groups. Additionally, because data were not collected about faculty members' length of service, it is difficult to know if the mildly positive outlook captured in this study is sustainable for contingent and non-contingent faculty groups. The Coalition on the Academic Workforce (CAW, 2012) found that over 80% of contingent faculty were employed on a part-time basis for over 3 years, and 75% of contingent faculty indicated interest in tenure-track opportunities. This finding suggests there may be unexplored layers of the faculty job satisfaction paradigm that should be addressed, particularly as it relates to contingent faculty. Such insight will be invaluable as over 75% of faculty at American higher education institutions are employed on a contingent basis; though not all contingent faculty are interested in tenure-track opportunities (CAW, 2012).

The value of the instrument used in this study is that it provided insight about satisfaction with various aspects of the job, which enabled the researcher to make distinctions between what aspects of their work faculty were satisfied or dissatisfied. For instance, while faculty consistently indicated satisfaction with academic work across demographic groups on and off the tenure-track, contingent faculty were not satisfied with pay and promotion opportunities.

Additionally, some faculty members were less satisfied with their jobs as their level of academic achievement increased. To gain clearer insight, it may be necessary to capture a more complex demographic profile to understand different groups of faculty (Browne & Misra, 2003). Such complexity will allow institutions to improve the examination of additional faculty characteristics that are more cogent indicators of job satisfaction than are class, gender, race/ethnicity, academic achievement, and academic discipline. Moreover, fundamental questions should be asked about what happens to faculty job performance when they are pleased with the nature of their work but dissatisfied with communication patterns or leadership teams. Given the importance of student outcomes and the growing trend of tying funding levels to student success, answers to such questions may help institutions achieve their missions and improve faculty satisfaction with effective departmental and organizational policies.

The comparative data on Americans in the service sector and other employees in higher education confirm that overall the total job satisfaction for faculty in this study was higher than both groups. This finding may be indicative of district culture or campus-specific initiatives that mitigate lower job satisfaction levels with wages. Additionally, individuals who are interested solely in financial benefits often do not gravitate toward academic careers. Perhaps the low satisfaction with pay is a reality that faculty are willing to accept because of other benefits that are not readily available in the private sector. Still, it is important to consider the changing nature of the economy. As the number of research-oriented sectors increase, more opportunities exist to use candidates with graduate degrees in the private sector. As such, colleges and universities must be willing to compete to recruit and retain qualified faculty. Failure to be creative and agile will limit the long-term competitiveness of academic institutions. Additionally, employers in the private sector who understand the nature of academic work may

strategically leverage time-management skills and autonomy of the contingent workforce to achieve long- and short-term goals, which will make it difficult for institutions of higher education to have continued access to this pool of highly qualified and skilled professionals.

Implications

In recent years, the number of faculty jobs with non-tenure-track designations has increased considerably (Caye & de Saxe Zerden, 2014). Kezar and Sam (2014) emphasized the importance of governance to bridge the gap between vaguely articulated policies and enacting concrete change, which could yield significant benefits for contingent faculty, their respective departments, and their institutions. For example, Seifert and Umbach (2008) explored gaps in research on job satisfaction, which often failed to account for differences between academic disciplines in studies of employee satisfaction. It is also important to consider the organizational climate and contemplate implicit, structural, and operational biases at colleges and universities (Leboy & Madden, 2012); particularly as institutions seek to attract candidates from underrepresented racial and gender groups (Leboy & Madden, 2012).

Traditionally, researchers have focused more on gender than on racial differences in their analysis of STEM academic disciplines (Leboy & Madden, 2012). However, findings from the current study suggested that gender and race/ethnicity were not statistically significant indicators of job satisfaction. Perhaps additional data are needed on racial/ethnic groups to capture insight into how White and non-White faculty experience contingent and non-contingent work at the 2-year college district in this study. Additionally, although class was a statistically significant indicator of job satisfaction, when paired with other variables, the findings revealed that not all non-contingent faculty were more satisfied than contingent faculty, as was the case for female non-contingent faculty members (M = 147.6) who were less satisfied than their contingent

counterparts (M = 148.4). It is possible that factors external to the employment environment are pertinent to understanding female contingent and non-contingent jobs satisfaction trends in the 2-year college district in this study.

The analysis of job satisfaction based on academic discipline also revealed statistically significant differences between transfer/core, technical/vocational, and continuing/developmental education faculty on all subscales and on total job satisfaction. Verret (2012) highlighted gaps in the literature that address discipline-specific differences in job satisfaction. The current study addressed this gap; however, the researcher did not collect data to determine whether faculty in different academic discipline clusters reported to the same dean. Thus, because academic disciplines were clustered into three groups and administrative structures were not examined, valuable insight may be missing. Specifically, it is common for different academic disciplines to share the same academic deans in 2-year college environments. Perhaps, the administrative structure is relevant to providing a more holistic analysis of understanding faculty job satisfaction.

Typically, adjunct faculty have been hesitant to highlight their deplorable working conditions, despite the importance of providing honest insight to better serve students (Rentz, 2010). However, change will not be enacted if problems and concerns go unaddressed or are unrepresented in the consciousness of institutional leaders (Kezar & Sam, 2013). Equitable environments are important because faculty conditions appear to affect student performance (Charlier & Williams, 2011; Diegel, 2013; Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Jaeger & Eagan, 2009; Johnson, 2011; Kezar, & Sam, 2013; Ochoa, 2012). Ochoa (2012) highlighted gaps in research on student learning outcomes to clarify how a growing dependence on contingent or non-tenure-track faculty affects undergraduate student success rates. Also, as diversity on campuses

increases, traditionally underrepresented groups often mention a lack of diversity as problematic, with non-White students perceive the environment less favorably than their White peers (Lee, 2010). It is important to note that variations exist among non-White students regarding their perceptions and needs (Lee, 2010).

