

University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

9-1992

Part-time faculty satisfaction and reward systems.

William E. Thompson
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Thompson, William E., "Part-time faculty satisfaction and reward systems." (1992). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 1439.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/1439>

This Master's Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

PART-TIME FACULTY SATISFACTION AND REWARD SYSTEMS

By

**William E. Thompson
B.S., University of Missouri, 1977**

**A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of the University of Louisville
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of**

Master of Arts

**Department of Administration and Higher Education
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky**

September 1992

PART-TIME FACULTY SATISFACTION AND REWARD SYSTEMS

By

**William E. Thompson
B.S., University of Missouri, 1977**

A Thesis Approved on

Sept 23, 1982

by the following Reading Committee

Thesis Director

Abstract

This document is a study of part-time faculty at the University of Louisville. The data collection, conducted by a questionnaire mailed to all part-time faculty members, developed a demographic profile of the university's part-time faculty as well as a profile within the taxonomy of part-time faculty motivation described by Tuckman. After establishing that profile, a comparative analysis of the level of satisfaction and desired reward systems was conducted. This study provides initial data about the composition of part-time faculty at this four-year institution and provides possible strategies for college and university administrators planning part-time faculty compensation and recognition programs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. Statement of the Problem	
B. Purpose of the Study	
C. Importance of the Study	
D. Delimitations and Limitations of the Study	
E. Definition of Terms	
F. Data Analysis	
G. Organization of the Chapters	
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	12
A. Salary as Dissatisfier	
B. Fringe Benefits as Dissatisfiers	
C. Job Satisfaction Among Part-Time Faculty Members	
D. Dissatisfaction Among Certain Classes of Part-Time Faculty	
E. Reward Structures for Part-Time Faculty	
III. THE METHOD OF STUDY.....	25
A. The Sample	
B. The Survey Instrument	
C. The Data Analysis	

IV.	DATA ANALYSIS	31
	A. Differences Between the 1988 and 1989 Samples	
	B. A Portrait of the University's Part-Time Faculty	
	C. Part-Time Faculty Motivation	
	D. Satisfaction Levels and Satisfiers	
V.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	55
	A. Summary of the Results	
	B. Policy Recommendations	
	C. Recommendations for Future Studies	
APPENDIX		
	A. PART-TIME FACULTY SURVEY	67
	B. PART-TIME FACULTY NARRATIVE COMMENTS	74
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	84
	VITA	87

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
TABLE 1. PORTRAIT OF PART-TIME FACULTY MEMBERS COMPARING 1988 AND 1989 UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE SAMPLES WITH TUCKMAN'S NATIONAL SURVEY	33
TABLE 2. SATISFACTION OF UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE PART-TIME FACULTY	36
TABLE 3. PERCENTAGE OF INCOME RECEIVED FROM PART-TIME TEACHING, BY DECILES	37
TABLE 4. TUCKMAN'S PART-TIME FACULTY MOTIVATION CATEGORIES: A COMPARISON OF TUCKMAN'S NATIONAL SURVEY WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE SURVEY	39
TABLE 5. PART-TIME FACULTY SATISFACTION LEVELS BY YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE	44
TABLE 6. RANKED LISTING OF SATISFIERS FOR PART-TIME FACULTY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE	46
TABLE 7. RANKING OF ABOVE-MEAN SATISFIERS FOR UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE PART-TIME FACULTY, BY TUCKMAN'S MOTIVATION CLASSIFICATIONS	49

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

During the past 20 years, the number of part-time faculty at colleges and universities in the United States has undergone tremendous growth. Between 1970 and 1984 the number of part-time faculty more than doubled (Grant & Synder, 1986).

Unfortunately, the growing importance of part-time faculty within American higher education has not been accompanied by a similar growth of knowledge about this increasingly vital element of the university system. Published information about part-time faculty has largely been anecdotal, and the research needed to help administrators establish coherent and efficient personnel policies has been lacking. This study will start to draw together a base of knowledge that will allow part-time faculty members to be integrated more effectively into the university environment.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to establish a profile of part-time faculty members at the University of Louisville, an urban institution, and then explore relationships between motivations for teaching and desired reward systems.

Purpose of the Study

Part-time faculty are becoming a much larger presence in the nation's colleges and universities. Between 1970 and 1984, the number of part-time faculty grew from 104,000 to 245,000. The percentage of the total college faculty represented by part-timers has also increased dramatically. In 1970, just 21% of the nation's college teachers were part-timers. By 1984 that figure had increased to 35% (Grant & Synder, 1986).

While a great part of that growth occurred in junior colleges, where the number of part-time faculty grew 88% in the four years between 1973 and 1977 (Gappa, 1984), there has been significant growth in part-time faculty at four-year institutions as well. It was estimated that 42% of the total teaching staff at these colleges and universities were part-timers in 1985 (Grant & Synder, 1986).

This extraordinary growth in the number of part-time faculty has presented college administrators with new personnel management problems as the number of part-timers has become larger and they have become increasingly organized and vocal in communicating their concerns (Heller, 1987).

As a result, careful study is necessary to determine elements of the part-time teaching experience that foster the most discontent. Such

information could help college administrators develop management guidelines for the most efficient use of institutional resources so as to gain positive part-time faculty involvement in the university's missions.

Importance of the Study

While there are a number of studies, both anecdotal and quantitative, that examine the dissatisfactions of part-time faculty, the findings from this research project are intended to add definitive information about the rewards part-time faculty members view as potential satisfiers.

According to Herzberg (1959), the job factors that caused satisfaction for workers were quite different from those elements of a job that prompted dissatisfaction. For instance, while Herzberg found salary level was often listed as a cause of dissatisfaction, increased salary did not usually result in sustained job satisfaction. Those dissatisfiers, called hygiene factors, included company policy and administration, working conditions and interpersonal relations with supervisors.

Conversely, there were five strong factors that were mentioned very rarely as prompting dissatisfaction, but that produced strong and long-lasting job satisfaction levels. Those satisfiers were achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility and advancement.

Virtually all the literature on part-time faculty examines

dissatisfiers. For instance, there are numerous personal reminiscences scattered through the literature complaining about the treatment of part-time faculty members. Spofford (1979) described vast salary inequities between part-time and full-time faculty. He classified part-time faculty as the "field hands of academe," slaves in the plantation system of modern universities, workers who toil at low wages at the university's fundamental tasks to preserve the class structure and perquisites of the privileged tenured class.

Wilson (1984) stocked her article with horror stories about the hours of commuting undertaken by colleagues who try to assemble part-time positions at two or three colleges into a subsistence salary. She complained of last-minute calls to teach new classes opened because of enrollment pressure and last-minute calls cancelling classes with insufficient enrollment. She noted the frustrations of developing professionally without support for research projects or travel and the difficulty of teaching if one did not have the simplest of institutional supports, like office space and secretarial help.

Wallace (1984) duplicated the litany of complaints voiced by the other articles and detailed the problems part-time faculty encounter because of the lack of health and unemployment insurance, sick leave, retirement

plans and other fringe benefits.

There have been a limited number of articles that have made more systematic examinations of the compensation systems for part-time faculty members. However, they too studied reasons for part-time faculty dissatisfaction rather than inquiring about possible satisfiers.

In a national study of part-time faculty, Tuckman, Caldwell and Vogler (1978) found part-time college faculty members were paid about 25% to 35% less than full-time faculty. In the California Community Colleges (1987), where the difference in salaries was almost 39%, the disparity was even more profound.

Given the profusion of articles detailing the salary disparities between part-time and full-time faculty, a surprising finding supporting Herzberg's position emerges from the few studies that have more objectively examined the role salaries have in part-time faculty satisfaction.

For example, Leslie, Kellam and Gunne (1982) found economic considerations ranked lower than aesthetic reasons for teaching among the satisfiers of part-time teachers. Among part-time faculty polled, economic considerations only placed fourth among their reasons for teaching.

What this seems to indicate is that higher education administrators, even in the absence of significant financial resources, might have the ability to alter their non-salary personnel management policies and significantly increase part-time faculty satisfaction. What is needed to guide those policy changes is greater knowledge about the characteristics of part-time faculty. Among those questions that must be answered are the following:

Since most previous studies have concentrated on the experiences of part-time faculty at two-year colleges, what are the characteristics of part-time faculty at the university level? What reward structures are desired by part-time faculty? Finally, what compensation systems and personnel management practices might promote satisfaction for part-time faculty at four-year colleges and universities?

With continuing financial difficulties hampering higher education, it is most likely that part-time faculty will be an important presence in fulfilling the university's teaching mission in the years to come. This study suggests a strategy as to where best to concentrate institutional resources and efforts to integrate part-time faculty into the academy. That integration is vital if the university is to progress in a time of financial stress.

Delimitations and Limitations of the Study

Because of the institutional focus of the study, the data collected in this project has some delimitations. Because the survey has a limited scope, querying only the part-time faculty at the University of Louisville, a medium-sized urban university, the applicability of its results to other institutions, especially those in rural areas, might be profoundly different.

Definitions of Terms

Part-time faculty - Part-time faculty were defined under the same criteria as those used by Tuckman (1978) so results from this survey can be checked against findings of other studies. These studies defined part-time faculty as those college faculty who teach less than a full-time load at a single institution, but excluded students who are seeking a degree at the same institution at which they teach, or faculty with a regular full-time appointment who are teaching a reduced load or are receiving supplements to their regular teaching income because of overload teaching.

Additionally, part-time faculty were further classified using Tuckman's (1978) taxonomy which categorized part-time faculty into seven categories based upon their motivations to teach in part-time positions.

The criteria for those classifications are as follows:

Semiretireds - former full-time academics who had reduced their

teaching involvement to part-time duties.

Students - graduate students employed at institutions other than the one they were attending.

Hopeful full-timers - people who wanted full-time academic careers but could not find full-time teaching positions.

