


2021

Postsecondary Writing Program Collegiality, Job Satisfaction, and Self-efficacy Teaching Writing: A Quantitative Analysis Using Self-Determination Theory

David A. MacKinnon II
University of North Florida, david.mackinnon@unf.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unf.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Suggested Citation

MacKinnon, David A. II, "Postsecondary Writing Program Collegiality, Job Satisfaction, and Self-efficacy Teaching Writing: A Quantitative Analysis Using Self-Determination Theory" (2021). *UNF Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 1013.

<https://digitalcommons.unf.edu/etd/1013>

This Doctoral Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship at UNF Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in UNF Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UNF Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [Digital Projects](#).

© 2021 All Rights Reserved

Running head: COLLEGIABILITY, JOB SATISFACTION, & SELF-EFFICACY TEACHING
WRITING

Postsecondary Writing Program Collegiality, Job Satisfaction, and Self-efficacy Teaching

Writing: A Quantitative Analysis Using Self-Determination Theory

by

David Alan MacKinnon II

A Proposal submitted to the Department of Leadership,

School Counseling & Sport Management

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES

April 2021

Unpublished work © David Alan MacKinnon II

This proposal titled Postsecondary Writing Program Collegiality, Job Satisfaction, and Self-efficacy Teaching Writing: A Quantitative Analysis Using Self-Determination Theory

Dr. Daniel Dinsmore, Committee Chair

Dr. Linda Skrla, Committee Member 1

Dr. John White, Committee Member 2

Dr. Amanda Kulp, Committee Member 3

Dedication

For Caitlin and Ruby Constance,

But for whose support could this work have been possible—

But for whose love has it all been worthwhile.

Acknowledgments

“Oh, Life! Here I am, proud as Greek god, and yet standing debtor to this blockhead for a bone to stand on! Cursed be that mortal inter-indebtedness which will not do away with ledgers. I would be free as air; and I’m down in the whole world’s books. I am so rich, I could have given bid for bid with the wealthiest Prætorians at the auction of the Roman empire (which was the world’s); and yet I owe for the flesh in the tongue I brag with. By heavens!”

--Ahab, *Moby-Dick* (Melville)

“Someone who expresses himself in his nakedness—the face—is in fact one to the extent that he calls upon me, to the extent that he places himself under my responsibility: I must already answer for him, be responsible for him. Every gesture of the Other was a sign addressed to me ... to show oneself, to express oneself, to associate oneself, to be entrusted to me. The Other who expresses himself is entrusted to me (and there is no debt with regard to the Other—for what is due cannot be paid; one will never be even).”

--Jacques Derrida, *Adieu*

No matter whether one pursues the whale as captain or carpenter, to live is to live in debt. To seek out the Other in this debt, though, is to locate joy amid these abyssal costs. Here, in this moment of acknowledging—of admitting my knowledge—I am confronted by an equally abyssal, countersigning ignorance. I am driven to name all who have supported me in pursuing this project, who have given to me in ways memorable and not, whose love and labors entangle me in inextricable prosthesis that constitute the “I” of these pages. Within the breaths that separate syllables and sentences fail to enunciate you here, then, I name you:

My family: Caitlin, Ruby, and Trevi, who have taught me the extraordinary and everyday meanings of love and family in their unflinching support, who continue to endure all the jokes and word play with smiles and who have given up countless weeknights and weekends to this research project, and who give value to the choices I make; Mom, Brian, Grandma, and Grandpa, whose unflagging affection

have seen my through all the good and bad that have marked my path through today, and whose vision and values modeled for me the value of exploring the world while sharing in adventures;

My current and former colleagues, Linda, Jennie, Kadesh, Ash, Tara, Mikayla, Will, Alex, Fred, Russ, Jeanette, and Keith, who have all shared their time and energy with me to talk through countless ideas, without whom I would not be able to do the work I do today, and whose conversations led to the genesis of this study; as well as each graduate assistant who has made the past seven years' worth of writing program work as valuable and fun as it has been: Misty, Brian, Kel, Kyle, Valerie, Sana, Blake, Colleen, Kayla, Max, Monica, Paige, Hannah, Farrah, Holly, Zach, Danetra, Michaela, Lucy, Jared, and Miles, I may never get to express fully to you how grateful I am for your working in the program, or how happy it has made me to pass these years with you;

The teachers who have shared their love of teaching, of language, of finding ways to connect with others: David Flom, Chris Gabbard, Sam Kimball, your dedication not only to your craft but to your fellow human have been models for me to pursue; with every student I meet now I do my best to draw on the examples you set with your generosity of spirit and expectation for more;

My current and former students, you are one my favorite reasons for going to my office each day, each semester, each year, to collaborate with you, to grow alongside you, to pursue the question of "When have I succeeded in teaching?" with you;

My doctoral cohort, without whom I would not have made it through coursework in one, sane piece, through your support and good humor I found reasons to continue term to term, year to year, and you have my profoundest thanks, with special thanks to Jessica and Megan, who always had time to talk through drafts and life, to commiserate and to cheerlead; and

My dissertation committee, Dan, Amanda, Linda, and John, who have given their time and their thoughtfulness to this project and to helping me develop as a researcher and a writer, for never shying away from posing difficult questions or taking a red pen to my words, you have each inspired me to

continue even in the face of what has at times felt like a never-ending study, and you have each aided me to ask better question and to see bigger purposes in asking these.

With this submission, I hope that I do well to make each of you proud. Your support has meant everything to me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Dedication.....	iii
Acknowledgments.....	iv
List of Tables	x
Abstract.....	xi
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	12
Problem Statement.....	16
Purpose of Study.....	19
Research Questions.....	20
Overview of Theoretical Framework.....	20
Significance of Study.....	21
Study Design Summary	22
Organization of the Study.....	23
Chapter 2: Review of Literature	25
Higher Education, Writing Programs, and Faculty Models.....	26
Higher Education and Funding	28
State Funding and Metrics Models	29
Contingent Faculty.....	31
University Writing Programs	32
Theoretical Framework.....	34
Self-Determination Theory	35
SDT research on postsecondary faculty.....	37
Faculty Job Satisfaction	38
Faculty Self-Efficacy	41
Self-efficacy and Faculty Type.....	45
Faculty Behavior and Collegiality	46
Collegiality and Faculty Type.....	48
Collegiality, Job Satisfaction, and Self-Efficacy	50

Conceptual Model.....	50
Chapter Summary	50
Chapter 3: Method	52
Research Questions.....	52
Study Design.....	52
Participants.....	52
Data Collection	54
Instrumentation	54
Measures	55
Job Satisfaction	55
Self-efficacy Teaching Writing.....	57
Collegiality Behaviors and Beliefs	59
Data Analysis	61
Validity and Reliability.....	62
Limitations & Delimitations	62
Chapter Summary	63
Chapter 4: Results.....	65
Data Preparation	65
Factor Analysis	67
Faculty Collegiality.....	68
Job Satisfaction Teaching Writing.....	70
Self-efficacy Teaching Writing.....	72
Results of Regression Analysis.....	78
Chapter 5: Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations.....	82
Discussion of the Findings.....	84
Limitations to Generalization	87
Implications for Practice	88
Implications for Future Study.....	91
References.....	93
Appendix A: IRB Approval	106

Appendix B: Recruitment Email.....107

Appendix C: Informed Consent Language109

Appendix D: Curriculum Vitae.....110

List of Tables

Table

1	Job Satisfaction Measures.....	56
2	Self-efficacy Teaching Writing Measures.....	58
3	Collegiality Behavior Measures.....	60
4	Collegiality Beliefs Measures.....	61
5	Respondent Characteristics.....	66
6	Factor Loadings for Collegiality Constructs.....	68
7	Factor Loadings for Job Satisfaction Teaching Writing.....	71
8	Factor Loadings for Self-efficacy Teaching Writing.....	73
9	Measures, Items, and Item Reliabilities.....	74
10	Results of Linear Regression Predicting Collegiality to Affect Job Satisfaction Teaching Writing.....	79
11	Results of Linear Regression Predicting Collegiality to Affect Self-efficacy Teaching Writing.....	80