The over-representation of White faculty in this study should prompt administrators to question whether faculty diversity effects student outcomes at individual colleges and within the district. Lee (2010) reported that African American and Asian students perceived White faculty as less fair, respectful, and appreciative of diversity compared to White students. Serious questions should be raised about the intercultural competencies of faculty and how institutions assess the skills of contingent and non-contingent faculty groups to prepare them to interact with diverse groups of domestic and international students. While no single formula exists to integrate diverse students, institutions should consider the climate and make changes based on current and emerging needs (Lee, 2010).

Intersectionality as a theory moves beyond individual identity to provide context about how individuals are viewed and valued in society; this is important because perceptions of value often become normalized and embedded in institutional practices (Browne & Misra, 2003). The current study included six physical campuses and a virtual campus in the selected 2-year college district. As such, each college has its own leadership team, organizational culture, and demographic concerns for students and faculty. Interviews with faculty and students of color may help institutions to clarify the challenges of extricating institutional experiences from the power context within which they exist (Hooks, 2003). As such, each institution in the district should assess how to address diversity adequately beyond the racial/ethnic or gender binary to implement effective initiatives for faculty and students.

The American higher education system has been effected by decreased funding (Carroll & Burke, 2012; Crookston & Hooks, 2012; Curtis & Thornton, 2013; Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Ochoa, 2012), and as a result, contingent faculty numbers have increased and now represent the majority of faculty appointments (Curtis & Thornton, 2013). It is important to consider how changes in academic freedom, governance, and institutional support will affect their employment outlook if these trends continue (Curtis & Thornton, 2013). As such, legislators should understand that short-term savings may foster employment environments that are not conducive to realizing desired long-term educational attainment goals. It is necessary to create and nurture strong networks within and beyond the academy to inform and influence legislators and the electorate of the value of higher education in a global economy as societal structures, philosophies, and policies are enacted on campuses and in classrooms. Hooks (1994) explored the hesitation within the academy to address converging identities including gender, class, and race/ethnicity. He highlighted how power or powerlessness related to those identities are replicated in the classroom. Because student success is not achieved in a vacuum, and faculty job satisfaction is an important part of engaging students beyond the classroom, it is vital that holistic strategies be employed to overcome areas of low job satisfaction or ambivalence for contingent and non-contingent faculty. The next section includes a discussion on recommendations for future research.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future researchers should consider qualitative and mixed-methods studies to understand how reported job satisfaction operates on the individual level within different demographic and geographical contexts. In addition to individual variables, the variety of possible intersecting identities was not fully captured in the current study and may be more effectively achieved by

allowing research participants to identify themselves instead of making choices from a list provided by the researcher. Many identifying characteristics may frame how someone experiences the system and norms within an organization. To explore this complexity, Verret (2012) included gender, tenure status, family status, work-family conflict, and children in the home to understand how circumstances beyond the academy may affect job satisfaction. The results revealed that faculty with high work-family conflict had lower job satisfaction scores (M = 143.1) than did faculty with low work-family conflict (M = 153.9; Verret, 2012). Faculty participants in future job satisfaction studies should be allowed to provide descriptions of their expectations and experiences within and beyond the academy. Insight gained from such a study may clarify how administrators can provide better job orientation to minimize frustration, disappointment, and dissatisfaction with contingent and non-contingent faculty appointments.

As diversity on college campuses increases, it is important to understand how the changing tenure structure may reinforce societal inequalities. Additionally, researchers may miss cognitive and cultural complexities related to job satisfaction when faculty members of similar cultural or ethnic groups are examined as homogeneous groups. Future studies should address differences within groups to overcome such challenges. Future studies should also examine how dominant and underrepresented ethnic and cultural groups are challenged when working with or supervising cross-cultural teams.

Further, a study of job satisfaction and retention rates on individual community college campuses and within community college districts may help researchers understand whether large numbers of female faculty and administrators are related to retention rates of male faculty. It would also be important to understand whether low job satisfaction levels and retention rates of male faculty are replicated in the male student population. Finally, as institutions embrace the

addition of clinical track faculty who are not as vulnerable as contingent faculty but are less secure than tenured/tenure-track faculty, it will be important that future researchers assess job satisfaction outside the binary of tenure and non-tenure-track to determine job satisfaction trends of this growing group of faculty members.

Recommendations for Policy and Practice

A clearer understanding of contingent, non-contingent, and clinical faculty values in terms of job satisfaction may help college leaders leverage effective policies and replicate them as needed. Kezar and Maxey (2012) recommended increased inquiry to understand the changing nature of tenure. Monks (2009) recommended a closer look at the faculty needs to facilitate effective policies and provide adequate needs-based support services. Interestingly, the current study revealed that non-contingent female faculty were less satisfied than their female contingent peers. This finding implies the possible existence of external factors that make contingent work more appealing to some faculty groups (Monks, 2009). Understanding the needs of contingent and non-contingent faculty groups will help leadership implement effective policies on their respective campuses. Additionally, insight into how dissatisfied or ambivalent faculty engage diverse groups of students to achieve positive outcomes will allow institutions to meet or improve student outcomes goals.

As administrators work to implement policies, it is important to consider ways to empower faculty and assess job satisfaction to improve student outcomes and institutional effectiveness. Chen (2014) explored how the implementation of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) limited course loads for contingent faculty, particularly adjunct faculty in the 2-year college environment. The ACA included a 30-hour rule, which means that certain contingent faculty, particularly adjuncts, could qualify for health benefits (Chen, 2014). The current study revealed

that contingent faculty were dissatisfied with their fringe benefits (M = 11.94) while non-contingent (M = 16.94) faculty were satisfied. Because adjunct faculty members do not typically receive health benefits and institutions are challenged to make difficult financial decisions to avoid additional costs, it is possible that course offerings may be limited (Chen, 2014). It is also important to grasp that reductions in the course loads of contingent faculty may lead to increased course loads for non-contingent faculty, which could affect job satisfaction levels and institutional effectiveness. Moving forward, legislative leaders and administrators should implement creative initiatives to align contingent faculty compensation with health care cost so contingent faculty can afford the cost of health care without working additional jobs or depending on spouses or parents.