Full-mooners - individuals who held another, primary job of at least 35 hours a week.

Homeworkers - people who were limited in the number of hours they could work because of child care and other domestic responsibilities.

Part-mooners - part-time instructors who held a second job of under 35 hours elsewhere.

Part-unknowners - individuals whose motivations for teaching were not known or could not be classified in the other six categories.

Data Analysis

This study has examined the importance part-time faculty at the University of Louisville placed on various satisfiers, including higher pay scales, fringe benefits, prestige rewards and greater autonomy. The study has also delineated different categories of part-time faculty to determine if their reasons for teaching part-time could help predict the rewards they desired from their teaching activities.

The evaluation instrument for accomplishing this was a questionnaire mailed to all University of Louisville part-time faculty at their campus addresses. The university's payroll office indicated the University of Louisville had 348 academic employees who met these criteria for part-time faculty members.

The questionnaire was adapted from one used to survey part-time faculty members at Ohio colleges and universities (Yang & Zak, 1981). The questionnaire used in the current study was structured so faculty could not only be classified within Tuckman's taxonomy (1978), but it also asked for information about gender, work load, educational level, and income derived from part-time teaching so that additional meaningful demographic identifiers about part-time faculty satisfaction and desired reward systems could be established.

The survey was administered to all university part-time instructors on two separate occasions, in April 1988 and April 1989. A copy of the survey instrument is attached as Appendix A.

After the questionnaire was returned by part-time faculty members, a statistical analysis of the data was completed. Initially, the survey was useful in establishing a portrait of the University of Louisville's part-time faculty, indicating their motivations for teaching, their education levels,

other employment and dependence on their part-time teaching income. By comparing the means of demographic data from the 1988 and 1989 surveys, it was determined if there had been substantial changes in the composition or characteristics of the university's part-time faculty. Any other changes in administrative or environmental conditions that might have affected faculty responses were detected through an analysis of written narratives provided by part-time faculty who completed both the 1988 and 1989 surveys.

After that base-line data was discovered and the part-time faculty classified within Tuckman's taxonomy of motivation, the data was examined to discover any relationships between the personal characteristics of part-time faculty and their satisfaction with part-time employment. A similar examination was conducted to discover if there were relationships between Tuckman's categories of part-time faculty and desired rewards.

Organization of the Chapters

This chapter presented an overview of the project. It defined the problem, discussed the rationale for the study, indicated limitations of the study and established necessary definitions of terms.

The second chapter will put the present study within the perspective

of past research. It will examine studies concerning salaries, fringe benefits and services offered part-time university academic personnel as well as part-time faculty satisfaction levels.

Chapter three will discuss the design of the survey instrument, describe the sample chosen for the survey and indicate the methods by which the data was compiled and evaluation categories into which the information will be classified.

The fourth chapter will first establish a statistical profile based on the survey of part-time faculty at the University of Louisville. Then it will examine the correlation between Tuckman's taxonomy of part-time faculty motivation and faculty satisfaction, as well as between Tuckman's categories and reward systems desired by part-time faculty.

The final chapter will summarize the study's major findings and discuss possible applications for the research results. It will also indicate possible improvements in the research project's design and suggest additional studies that could be undertaken to extend our understanding of the problem.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter I briefly noted articles written by part-timers that have recalled anecdotes for their being dissatisfied with their positions. Many of those articles seemed to concentrate on the emotional and spiritual degradations of part-time teaching, focusing on inadequate office facilities and secretarial services that prevent part-time faculty from fully realizing their potential. Others have lamented a demoralizing lack of recognition of the part-timer's role in the success of higher educational institutions.

Only a very few of the limited number of part-time faculty surveys have confirmed that these psychic transgressions against part-timers's spirits were the dominant complaints that part-timers had against their colleges and universities.

For instance, among the part-time faculty polled by Eliason (1980), the most frequent complaints were, in order: (a) inadequate facilities and resources for student advisement; (b) lack of secretarial and reproduction services; and (c) inadequate budgets for academic and support materials. In a study of nursing faculty, Hawkins (1987) found that the number one reason part-timers listed for their dissatisfaction was the lack of opportunity to

advance within the academic ranks.

Salary as Dissatisfier

However, in the overwhelming majority of investigations where systematic research of part-time faculty satisfaction has been undertaken, there is evidence indicating that lack of financial rewards were the primary reasons for the discontent among part-timers. For instance, Feldman and Keidel (1987) found part-time faculty satisfaction increased as perceived salary increased. While 39% of those part-timers who felt they were being paid equitably had high levels of dissatisfaction, 60% of those who thought they were inequitably compensated had high dissatisfaction levels.

In another study of part-time nursing faculty, Feldman and Keidel (1987) asked part-timers what they disliked about part-time teaching. In their study, the two sources of discontent most often mentioned were lack of fringe benefits and perceived inequities in salaries. Following those complaints were, in order, lack of office space, lack of recognition for their contributions to the institution, professional isolation, short notification of teaching assignments and a lack of feedback from administrators.

The California Community Colleges (1987) poll of their part-time

faculty reinforced that concern over finances. The California faculty's major complaints were: (a) lack of job security; (b) lack of fringe benefits; (c) inadequate compensation and insufficient teaching hours; and (d) lack of secretarial and other support services.

Even in Hawkins' (1987) study of nursing faculty cited above, about 60% of the part-time faculty Hawkins surveyed indicated they were dissatisfied with the fringe benefits they received and 45% were not satisfied with their salaries.

Studies that have focused on the relative compensation levels for part-time and full-time faculty members show that part-timers' complaints have some merit.

In a national study of part-time faculty, Tuckman, Caldwell and Vogler (1978) found part-time college faculty members were paid about 25% to 35% less than full-time faculty. In the California Community Colleges (1987) the difference in salaries was even more profound. There the disparity between part-time and full-time faculty pay was almost 39% if fringe benefits were omitted from the calculations and over 45% if fringe benefits were included.

The California study suggested that part-time faculty dissatisfaction might be heightened not only by the disparity between part-time and

full-time salaries, but also by the seeming irrationality of part-time faculty compensation. The California research discovered that during the first 10 years of teaching, part-timers receive about two-thirds of the hourly wage received by full-time faculty members with the same skills and experience. However, as part-timers' teaching seniority grows, their relative pay drops. Part-timers with over 10 years teaching experience receive only one-half the per-hour salary of full-time faculty.

There is other evidence of the irrationality of part-time pay scales. Tuckman and Caldwell (1979) found that 65% of the variation in full-time faculty salaries was accounted for by differences in education, experience and the quality of institution the faculty member attended. Among part-timers, the same factors accounted for only 20% of the salary variation. From that, the two researchers concluded that institutional policies and market differences, not individual abilities and experience, were the most important factors in determining part-time salary levels.

Fringe Benefits as Dissatisfiers

Similar disparities prevailed when fringe benefits were researched. Tuckman and Vogler (1978) found that while 96.3% of all full-time faculty had medical insurance provided by their institutions, only 6.3% of part-time faculty working a half-time teaching load were provided medical

insurance coverage. Only 2.8% of part-time faculty were offered life insurance by their institutions, compared to 84.1% of full-timers. Just 11.1% of those part-time faculty were offered paid sick leave, only 12.5% were included in the college's retirement plan and just 39.4% were covered by unemployment insurance.

Other studies corroborated these statistics. In Smith's survey (1986), only five of the 84 responding private junior colleges across the nation offered part-timers any fringe benefits. Feldman and Keidel (1987) found part-time nursing faculty had slightly higher benefits than other part-timers, but still substantially lower than full-time nursing faculty.

Job Satisfaction Among Part-Time Faculty Members

Given the profusion of articles detailing and documenting the complaints of part-time faculty, a surprising finding emerges from the few studies that have more objectively examined part-time faculty satisfaction. Universally, those researchers have found the majority of part-time faculty were generally satisfied with their positions.

Tuckman (1978) found satisfaction scores among part-time faculty averaged about 30 points on the 50-point semantic differential scale he devised to measure faculty satisfaction. Yang and Zak (1981) also noted moderate levels of satisfaction among part-time faculty in Ohio. Feldman

and Keidel (1987) found that over 75 percent of part-time nursing faculty they surveyed were "very satisfied" or "fairly satisfied" with their jobs. This would seem to indicate that few management changes are needed in regard to part-time faculty administration.

Dissatisfaction Among Certain Classes of Part-Time Faculty

Despite the rosy outlook when looking at the overall statistics, Tuckman (1978) discovered distinct pockets of intense dissatisfaction among the part-time faculty when he divided part-time faculty into categories based upon their career aspirations.

For the purpose of his study, Tuckman (1978) examined the motivations people had to teach part-time, then split the part-time faculty into seven categories based upon those motivations:

- a) semiretireds - former full-time academics who had reduced their teaching involvement to part-time duties;
- b) students - graduate students employed at institutions other than the one they were attending;
- c) hopeful full-timers - people who wanted full-time academic careers but could not find full-time teaching positions;
- d) full-mooners - individuals who held another, primary job of at least 35 hours a week;

- e) homeworkers - people who were limited in the number of hours they could work because of child care and other domestic responsibilities;
- f) part-mooners - part-time instructors who held a second job of under 35 hours elsewhere;
- g) part-unknowners - individuals whose motivations for teaching were not known or could not be classified in the other six categories.

The largest categories were the full-mooners, who comprised 27.6% of the total, and students, who made up 21.2%. Hopeful full-timers comprised 16.6% of the part-timers and 13.6% were part-mooners.

Among all those seven groups, Tuckman found the hopeful full-timers were by far the most discontented. On the 50-point satisfaction index that Tuckman devised, the average satisfaction level of hopeful full-timers was 4.5 points lower than the next lowest category.