Abstract

Calling on Ryan & Deci's (2000) Self-Determination Theory framework, the author sought to explore the relations among writing program faculty collegiality in their work (i.e., teaching, research/scholarship, and service), their job satisfaction in teaching writing courses in postsecondary settings, and their sense of self-efficacy for that teaching. The author surveyed writing program faculty across the State University System of Florida and analyzed collect evidence towards addressing if faculty collegiality behaviors and beliefs relate to faculty job satisfaction in teaching writing or faculty self-efficacy around the teaching of writing. Using exploratory factor analysis and linear regression modeling, the author analyzed the respondents' ($n=52$) data and made two significant findings for the sample surveyed: as respondents reported higher faculty collegiality-service behaviors, their self-efficacy in teaching writing increased ($\beta=.57, p<.05$). At the same time, as respondents reported greater faculty collegiality-research beliefs, their self-efficacy in teaching writing decreased ($\beta =-.51, p<.10$).

Keywords: self-efficacy, job satisfaction, higher education, contingent faculty

Postsecondary Writing Program Collegiality, Job Satisfaction, and Self-efficacy Teaching
Writing: A Quantitative Analysis Using Self-Determination Theory

Chapter 1: Introduction

Since the inception of writing programs in United States higher education, postsecondary writing program administrators (WPAs) have done their best to balance quality instruction with unpredictable institutional funding, enrollment swings, and, more recently, a deepening dependency on contingent faculty (Carino, 1995). Writing programs vary by location and in terms of practices, policies, and models—from staffing and funding to curricula and mission—but routinely offer many of the first courses in which first-year students will enroll (White-Farnham & Siegel Finer, 2017). This first year is an important time in a student’s postsecondary education and marks a significant transitional period from their secondary education institutions (see, e.g., Astin, 1975; Tinto, 1975). In terms of their academic development, student success in this first semester has been shown to predict how likely these new students are to persist into subsequent semesters and the likelihood of their graduation from their institutions (Bloemer, Day, & Swan, 2017; Jaeger & Hinz, 2008).

As more researchers have begun studying student success in higher education, they have found postsecondary students are more likely to persist and graduate when they receive instruction from full-time faculty (i.e., those not on a semester-to-semester contract) (see, e.g., Harrington & Schibik, 2004; Kezar & Sam, 2013; Mueller, Mandernach, & Sanderson, 2013). Harrington and Schibik, for example, explain that the first year of a student’s postsecondary education is the most impactful on their success and suggest that part-time faculty lack the

resources to integrate the student into the university community, especially with faculty. While the scholarship on this topic has yielded mixed results to date, many researchers have pointed to the significance of the first-year student experience and the relation between student success and faculty type. Yet, many writing programs have nonetheless come to rely on increasing numbers of non-tenure-track faculty to deliver first-year instruction (Finkelstein, Conley, & Schuster, 2016; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). This phenomenon is not unique to postsecondary writing programs; rather, it represents a larger, longer-term shift in the higher education landscape (Hirsch-Keefe, 2015; Mueller, Mandernach, & Sanderson, 2013; Wells, 2015).

This shift has mirrored the greater national shift towards neoliberal educational policies that have repositioned students into consumers and institutions as marketers (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). In this way, institutions actively compete with one another to attract first-year students via increasingly attractive amenities outside the classroom. At the same time, these institutions end up hiring contingent faculty (i.e., non-tenure-track faculty) to help meet enrollment at postsecondary institutions (Kezar, 2013). As university administrators focus on budgetary issues, academic program administrators are tasked with staffing courses with a variety of short-term instructor types: graduate assistants, part-time faculty, and visiting faculty (Schuster & Finkelstein., 2006).

Over the same period, the instruments of neoliberal economics have grown more common within the administration of higher education, and are perhaps most obvious now in the ways state legislatures have addressed institutional efficiencies and account for postsecondary education costs by experimenting with performance-funding models (Shin, 2010). Such initiatives in the 1980s and 1990s in states like Florida, Missouri, and Tennessee saw states

award additional funds on top of a base budget allocation to institutions that performed well against specific criteria (Dougherty et al., 2014; Li, 2016). However, since the Great Recession of 2008, many state legislatures have refined their higher education funding policies by combining a percentage of each institution's base funding and from that pool awarding portions of it to top-performing institutions relative to their success on given metrics. In such a model, underperforming institutions risk those same base funds they contributed to the collective pot (Dougherty & Natow, 2015). For instance, in the state of Florida the body overseeing the entire state university system—the Board of Governors—has identified key metrics with which to compare its 12 public universities. Their metrics include, among others, rates of student retention, progress to degree, cost to degree, number of online programs, and four- and six-year graduation rates (SUS BOG, 2017) in the name of comparing institutional effectiveness and efficiencies (Dougherty, Natow, Bork, & Vega, 2010).

Concerns with institutional efficiency and an increasing reliance on contingent faculty cast a light on a larger issue and a potential paradox of educational quality: state institutions are forced to compete with one another for funding as their governing boards demand improved rates of student retention, academic progress, and graduation (RPG); yet, because institutions cannot predict their financial circumstances from year to year, they are increasingly forced to rely on contingent faculty. Such faculty are often hired to teach lower-level and general education coursework and are directly responsible for much of the initial instruction that first-year students receive (Khan, 2013). In turn, these students' academic successes and failures affect an institution's RPG rates and thus its financial well-being, yet the needs of contingent faculty are often undertreated and unmet. The position of contingent faculty is in many ways a well-studied

topic, with many researchers investigating faculty well-being in this shifting employment landscape (e.g., Hirsch-Keefe, 2015; Levin & Hernandez, 2014; Ruiz Avila, 2015; and Wells, 2015). And, perhaps in response to the recent increase in state accountability efforts that rely on quantitative data, researchers have begun to employ more quantitative methods to address the relation of faculty type to student learning outcomes (Eagan & Jaeger, 2008; Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Harrington & Schibik, 2004; Jacoby, 2006) and to identify ways to support faculty well-being (Antony & Valadez, 2002; Maynard & Joseph, 2008; Mueller, Mandernach, & Sanderson, 2013; and Seipel & Larson, 2018). However, faculty well-being and faculty needs across faculty types—specifically contingent faculty—go largely unexamined.

Placed side by side, such studies that examine student success and faculty well-being begin to make clear that contingent faculty appear to have less success in undergraduate teaching assignments. Contingent faculty frequently lack many institutional supports like classroom and peer observations, periodic review of their work, or travel and research funding that their full-time peers can access and on which they rely to complete their work. Moreover, research on contingent faculty well-being is scant when compared with that of tenure-track faculty (Seipel & Larson, 2018). So while we know that tenure-track faculty are likely to have access to certain institutional supports to improve their individual well-being, those same supports are lacking or altogether absent when one considers contingent faculty needs—despite the fact that nearly 80% of higher education faculty are non-tenure-track faculty (AAUP, 2013).

If institutions and researchers alike operationalize teaching quality in terms of student learning outcomes met/not met, they do so at the cost of minimizing the significance of faculty well-being (engagement, satisfaction, self-efficacy). That is, while many studies examine

discrete aspects of contingent faculty instructional quality and job satisfaction and motivation *or* how institutions treat individual faculty, those studies fail to offer a more complicated perspective or to operate within a stable, complex theoretical framework (Bolitzer, 2019). In considering how one discusses an institution's quality of instruction, faculty working conditions should be included (Brown, 2016; Rhoades, 2019). To this end, I sought to examine how faculty working conditions across a state's public institutions of higher education highlight the costs of higher education's long-trending shift to dependence on contingent faculty (AAUP, 2018) to both faculty and students alike. Common to these state institutions are their writing programs, whose faculty's working conditions provide a compelling locus for examining the issue of faculty well-being and for responding to Rhoades' call.