Bichsel and McChesney (2017) discussed the underrepresentation of minorities in administrative roles in higher education. They highlighted that, in 2016, 86% of higher education administrators were White. Bichsel and McChesney also found that although underrepresentation persisted for non-White administrators, the pay was the same and, in some cases, more than their White peers, particularly in regions with significantly lower minority representation. These findings are significant considering the current study, which found significant differences on the supervision subscale White and non-White faculty in terms of job satisfaction, with non-White faculty being less satisfied. To date, there are still more qualified White administrators; however, the representation of minority administrators continues to lag behind the pool of qualified minorities in the population (Bichsel & McChesney, 2017). However, hiring diversity for diversity alone will fail when oppressive formal and informal structures and relationships persist and go unexamined (Duncan, 2014). In addition to hiring

diverse staff, institutions should implement concrete plans to mitigate structural inequity and reduce the commodification of female and non-White employees (Duncan, 2014).

Finally, as Texas plans to improve undergraduate student success (Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board [THECB], 2015), faculty input should be invited. Faculty input can add diverse perspectives to the creation of policy and create support for policies during the implementation phase. Additionally, administrators and executive leadership teams should empower contingent and non-contingent faculty groups to be advocates for themselves. These faculty groups can provide discipline-specific, industry, and operational insight that may not be obvious to administrators and executive leadership teams. Such insight will help students achieve their goals and will help the State of Texas to compete effectively in a dynamic global economy.

REFERENCES

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C. K., & Walker, D. (2013). *Introduction to research in education*. Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning.

Ashraf, J., & Aydin, R. (2009a). Collective bargaining and academic compensation: Evidence in the 21st Century. *Southwest Business & Economics Journal, 17,* 15-21.

Ashraf, J., & Aydin, R. (2009b). Revisiting the gender earnings gap in academia: Evidence from new data. *Southern Business & Economic Journal, 32*(3/4), 1-10.

Aud, S., Wilkinson-Flicker, S., Kristapovich, P., Rathbun, A., Wang, X., & Zhang, J. (2013). *The condition of education 2013* (NCES 2013-037). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2013/2013037.pdf

Baldwin, R. G., & Wawrzynski, M. R. (2011). Contingent faculty as teachers: What we know; what we need to know. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *55,* 1485-1509. doi:10.1177 /0002764211409194

Barnshaw, J., & Dunietz, S. (2015). Busting the myths: The annual report on the economic status of the profession. *Academe, 101*(2), 4-84.

Barrett, J. J., Gillentine, A., Lamberth, J., & Daughtrey, C. L. (2002). Job satisfaction of NATABOC certified athletic trainers at division one national collegiate athletic association institutions in the southeastern conference. *International Sports Journal, 6*(2), 1-13.

Bartholomae, D. (2011). Teaching on and off the tenure track. *Pedagogy, 11,* 7-32. doi:10.1215 /15314200-2010-012

Bichsel, J., & McChesney, J. (March, 2017). *Pay and representation of racial /ethnic minorities in higher education administrative positions: The century so far*. Retrieved from www.cupahr.org/surveys/briefs.aspx

Bittner, N., & O'Connor, M. (2012). Focus on retention: Identifying barriers to nurse faculty satisfaction. *Nursing Education Perspectives, 33,* 251-254. doi:10.5480/1536-5026-33.4.251

Boe, J. (2011). Don't call me professor! *Pedagogy, 11,* 33-42. doi:10.1215/15314200-2010-013

Bowden, R. G. (2009). The postsecondary professoriate: Problems of tenure, academic freedom, and employment law. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal, 13*(3), 17-36.

Browne, I., & Misra, J. (2003). The intersection of gender and race in the labor market. *Annual Review of Sociology, 29,* 487-513. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.29.010202.100016

Carroll, N., & Burke, M. (2012). An empirical study in organizational performance. *International Journal of Business & Public Administration, 9,* 151-161.

Caruth, G., & Caruth, D. (2013). Adjunct faculty: Who are these unsung heroes of academe? *Current Issues in Education, 16*(3), 1-11.

Caye, J. S., & de Saxe Zerden, L. (2014). Development of promotion materials for social work non-tenure track faculty: Internal and external factors. *Journal of Social Work Education, 50,* 535-547. doi:10.1080/10437797.2014.916973

Charlier, H. D., & Williams, M. R. (2011). The reliance on and demand for adjunct faculty members in America's rural, suburban, and urban community colleges. *Community College Review, 39,* 160-180. doi:10.1177/0091552111405839

Chen, L. (2014). *Hearing on the impact of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) employer mandate's definition of full-time employee on jobs and opportunities* (No. 14105). Retrieved from http://www.hoover.org/sites/default/files/14105_-_chen_-_hearing_on_the_impact_of_the_aca_employer_mandates_definition_of_full-time_employee_on_jobs_and_opportunities.pdf

Coalition on the Academic Workforce. (2012, June). *A portrait of part-time faculty members: A summary of findings on part-time faculty respondents to the coalition on the academic workforce survey of contingent faculty members and instructors*. Retrieved from http://www.academicworkforce.org/CAW_portrait_2012.pdf

Coe, R. (2002). *It's the effect size, stupid: What effect size is and why it is important*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the British Educational Research Association, University of Exeter, England. September 12-14, 2002.

Crenshaw, K. W. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum,* 139-167. Retrieved from http://chicagounbound.uchicago .edu/cgi /viewcontent.cgi?article=1052&context=uclf

Crenshaw, K. W. (2012). From private violence to mass incarceration: Thinking intersectionally about women, race, and social control. *UCLA Law Review, 59,* 1418-1472.