And among hopeful full-timers, more than in any other category, money seemed to be the major problem. Tuckman (1978) found the percentage of hopeful full-timers who thought their pay was equitable with full-time faculty to be about one-half that of the average for all part-time faculty. He also discovered that while 27.8% of all part-time faculty felt they

received pay proportionate to full-time faculty, only 14.4% of the hopeful full-timers felt their pay was proportionate, explaining why the satisfaction index for hopeful full-timers was so low.

Since hopeful full-timers make up only 16.6% of the part-time faculty, their satisfaction would seem to be a minor consideration in university personnel administration. But there is evidence to suggest the hopeful full-timers are important to a degree beyond their numbers.

First of all, individual hopeful full-timers teach more classes on average than part-time faculty in any of the other categories. Although they comprise less than 17% of all part-time faculty, they are responsible for teaching 21% of the classes taught by part-timers, the largest ratio for any of Tuckman's categories.

If we employ the same standards used to judge the teaching potential of full-time faculty, there is also evidence to suggest that hopeful full-timers may be among the most qualified instructors in the part-time ranks. The percentage of hopeful full-timers with doctoral degrees was 30.3%, nearly equal to the 31.4% of the semi-retired category with doctorates and over 10 percentage points above the average for part-timers. When comparing the percentage of full-timers with either a master's degree or a doctorate, the hopeful full-timers had more education than any

of Tuckman's part-time categories. Over 87% of hopeful full-timers had an advanced degree.

Comparing publishing activities, the hopeful full-timers also were among the top part-time categories. Almost 24% of hopeful full-timers had been published, ranking them just behind the semi-retirees in that category. That percentage of hopeful full-timers who had published was over four percentage points higher than the average for all part-timers. In addition, Tuckman found that hopeful full-timers also followed only the semi-retirees in the percentage who previously had taught full-time.

Reward Structures for Part-Time Faculty

Since the hopeful full-time faculty appear to be both the most qualified of the university's part-time faculty as well as the most discontented, there is some support for the contention that colleges and universities should strive to invest available resources in retaining that valuable resource.

Unfortunately, university officials have little solid evidence to guide them in developing a reward system for hopeful full-timers, or indeed, even for part-timers as a class. For while a small number of research studies have been conducted to find the complaints of part-time faculty, only one study has investigated what rewards part-time faculty want.

At first, that may seem a peculiar distinction to make. But Herzberg's study (1966) found the elements of a job that bring gratification are quite different from those that bring discontent. Certain job factors, like salary, company policy and working conditions, serve primarily to prevent job discontent, yet don't seem to establish a positive job attitude. Herzberg called these hygiene factors.

Herzberg found instead that job factors such as achievement, recognition, responsibility, advancement and the work itself were much more powerful determinants of employee job fulfillment. He called these motivators.

The one study that specifically asked part-time faculty about what gratified them in their positions, instead of what they found objectionable, indicated that same distinction may hold for part-time faculty as well. In spite of the volume of evidence chronicling complaints about pay scales and fringe benefits, when part-time faculty polled by Leslie, Kellam and Gunne (1982) were asked what their top three reasons for teaching were, they replied: 1) personal satisfaction; 2) gaining professional goals in their non-academic careers and; 3) striving for careers in academic fields. Economic considerations only placed fourth in this survey.

Although there have been no formal studies that have attempted to

discover if those part-time faculty motivations could be translated into specific reward structures, there have been many suggestions about how to increase part-time faculty satisfaction and efficiency.

Some, like Albert & Watson (1980), Parsons (1980) and Moore (1986), urge non-financial reforms such as improved orientation programs and increasing interaction between administrators and part-timers. Another (Biles & Tuckman, 1986) recommended graduated compensation scales based upon total classes taught so part-time faculty members who teach the equivalent of a full-load would get pay that was closer to a full-time faculty member.

Other studies (American Association of University Professors, 1981; Tuckman, 1981) suggested part-timers be offered fringe benefits prorated on the number of classes taught. Wilson (1984) proposed cash teaching awards and special professorial chairs for outstanding part-time instructors.

As the diversity of these proposed reforms suggest, there is no consensus on how to administer compensation and development programs for part-time faculty. Among the colleges and universities that have made administrative responses to part-time faculty problems, actions have been just as widely divergent.

San Francisco State University and the University of Maryland have appointed coordinators of part-time instruction. New York's Pratt Institute offers fringe benefits to part-time faculty who have taught 10 or more semesters. Ball State University and the University of Tennessee have begun offering tenure to a limited number of part-time faculty (Reed, 1985).

But it is unionism or the threat of unionism that has motivated most part-time faculty administrative reforms (Heller, 1987). Some unions, like those in California, Massachusetts, New York and Connecticut, have concentrated primarily on salaries and fringe benefits. Heller indicated Massachusetts' university system has had to boost part-time salaries 35%, to \$2,800 per class.

Other unions have also included work rules in their negotiations. In Maine, the part-timers' union has asked for office space, clerical assistance and rules on seniority and class cancellation policies in its negotiations.

What is most worrisome is that the suggestions being discussed and the reforms being undertaken, while crucial to the successful integration of burgeoning numbers of part-time faculty into higher education, are based on very inadequate research and are being conducted in an atmosphere of

reactive haste, and not proactive consideration.

The next chapter outlines the research methodology designed to discover satisfiers for part-time faculty, and to discover if those satisfiers are different for faculty who are within different categories of Tuckman's taxonomy.

CHAPTER III

THE METHOD OF STUDY

This study establishes a profile of part-time instructors at the University of Louisville, and highlights the relevant relationships between those faculty traits and satisfaction levels and sources of satisfaction. It employed data obtained from a questionnaire designed for use by the university's College of Arts and Sciences to obtain more information about its part-time faculty. A copy of the questionnaire is in Appendix A.

The Sample

The list of faculty to be polled was assembled from payroll records maintained by the university's personnel department. The part-timers were selected from the university's computer files using criteria established by Gappa (1984). She defined a part-time faculty member as an individual who teaches less than a full-time teaching load at a single institution, or has less than a full-time faculty assignment and range of duties at a single institution. This admits the possibility that some individuals may combine assignments at a number of institutions to create a teaching load equivalent or even exceeding a full-time teaching load.

All the faculty selected from the personnel files were nontenured and nonpermanent. Conveners of continuing education courses were excluded unless they also taught for-credit university courses. In addition, the survey excluded full-time faculty who received extra compensation for teaching courses in addition to their regular appointment and graduate assistants who were teaching part time in the department where they were pursuing a graduate degree.

The questionnaire was not administered to faculty at the university's off-campus health sciences center, since dramatically higher part-time faculty pay scales at the school's medical and dental schools might possibly have introduced unwanted variables into the data collection effort. The survey yielded 175 responses in 1988 and 145 responses in 1989.

The Survey Instrument

The survey was designed to obtain four primary measures of the part-time faculty at the University of Louisville. The study sought to establish a demographic profile of the school's part-timers, to discover their motivation for teaching part-time, to ascertain the level of job satisfaction among part-timers and to find what rewards they felt would increase their satisfaction.

In all cases, the questionnaire was modeled after other major research studies, so as to make it possible to compare the findings of this survey with those studies.

The survey's demographic items were adapted from Yang and Zak's (1981) study of part-time faculty at four-year colleges and universities in Ohio. One question was structured to categorize the University of Louisville's part-time faculty into Tuckman's (1978) taxonomy of motivation for teaching part-time. The questions about satisfaction level and satisfiers were developed to gather information within the framework of job hygiene and satisfaction factors established by Herzberg (1959).

The questionnaire was delivered to the part-time faculty's campus addresses twice, once in April 1988 and once in April 1989. The questionnaires were identical, except for three additional questions in the 1989 version that were developed to elicit narrative answers concerning possible modifications in administrative or academic structures that might have changed part-timer perceptions during the 1988-89 school year.

The additional questions asked if the individual had completed the previous survey. If part-time faculty members answered yes, they were asked to indicate in narrative form if there had been any changes had occurred at the university that altered the way they felt about part-time

teaching and then asked for additional comments about the part-time teaching experience at the University of Louisville.

The Data Analysis

When the 1989 surveys were returned, the forms from faculty members who had indicated they had previously completed the form were separated from those who had not completed the survey. Initially, responses to demographic questions and desired satisfiers from all 1988 surveys and the 1989 surveys completed by repeaters were compared. Means for the age of part-time instructors and their years of part-time teaching were established. The education levels as well as the percentages of men and women within the sample were also tabulated.

Faculty satisfaction levels were established using a semantic differential scale comparable to that used by Tuckman (1978). Those ratings were compared to discover differences between the faculty perceptions at the time of the 1988 survey and then one year later.

In addition, the responses from the group of faculty who had completed both questionnaires were tabulated and their narrative responses evaluated to determine if significant changes in the university's environment had occurred that might have altered faculty satisfaction levels. It was decided that if there was no statistically significant difference in the

reward strategies could be undertaken by university administrators that would improve part-time faculty satisfaction and improve retention of the most talented faculty.

The results and analysis of the data collection will be discussed in the next chapter.

At first, that may seem a peculiar distinction to make. But Herzberg's study (1966) found the elements of a job that bring gratification are quite different from those that bring discontent. Certain job factors, like salary, company policy and working conditions, serve primarily to prevent job discontent, yet don't seem to establish a positive job attitude. Herzberg called these hygiene factors.

Herzberg found instead that job factors such as achievement, recognition, responsibility, advancement and the work itself were much more powerful determinants of employee job fulfillment. He called these motivators.

The one study that specifically asked part-time faculty about what gratified them in their positions, instead of what they found objectionable, indicated that same distinction may hold for part-time faculty as well. In spite of the volume of evidence chronicling complaints about pay scales and fringe benefits, when part-time faculty polled by Leslie, Kellam and Gunne (1982) were asked what their top three reasons for teaching were, they replied: 1) personal satisfaction; 2) gaining professional goals in their non-academic careers and; 3) striving for careers in academic fields. Economic considerations only placed fourth in this survey.