Problem Statement

Many states have begun to rely on student success metrics to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of their public institutions of higher education; however, institutions are increasingly relying on contingent faculty to deliver their undergraduate courses and, in particular, their general education curricula. Institutions are employing increasing numbers of contingent faculty despite research that points out that this may lead to poorer student outcomes. This body of research (e.g., Eagen & Jaeger, 2008; Jacoby, 2006; Jaeger & Hinz, 2008; Mueller, Mandernach, & Sanderson, 2013) shows a relation between faculty type (contingent vs. non-contingent) and student success, yet offers few methods to improve student success other than

noting that institutions should do better to hire more non-contingent faculty or make sure to provide contingent faculty more teaching training.

Such nonspecific advice is problematic in several ways, but not least because it posits that teaching is a singular set of skills unrelated to other common faculty responsibilities such as scholarship and service. A shortcoming of such frameworks is that they skip over the composite nature of what it has historically meant to hold or occupy a faculty position and what most university faculty across rank have been inculcated to understand through their graduate work: teaching is only one part of their role. As many institutions have reduced the faculty role from a comprehensive set of responsibilities (scholarship, teaching, service) for many of its employees, they have simultaneously limited how many of their faculty are able to call on or cultivate their teaching identities in their continued engagement with their institutional communities.

This issue is especially visible in writing programs, whose administrators must respond to each semester's financial and enrollment shifts (Brown, 2002). General education writing courses are often staffed by an unpredictable mix of full-time non-tenure-track faculty, visiting faculty, or part-time faculty and graduate assistants rather than by tenure-track faculty (McBeth & McCormack, 2017). The history of the teaching of writing is one that has largely been subsumed into that of English departments, where tenure-track faculty have tended to teach literature courses, in turn positioning writing courses to be taught primarily by short-term contract faculty or as "service" courses when none could be found (Chace, 2009). When institutions and their administrators attempt to balance student outcomes against budgetary

concerns, they are likely to do so at the peril of not only their students but the faculty who teach their students, as well.

Scholars have shown that this financial considerations-student outcomes model results in high turnover and lesser teaching quality among part-time faculty in writing programs (Caruth & Caruth, 2013). Such scholarship reinforces the narrative that, due to the reality of budget constraints, there is little need to address other areas. And while many autobiographical or single case (i.e., qualitative) studies address individual faculty well-being in a writing program, little data exist to produce a general sense of well-being in writing programs. Instead, researchers engage the question of writing program faculty well-being as inherently problematic. For instance, one could examine the Conference on College Composition and Communication's long history of issuing resolutions such as the Wyoming Resolution (Robertson et al., 1987) and the Indianapolis Resolution (Cox et al., 2016)—two documents that state clearly the challenges facing contingent faculty and set up guidelines for writing program administrators to consider and abide. These documents exemplify a field's attempts to defend against institutional policies that undermine faculty well-being in specific charges such as faculty perception of a caste system of hiring in writing programs and the ongoing failure of previous documents to capture these issues and motivate those in power (e.g., WPAs) to create mechanisms to improve equity for faculty chief among them. In such seminal texts for the field, salary inequity and job benefits are only a piece of that individual faculty well-being question.

While appropriate compensation is significant in supporting faculty well-being, it is only one avenue institutions can take to support faculty and student learning. University administrators have other means through which they can help their faculty develop and support

their faculty identities in ways that provide the latter with opportunities to mix their teaching with service and scholarship. Moreover, as faculty well-being correlates with student success (Dolinsky, 2013; Seipel & Larson, 2018), if administrators seek to increase student success, they have a responsibility to address those issues that affect faculty well-being and, thus, student learning. In differentiating and understanding more distinctly the particular motivations of writing program faculty, then, writing program administrators can better argue for and offer professional development opportunities for their program faculty, regardless of position type. Greater attention to faculty well-being may support faculty satisfaction in their teaching as well as their self-efficacy in that work—aspects that relate positively with improved student learning outcomes—as well as answer the long-standing call that many contingent faculty have voiced over the decades (see, e.g., Antony & Valadez, 2002; Hirsch-Keefe, 2015; Wells, 2015).

Purpose of Study

In this study I used Self-Determination Theory (SDT) to explore the relations among writing program faculty collegiality in their work (i.e., teaching, research/scholarship, and service (Kuntz, 2012)), their job satisfaction in teaching writing courses in postsecondary settings, and their sense of self-efficacy in that teaching. SDT accounts for motivation through three innate needs: needs for competence, autonomy, and relatedness. Deci and Ryan (2000)

have hypothesized that these innate needs are affected by social environments that can foster or hinder their growth and motivation.

Research Questions

In this study, I sought to collect information to explore the possible relations between faculty collegiality and faculty job satisfaction in teaching writing and faculty self-efficacy teaching writing.

Overview of Theoretical Framework

With Self-Determination Theory (SDT), Deci and Ryan offer a theoretical framework to examine the internal motivations and psychological needs of faculty as well as their perceptions of their social environments. In this way, a researcher can examine an individual's collegial behaviors and their perceptions of their self-efficacy and job satisfaction. As a result, this STD framework permits researchers to begin with a more holistic definition and perception of faculty well-being and allows them to focus on the internal motivations of individual faculty. Whereas previous studies have focused on the qualities of one's social environment (e.g., availability of professional development across ranks, inclusive participation in shared governance), Self-Determination Theory offers a framework that incorporates the psychological aspects of competence, autonomy, and relatedness. With this framework, a researcher can posit that one's social environment affects individuals. It also allows the researcher to investigate the mediating

effects of competence, autonomy and relatedness on the individual within their social environments (Larson et al., 2019).

Significance of Study

This study has significance for both practice and theory. Concerning practice: scholars have demonstrated that environmental factors such as compensation, recognition, and student quality play an important role in faculty development and well-being (e.g., Elder et al., 2016; Hardré, 2012). However, only recently have researchers begun to analyze the interplay of environmental factors with individual faculty's innate, psychological needs and how these contribute to faculty development and well-being. This study, then, provides academic leaders an enhanced framework to refine how they understand and discuss faculty hiring and professionalization—both in contingent and non-contingent faculty populations. While writing program administrators can continue to advocate for more equitable hiring practices, they can also develop additional ways to support contingent faculty growth. Faculty enhancement of this population is a neglected area of institutional interest even though contingent faculty numbers continue to swell (AAUP, 2013). Institutional administrators, and writing program administrators, in particular, may in turn have the opportunity to develop contingent faculty professionalization mechanisms that support the professional growth of contingent faculty. In a time when public education faces increasing demands paired with reduced budgets (see, e.g., Dougherty & Natow, 2015; Hearn, Warshaw, & Ciarimboli, 2016), institutions of higher

education would be well-served in finding ways to better support the instructors who are teaching the lion's share of students (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006).

Concerning theory, Seipel and Larson (2018) have remarked that the application of Self-Determination Theory to the study of contingent faculty is an emerging area of research. They note the dearth of studies on this topic as concerns demographic variables and the need to invest further such study with concepts beyond satisfaction. In combining faculty behavior with job satisfaction and perceived sense of self-efficacy, as well as individual demographics across institution types, this study responds directly. It offers researchers an enhanced framework to understand faculty well-being. Ryan and Deci (2020) note, too, that teacher and leadership motivations is an area of STD scholarship that needs further study and development.