Cronin, T., & Smith, H. (2011). Protest, exit, or deviance: Adjunct university faculty reactions to occupational rank-based mistreatment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 41,* 2352-2373. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00826.x

Crookston, A., & Hooks, G. (2012). Community colleges, budget cuts, and jobs: The impact of community colleges on employment growth in rural U.S. counties, 1976–2004. *Sociology of Education, 85,* 350-372. doi:10.1177/0038040712441376

Croom, N., & Patton, L. (2011). The miner's canary: A critical race perspective on the representation of black women full professors. *Negro Educational Review, 62/63*(1-4), 13-39.

Crosby, F. (1976). A model of egoistical relative deprivation. *Psychological Review, 83*(2), 85-113. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.83.2.85

Cox, B., McIntosh, K., Terenzini, P., Reason, R., & Lutovsky Quaye, B. (2010). Pedagogical signals of faculty approachability: Factors shaping faculty-student interaction outside the classroom. *Research in Higher Education, 51,* 767-788. doi:10.1007/s11162-010-9178-z

Curtis, J. W., & Thornton, S. (2013). Here's the news: The annual report on the economic status of the profession, 2012–13. *Academe, 99*(2), 4-86.

Curtis, J. W., & Thornton, S. (2014). Losing focus: The annual report on the economic status of the profession. *Academe, 100*(2), 4-17

Deutsch, F. M., & Yao, B. (2014). Gender differences in faculty attrition in the USA. *Community, Work & Family, 17,* 392-408. doi:10.1080/13668803.2014.885880

Diegel, B. L. (2013). Perceptions of community college adjunct faculty and division chairpersons: Support, mentoring, and professional development to sustain academic quality. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 37,* 596-607. doi:10.1080/10668926.2012.720863

Draugalis, J. R., Plaza, C. M., Taylor, D. A., & Meyer, S. M. (2014). The status of women in US academic pharmacy. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 78*(10), 1-10. doi:10.5688/ajpe7810178

Duncan, P. (2014). Hot commodities, cheap labor. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies, 35*(3), 39-63. doi:/10.5250/fronjwomestud.35.3.0039

Eagan, M. K., & Jaeger, A. (2009). Effects of exposure to part-time faculty on community college transfer. *Research in Higher Education, 50,* 168-188. doi:10.1007/s11162-008-9113-8

Ehrenberg, R. G., & Zhang, L. (2005). Do tenured and tenure-track faculty matter? *Journal of Human Resources,40,* 647-659. doi:10.3368/jhr.XL.3.647

Experiences of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty. (2010). *ASHE Higher Education Report, 36*(4), 48-75

Feldman, D. C., & Turnley, W. H. (2004). Contingent employment in academic careers: relative deprivation among adjunct faculty. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 64,* 284-307. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2002.11.003

Finkelstein, M., & Cummings, W. (2012). American faculty and their institutions: The global view. *Change, 44*(3), 48-59. doi:10.1080/00091383.2012.672882

Fjortoft, N., Winkler, S. R., & Mai, T. (2012). Pharmacy practice department chairs' perspectives on part-time faculty members. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 76*(4), 1-5. doi:10.5688/ajpe76459

Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E., & Trice, A. G. (2005). Rethinking academic work and workplaces. *Change, 37*(6), 32-39. doi:10.3200/CHNG.37.6.32-39

Gay, L. R., Mills, G., & Airasian, P. (2006). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Gloss, F. G. (2011). Declining faculty wage premiums: Analysis over time by gender in the public and private sectors. *Wagadu: A Journal of Transnational Women's & Gender Studies, 9,* 187-205.

Glover, L. C., Simpson, L. A., & Waller, L. (2009). Disparities in salaries: Metropolitan versus non-metropolitan community college faculty. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 33,* 47-54. doi:10.1080/10668920701831654

Griffin, K. A., Lunsford, L. G., Baker, V., & Johnson, W. (2013). Mentoring: A typology of costs for higher education faculty. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 21,* 126-149. doi:10.1080/13611267.2013.813725

Griffin, K. A., & Museus, S. D. (2011). Application of mixed-methods approaches to higher education and intersectional analyses. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 2011*(151), 15-26. doi:10.1002/ir.396

Gutierrez, A. P., Candela, L. L., & Carver, L. (2012). The structural relationships between organizational commitment, global job satisfaction, developmental experiences, work values, organizational support, and person-organization fit among nursing faculty., *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 68,* 1601-1614. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2648.2012.05990.x

Halcrow, C., & Olson, M. R. (2011). Adjunct faculty: Valued resource or cheap labor? *Focus on Colleges, Universities & Schools, 6,* 1-8.

Hart, J., & Mars, M. (2009). Joint appointments and the professoriate: Two houses but no home? *Innovative Higher Education, 34,* 19-32. doi:10.1007/s10755-008-9092-x

Herzog, S. (2008). A four-step faculty compensation model: From equity analysis to adjustment. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 2008*(140), 49-64. doi:10.1002/ir.269

Hooks, B. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Hooks, B. (2003). Teaching community: A pedagogy of hope (Vol. 36). New York., NY: Routledge.

Hoyt, J. (2012). Predicting the satisfaction and loyalty of adjunct faculty. *Journal of Continuing Higher Education, 60,* 132-142. doi:10.1080/07377363.2013.722417

Intellectual Rationale for Different Faculty Compensation Systems. (2001). *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*, *28*(2), 25.

Jaeger, A. J., & Eagan, M. K. (2009). Examining the effect of part-time faculty members on Associate's degree completion. *Community College Review, 36,* 167-194. doi:10.1177 /0091552108327070

Jalbert, T., Jalbert, M., & Zarraga Cano, L. (2010). Additional evidence on university rankings by cost of living adjusted faculty compensation. *Accounting & Taxation, 2,* 71-94.