Although there have been no formal studies that have attempted to

discover if those part-time faculty motivations could be translated into specific reward structures, there have been many suggestions about how to increase part-time faculty satisfaction and efficiency.

Some, like Albert & Watson (1980), Parsons (1980) and Moore (1986), urge non-financial reforms such as improved orientation programs and increasing interaction between administrators and part-timers. Another (Biles & Tuckman, 1986) recommended graduated compensation scales based upon total classes taught so part-time faculty members who teach the equivalent of a full-load would get pay that was closer to a full-time faculty member.

Other studies (American Association of University Professors, 1981; Tuckman, 1981) suggested part-timers be offered fringe benefits prorated on the number of classes taught. Wilson (1984) proposed cash teaching awards and special professorial chairs for outstanding part-time instructors.

As the diversity of these proposed reforms suggest, there is no consensus on how to administer compensation and development programs for part-time faculty. Among the colleges and universities that have made administrative responses to part-time faculty problems, actions have been just as widely divergent.

San Francisco State University and the University of Maryland have appointed coordinators of part-time instruction. New York's Pratt Institute offers fringe benefits to part-time faculty who have taught 10 or more semesters. Ball State University and the University of Tennessee have begun offering tenure to a limited number of part-time faculty (Reed, 1985).

But it is unionism or the threat of unionism that has motivated most part-time faculty administrative reforms (Heller, 1987). Some unions, like those in California, Massachusetts, New York and Connecticut, have concentrated primarily on salaries and fringe benefits. Heller indicated Massachusetts' university system has had to boost part-time salaries 35%, to \$2,800 per class.

Other unions have also included work rules in their negotiations. In Maine, the part-timers' union has asked for office space, clerical assistance and rules on seniority and class cancellation policies in its negotiations.

What is most worrisome is that the suggestions being discussed and the reforms being undertaken, while crucial to the successful integration of burgeoning numbers of part-time faculty into higher education, are based on very inadequate research and are being conducted in an atmosphere of

reactive haste, and not proactive consideration.

The next chapter outlines the research methodology designed to discover satisfiers for part-time faculty, and to discover if those satisfiers are different for faculty who are within different categories of Tuckman's taxonomy.

CHAPTER III

THE METHOD OF STUDY

This study establishes a profile of part-time instructors at the University of Louisville, and highlights the relevant relationships between those faculty traits and satisfaction levels and sources of satisfaction. It employed data obtained from a questionnaire designed for use by the university's College of Arts and Sciences to obtain more information about its part-time faculty. A copy of the questionnaire is in Appendix A.

The Sample

The list of faculty to be polled was assembled from payroll records maintained by the university's personnel department. The part-timers were selected from the university's computer files using criteria established by Gappa (1984). She defined a part-time faculty member as an individual who teaches less than a full-time teaching load at a single institution, or has less than a full-time faculty assignment and range of duties at a single institution. This admits the possibility that some individuals may combine assignments at a number of institutions to create a teaching load equivalent or even exceeding a full-time teaching load.

All the faculty selected from the personnel files were nontenured and nonpermanent. Conveners of continuing education courses were excluded unless they also taught for-credit university courses. In addition, the survey excluded full-time faculty who received extra compensation for teaching courses in addition to their regular appointment and graduate assistants who were teaching part time in the department where they were pursuing a graduate degree.

The questionnaire was not administered to faculty at the university's off-campus health sciences center, since dramatically higher part-time faculty pay scales at the school's medical and dental schools might possibly have introduced unwanted variables into the data collection effort. The survey yielded 175 responses in 1988 and 145 responses in 1989.

The Survey Instrument

The survey was designed to obtain four primary measures of the part-time faculty at the University of Louisville. The study sought to establish a demographic profile of the school's part-timers, to discover their motivation for teaching part-time, to ascertain the level of job satisfaction among part-timers and to find what rewards they felt would increase their satisfaction.

In all cases, the questionnaire was modeled after other major research studies, so as to make it possible to compare the findings of this survey with those studies.

The survey's demographic items were adapted from Yang and Zak's (1981) study of part-time faculty at four-year colleges and universities in Ohio. One question was structured to categorize the University of Louisville's part-time faculty into Tuckman's (1978) taxonomy of motivation for teaching part-time. The questions about satisfaction level and satisfiers were developed to gather information within the framework of job hygiene and satisfaction factors established by Herzberg (1959).

The questionnaire was delivered to the part-time faculty's campus addresses twice, once in April 1988 and once in April 1989. The questionnaires were identical, except for three additional questions in the 1989 version that were developed to elicit narrative answers concerning possible modifications in administrative or academic structures that might have changed part-timer perceptions during the 1988-89 school year.

The additional questions asked if the individual had completed the previous survey. If part-time faculty members answered yes, they were asked to indicate in narrative form if there had been any changes had occurred at the university that altered the way they felt about part-time

teaching and then asked for additional comments about the part-time teaching experience at the University of Louisville.

The Data Analysis

When the 1989 surveys were returned, the forms from faculty members who had indicated they had previously completed the form were separated from those who had not completed the survey. Initially, responses to demographic questions and desired satisfiers from all 1988 surveys and the 1989 surveys completed by repeaters were compared. Means for the age of part-time instructors and their years of part-time teaching were established. The education levels as well as the percentages of men and women within the sample were also tabulated.

Faculty satisfaction levels were established using a semantic differential scale comparable to that used by Tuckman (1978). Those ratings were compared to discover differences between the faculty perceptions at the time of the 1988 survey and then one year later.

In addition, the responses from the group of faculty who had completed both questionnaires were tabulated and their narrative responses evaluated to determine if significant changes in the university's environment had occurred that might have altered faculty satisfaction levels. It was decided that if there was no statistically significant difference in the

reward strategies could be undertaken by university administrators that would improve part-time faculty satisfaction and improve retention of the most talented faculty.

The results and analysis of the data collection will be discussed in the next chapter.

Satisfaction Levels and Satisfiers

When examined within the context of Tuckman's categories of part-time faculty motivation, quite differing levels of satisfaction were found among the different groups. Using the same weighting system that found a mean of 4.17 for the overall sample, part-mooners were the least satisfied of all the categories, at 3.63. While hopeful full-timers, homeworkers and semiretired groups hovered slightly below that derived mean of 4.14, the students, at 4.44, and full-mooners, at 4.49, were well above the mean.

But even within the part-mooner category, satisfaction levels were remarkably high. However, there is a paradox concerning part-time satisfaction that is difficult to explain.

As Herzberg (1959) suggested, the nature of the work itself is a prime motivator for satisfaction. And it is true that the respondents who wrote about their experiences at the university almost universally discussed their fulfillment from the actual classroom teaching experience.

But from narrative answers volunteered by respondents to the survey, part-timers experience a perplexing current of intense resentment and anger mixed with the great joy they feel for their work (see Appendix B for a listing of all narrative comments).

Of the 55 instructors who made written comments, 30% made positive responses about the teaching environment. But while 83.8% of the total sample described themselves as satisfied or very satisfied with their experiences at the University of Louisville, a surprising 60% of those who wrote narrative answers made negative comments, often describing themselves as "lackeys," "slaves," "serfs," and "ugly stepchildren" in the university hierarchy. Their language expressed not just resentment because of their perception they had been exploited. Equally evident was a belief the university had ignored them and belittled their contributions to the academy.

"I'll continue to teach for enjoyment," one wrote, "but I'm tired of being a damn slave to this university. I hold contempt for the administration of U of L and their asinine policies."

Yet another part-time faculty member stated:

The university, as a supposedly enlightened institution, should realize it is being exploitative and take noticeable steps to increase pay and provide any benefits. Without part-time instructors it would have to shut down tomorrow. Maybe a strike is necessary among part-time faculty so the university realizes we have some importance.

Another one wrote: "Part-time teachers, who are the bulk of the English department, are still treated as second-class citizens and herded together in stalls that signify our status at the bottom of the profession."

Or this: "We are willing to take the part-time position in order to stay involved in our discipline - or because of other priorities, i.e., family. But to pay a Ph.D. so little and allow so little room for advancement is exploitative."

Another comment: "I have always viewed part-time teaching as serfdom. I am now trying to get out. By the way, I'm not a failure - I'm an excellent teacher."

There is evidence that many part-timer instructors are following through on that threat. As the extraordinarily high number of respondents who indicated they had taught for one year or less suggested, there is approximately a 20% turnover among part-time teachers each year. This was seen in both the 1988 survey, when 24.3% reported they had been teaching one year or less, and in 1989, when the figure was 19.3%. To further confirm that theory, 26.6% of the part-time faculty who completed the 1989 sample indicated they were looking for full-time employment elsewhere.

The attitude that sparks that defection is shown in the statistics. During the first decade of part-time work experience at the University of Louisville, satisfaction levels steadily decrease. For those who had been teaching one year or less, the satisfaction level was 4.37. In years 2-5,

the mean satisfaction level dipped to 4.07, then in years 6-10 satisfaction dropped to 3.96. Only after that point, presumably after most of the people who needed more income left teaching, did satisfaction begin to rise slightly, reaching 4.08 for those part-time faculty who stayed more than 15 years.

Table 5

Part-Time Faculty Satisfaction Levels by Years of Teaching Experience

	Years of Teaching Experience				
	1 or less	2-5	6-10	11-15	over 15
Satisfaction	4.37	4.07	3.96	4.00	4.08

Note. Satisfaction level corresponds of high of 5 and low of 1 on Tuckman's summated rating scale (1978).

That resentment seems to stem from financial issues. In the survey, part-time faculty members gave overwhelming precedence to economic factors in compiling their list of elements "that would most improve their satisfaction with the teaching experience at the University of Louisville."