Study Design Summary

While each of these three aspects of faculty life—collegiality, job satisfaction, and self-efficacy—has been examined individually or in pairs, I have placed all three into a more holistic conversation. This study employed a non-experimental quantitative approach by determining any relations between the constructs of interest (i.e., paths; Creswell, 2014) by gathering responses from respondents on the topics of (i) writing program faculty collegiality behaviors in teaching, research, and service; (ii) writing program faculty collegiality beliefs about the significance of teaching, research, and service in their roles; (iii) job satisfaction teaching writing; and (iv) self-efficacy for teaching writing.

This study took place during the initial months of COVID-related quarantining and amid a tumultuous period for many institutions and their faculty. I solicited individuals to participate in this study during April, often the last month of many schools' spring semesters, and due to a

small response rate (n=44), I waited until the subsequent fall semester to solicit more responses and only received an additional eight completed surveys. Due to the diminished rate of return, I was unable to drill down into any of the within- and between-group traits such as faculty rank, status, age, years teaching, degree, and focus of degree, among others.. Moreover, as a result, I adapted this study from a model-testing study to a model-building survey to offer a first step towards subsequent study of this same topic.

Organization of the Study

In this first chapter, I have provided an overview of the ongoing writing program administration conversation to situate questions of faculty labor difference and its effects on faculty well-being and student learning. In Chapter 2, I will review the literature on faculty collegiality, job satisfaction, and self-efficacy, moving specifically to discuss these aspects within the context and literature of postsecondary writing program administration. Within this same chapter, I will also identify and explain the theoretical framework for this study, Self-Determination Theory, and explicate how this framework can connect these faculty aspects for the study at hand. Then, in Chapter 3, I will review the method I propose to collect and analyze writing program faculty data within the state of Florida for the purposes of exploring the relations among these aspects of faculty engagement, job satisfaction, and self-efficacy in teaching postsecondary writing.

Study Definitions

Autonomy. The sense an individual has that their actions originate internally instead of from an outside source or force (e.g., coercion) (Deci & Ryan, 2002).

Competence. The sense an individual has that their actions are effective or efficacious within a particular environment or context (Deci & Ryan, 2002).

Contingent Faculty. Postsecondary faculty off the tenure track; this group includes part-time (adjunct) and full-time faculty, as well as postdocs and graduate students, whose institutions provide “no, or little, long-term commitment to them or their academic work” (AAUP, 2013).

Faculty Collegiality. The cultural, structural, and behavioral aspects that mark a group, such that the cultural components equate to a set of beliefs, the structural components equate to the governing rules, and the behavioral components equate to the actions supported and permitted by those cultural and structural components. For faculty, then, these behaviors are those evidenced in their teaching, research, and service (i.e., their faculty behaviors) (Mangiardi & Pellegrino, 1992).

Job Satisfaction. The total affective assessment an individual has of their work, resulting from specific work hygiene and motivator factors (Herzberg, 1973).

Relatedness. The sense an individual has that they are connected with others (Deci & Ryan, 2002).

Self-efficacy. How well one perceives their ability to perform a task within a specific context (Bandura, 1993).

Chapter 2: Review of Literature

Under demands to improve student writing, postsecondary writing program administrators (WPAs) occupy a challenging position in which they are responsible for ensuring that first-year writing courses are staffed by effective faculty able to create and facilitate curriculum in line with an institutional mission. At the same time, WPAs are often constrained by their institutions' financial focus in other academic areas such as STEM that are higher profile or high need. As a result, WPAs frequently rely on a combination of faculty types—the majority of whom are employed contingently as part-time, visiting, or otherwise non-tenureable faculty. This issue is not singular to writing programs and instead is one that affects many levels of higher education administration. As legislators and administrators focus on metrics of student success such as student persistence and graduation rates, they have shined a light on the quality of faculty instruction. Existing research has addressed how environmental factors like compensation, recognition, and quality of students affect faculty instruction quality and faculty well-being (e.g., Elder, Svoboda, Ryan, & Fitzgerald, 2016; Hardré, 2012; Hoyt, Howell, & Eggett, 2007; Kasemap, 2017). Yet, little research addresses how an individual's psychological needs satisfaction may factor in or mediate those environmental factors and how they relate to faculty instruction quality and well-being. At the same time, much has been written on job satisfaction and perceived self-efficacy in teaching within higher education, but the majority of that scholarship has focused on full-time, tenure-track faculty (e.g., Lechuga & Lechuga, 2018; Rosen, Ferris, Brown, Chen, & Yan, 2013).

To study these psychological needs in the contingent faculty context, I employed Deci and Ryan's (2004) Self-Determination Theory (SDT) to examine the effect that faculty collegiality behaviors have on their job satisfaction in teaching writing and perceived self-efficacy for teaching writing. First, I review the history of postsecondary writing instruction amid labor and financial changes in public higher education models before discussing what existing researchers have found regarding the significance of job satisfaction and perceived-self efficacy as they relate to improving faculty well-being through study of environmental factors of motivation. I then review the emerging literature on the psychological components of motivation and how the study at hand will contribute to this latter emphasis.

Higher Education, Writing Programs, and Faculty Models

Over the past half century, the politics and economics of higher education hiring have shifted in response to ongoing funding and enrollment uncertainties, and many institutions have increasingly employed contingent faculty (Hirsch-Keefe, 2015; Mueller, Mandernach, & Sanderson, 2013; and Wells, 2015). Rather than hire tenure-track faculty to meet fluctuating enrollment at universities, many institutions depend on the budgetary elasticity that hiring contingent faculty enables. At the same time, institutions continue to matriculate students into graduate programs that will yield more potential university faculty (Zusman, 2005). These two threads are at odds with one another, and an increasing number of well-trained and well-educated doctoral and master's graduates find few available tenure-track (i.e., non-contingent) positions within higher education. In fact, while it is unlikely that all such graduating students seek out a tenure-track position, only 17%—or approximately one in six—of doctoral degree holders are able to secure a tenure track position (Andalib, Ghaffarzadegan, & Larson, 2018). As a result,

this process has exacerbated the labor conditions associated with contingent faculty and perpetuated an ethical dilemma endemic to higher education (Kimmel & Fairchild, 2017). With so many doctoral degree holders and few tenure track positions available, many of these graduates with advanced degrees end up accepting contingent positions that are generally lower paid and under-supported by their institutions.

Concurrent with the shrinking number of tenure-track faculty positions and oversupply of students with advanced degrees is the problem of student retention and persistence in postsecondary education. While student retention is a well-examined issue (see, e.g., Astin, 1975; Bean, 1983; Tinto, 1975), questions of how to ensure student retention and success still frustrate institutions. The question of student retention is one, though, that may afford institutions of higher education the opportunity to examine the interplay of two distinct issues: variables affecting student success and the professionalization of university faculty. Located within this dynamic—and specifically more recently within the larger shifts towards institutional performance funding models—is a question of whether or not first-time-in-college (FTIC) students' ability to persist into subsequent semesters and ultimately succeed within their institutions is affected by their exposure to contingent faculty instruction (Harrington & Schibik, 2004)—i.e., those generally under-supported faculty.

Built within a question of performance metrics, specifically within the Florida higher education conversation, student attrition and retention rates have become a primary concern for public institutions of higher education (FL HECC, 2016). Within this conversation, the role of the faculty student-interaction and its effect on student attrition and retention has become a significant nexus point (Cotton & Wilson, 2006; Jaeger & Eagan, 2011). In light of this greater,

existing conversation, the degree to which a first-year student interacts with and succeeds in contingent faculty-led classrooms and courses may have an effect on a student's ability to persist into a subsequent semester or graduate, and ultimately the degree to which a university receives performance funding based on the existing model (Rutherford & Rabovsky, 2014).