Johnson, I. (2011). Contingent instructors and student outcomes: An artifact or a fact? *Research in Higher Education, 52,* 761-785. doi:10.1007/s11162-011-9219-2

Jolley, M. R., Cross, E., & Bryant, M. (2014). A critical challenge: The engagement and assessment of contingent, part-time adjunct faculty professors in United States community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 38,* 218-230. doi:10.1080/10668926.2014.851969

Kaufman, K. A. (2010). Findings from the 2009 faculty census: Study confirms reported demographic trends and inequities in faculty salaries. *Nursing Education Perspectives, 31,* 404-405.

Kelly, K., & Grant, L. (2012). Penalties and premiums: The impact of gender, marriage, and parenthood on faculty salaries in science, engineering and mathematics (SEM) and non-SEM fields. *Social Studies of Science, 42,* 869-896. doi:10.1177/0306312712457111

Kezar, A. (2013). Examining non-tenure track faculty perceptions of how departmental policies and practices shape their performance and ability to create student learning at four-year institutions. *Research in Higher Education, 54,* 571-598. doi:10.1007/s11162-013-9288-5

Kezar, A., & Lester, J. (2009). Supporting faculty grassroots leadership. *Research in Higher Education, 50,* 715-740. doi:10.1007/s11162-009-9139-6

Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (2012). Missing from the institutional data picture: Non-tenure-track faculty. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 2012*(155), 47-65. doi:10.1002/ir .20021

Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2013). Institutionalizing equitable policies and practices for contingent faculty. *Journal of Higher Education, 84,* 56-87. doi:10.1353/jhe.2013.0002

Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2014). Governance as a catalyst for policy change creating a contingent faculty friendly academy. *Educational Policy, 28,* 425-462. doi:10.1177 /0895904812465112

Kirk, F. R., & Spector, C. A. (2009). A comparison of the achievement of students taught by full-time versus adjunct faculty in business courses. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal, 15*(2), 73-81.

Landrum, R. (2009). Are there instructional differences between full-time and part-time faculty? *College Teaching, 57,* 23-26. doi:10.3200/CTCH.57.1.23-26

Langen, J. M. (2011). Evaluation of adjunct faculty in higher education institutions. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 36,* 185-196. doi:10.1080/02602930903221501

Lawrence, J. (2014). Is the tenure process fair? What faculty think. *Journal of Higher Education, 85,* 155-188. doi:10.1353/jhe.2014.0010

Leboy, P. S., & Madden, J. F. (2012). Limitations on diversity in basic science departments. *DNA & Cell Biology, 31,* 1365-1371. doi:10.1089/dna.2012.1756

Lee, J. A. (2010). Students' perceptions of and satisfaction with faculty diversity. *College Student Journal, 44,* 400-412.

Leitch, V. B. (2011). Governance matters. *Pedagogy, 11,* 539-545. doi:10.1215/15314200-1302759

Lester, J., & Bers, T. (2010). Hiring and recruiting female faculty. *New Directions For Community Colleges, 2010*(152), 41-48. doi:10.1002/cc.426

Lester, J., & Kezar, A. (2012). Faculty grassroots leadership: Making the invisible visible. *Journal of the Professoriate, 6*(2), 98-129.

Levin, J. S., & Shaker, G. G. (2011). The hybrid and dualistic identity of full-time non-tenure-track faculty. *American Behavioral Scientist, 55,* 1461-1484. doi:10.1177/0002764211409382

Manchester, C., Leslie, L. M., & Kramer, A. (2010). Stop the clock policies and career success in academia. *American Economic Review, 100,* 219-223. doi:10.1257/aer.100.2.219

Mazurek, R. A. (2011). Academic labor is a class issue: Professional organizations confront the exploitation of contingent faculty. *Journal of Workplace Rights, 16,* 353-366. doi:/10 .2190/WR.16.3-4.f

McGrew, H., & Untener, J. (2010). A primer on improving contingent faculty conditions. *Academe, 96*(4), 43-45.

McNair, D. E., & Hebert-Swartzer, C. (2012). Faculty hiring mandates: A cautionary tale. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 36,* 262-268. doi:10.1080 /10668926.2012.637862

Meixner, C., Kruck, S. E., & Madden, L. T. (2010). Inclusion of part-time faculty for the benefit of faculty and students. *College Teaching, 58,* 141-147. doi:10.1080/87567555.2010 .484032

Monks, J. (2009). Who are the part-time faculty? *Academe, 95*(4), 33-37.

Mudge, S., & Swiger, J. (2008). The effect of higher education on human capital formation: A multi-national study. *International Journal of Learning, 15,* 227-236.

Myers, C. B. (2011). Union status and faculty job satisfaction: Contemporary evidence from the 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty. *Review of Higher Education, 34,* 657-684. doi:10.1353/rhe.2011.0028

National Education Association. (n.d.). *The truth about tenure in higher education*. Retrieved from http://www.nea.org/home/33067.htm

Ochoa, A. (2012). Contingent faculty: Helping or harming students? *Journal of the Professoriate, 6,* 136-151.

O'Keefe, S., & Wang, T. (2013). Publishing pays: Economists' salaries reflect productivity. *Social Science Journal, 50,* 45-54. doi:10.1016/j.soscij.2012.09.008

Pallant, J. (2016). *SPSS survival manual*. United Kingdom: McGraw-Hill Education.

Palmquist, M., Doe, S., McDonald, J., Newman, B. M., Samuels, R., & Schell, E. (2011). Statement on the status and working conditions of contingent faculty. *College English, 73,* 356-359.

Park, T. (2012). Do faculty members get what they deserve? A review of the literature surrounding the determinants of salary, promotion and tenure. *Journal of the Professoriate, 6,* 28-47.