The list of 20 satisfiers included in the survey was examined to determine the frequency with which each was mentioned as a satisfier by the part-timers who responded to the questionnaire. That summary is

detailed in Table 6.

Using that system, all seven of the economic compensation satisfiers included in the survey ranked among the top eight satisfiers for part-time faculty. The top ten satisfiers of part-time faculty at the University of Louisville were: 1) more pay; 2) salary increase with experience; 3) tuition waiver; 4) being considered for full-time positions when they open; 5) admitted into the university's retirement plan; 6) a health insurance plan; 7) being eligible for promotion in faculty rank; 8) recognition programs for teaching excellence; 9) more contact with full-timers and; 10) more opportunities for professional development.

There were few major differences when the satisfiers desired by individuals in each of Tuckman's categories were isolated. Only one satisfier, more pay, was named at a level above the mean by all six Tuckman-defined categories. However, three other factors, pay scales rising with experience, honoring part-time teaching excellence and tuition remission occurred above the mean in five of the six groups.

Group members generally defined their individual self-interests in their number 1 rankings for satisfiers. For instance, students most often wanted tuition remission, hopeful full-timers wanted to be considered for open full-time positions, and part-mooners, semiretireds and full-mooners

Table 6

Ranked Listing of Satisfiers for Part-Time Faculty

Rank	Satisfier	Frequency Listed	Listed as No. 1
1.	More Pay for Part-time Teaching	108	51
2.	Pay Scale Based on Teaching Experience	85	15
3.	Tuition Waiver for Self and Dependents	73	10
4.	Considered for Open Full-time Positions	57	13
5.	Included in Retirement Plan	53	10
6.	Included in University Health Insurance	53	8
7.	Eligible for Promotion in Faculty Rank	52	7
8.	Recognizing Part-time Teaching Excellence	51	15
9.	More Contact with Full-time Faculty	42	6
10.	Opportunities for Professional Development	34	4
11.	More Knowledge about Campus Policies	30	3
12.	More Contact with Chairpersons	26	0
13.	More Clerical Help	20	0
14.	Involvement in Faculty Meetings	19	1
15.	Better Offices for Part-time Faculty	18	9

(table continues)

Rank	Satisfier	Frequency	Listed
		Listed	as No. 1
16.	Other Reasons	15	10
17.	Access to Library, AV and Research Resources	14	3
18.	Academic Job Counseling	12	1
19.	Freedom to Pick Syllabus, Textbook	11	0
20.	Less Interference from Faculty, Administrators	7	0
21.	Central Part-time Hiring, Supervision	7	0

wanted more pay. Homeworkers, who most likely had the security of an additional wage earner to supplement their total household income, wanted increasing pay based upon years of teaching experience. It is also possible to draw additional insights about the relative satisfaction of the various part-time faculty classifications by examining the number of perceived satisfiers. As detailed in Table 7, which lists desired satisfiers that were higher than the mean for each group, it appeared that hopeful full-timers saw the need for the most changes to make the part-time teaching experience satisfactory. Part-mooners, whose overall satisfaction level was well below every other category, actually asked for fewer satisfiers

at levels above the mean. Students asked for the fewest satisfiers.

A careful analysis of economic factors motivating each group seems to explain some of the differences between the categories. A comparison was made of the satisfaction of the faculty who made less than 10% of their income from part-time teaching to the satisfaction of those who made over 90% of their income from part-time teaching. As might be expected, the satisfaction of the instructors who made less of their income from part-time teaching was much higher. The mean satisfaction level of 4.41 among those who made 10% or less of their income was decidedly different from the 3.96 mean of those who depended on part-time teaching for more than 90% of their income.

Similarly, a comparison of faculty categories with great concentrations of individuals who depended upon part-time teaching for more than 90% of their income correlated with the groups that desired the most satisfiers. Over 60% of hopeful full-timers and homeworkers counted on part-time teaching for more than 90% of their income. Even part-mooners, who had other jobs supplementing their teaching income, had 27.6% of their members counting on part-time teaching for over 90% of their income. At the same time, only 9% of the full-mooners relied on part-time teaching for more than one-fifth of their income and no

Table 7

Ranking of Above-Mean Satisfiers For University of Louisville Part-time Faculty, by Tuckman's Motivation Classifications

rank of satisfier	hopeful FT	part-mooner	homeworker	semiretired	full-mooner	student
*1	Consider FT	More Pay	Pay with Exp.	More Pay	More Pay	Tuition
*2	Health Ins.	Pay with Exp.	More Pay	Pay with Exp.	Pay with Exp.	More Pay
*3	Pay with Exp.	Health Ins.	Tuition	Retirement	Tuition	Health Ins.
*4	More Pay	Tuition	Consider FT	Contact/FT	Honor Excel.	
*5	Rise in Rank	Retirement	Retirement	Honor Excel.		
*6	Contact/FT	Rise in Rank	Honor Excel.			
*7	Retirement	Honor Excel.	Health Ins.			
*8	Honor Excel.	Consider FT				
*9	Better Office	Prof. Develop				
*10	Campus Gov.					
*11	Tuition					

Note: The following abbreviations were used: Pay with Exp. (increased pay with experience); Consider FT (considered for full-time positions); Contact/FT (increased contact with full-time faculty); Prof. Develop (opportunities for professional development); Honor Excel. (recognized for teaching excellence); Campus Gov. (more involvement in faculty meetings and campus governance); Health Ins. (inclusion in university health insurance plan).

full-mooners looked to part-time teaching for more than 40% of their income.

When the survey results were studied to determine which part-time instructors were leaving as a result of their dissatisfaction, it was found that most of the teachers who indicated they wanted to leave were generally also the instructors who held the highest educational qualifications. Although the comparisons did not hold strictly across all categories, those categories whose members had higher levels of education and published more articles generally were more likely to be looking for full-time employment elsewhere.

For instance, the homeworkers category, which had the lowest percentage of its members at the A.B.D. or Ph.D. level and the lowest percentage who had published articles, had no members indicating they were looking for a full-time job.

Conversely, among the hopeful full-timer respondents, 55.6% of whom had attained the A.B.D. or Ph.D. and 61.0% of whom had published an article, every single one was looking for full-time employment. Members of the student category, who obviously had lower percentages of doctorates, still had a very high proportion who had published. Fiftyfive percent of the student group had published an article and 33.3% were looking for full-time

work. Semiretired faculty, of whom 61.5% held the A.B.D. or Ph.D. and 46% had published, were also looking for full-time employment at greater percentages than all but the hopeful full-timer and student categories. Thus, while satisfaction levels are high, there is a high and constant turnover of instructors within the part-time ranks, a turnover that is concentrated among the best and brightest of the part-time faculty.

Discussion and Analysis

In analyzing the results from this study, it is necessary to reconcile two seemingly contradictory currents that emerge from the findings.

The previous quantitative findings details a part-time faculty that is talented and that expresses a high degree of satisfaction with their experiences at the University of Louisville.

This image of contentment is disputed by other evidence presented by the study. For instance, this satisfied work force exhibits high turnover rates. And most confounding are the vehement and embittered narrative comments that often accompanied an individual faculty member's rosy satisfaction index. It is difficult to fully understand the high satisfaction level when 60% of the narrative comments are negative, describing their positions as "lackeys" and "serfs" and the university as "asinine."

Interpreted from within Herzberg's theories of satisfiers (1959), it is

apparent that the emotional and psychological rewards of teaching are potent motivators for part-time teachers and primarily account for the high satisfaction levels. As Herzberg suggested, the nature of the work itself, in this case the experiences in the classroom, do contribute significantly to part-time satisfaction levels. By investing nothing more than the opportunity to teach at the college level, the university has been able to attract mature, committed individuals with high levels of academic achievement to add their talents to the institution's mission.

In describing job satisfaction, Herzberg distinguished between job factors that brought contentment and other factors whose presence did not bring gratification, but whose absence sometimes brought discontent.

Herzberg said these "hygiene factors", elements like money and working environment, act as an "essential base," a floor from which the satisfiers of the work itself can be effective.

It is apparent that in part-time teaching, that floor is not in place. During the 1989-90 academic year, the rare University of Louisville adjunct instructor who was lucky enough to have a full-time load of four classes per semester had a gross annual income of only \$12,240. There was no health insurance, no retirement plan and no genuine opportunity to advance within the profession.

For most part-timers, all the emotional satisfaction provided by teaching is not enough to counter that grim financial reality. So while there are high levels of satisfaction among part-time faculty at the University of Louisville, it is apparent that this satisfaction isn't being translated into the ability to retain talented part-time faculty over a long period of time.

The faculty narrative comments suggest a more psychological rationale for the high turnover rates. From the language the part-time faculty members use in their comments ("ugly stepchildren," "lackeys" and "second-class citizens") all signify a belief that the university doesn't admit or admire the contributions part-timers make to the institution. This is further reinforced by the predominance part-time faculty members placed on "recognizing part-time teaching excellence" among their list of satisfiers. It ranked as the fifth top satisfier among the entire sample.

It is that reality of low pay and the perception of low status that apparently causes 25% of part-time faculty to abandon the field each year, that cause many otherwise satisfied and committed instructors to fall from the teaching ranks. Among those people who are unable to view part-time teaching as a pleasant hobby that supplements full-time work, the school extracts performance and commitment for a brief period until

the part-timer sees the futility of a long-term commitment to the university. At that time, those part-timers quit and are replaced by another group who will most likely perpetuate the same cycle.

From these comments, it would appear that the most obvious explanations for the high level of satisfaction among part-timers are that most part-timers receive genuine fulfillment from the teaching experience. Other part-timers, very disgruntled by the pay and institutional policies, have left academia for other professions.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary of the Results

This study established a portrait of the part-time faculty at the University of Louisville, including their motivations for teaching part-time. It studied their relative satisfaction level with their experiences and then established satisfiers they felt would make their vocational experiences more fulfilling. Finally, this document analyzed the university's part-time faculty within Tuckman's taxonomy classifying part-timers by their motivation to teach and discovered the difference between the satisfiers desired by members of each group. In this chapter, recommendations will be made concerning administration of part-time faculty reward systems and personnel management.