However, if institutions continue to rely on contingent faculty to meet and teach these students while studies show that such instruction may jeopardize student learning and persistence, then these institutions may be injuring themselves at a great expense in the name of cost-savings and flexibility. Thus, these institutions may be well served to understand better what aspects differentiate student learning outcomes by faculty type. That is to say, if postsecondary institutions focus their support on the shrinking population of tenure-track faculty—faculty who are less likely to teach first- and second-year students (Childress, 2019)—these institutions are missing a significant opportunity to support their students and faculty simultaneously through a more evenly distributed system of professional support for faculty.

Higher Education and Funding

From the 1950s through the 1970s, in response to changes in student demographics and interests, states increased the number and variety of paths to an undergraduate education (Baum, Kurose, & McPherson, 2013). In the past 20 years, however, states have dramatically reduced their postsecondary education funding in ways unseen since the 1940s (Zusman, 2005). Stakeholder values have shifted relative to their willingness to fund public education. However, the question of *where* the onus of funding public lies for education beyond the secondary level is far from a new one. Ellis (2015), for example, noted that public postsecondary education has come under greater legislative and taxpayer scrutiny, and state legislatures have begun to tie

institutional funding to student outcomes. In his recent elegiac article on the passing of William G. Bowen, Cassuto (22 November 2016) described this shift towards institutional efficiency-minded practices as a shift from education as a public good to an individual investment.

Conceived thus as a tax-supported personal investment, then, a postsecondary education is a private good that individuals should themselves fund and government agencies should ensure students can access but that states should not fund as greatly (Baum, Kurose, & McPherson, 2013).

State Funding and Metrics Models

Offering a history of performance funding models, Dougherty et al. (2014) have explained that in the last five decades, lawmakers at each level of government have taken a greater interest in the results of postsecondary institution outcomes. During that period, many states have enacted some form of performance funding within higher education budgeting, and these efforts fall into two categories: “performance funding 1.0” and “performance funding 2.0” (Dougherty et al., 2014, p. 165). As part of their study, they examined performance-funding programs from 1979 through 2006 and 2007 to the present to identify the underlying drivers of these budgeting innovations. Focusing on performance funding 1.0 in Florida, Illinois, Missouri, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Washington, the authors indicated that the shift towards performance funding was an attempt by institutions to provide more funding amid an anti-tax climate. During this time, 21 states instituted some form of funding policy tied to institutional efficiencies (i.e., performance) (Li, 2016). These earlier, first-generation models of performance funding models offered institutions opportunities to secure funding beyond their normal annual allotment (Dougherty et al., 2014). Subsequently, however, many states did away with and later

revised and reinstated funding models (here, second-generation) that drew from institutions' existing base budgets such that institutions became susceptible to lost base budgets when their institutions did not satisfy minimum performance metrics (Li, 2016). In his analysis of fiscal incenting, Lang (2015) examined the history of performance-funding models in the same period and offers a complementary view to Dougherty et al.'s and Li's by identifying two fiscal management models: "incentive or performance funding on the part of the state and incentive-based budgeting on the part of institutions" (para. 1).

While Dougherty et al., Li, and Lang discussed the history of and lenses through which to see the origins and histories of performance funding models within public systems of higher education, their studies did not examine the effects of these policies and models on their stakeholders. That work has been taken up by other scholars. Hillman, Tandberg, and Fryar (2015), for instance, studied the Washington State Community College System to compare their institutions' outcomes post-implementation of a performance funding model against other states' community colleges. They found that institutions employing such funding models performed comparably with institutions in other states who are not subject to the same kinds of funding models (Hillman, Tandberg, & Fryar, 2015). Similarly, Umbricht, Fernandez, & Ortagus (2015) studied the consequences of performance funding models in Indiana's higher education system and found that the state's performance funding model had no effect on the number of students graduating but that instead institutions began targeting students with certain academic profiles to increase their odds of satisfying the metrics. Such funding models, they argued, could limit accessibility in higher education by excluding students with lesser educational backgrounds as institutions attempted to "game" the funding model (Umbricht, Fernandez, & Ortagus, 2015).

Contingent Faculty

Concomitant with these national shifts towards performance funding models is the continued growth of institutional dependence on contingent faculty to respond to financial uncertainties and increasing student populations at public institutions of higher education. Kezar and Sam (2013) define “contingent faculty” as those faculty who are tenure-ineligible, to include both part- and full-time faculty. Faculty types included under this umbrella include part-time faculty, full-time faculty with no recurring appointment, full-time faculty with recurring appointments, and graduate students. Each of these roles is marked by assignments that focus exclusively on teaching and offer few job securities or academic freedom protections (Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011). In 1975, tenure-track faculty made up approximately 45% of faculty, and in 2015 they made up 29%. Despite steady enrollment growth over that period, contingent faculty have come to dominate the professional faculty ranks and account for at least 70% of those teaching in higher education (NCES, 2010; Wells, 2015). It is clear that contingent faculty instruction has become an integral part of how contemporary higher education is made to work.

Cognizant of postsecondary institution reliance on a variety of faculty, the Modern Language Association (2014) issued a call for support for all faculty types, noting that regardless of rank, all faculty “need to see themselves as members of one faculty working together to provide a quality education to all students” (p. 1). And while this organization may nominally speak for only a specific set of teaching faculty—those who teach literatures and languages, primarily—their call resounds elsewhere in the literature. At the heart of this observation is the presumption that faculty, no matter their label, must be collegial in a specific way to ensure their students receive a quality education; however, as more institutions of higher education hire

contingent faculty to meet growing enrollments and inconsistent budgets, more scholars have begun studying the latter's increasing role in higher education. Leslie & Gappa (1994) argued that universities often overlook "this veritable gold mine of experienced and skilled instructors" in failing to recognize faculty responsible for large swaths of curricula" (p. 61). Echoing much of the previously mentioned literature, they pointed to reduced funding at the state levels as well as growing student populations with greater demographic variety as drivers for the growth in contingent faculty hiring practices.

This narrative purports that the hiring of contingent faculty has offered institutions a means to respond to unpredictable funding and enrollments, and many postsecondary institutions have continued these practices to the point that contingent faculty make up the majority of faculty in many institutions (Antony & Valadez, 2002). In light of this shift towards the hiring of more permanent contingent faculty, Rhoades (2008) has argued that "the future of the academic profession is connected to the working conditions of contingent faculty. So is the academy's future" (p. 12). Responding in part to Rhoades' argument, Jolley, Cross, and Bryant (2014) concluded that contingent faculty and university hiring practices are now a defining, primary feature of the postsecondary education ecosystem, and while the number of contingent faculty is unlikely to shrink, institutions have the opportunity to address the working conditions of these faculty and "integrate these professors into their respective institutions" (p. 228).

University Writing Programs

University writing programs offer an illustrative location for studying contingent faculty working conditions. Public institutions of higher education have historically offered introductory writing courses to incoming students as part of their general education foundations, and over the

past several decades these programs have come to be taught primarily by Ph.D.-holding contingent faculty (Kahn et al., 2017). Writing programs have a well-documented history of self-reflection and analysis and a great deal of that literature has focused on the institutionalization of contingent faculty instruction. Partly as a result, issues of faculty labor and hiring ethics make writing programs a prime location to examine how institutions hire and use contingent faculty.

In reviewing the history of postsecondary writing instruction, Mendenhall (2014) explained that while at one point English faculty position openings outpaced the number of doctoral students graduating, that ratio has inverted over the past two decades. In that time, the type of faculty responsible for writing courses has also changed (Mendenhall, 2014). In response to federal and state accountability initiatives, English departments shifted their curriculum away from a sole focus on literature toward a more diversified curriculum that could address pragmatic writing concerns (Mendenhall, 2014). This diversification has led to a discipline with many faculty staffing models and ranks. Examining what it means to be a professional faculty within such a discipline, Penrose (2012) cited expertise, autonomy, and community as cornerstones of one's professional identity. With various faculty types staffing writing programs, however, the degrees of autonomy and community vary widely while levels of expertise tend to be more similar across ranks. The National Census of Writing (2014) found, for instance, that within four-year institutions nearly 73% of faculty teaching college-level writing had doctoral-level training with nearly 25% reporting a master's degree-level of training. They found, too, that approximately 80% of respondents had degrees in either English, Rhetoric, Composition, or Writing Studies.