Pfeiffenberger, J. A., Rhome, D. H., Cutler, S. J., Oliveira, M. A., Whalen, K. L., Radhakrishnan, R., & Jordan, R. P. (2014). Perceptions of tenure and tenure reform in academic pharmacy. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 78,* 1-10. doi:10.5688 /ajpe78475

Reevy, G. M., & Deason, G. (2014). Predictors of depression, stress, and anxiety among non-tenure track faculty. *Frontiers in Psychology, 5*1-32. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00701

Rentz, K. (2010). Standing up for good teaching: The business communication academic as activist. *Business Communication Quarterly, 73,* 5-15. doi:10.1177/1080569909358677

Rose, G. L., & Rukstalis, M. R. (2008). Imparting medical ethics: The role of mentorship in clinical training. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 16,* 77-89. doi:10.1080 /13611260701801031

Ryan, J., Healy, R., & Sullivan, J. (2012). Oh, won't you stay? Predictors of faculty intent to leave a public research university. *Higher Education, 63,* 421-437. doi:10.1007/s10734-011-9448-5

Sabharwal, M., & Corley, E. A. (2009). Faculty job satisfaction across gender and discipline. *Social Science Journal, 46,* 539-556. doi:10.1016/j.soscij.2009.04.015

Schulz, E., & Tanguay, D. (2006). Merit pay in a public higher education institution: Questions of impact and attitudes. *Public Personnel Management, 35,* 71-88. doi:10.1177 /009102600603500105

Schutz, K. R., Drake, B. M., & Lessner, J. (2013). Do community college full-time and adjunct faculties differ in their perceptions of rigor in assigning grades? *American Journal of Business Research, 6*(2), 59-79.

Schwartz, J. M. (2014). Resisting the exploitation of contingent faculty labor in the neoliberal university: The challenge of building solidarity between tenured and non-tenured faculty. *New Political Science, 36,* 504-522. doi:10.1080/07393148.2014.954803

Seifert, T., & Umbach, P. (2008). The effects of faculty demographic characteristics and disciplinary context on dimensions of job satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 49,* 357-381. doi:10.1007/s11162-007-9084-1

Smith, H. J., Cronin, T., & Kessler, T. (2008). Anger, fear, or sadness: Faculty members' emotional reactions to collective pay disadvantage. *Political Psychology, 29,* 221-246. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2008.00624.x

Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 13,* 693-713. doi:10 .1007/BF00929796

Spector, P. E. (1992). *Summated rating scale construction: An introduction* (No. 82). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Spector, P. E. (1994). *Interpreting satisfaction scores with the Job Satisfaction Survey*. Retrieved from http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pSpector/scales/jssinterpretation.html

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Spector, P. E. (2011a). *Job satisfaction survey norms. Higher education United States*. Retrieved from: http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pSpector/scales/jssnorms.html

Spector, P. E. (2011b). *Job satisfaction survey norms. Norms for Total U.S.* Retrieved from: http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pSpector/scales/jssnorms.html

Stenerson, J., Blanchard, L., Fassiotto, M., Hernandez, M., & Muth, A. (2010). The role of adjuncts in the professoriate. *Peer Review, 12*(3), 23-26.

Stripling, J. (2011). (2011 May 15). Most presidents prefer no tenure for majority of faculty. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com /article/Most-Presidents-Favor-No/127526/

Sulé, V. T. (2014). Enact, discard, and transform: A critical race feminist perspective on professional socialization among tenured black female faculty. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 27,* 432-453. doi:10.1080/09518398.2013.780315

Tang, T., & Tang, T. (2012). The love of money, pay satisfaction and academic tenure: Professors in a public institution of higher education. *Public Personnel Management, 41,* 97-126.

Tensions. (2010). *ASHE Higher Education Report, 36*(5), 39-62.

Tenure-track. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/tenure track

Terpstra, D. E., & Honoree, A. L. (2009). Merit pay plans in higher education institutions: Characteristics and effects. *Public Personnel Management, 38*(4), 55-77. doi:10.1177 /009102600903800404

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. (2015, July 23). *Texas higher education strategic plan 2015–2030*. Retrieved from http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/reports/PDF/6862.PDF ?CFID=41531877&CFTOKEN=29618147

Thirolf, K. Q. (2012). The faculty identities of community college adjuncts teaching in the humanities: A discourse analysis study. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 36,* 269-278. doi:10.1080/10668926.2012.637864

Thirolf, K. Q. (2013). How faculty identity discourses of community college part-time faculty change over time. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 37,* 177-184. doi:10.1080/10668926.2013.739511

Thornton, S., & Curtis, J. W. (2012). A very slow recovery: The annual report on the economic status of the profession, 2011–12. *Academe, 98*(2), 4-15. Retrieved from https://www .aaup.org/sites/default/files/files/zreport.pdf

Trower, C. A. (2010). A new generation of faculty: Similar core values in a different world. *Peer Review, 12*(3), 27-30.

Tuckman, B. W., & Harper, B. E. (2012). *Conducting educational research*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Van Ummersen, C. A. (2005). No talent left behind. *Change, 37*(6), 26-31. doi:10.3200/CHNG.37.6.27-31

Verret, L. B. (2012). *Factors affecting university STEM faculty job satisfaction* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Louisiana State University.