This study found a part-time faculty that was well trained and professionally qualified. Almost one-third had doctorates and averaged over four years of teaching experience. Expressed satisfaction with their part-time teaching experience was high, although satisfaction levels seemed to steadily decline through the first ten years of teaching experience.

There were great variations in the financial positions of part-time

faculty members. While 40% of the sample said they earned less than 10% of their annual income from part-time teaching, nearly one of every four part-time faculty members said they earned all their income from their teaching.

When placed into Tuckman's classification system that analyzed their reasons for teaching part-time, the largest three categories were, respectively, those who supplemented a full-time job elsewhere with part-time teaching (full-mooners), those who had other part-time jobs elsewhere (part-mooners), and the part-timers who wanted to teach full-time (hopeful full-timers). Satisfaction levels were highest for the full-mooners, and lowest for the part-mooners. However, overall satisfaction levels for the entire sample were well above that found by Tuckman (1978).

Narratives volunteered by part-timers completing the questionnaire disputed the high satisfaction levels. A majority of the narrative answers used very harsh language to criticize the university's administration of part-time faculty members. From the subject of the narratives, the author speculated the disparity may be due to an overall satisfaction with the teaching experience, but bitterness toward university policies.

When asked what would make them more satisfied with their jobs,

part-time faculty members nearly universally expressed the desire for further financial incentives. All seven of the financial satisfiers listed on the questionnaire were included among the top eight desired satisfiers. More pay and a pay scale based on teaching experience were the two top desired satisfiers among the entire sample.

Although there were some variations, when the sample was classified within Tuckman's taxonomy, those two elements -- more pay and a pay scale based on teaching experience -- were in the top three of nearly every group's desired satisfiers. Health insurance, recognition of teaching excellence, a rising pay scale based on experience and tuition remission were satisfiers requested at a rate above the mean by six of the seven Tuckman groups.

Policy Recommendations

One of this study's stated purposes was to analyze the satisfiers of university part-time instructors so as to formulate a management plan that could substantially improve part-time faculty satisfaction without demanding substantial financial investment from the university. The study's results have forced an abandonment of that original goal. There appear to be few low-cost solutions.

Almost all the desired satisfiers involved economic rewards.

Although individual part-time faculty members within the sample did list the following factors (better offices, better parking, more involvement in faculty meetings, better access to library and audio-visual resources, teaching seminars, and academic job counseling) as their most desired satisfier, none of those factors scored above the mean among all the weighted satisfiers.

Instead, all seven economic factors listed in the questionnaire were included in the top eight desired satisfiers. The only non-financial satisfiers to qualify within that group were "programs to recognize part-time teaching excellence."

It appears that if the university wants to translate that satisfaction with the teaching experience into satisfaction with the institution, if it wishes to keep and develop that pool of teaching talent, it needs to make a financial commitment to those part-time faculty members. Obviously, the most immediately fulfilling factor, as indicated convincingly in the survey, would be more pay for teaching part-time. But an across-the-board pay increase for part-timers, even if it were deserved, would be a potentially expensive strategy. In addition, unless it were very large, it would put only a minor dent in perceived inequalities between part-timer and full-timer pay, and it would only tangentially be related to improving retention of

experienced part-time faculty.

However, university administrators may be satisfied with their relationship with part-time faculty members. On initial analysis, the institution has succeeded in recruiting a group of talented, committed part-time instructors with a relatively small investment. Although many part-timers might label this approach "exploitative," to university administrators it appears to be an economically sensible strategy. There are no doubts that maintaining a teaching staff that contains a significant percentage of part-timers is much less expensive than one wholly comprised of full-time faculty members.

But there are potential costs to it as well, as borne out by examining the characteristics of the faculty most eager to leave. Unfortunately, the highest proportion of turnover would appear to come from the part-time faculty who are most qualified to be teaching on the university level, those with the highest education levels and those with the most impressive professional achievements.

So this strategy may have implications for the quality of teaching and the quality of education at the University of Louisville. In an institution where 25% of the part-time faculty is being replaced each and every year, controls over screening and quality control of new faculty are precarious.

No matter how talented, knowledgeable and enthusiastic the new part-time faculty members are, there would seemingly be at least some diminution of teaching effectiveness because of inexperience in the classroom and unfamiliarity with instructional materials, campus resources and other mundane aspects of teaching.

However, if retaining part-time faculty is the desired end, there are a number of more promising options that could be implemented. For instance, part-time faculty gave very high ratings to plans that would increase pay with years of teaching experience.

If the university were looking for other economic satisfiers that would encourage retention while entailing the least immediate financial commitment there are other opportunities, some of which have already been put in place at other institutions.

Several colleges, for instance, have created "vested" health insurance and tuition remission plans for their part-time faculty (Reed, 1985). These plans award benefits, sometimes at reduced levels, to part-time faculty who have been teaching at least one-half time for two or more years. In one health insurance plan, the university pays one-half the usual insurance payment it would make for a full-time faculty member. In the tuition remission plan, the university provides a benefit that has few direct costs

to the university. Other universities have allowed part-timers to be vested in retirement plans, again usually at reduced levels, after a certain period of years. This is another instance of being able to offer benefits now while delaying direct costs for many years, acknowledging the inevitability of a certain proportion of workers dropping out before becoming vested or dying before retiring.

All the suggestions indicated in this section might seem to be premature, given the high levels of satisfaction professed by the university's part-time faculty and the high turnover that has probably eliminated major sources of discontent from the teaching ranks in the past.

It is difficult, however, to explain the anger contained within the personal messages of the university's part-timers, and equally difficult to predict when that resentment might break out in more tangible, destructive measures than simply the loss of another talented part-timer.

A major focus of that resentment is the perception the university has abandoned and demeaned part-time faculty members. To counter that powerful, and potentially destructive perception, a final recommendation is that the university demonstrate a commitment to and an appreciation of part-time faculty members. An analysis of the narrative answers reveal time and time again individuals who take pride in their expertise and their

performance but who feel they receive no attention or support from the university.

Here is a glance at how quickly a sense of contentment can change to aggression. This comment, included in its entirety earlier in the chapter, is from a faculty member who indicated on the questionnaire's second page that he was "satisfied" with teaching part-time.

In his closing comment on the survey's fifth page he wrote: "... Without part-time instructors it (the university) would have to shut down tomorrow. Maybe a strike is necessary among part-time faculty so the university realizes we have some importance."

As the part-timers stated in their list of desired satisfiers, one action signalling that recognition is a program to honor part-time teaching excellence. Other important indications that the university is cognizant of part-time contributions are more structured methods for handling part-time contracts and hiring notifications. There are other symbolic statements that might be useful in mollifying the psychological resentment that appears to be one dimension of part-time faculty discontent.

The activism of one person who might possibly choose to stay at the institution and fight for better conditions rather than abandon academia for another field should stir contemplation among university officials. Despite

the satisfaction part-time faculty gain from the teaching experience, there is widespread disenchantment among them. This is a fertile field of resentment that one part-time faculty member might be able to stir into determined protest, a protest over which the university would exercise little control or direction and that might possibly provoke a crisis within the entire faculty body.

In these times of financial difficulties for the university, the contemplation of the effect that one part-time instructor could have on the institution should provoke an interesting debate on the cost-effectiveness of viewing part-time faculty as an exploitable, interchangeable source of cheap labor to make the academy work. It's a time of contemplation to determine whether intervention now to satisfy some of the part-time faculty's wants would help the university control and maintain the loyalty and commitment of this vital work force.

Recommendations for Future Studies

If this study were replicated, the questionnaire should be structured differently to obtain a more systematic and sophisticated statistical analysis of the information. While this questionnaire, constructed to match the format of previous instruments, was useful in validating the sample by making comparisons possible between the Louisville findings and

previous studies, its structure prevented a number of statistical analyses. Any subsequent questionnaire should be formed with consistent use of either closed-form items or scaled questions so more meaningful correlation studies can be completed.

On a more formative level, it seems obvious from the narrative comments that further study needs to be conducted on the satisfaction issue to explain how the high satisfaction level found in the quantitative section and the bitter personal comments contained in the narrative section can coexist. The question requesting that faculty members list their level of satisfaction needed to provide more dimensions upon which faculty members could comment. A multi-part question that explores personal satisfaction as well as satisfaction with institutional policies would be valuable in differentiating true faculty attitudes.

As researchers continue to explore how part-time faculty members can be integrated more surely within the university environment, studies similar to the present one should be conducted at other institutions to determine if the University of Louisville's part-time faculty is similar to part-time teachers at other colleges and universities and if the findings can be generalized to other campuses.

To further validate the effect of employing the management methods

suggested by the Louisville study, there is a need to evaluate the effect of administrative changes on part-time faculty. By conducting follow-up research at the institutions that have implemented new compensation systems, improved fringe benefits and programs, university administrators could more surely determine if those satisfiers help integrate part-time faculty into the campus environment and improve satisfaction levels.

There are other ways to ascertain whether the opinions stated by the Louisville faculty are valid. While this analysis has speculated on why part-time turnover is high, the rationale part-timers used in making that vocational decision would be more accurately determined by conducting exit interviews of the people who are leaving the ranks of part-time teachers.

The hardest studies to undertake, but the ones that might be the most valuable, will be those that help university administrators understand the effect that large numbers of part-time instructors will have on the institutional environment. While there have been some studies conducted on part-time teaching effectiveness, more comprehensive and precise studies of the comparative instructional effectiveness of part-time and full-time faculty is needed.