Theoretical Framework

There is a wealth of research on the topic of motivation, job satisfaction, and self-efficacy, and over the past 60 years, that research has grown to include many domain-specific examinations within one's personal life and workplace. Through such research, scholars have examined these topics within higher education faculty ranks (e.g., Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Laden & Hagedorn, 2000) and in turn their research has provided practitioners evidence-based information to make decisions that affect their programs and faculty. However, much of this research has either focused exclusively on tenure-track faculty (e.g., Hagedorn, 2000; Lechuga, 2014) or has focused on faculty ranks in relation to student learning outcomes (e.g., Eagen & Jaeger, 2008; Harrington & Schibik, 2004). Such efforts fail to account for the varied nature of individual psychological needs as significant contributors to faculty well-being in terms of faculty motivation, satisfaction, and self-efficacy (Seipel & Larson, 2018). Over the past decade, though, more researchers have begun to take advantage of theoretical frameworks instead of what Kezar and Sam (2011) have noted as "largely atheoretical" approaches to study faculty motivations (p. 1430).

In particular, Self-Determination Theory (SDT) offers a theoretical framework that researchers have found productive in examining and assessing the internal and external motivations of an individual within their personal and work lives (Van den Broeck, Ferris, Chang, & Rosen, 2016). The study of faculty well-being through a Self-Determination Theory framework is a budding area of research in which there is an opportunity for institutions and researchers to address faculty well-being beyond job satisfaction (Seipel & Larson, 2018). In this way, I have suggested how to relate writing faculty's collegial behaviors and beliefs with their

job satisfaction and perceived self-efficacy—those evidenced in their practice of teaching, research/scholarship, and service (Kuntz, 2012). Faculty job satisfaction and self-efficacy have a positive relationship, and that phenomenon is well documented (Seipel and Larson, 2018). However, previous work has focused chiefly on environmental components of satisfaction and efficacy—those external factors—more than individual or intrinsic motivators.

Self-Determination Theory

Examining the mechanisms and effects of internal and external motivations, Deci and Ryan (2004) forwarded a theory of motivation in which three basic psychological needs must be satisfied for an individual to function optimally: competence, autonomy, and relatedness. When these needs are supported, an individual can grow and achieve a greater sense of well-being (Deci & Ryan, 2004). Broadly, the authors defined competence as how effective one feels within a particular environment. Similarly, they defined autonomy as how one distinguishes the source of one's behavior—regardless of whether a choice emanates from within or without. Finally, Deci and Ryan defined relatedness as the ways in which one feels connected to others within a context. Taken together, then, these three basic psychological needs offer researchers a framework to understand individual's motivations within particular contexts or situations. Moreover, as Seipel and Larson (2018) have noted, while an individual's workplace environment affects their performance, satisfaction, and well-being, they noted, too, that studies on the basic psychological needs—competence, autonomy, and relatedness—are lacking.

Within the Self-determination model, each of these basic psychological needs can be supported or thwarted by particular environmental circumstance. When an environmental circumstance supports one of these needs, individuals tend to report increased intrinsic

motivation; and, when the reverse is true and an environmental circumstance thwarts that need, individuals tend to orient towards extrinsic motivation values. (Deci & Ryan, 2002). Within this support-or-thwart spectrum, then, an individual's motivations can be oriented and reoriented depending on both the environment and their existing psychological needs satisfaction.

Competence functions as a measure of one's sense of mastery within a particular context and can have a powerful effect or influence on one's well-being (Deci & Ryan, 2002). Those who work as postsecondary faculty have at a minimum some graduate coursework and thus a history of pursuing education, but defining competence by this definition of competence is far too general. Postsecondary faculty, for instance, maintain assignments that often include more than what they have learned in their own coursework, assignments that call on them to possess competence in teaching, in scholarship or research, and in shared governance (Bess, 1992).

The development of faculty competence in these domains requires ongoing environmental support and time. When one's competence need is supported and satisfied, an individual is more likely to demonstrate an enduring, durable sense of motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2002). Similarly, autonomy functions within this framework as a measure of one's belief that the source of one's own actions or behaviors originates from within. As with competence, autonomy can be supported or thwarted and has been studied in its mediating effect between environmental supports and well-being (Seipel & Larson, 2018). Relatedness, or the need to feel a sense of belonging, has been shown to affect one's motivations in ways comparable to competence and autonomy, albeit to a lesser, "more distal" extent (Deci & Ryan, 2002, p. 14). Taken together,

these three basic psychological needs relate to one's intrinsic motivation, which has been documented as a significant source of drive when one faces a challenge (Deci & Ryan, 2002).

SDT research on postsecondary faculty. Numerous researchers have examined postsecondary faculty motivations in various contexts as they relate to faculty job satisfaction. Seipel and Larson (2018), for instance, studied full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to test how individual faculty sense of competence, autonomy, and relatedness mediated the effects of environmental supports (e.g., support from a department chair or colleagues) on the faculty's well-being. They found that an individual's perceived relatedness to others was positively correlated with their general job satisfaction and teaching/service satisfaction. Similarly, Crick, Larson, and Seipel (2019) found that relatedness and autonomy were positively correlated with the relations between faculty supports and faculty job satisfaction indices.

Looking at non-contingent faculty, Mamiseishvili and Rosser (2011) examined National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) data from 2004 to examine productivity and satisfaction. They premised their analysis in an SDT frame to test if faculty satisfaction would result from specific faculty behaviors in teaching, research, and service (i.e., productivity); they also used this model to examine if self-efficacy in a context would lead to job satisfaction. They were able to conclude that some behaviors like graduate teaching and research were more likely to be associated with higher faculty rank and higher levels of satisfaction while undergraduate teaching and service often were associated with lower faculty ranks and lower levels of satisfaction. Such distinctions are important in clarifying that faculty behaviors are linked to job productivity and satisfaction. Moreover, in this study the authors illustrated that different faculty behave differently by rank with various institutional constraints. Such difference merits future

examination, especially as one expands the focus from tenure track faculty to all faculty: part-time faculty, visiting faculty, and graduate teaching assistants chief among those.

Several SDT researchers have examined the effects of internal motivation on self-efficacy, although not to the same degree as those studying job satisfaction. Lechuga (2014) interviewed tenured and tenure-track faculty on the topic of mentoring across science and engineering disciplines within an SDT framework and ultimately concluded that academic faculty competence, autonomy, and relatedness needs varied by discipline in relation to their productivity and mentoring opportunities. Specifically, Lechuga (2014) posited that fostering certain autonomy-enhancing opportunities through mentoring created higher senses of perceived faculty self-efficacy in areas of their work. His qualitative work forms a strong call for future scholars to collect and analyze data to test the relation between such psychological needs satisfaction or frustration and self-efficacy further among non-contingent faculty. At the same time, this question of the relation between intrinsic motivations and self-efficacy is not one limited to this population but requires further exploration across faculty ranks and types. If, as Lechuga noted, different disciplines have different needs in terms of autonomy-supporting environmental factors, such a logic might well map out on to various faculty types: i.e., faculty of different disciplines with different ranks are likely to have different needs in terms of autonomy-supporting mechanisms as well as those that support relatedness and competence.