Weinbaum, E. S., & Page, M. (2014). Solidarity: An argument for faculty unity. *New Labor Forum, 23,* 14-16. doi:10.1177/1095796013512797

Weinberg, S. L. (2008). Monitoring faculty diversity: The need for a more granular approach. *Journal of Higher Education, 79,* 365-387. doi:10.1353/jhe.0.0014

Worrell, D. L. (2009). Assessing business scholarship: The difficulties in moving beyond the rigor-relevance paradigm trap. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 8,* 127-130. doi:10.5465/AMLE.2009.37012187

Yining, C., Gupta, A., & Hoshower, L. (2006). Factors that motivate business faculty to conduct research: An expectancy theory analysis. *Journal of Education for Business, 81,* 179-189. doi:10.3200/JOEB.81.4.179-189

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY

APPENDIX A

JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY

	JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY Paul E. Spector Department of Psychology University of South Florida Copyright Paul E. Spector 1994, All rights reserved.	
	PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION ABOUT IT.	Disagree very much Disagree moderately Disagree slightly Agree slightly Agree moderately Agree very much
1	I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	1 2 3 4 5 6
2	There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.	1 2 3 4 5 6
3	My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	1 2 3 4 5 6
4	I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.	1 2 3 4 5 6
5	When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	1 2 3 4 5 6
6	Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.	1 2 3 4 5 6
7	I like the people I work with.	1 2 3 4 5 6
8	I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.	1 2 3 4 5 6
9	Communications seem good within this organization.	1 2 3 4 5 6
10	Raises are too few and far between.	1 2 3 4 5 6
11	Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	1 2 3 4 5 6
12	My supervisor is unfair to me.	1 2 3 4 5 6
13	The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	1 2 3 4 5 6
14	I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.	1 2 3 4 5 6
15	My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.	1 2 3 4 5 6
16	I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.	1 2 3 4 5 6
17	I like doing the things I do at work.	1 2 3 4 5 6
18	The goals of this organization are not clear to me.	1 2 3 4 5 6

	PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION ABOUT IT. Copyright Paul E. Spector 1994, All rights reserved.	Disagree very much / Disagree moderately / Disagree slightly / Agree slightly / Agree moderately / Agree very much
19	I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.	1 2 3 4 5 6
20	People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	1 2 3 4 5 6
21	My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.	1 2 3 4 5 6
22	The benefit package we have is equitable.	1 2 3 4 5 6
23	There are few rewards for those who work here.	1 2 3 4 5 6
24	I have too much to do at work.	1 2 3 4 5 6
25	I enjoy my coworkers.	1 2 3 4 5 6
26	I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.	1 2 3 4 5 6
27	I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	1 2 3 4 5 6
28	I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	1 2 3 4 5 6
29	There are benefits we do not have which we should have.	1 2 3 4 5 6
30	I like my supervisor.	1 2 3 4 5 6
31	I have too much paperwork.	1 2 3 4 5 6
32	I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.	1 2 3 4 5 6
33	I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	1 2 3 4 5 6
34	There is too much bickering and fighting at work.	1 2 3 4 5 6
35	My job is enjoyable.	1 2 3 4 5 6
36	Work assignments are not fully explained.	1 2 3 4 5 6

APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

Gender

- Male
- Female

Current faculty rank

- Full-time: Tenured
- Full-time: On tenure-track
- Part-time: Adjunct
- Full-time: Temporary

Other_____

Race/Ethnicity:

_____ African American/Black
_____ American Indian/Alaskan Native
_____ Asian
_____ Hispanic/Latino
_____ Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
_____ White
_____ Mixed Race (2 or more)
_____ Other

What is the highest level of education you have achieved?

- Bachelor's Degree
- Master's Degree (M.A., M.S., M.Ed. etc.)
- Professional or Doctoral Degree (MBA, Ph.D., Ed.D, MD, JD, etc)

What academic discipline do you teach?

- Arts: Dance: Drama / Theater: Graphic Communication: Music: Photography: Visual Arts
- Business: Accounting: Architecture: Business: Economics: Fashion Merchandising etc.
- Communication: Graphic Communication: Speech: etc.
- Developmental Studies: Developmental Studies / Math: Reading and Writing etc.
- Education: Child Development: Library Technology: Teacher Education etc.
- Health: Dance: Dental Hygiene: Nursing: Respiratory Care: Surgical Technology etc.
- Languages: English: English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL): French: Spanish etc.
- Math & Sciences: Biology: Chemistry: Mathematics: Physics / Astronomy
- Public Service / Public Safety: Criminal Justice: Emergency Medical Services: Fire etc.
- Social Sciences: Economics: Government: History: Humanities: Psychology: Sociology etc.
- Technology: Architecture: Automotive: Engineering: Welding Technology
- Transportation Technology: Automotive: Aviation:
- Continuing Education

APPENDIX C

FACULTY LETTERS

APPENDIX C

FACULTY LETTERS

Dear _____ College Faculty Member,

With _____ College administrative consent, faculty members are invited to take part in a research study that will examine job satisfaction levels. Faculty are invited to click on the link below to complete a survey regarding their experiences as instructional staff. Faculty will be asked to rate their satisfaction with pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, coworkers, nature of work, and satisfaction at _____ College.

The opening page of the survey provides consent information. It should take faculty no more than 15 minutes to complete the demographic information and survey. The professional insight of community college faculty will be valuable to this study. Results of this research study may be beneficial to faculty, to administrators who supervise faculty, and to the community colleges that depend upon faculty to educate college students. If faculty members have any questions or concerns about this study, please feel free to contact the researcher, Denecia Spence at dspence1@leomail.tamuc.edu.

Respectfully,

Denecia Spence
Doctoral Candidate Texas A&M University-Commerce
Department of Educational Leadership
682-556-9042
dspence1@leomail.tamuc.edu

FACULTY E-MAIL REMINDER

Dear Tarrant County College Faculty Member,

One week ago, faculty members at Tarrant County College were invited to complete a Job Satisfaction survey regarding their experiences as teaching faculty members. Thank you for your participation. This research is part of a dissertation project. Your Participation is voluntary. You may choose not to take part and you may choose to stop taking part at any time. You can reference that this study has gone through the IRB process at TCCD and has been approved for dissertation research. The approval information is listed here for your convenience: Approval # IRB_2016_17_Spence.

Faculty, who have not yet had the chance to complete the survey are invited to do so by clicking on the link provided below. The survey will close on October 12th 2016. The professional insight of faculty is very much appreciated.