On a more philosophical level, has the integrity of the academy been

damaged because of the growing presence of part-timers? Are we creating a two-tier labor structure within colleges and universities, where the full-time faculty's primary task is research while part-timers handle the bulk of teaching duties? Does that situation degrade teaching and ultimately hurt the quality of college instruction?

Those are all important questions that impact directly upon the future image and performance of colleges and universities in this nation. Higher education administrators and faculty members should recognize their implications and begin a more formative exploration of their effects on the university and its mission.

APPENDIX A
PART-TIME FACULTY SURVEY

UNIVERSITY of LOUISVILLE

April 13, 1989

Dear Part-Time Faculty Member:

As a fellow part-time faculty member, I once again need your help in a campus-wide survey studying the characteristics, motivations for teaching, and reward systems for part-time faculty at the University of Louisville. For those of you who have been here for more than a year, the survey will look familiar. I'm once again asking you to volunteer some of your time so I can gain additional information that would allow me to assess changes in the characteristics of the university's part-time faculty.

As before, your answers will be treated confidentially and will be used for statistical purposes only. Data will be released only in the form of statistical summaries from which it will be impossible to identify information about any particular person.

It would be of great help if you would take about 10 minutes to complete and return the questionnaire. A mailing label is attached to the final page of the survey, so you may return the form without charge through the campus mails.

The results of the study will be shared with university administrators and faculty. Obviously, the success of this project in providing a continuing profile of part-time faculty at the University of Louisville depends on your help.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Very truly yours,

**William Thompson
Lecturer**

PART-TIME FACULTY SURVEY -- UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

1. What is your gender?

- (a) male
- (b) female

2. What year were you born?

3. What is your present marital status?

- (a) single, never married
- (b) married
- (c) separated
- (d) divorced
- (e) widowed

4. What is your highest earned college degree? Please do not report honorary degrees.

- (a) no earned college degree
- (b) associate degree
- (c) bachelor's degree
- (d) master's degree
- (e) finished doctoral course work, but doctorate not yet awarded
- (f) doctorate or professional degree

5. If you answered that you were married, what is your spouse's association with the University of Louisville?

- (a) my spouse is a full-time faculty member at UofL
- (b) my spouse is a part-time faculty member at UofL
- (c) my spouse is employed in a non-academic position at UofL
- (d) my spouse is a student at UofL
- (e) my spouse is not a student or employee at UofL

6. At which University of Louisville campus do you teach?

- (a) Belknap campus
- (b) Shelby campus
- (c) downtown center
- (d) some other site

7. In what field(s) are you currently teaching part-time at UofL?

- (a) _____
- (b) _____
- (c) _____
- (d) _____

17. What would most improve your satisfaction with your teaching experience at UofL? Please rank order the responses that apply, beginning with *1 as the one you desire most.

- (a) more clerical help, photocopying and other administrative services
 - (b) more access to the library, audio-visual equipment, media and research resources
 - (c) better office arrangements (better equipped offices, more space or private space)
 - (d) more contact/interaction with full-time faculty members
 - (e) more contact/interaction with chairpersons/administrators
 - (f) vocational and academic employment counseling and referrals
 - (g) more involvement in faculty meetings and other campus governance activities
 - (h) more opportunities for professional development (seminars, etc)
 - (i) recognition program to honor teaching excellence among part-time faculty
 - (j) more knowledge about campus policies and academic programs
 - (k) be considered for full-time faculty positions when they open
 - (l) involved in salary plan that increases pay with years of teaching experience
 - (m) be eligible for promotion in faculty rank
 - (n) be included in UofL health insurance plan
 - (o) more pay for teaching part-time
 - (p) be included in UofL retirement program
 - (q) tuition waiver for self and dependents
 - (r) more freedom to develop the syllabus and select textbooks for my courses
 - (s) less interference from administrators and other faculty members
 - (t) more centralized authority for part-time faculty hiring and supervision
 - (u) other, please specify _____
-

18. What percentage of your working time do you devote to each of the following activities during a semester's typical week? Calculate percentages based upon all the non-academic jobs you hold and all institutions at which you teach. Please write the percentages.

- % activities connected with non-teaching job(s)
- % lecturing and carrying out duties in the classroom
- % preparing lectures and grading
- % doing academic administrative duties (completing reports, attending meetings, etc.)
- % doing reading and research in academic field
- % advising and counseling students

19. During your career, how many times have you been published in professional journals in your field or have presented professional papers. Zero indicates none.

- (a) I have published _____ articles in the journals related to my field.
- (b) I have published _____ books related to my field.
- (c) I have presented _____ papers related to my field at professional/academic meetings.

20. What percentage of your total earnings is from your part-time teaching? Include earnings from all institutions at which you teach part-time.

_____ %

21. Are you employed elsewhere?

- _____ yes, I have a full-time job
- _____ yes, I have a part-time job(s)
- _____ no (if no, please skip question 22.)

22. If you are employed elsewhere, what is the nature of your other employment?

- (a) college-level teaching at an academic institution
- (b) administrative position at an academic institution
- (c) elementary or secondary school teaching
- (d) government employee (state, city or federal)
- (e) industry
- (f) business
- (g) medical or health
- (h) law
- (i) own business
- (j) other, please specify _____

23. Are you presently looking for a full-time position?

- _____ yes
- _____ no (if no, please go to question 26)

24. If yes, what type of full-time position are you looking for?

- (a) college-level full-time teaching
- (b) elementary or secondary teaching
- (c) non-academic position
- (d) position in any field, whatever comes first
- (e) haven't yet decided

25. If answer on number 23 is yes, what is the most important reason for your looking for a full-time position? Please rank order the responses which apply, beginning with *1 as your most important reason.

- (a) not satisfied with present employment
- (b) would like to move to another geographic area
- (c) have financial need to work full-time
- (d) fewer family responsibilities now will allow me to work full-time
- (e) just completed degree
- (f) other, please specify _____

26. If answer on number 23 is no, which of the following best describes your reason for not seeking full-time employment?

- (a) health reasons
- (b) family responsibilities and other interests
- (c) still going to graduate school
- (d) retired or semi-retired
- (e) no financial need to work full-time
- (f) cannot find full-time work in my field
- (g) working full-time now
- (h) other, please specify: _____

Thank you for your time and effort in completing this questionnaire. Please return it through CAMPUS MAIL using the attached mailing label. If you would like to make additional comments, please include them on an attached sheet.

If mailing label is missing, return questionnaire through CAMPUS MAIL to:

William Thompson
Department of Communication
310 Strickler Hall
CAMPUS

Did you complete the part-time survey last April?

Yes

No

If yes, have you noticed a change in the university's policies toward part-timers in the past year?

If so, what is that difference?

Please feel free to include any other comments about part-timers at the University of Louisville.

APPENDIX B

PART-TIME FACULTY NARRATIVE COMMENTS

The following comments are from University of Louisville part-time faculty. Option a is the respondents' answer to a question directed toward those who completed the 1988 part-time faculty questionnaire. The question: "Have you noticed a change in the university's policies toward part-timers in the past year? If so, what is that difference?" Option b is the respondent's answer to the request, "Please feel free to include any other comments about part-timers at the University of Louisville."

1.
 - a. I seem to have more students per class.
 - b. It seems to me that if a part-time faculty member received good evaluations and performs satisfactorily his salary should be increased after a period of time; e.g., one year.
2.
 - a. none
 - b. I believe my situation is unique. I have the full support of my Dean and full-time faculty and have been offered full-time tenure-track positions. I don't want them. I call my own shots and enjoy this. The key variable: my husband is our primary source of support.

3. b. Treated very well.
4. a. It appears to me that the administration seems less and less concerned with the quality of teaching. UofL has some excellent professors who conduct inspiring classes. But this appears to count for nothing compared to the emphasis on publishing. What is a university's basic purpose?
5. a. I am well treated by my dept. and the A&S Dean's office, but poorly paid. I am frustrated by the lack of recognition given to part-time lecturers. Would especially like reduced tuition for computer courses, post-degree courses in our field, etc. Also by lack of semester-to-semester predictability of position.
b. Certain murmuring circulating about a labor law involving equal distribution of job benefits, e.g., whatever you offer your highest paid employee, you must offer your lowest paid. I'm sure I don't have it right but I am hearing about it from part-time colleagues in several departments. Also, will PTL's be considered for membership in new faculty club? Not high on my list of priorities, but a psychological "perk."
6. a. Poor treatment of PTLs. No respect for PTLs as professionals, but full expectation for them to be involved in professional growth.

- b. The pay system is exploitative.
7. a. none
- b. I think that attendance of students should be considered in part with academic grade for final grade in course.
8. a. absolutely none
- b. The university, as a supposedly enlightened institution, should realize it is being exploitative and take noticeable steps to increase pay and provide any benefits. Maybe a strike is necessary among part-time faculty so that the university realizes we have some importance.
9. a. Prep Division has made some efforts to address the needs of its PTL staff.
- b. I would be interested in forming a Part-Time Lecturer's Organization.
10. a. I have been teaching 3 classes part-time. The interior design program is growing and improving. I would like to remain a part of that growth.
- b. I would like to know the results of this survey.
11. b. Move to give us better offices and more involvement with program.

12. a. I think that over time part-time teachers have come under closer supervision and are less independent. I do always like this, but I do understand the need for quality control for part-time faculty.
- b. I appreciate your interest in the part-time faculty.
13. a. None. It has always been inconvenient to study here. Reason: non-existent cafeteria hours on weekends; library doesn't stay open on Saturday evenings; poor aesthetic environment (this place needs more trees) and parking. More available low-cost on-campus housing facilities for graduate students would help alleviate this problem. Otherwise, no change.
- b. Airport expansion will prove to be a disaster for the university and ultimately for the city of Louisville, as the university is its greatest asset. The shift of noise footprints over Belknap will make the research-study-teaching environment here intolerable enough to generate a mass exodus of faculty from the school. In other words, I think the music school faculty to have a salient point in raising the issue. For now, that's the most burning issue facing the university.
14. a. We haven't gotten a raise since 1986. The full-time faculty is depressed and demoralized about the new round of budget cuts and other administrative shenanigans. I have always viewed part-time

teaching as serfdom. I am now trying to get out. By the way, I'm not a failure - I'm an excellent teacher.

b. A friend formulated a law called Stanley's First Law: Academics like to eat shit. The Second Law is: They don't care whose. I've had enough of living by these laws. I'm picky about what I eat.