Faculty Job Satisfaction

Across fields, job satisfaction is a key component to any individual's success as well as the success of an organization (Kasemsap, 2017). Moreover, organizations often go to significant lengths to boost employee job satisfaction to improve their overall organizational success

(Özpehlivan and Acar, 2015). And while both environmental and individual factors affect an individual's job satisfaction, individual and intrinsic motivators have been shown to have a greater effect on overall faculty job satisfaction within higher education faculty positions (Cano & Castillo, 2004; Hoyt, Howell, & Eggett, 2007). Researchers have proposed a few theories (e.g., Herzberg's Two-factor theory, Baldwin's tri-stage theory, as cited in Hagedorn, 2000) to account for this difference in motivational effect, noting primarily the extensive graduate school training and pre-professionalization that faculty experience regardless of eventual rank or position.

A great deal of workplace attitudes research is rooted in Herzberg's (1968/2008) Two-factor theory, which emphasizes two distinct factors that comprise job satisfaction: motivational aspects and hygiene aspects. In exploring how motivation functions in employees within accountancy and engineering, Herzberg (1968/2008) built from Maslow's hierarchy of needs and found that factors that lead to job satisfaction are different from those that lead to job *dissatisfaction*. Herzberg noted that job satisfaction and job *dissatisfaction* are not on the same continuum but are comprised of different constituent factors. He noted that job satisfaction stems from "motivator factors that are intrinsic to the job ... achievement, recognition for achievement, the work itself, responsibility, and growth or advancement" (p. 24). Job *dissatisfaction* tends to arise from "factors that are extrinsic to the job ... company policy and administration, supervision, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, salary, status, and security" (p. 24). Herzberg drew these observations from a large data set across a variety of respondents from numerous countries and over many years. It remains unclear, then, how well his model accounts for individuals working in other fields and contexts.

Scholars in the decades following Herzberg's publications formed the basis for faculty models of job satisfaction in higher education. Cano and Castillo (2004), for instance, adapted instruments calling on Herzberg's motivator-hygiene model to survey full-time, tenure track faculty within a university's College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences at The Ohio State University. Their study determined that male faculty tended to be more satisfied in their work overall than their female colleagues. The study also determined that intrinsic work factors motivated the faculty more than external factors. Other studies have reported similar findings. These studies stand in contrast to those examining non-academic disciplines and that identify the extrinsic factors as either equally or more motivating than intrinsic factors. Antony and Valadez (2002), while not calling on Herzberg's theory as a framework, found that part-time faculty were satisfied in their roles in ways statistically similar to their full-time and tenure track faculty peers. They also found that intrinsic motivators were more aligned with job satisfaction than were environmental concerns.

In her examination of online part-time faculty job satisfaction, Ruiz (2015) pointed to existing research that "argue[s] that faculty satisfaction has a direct impact on student outcomes" as well as "research [that] points to the lack of administrative and technical support as a demotivator to continuing teaching online" (p. 2). After analyzing more than 200 surveys of part-time faculty job satisfaction, Ruiz concluded that part-time faculty desire "fair compensation and the need for self-actualization where recognition of the work they do becomes increasingly important" (p. 64). In a similar study of online part-time faculty job satisfaction, Dolan (2011) found that "a great number of adjuncts noted an urgent need for faculty and management to exchange ideas, regardless of how this was achieved (i.e., whether it happened face-to-face [*sic*] or

via the Internet)” (p. 5). He expanded his observation to explain “that the absence of faceto face meetings apparently does not decrease faculty’s loyalty and motivation” and that “If the school enables faculty to enrich their own academic life and thereby become better teachers by arranging faceto face meetings, then the sense of loyalty that instructors feel toward their students will presumably extend, by virtue of its intermediary role, to the institution as well” (p. 6).

Hoyt, Howell, and Eggett (2007) drew from Herzberg’s framework to determine that for part-time faculty, eight constructs emerge as determinants of their job satisfaction: hygiene factors, those job-related factors that contribute to job dissatisfaction, include (i) teaching schedule, (ii) autonomy, (iii) quality of students, (iv) faculty support, (v) classroom facilities, and (vi) honorarium, while motivators, those job-related factors that contribute to job satisfaction, include (vii) work preference, and (viii) recognition. They too found that part-time faculty located much of their job satisfaction from intrinsic aspects of that work. They note, however, that because their studied faculty at a private doctoral university, there is a need for more research across a variety of institutions. And while many studies on contingent faculty job satisfaction have followed, most of these studies focus on community colleges (e.g., Antony & Valadez, 2002; Nagle, 2016). This focus may stem from the teaching-centric mission associated with community and two-year colleges and the historically non-contingent faculty-staffed universities. What emerges here is a clear need for university faculty-specific job satisfaction scholarship.

Faculty Self-Efficacy

While job satisfaction is an important feature when examining faculty well-being, it is not the only factor. Noting that faculty positions are complex in nature, Seipel and Larson (2018)

have pointed to the documented positive relation between the job satisfaction of employees with complex jobs and their self-efficacy. However, the idea of self-efficacy in a complex role is problematic insofar as self-efficacy is not a singular concept that can describe one's abilities in the aggregate; instead, self-efficacy must be examined in domain-specific ways (Bandura, 1993). Self-efficacy, or how well one perceives their ability to perform a task within a specific context, is predictive of the effort one exerts in a given task (Bandura, 1977). For postsecondary faculty, self-efficacy is instrumental to many of their various roles and responsibilities: in their teaching, in their research, and in their service. However, levels of self-efficacy often vary across many variables: gender, age, experience, and rank among them (Bailey, 1999; Kahn & Scott, 1997). Moreover, Bailey (1999) made clear that as universities increase their dependence on faculty roles focused exclusively on teaching (i.e., contingent faculty), then institutions must attend to faculty motivation and self-efficacy to ensure higher job satisfaction as these factors contribute to how well the university is able to meet its mission.

Over the past 40 years, Bandura's (1977) theory of self-efficacy has been the dominant model on which subsequent scholarship has been based. Bandura posited that teachers who do not believe that they can overcome difficult teaching circumstances are less likely to put energy into their work, and, conversely, teachers who do believe they can overcome the same difficult circumstances are more likely to put energy into that work and endeavor through a difficulty. Bandura (1993) argued that "[t]eachers' beliefs in their personal efficacy to motivate and promote learning affect the types of learning environments they create and the level of academic progress their students achieve" (p. 117.) Bandura further claimed that self-efficacy functions as part of his triadic reciprocal system of cognition, environment, and behavior. He went on to

argue that cognition operates as an individual's ability to reflect on their behaviors and alter their actions. Elsewhere, Bandura (2006) noted that sense of self-efficacy is domain-dependent and limited to "distinct realms of functioning" (p. 307).

Because teaching (and other job functions) differ per contexts, the matter of self-efficacy is one that requires context-specific investigation. Moreover, insofar as teaching in a postsecondary first-year mathematics classroom differs from a postsecondary first-year writing course, the matter of self-efficacy in teaching postsecondary writing requires further domain specificity and subsequent examination. Teaching self-efficacy cannot be reduced to teaching self-efficacy in all contexts or domains and must instead be examined within contexts. Much has been written on teaching self-efficacy in both the K-12 and postsecondary contexts, and many instruments assessing teaching self-efficacy have emerged in that time.

Building from Bandura's social cognitive theory, Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2007) sought to assess the effects of two of Bandura's four sources of a teacher's perceived self-efficacy (mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological arousal). They focused on verbal persuasion and mastery experiences and found that novice and career teachers' perceptions of self-efficacy were affected by mastery experiences in different ways. Because novice teachers have fewer mastery experiences on which to call, their self-efficacy sources were more frequently tied to verbal persuasion in the form of parental and community supports. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy developed their Teaching Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) to survey teachers, and in the time since other researchers have taken to using the instrument to assess teacher self-efficacy beliefs elsewhere (e.g., Cakiroglu, Capa-Aydin, & Hoy, 2012; Ozder, 2011; Wang, Hall, Rahimi, 2015). Comprised of three factors—efficacy in student

engagement, efficacy in instructional practices, and efficacy in classroom management—this instrument focuses on three areas of a teacher’s work.