Survey Link: https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSelVShjjZXDExEG0u3FNQsrj_UInjVno6h8Eb9h9W6TSbqjyA/viewform

Respectfully,

Denecia Spence
Doctoral Candidate Texas A&M University-Commerce
Department of Educational Leadership
dspence1@leomail.tamuc.edu

APPENDIX D

INSTRUMENT LETTERS

APPENDIV D

INSTRUMENT PERMISSION LETTER

February 28, 2016

Paul Spector
Department of Psychology,
PCD4118G,
University of South Florida,
Tampa, FL 33620 USA.

Dear Dr. Spector

My name is Denecia Spence and I am a doctoral candidate in the department of Educational Leadership at Texas A&M University-Commerce. I am writing to request your permission to use the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) as the instrument to collect information for my dissertation. I am currently refining my proposal to study job satisfaction for contingent and non-contingent faculty. I hope to understand variations between the job-satisfaction levels of full-time and part-time contingent and non-contingent faculty and clarify how the paired variables of gender and race/ethnicity may impact job satisfaction scores on the JSS.

I found your work on job satisfaction very helpful, and have already referenced several of your projects in my proposal. I will share my results with you via email, after data collection and analysis. Thank you for making this instrument available to educators. Please confirm your permission to use the Job Satisfaction Survey for my dissertation entitled: Faculty Job Satisfaction at a Public 2-Year College in Texas, by emailing me at decispence@yahoo.com or dspence1@leomail.tamuc.edu. If you have additional questions about the project, please feel free to contact me at 682-556-9042. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Denecia Spence
Doctoral Candidate Texas A&M University-Commerce
Department of Educational Leadership
682-556-9042
dspence1@leomail.tamuc.edu

Dear Denecia:

You have my permission for noncommercial research/teaching use of the JSS. You can find copies of the scale in the original English and several other languages, as well as details about the scale's development and norms. I allow free use for noncommercial research and teaching purposes in return for sharing of results. This includes student theses and dissertations, as well as other student research projects. Copies of the scale can be reproduced in a thesis or dissertation as long as the copyright notice is included, "Copyright Paul E. Spector 1994, All rights reserved." Results can be shared by providing an e-copy of a published or unpublished research report (e.g., a dissertation). You also have permission to translate the JSS into another language under the same conditions in addition to sharing a copy of the translation with me. Be sure to include the copyright statement, as well as credit the person who did the translation with the year.

Thank you for your interest in the JSS, and good luck with your research.

Best,

Paul Spector, Distinguished Professor

Department of Psychology

PCD 4118

University of South Florida

Tampa, FL 33620

813-974-0357

pspector [at symbol] usf.edu

http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~spector

APPENDIX E

INFORMED CONSENT

APPENDIX E

INFORMED CONSENT

Information about Being in a Research Study
Texas A&M University-Commerce

FACULTY JOB SATISFACTION AT A PUBLIC 2-YEAR COLLEGE DISTRICT IN TEXAS

Description of the Study and Your Part in It

Dr. JoHyun Kim, is inviting you to take part in a research study. Dr. Kim is an Assistant Professor at Texas A&M University-Commerce in the Department of Educational Leadership. Denecia Spence is a doctoral candidate at Texas A&M University-Commerce in the Department of Educational Leadership, and is conducting this study with the help of Dr. JoHyun Kim. The purpose of this research is to examine the similarities and differences between the faculty job satisfaction/dissatisfaction and clarify how the demographic characteristics of gender and race/ethnicity are related to the job satisfaction scores.

Your part in the study will be to complete a demographic questionnaire and answer a 36 question Job Satisfaction Survey.

It will take you about 15 minutes to answer the questionnaire and survey online.

Risks and Discomforts

There will be minimal risks, no more than that expected in daily life.

Possible Benefits

This study may provide administrators with information to improve faculty job satisfaction at public 2-year community colleges. The information collected and analyzed during this research study may help us to understand the perspectives of different faculty groups.

Incentives

No financial or other compensation will be offered.

Protection of Privacy and Confidentiality

Your participation will be confidential and you will not be required to disclose your identity or the identity of your institution. Data will be stored on an encrypted external drive and stored in the Department of Educational Leadership at the end of the study. Dr. JoHyun Kim will have access to all data to ensure confidentiality. These data will be stored for three years.

Choosing to Be in the Study

You do not have to be in this study. Participation is voluntary. You may choose not to take part and you may choose to stop taking part at any time without penalty. You will not be punished in any way if you decide not to be in the study or to stop taking part in the study.

Contact Information

If you have any questions or concerns about this study or if any problems arise, please contact the researcher at

Denecia Spence
Department of Leadership
Texas A&M University-Commerce
903-468-5083
dspence1@leomail.tamuc.edu

or the advisor at

Dr. JoHyun Kim
Assistant Professor
Department of Educational Leadership
Texas A&M University-Commerce
903-468-5083
JoHyun.Kim@tamuc.edu

If you have any questions or concerns about your rights in this research study, please contact the IRB Chair at

Dr. Tara Tietjen-Smith
Chair, Institutional Review Board (IRB)
Department of Health & Human Performance
Texas A&M University-Commerce
Commerce, TX 75429-3011
(903) - 886 - 5545
IRB@tamuc.edu

Consent

By beginning the survey you acknowledge that you are at least 18 years old, have read this consent form, have understood the above information, and agree to voluntarily participate in this research.
If you would like a copy of this form for your reference, you may print this out.

VITA

Denecia Spence, is the second of four children born to Mr. and Mrs. Spence. Ms. Spence is a graduate of the University of Texas at Arlington, where she completed her Bachelor of Arts Degree in 2006. She earned her Master of Science degree in Higher Education Administration in 2010 and her Doctor in Higher Educational Leadership in 2017 from Texas A&M University-Commerce.

Permanent Address:
P.O. Box 3011 / Young Education North #113
Department of Educational Leadership
Texas A&M University-Commerce
Commerce, TX 75429-3011
Email: decispence@yahoo.com