15. b. Yes, attempt to change course times. I teach Saturdays 9-12.

Now they schedule the same course Saturdays 1-4. Bad idea! I hope I have enough students to have the course.

16. a. This is first semester to teach on the main campus. Aside from the parking problems (BAD!) I can't really say that my perceptions have changed. On the whole, I enjoy teaching at UofL and I would like to continue if possible.

b. Just about the BAD parking situation teaching at Belknap (evenings) presents. Would like UofL to consider designated reserved faculty (for use by part-time who are probably driving in from another job somewhere miles away) slots. And since faculty, a complimentary sticker if required. A small courtesy that would mean so much and reduce stress level!

17. a. No - only that J.A. building will no longer be available and my job can not be done as well in the Central [writing is unreadable] room. I

will do my best!

b. I am so determined to stay part-time at UofL leading aerobic fitness classes. I wish we could use the facility at a nearby school, church or club because concrete rooms with staircases in the middle - no mats - no air circulation - really take the fun out of it and turn students away.

18. a. none

b. UofL is a great school to be associated with. I've enjoyed my many years here.

19. a. When people are paid the same thing year in and year out they become discouraged.

b. It is discouraging to see graduate students with no teaching experience and only a B.A. get paid more than I do, to be given tuition remission, and be accorded more respect and deference. In a few years they move on. I have a sincere commitment to UofL students but I am constatnly treated like an ugly step-sister, despite excellent evaluations by students and faculty. Also, why do my library privileges expire in the summer? Why is this necessary?

20. b. Part-time teachers seem to be more dedicated and better teachers. Tenured teachers, as a class, are inferior to part-time

teachers as a class.

21. a. No, the part-time teacher is one rank above the student. Still perceive a low perception. Students have a favorable impression of part-timers and respect them. The part-timer carries the major responsibility for teaching crucial courses, i.e. retention. We need to be recognized: 1) paid in timely matter in fall - six weeks before receive income; 2) have full-year, half-time teaching contract; 3) included in program development and scheduling of classes; 4) count towards full-time teachers years of credit/rank; 5) recognized for years of teaching - given priorities on schedule and courses taught; and 6) part-time=full time - change title.
22. a. The university offers nothing for part-time faculty (which makes up 15-20% of the teaching force?) I'm tired of being a damn slave to this university but will continue to teach for enjoyment.
- b. My students are amazed at what I am paid. Imagine teaching a full load for one-third the salary of regular faculty - with NO benefits. I hold contempt for the administration of UofL and their asinine policies. I have a running commentary in my classes about the cost of Howard Schnellenburger: Every time the lights are bad, the heat is high, the ripped movie screen does not stay down, or a

VCR-movie projector is broken - I wonder aloud about his salary and budget, hoping and praying, the great God of football could fix something for the lowly Ph.D.'s who have to teach. Academic excellence at this university - with the way they budget - I doubt it will be achieved.

23. b. What we're talking about is basically a question of diminishing respect. Many of my part-time colleagues are extraordinarily gifted and qualified teachers and are regarded as grad students (whose days are filled with meetings and seminars and "professional advancement," evidently) rather than with the teaching they're supposedly hired to do.
24. a. No really. I have had very little contact with UofL outside teaching.
- b. One thing that would enhance teaching part-time at UofL would be more frequent and dependable opportunities to teach. Not knowing till a month before the semester is rough on scheduling and preparation.
25. a. Very little. The School of Education recognized that my work is professional. I was treated as a lackey in the English Department where I earned the Ph.D. and a Graduate Dean's Citation. I'm much

more professionally fulfilled, but I can't believe that in six years, I've received not a pittance increase in salary.

26. b. I have always enjoyed teaching part-time at UofL. Everyone is cooperative and helpful.
27. a. Considerably less clerical support available.
28. a. No changes.
29. a. I use a lot of audio-visual materials. The already abysmal AV dept. on the Shelby Campus seems to have gotten worse.
- b. It would be great if any type of promotion and salary increase were possible for part-time faculty. I teach mostly for personal enjoyment, but tire of feeling like UofL slave labor. It's frequently a major accomplishment to get chalk, let alone anything else!! My class (I teach 4) are quite popular, but I am considering quitting at UofL for lack of any encouragement/ gratification. The administration at UofL certainly doesn't seem to put much value on part-time faculty.
30. a. Much more limited to set up course. Much more directed from the top; program director is a rule-bound person; cannot take the time or the risk of assessing each instructor for his/her strengths and weaknesses; therefore, shortchanges students by failing to assign

instructors according to their most effective posts and duties.

31. a. Part-timers still seem to be taken for granted and poorly compensated.
32. a. Last year, department gave me a small gift at the end of the year and invited me to a get-together. This year they didn't need me as much (1 course) so I guess they didn't think about my being included. Still, it made me feel less appreciated. Yet I know that students consider me a very good instructor - according to the evaluation stats - so I suppose that should be enough.
- b. What chance is there that anything will come of this survey? How about a follow-up report? Pay screwups have always been a hassle here. Is this plan even legal?
33. a. Not yet, but hope to see some in the future.
- b. Having devoted years of hard work to earn my Ph.D., and having done the best I could for my students, it actually hurts to see me lumped under "staff." I would like my name given against the courses I teach, as Dr. so and so. I know it would enhance my morale. Also, it would help if excellent work was applauded once in a while. What does the Dean's office do with the evaluations, other than mail them back to us?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albert, L. S., & Watson R. J. (1980). Mainstreaming part-time faculty: Issue or imperative? New Directions for Community Colleges, 30, 73-80.
- American Association of University Professors. (1981). The status of part-time faculty. Academe, 67, 29-39.
- Biles, G. E., & Tuckman, H. P. (1986). Part-time faculty personnel management policies. New York: Macmillan.
- California Community Colleges. (1987). Study of part-time instruction. Sacramento, CA: author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 278 449)
- Eliason, N. C. (1980). Part-time faculty: A national perspective. New Directions for Community Colleges, 8(2), 1-12.
- Feldman, R. B. & Keidel, G. C. (1987). Satisfactions and dissatisfactions of part-time faculty. Nursing Outlook, 35, 16-19.
- Gappa, J. M. (1984). Part-time faculty: Higher education at a crossroads. (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 3). Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education. (ERIC Clearinghouse for Higher Education No. ED 251 058)
- Grant, W. V., & Synder, T. D. (1986). Digest of education statistics: 1985-86. U.S. Department of Education Publication No. 86-400. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Hawkins, J. (1987). Role perceptions of part-time BSN faculty. Nursing Outlook, 35, 20-23.
- Heller, S. (1987, January 28). Part-time teachers turn to unions to alter status as "academic stepchildren." Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 1, 12.

- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Synderman, B.B. (1959) The Motivation to Work. (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Herzberg, F. (1966) Work and the Nature of Man. Cleveland: World.
- Leslie, D. W., Kellam, S. E., & Gunne, G. M. (1982). Part-time faculty in American higher education. New York: Praeger.
- Moore, R. N. (1986). Benefits desired by part-time faculty. Journal of Dental Education, 50, 270-271. (From Resources in Education abstract, 1986, Abstract No. EJ344865)
- Parsons, M. H. (1980). Future directions: Eight steps to parity for part-time faculty. New Directions for Community Colleges, 8(2), 85-88.
- Reed, S. (1985, August 18). Part-time instructors proliferate. New York Times (Education Summer Survey). pp. 40-41.
- Smith, M. L. (1986). Part-time faculty in private junior colleges: 1985-86. San Marcos, TX: Southwest Texas State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 274 403)
- Spofford, T. (1979). The field hands of academe. Change, 11(8), 14-16.
- Tuckman, H. P. (1978). Who is part-time in academe? AAUP Bulletin, 64, 305-15.
- Tuckman, H. P. (1981). Part-time faculty: Some suggestions of policy. Change, 13, 8-10.
- Tuckman, H. P., & Caldwell, J. (1979). The reward structure for part-timers in academe. Journal of Higher Education, 50, 745-760.
- Tuckman, H. P., Caldwell, J., and Vogler, W. D. (1978). Part-timers and the academic labor market of the eighties. The American Sociologist, 13, 184-95.

Tuckman, H. P., & Vogler, W. D. (1978). The "part" in part-time wages. AAUP Bulletin, 64, 70-77.

Wallace, M. E. (1984). The richness of language and the poverty of part-timers: Impact and invisibility. College English, 46, 580-586.

Wilson, W. L. (1984, November). The use and abuse of part-time faculty: The part-timers' point of view. Paper presented at the convention of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 252 119)

Yang, S. W., & Zak M. W. (1981). Part-time faculty employment in Ohio: A statewide study. Kent, OH: Kent State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 205 140)

VITA

The author, William E. Thompson, has had extensive experience in university administration and teaching. After graduating in 1977 from the University of Missouri with a Bachelor of Science degree in Secondary Education with concentrations in Journalism and English, he became an associate editor for the Political Science Extension Division of the University of Missouri.

After developing a number of communication programs for that division, Thompson became the communications manager for the Conservatory of Music at the University of Missouri-Kansas City. After three years, he was named the Conservatory's Associate Director and supervised all the college's communication, marketing, development and performance activities.

In 1986, Thompson became an instructor in the University of Louisville's Communication Department. He has since written Targeting the Message, a college text on public relations writing that will be published in March 1993.