Also building from Bandura’s definition of self-efficacy, Gow and Kember (1993) identified two conceptions of approaches to postsecondary teaching: knowledge transmission and learning facilitation, with nine dimensions comprising these approaches. The authors found that (i) training for specific jobs, (ii) imparting knowledge, and (iii) knowledge of subjects comprised knowledge transmission while (iv) problem solving, (v) motivator of students, (vi) use of media, (vii) facilitative teaching, (viii) interactive teaching, and (ix) pastoral interest. While sharing some scope with Tschannen-Moran and Hoy’s TSES model, Gow and Kember’s model operationalized teaching with different emphases.

Building off of Bandura’s work, Brown (1993) operationalized course design (i.e., knowledge transmission), the use of media, class management, teacher student interaction, and assessment and feedback to students (i.e., learning facilitation) as the constructs through which one could measure teacher self-efficacy. Chang, Lin, and Song (2011) drew from all of the constructs above to identify six constructs by which to examine teacher self-efficacy in postsecondary institutions: (i) course design, (ii) instructional strategy, (iii) technology usage, (iv) class management, (v) interpersonal relation, and (vi) learning assessment. Having surveyed postsecondary faculty in nine public and eight private universities, Chang, Lin, and Song found high levels of internal reliability and that their six-construct model (Faculty Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale) accounted for nearly 74% of total variance.

Self-efficacy and Faculty Type

Using Chang et al.'s (2011) FTSE scale, Mehdinezhad (2012) examined postsecondary faculty teaching self-efficacy in Iranian institutions across full-time faculty ranks (lecturers, assistant, associate, and full professor) and demographic variables, including gender and years teaching. The authors focused on communication, assessment, subject matter, curriculum and instruction, learning environment, and technology implementation for faculty across various academic disciplines. They found that years of experience teaching corresponded with perceived self-efficacy in assessment, and offered that this outcome is likely due to new faculty focusing on learning about curriculum and teaching by teaching while more experienced faculty perhaps are able to call on experience to reflect and compare with previous experiences. The authors also found that faculty within education disciplines tended to have higher perceived self-efficacy in nearly all categories.

In considering part-time faculty teaching self-efficacy, Tyndall (2017) found that part-time faculty with fewer than six years of postsecondary teaching experience were more likely to have lower levels of teaching self-efficacy. Her findings echoed those of Chang, Lin, and Song (2011). However, in studying online nursing faculty's sense of teaching self-efficacy, Robinia (2008) found no statistical difference between faculty ranks. As Mehdinezhad (2012) has shown, though, academic disciplines can affect the variance in self-efficacy. Professional schools (e.g., engineering, nursing/health, and business) are more likely to hire adjunct faculty who are employed full time within their respective fields and teach part-time on a voluntarily basis (Antony & Valadez, 2002). Therefore, teaching self-efficacy studies need to be careful in how they compare within and across disciplines, and perhaps in how they define that discipline.

Faculty Behavior and Collegiality

Postsecondary faculty positions are complex, and how one understands faculty job satisfaction and faculty self-efficacy requires an additional piece to connect these other two pieces: faculty collegiality behaviors. Both job satisfaction and self-efficacy are self-reported metrics and are thus prone to higher levels of subjectivity than are other quantifiable metrics. In recording specific faculty behaviors across existing frameworks of faculty labor and activities, one can begin to examine concrete actions and attach specific outcomes while establishing relations among those pieces. Each disciplinary community has its own norms and normalizing practices that keep the community's boundaries in place (Swales, 1990), and higher education is no different, excepting that higher education is itself not one community but a macro-community comprised of numerous disciplines and discourse communities. What each of these shares, however, is an underpinning notion of collegiality.

Collegiality is difficult to define (Bess, 1992). For instance, Alleman, Allen, and Haviland (2017) defined collegiality as an individual's "engage[ment] in open exchange of information" and "a commitment to the principle that self-advancement best results from working toward the common good, and a confidence in the authority of expertise over organizational status" (p. 20). At the same time, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has suggested that collegiality is a pervasive feature that underpins faculty's ability to execute their teaching, research, and service (2006).

Examining the "sea change of membership" that postsecondary institutions are experiencing, Alleman, Allen, and Haviland (2017) have remarked that the definition of collegiality and its inclusivity of workplace features provide researchers opportunities to

examine the composition of the collegium—those who comprise a community and are expected to practice collegiality (individual behavior) (p. 7). Lund, Boyce, Oates, and Fiorentino (2010) noted several professional dispositions that mark faculty collegial behaviors, including interactions between faculty, presence of mentor/mentee relationships, presence of open dialogues, and maintenance of professional manners. Mangiardi and Pellegrino (1990) associate collegiality with specific values, namely how a faculty “shares a commitment to the preservation, validation, communication, and extension of knowledge” (p. 292).

While researchers have been able to link higher levels of collegiality and higher levels of job satisfaction (e.g., Bode, 1999), institutions have also begun to consider how collegiality might feature as a means to evaluate faculty work. However, because of the nebulous and at times confusing nature of collegiality, administrators and researchers alike have worked to operationalize collegiality into models that can be measured. The American Association of University Professors (2006) has offered guidance on this question and maintain a position on this issue wherein collegiality should not be a tool for evaluating faculty but a system of values that informs how an institution defines teaching, research and service. Nonetheless, models have emerged and merit review.

Seigel and Miner-Rubino (2010), for instance, have offered a model to discuss collegiality among law faculty. Their model approaches collegiality by distinguishing affirmative from negative collegiality and in this way present collegiality in ways akin to civility. They found that women and minority faculty were more likely to have experienced some kind of negative collegiality than their white male peers. This definition is useful in considering faculty well-being, but not as much in the study at hand as it does not center on individuals’ interactions

alone. Focusing on teaching, research, and service as faculty responsibilities, Cipriano and Buller (2012) identified observable behaviors and used these to construct their Collegiality Assessment Matrix (CAM) that they provided to department chairs. Their model includes behaviors such as collaboration among faculty and administration, meeting deadlines, respectful communications, and relating to others in constructive ways. They also compiled a self-assessment matrix (S-AM) version for individuals to use and reflect on their own behaviors. The authors compared the administrative responses to individual responses and found that both administrators and individual faculty shared many of the same collegiality expectations.

Collegiality and Faculty Type

The role of postsecondary faculty has evolved and diversified in step with the changing university structures that have emerged over the history of the university. Whereas at the start of the 20th century, much of postsecondary education was offered primarily by full-time, tenure-track faculty, the majority of public postsecondary teaching today is offered by contingent faculty (Gappa & Austin, 2010). Describing faculty today, Gappa and Austin (2010) have remarked on their diversity: they “are diverse; they occupy different types of appointments; and their expectations about their work environments include new concerns, such as sufficient flexibility to manage both their work and life responsibilities” (p. 1). If collegiality is a professional feature of postsecondary faculty, and as contingent faculty continue to grow in size while tenure-track faculty proportions shrink, the issue of how faculty are able to participate in and practice that collegiality emerges as a significant concern; otherwise, the concerns and needs of a shrinking class of faculty frame the dominant narrative of faculty writ large.

If one subscribes to Mangiardi and Pellegrino's (1990) values of collegiality, for instance, one must then ask how part-time faculty with short-term contracts are able to contribute to "a commitment to the preservation, validation, communication, and extension of knowledge" (p. 292). Or, in considering Lund, Boyce, Oates, and Fiorentino's (2010) noted professional dispositions, one must ask in what kinds of inter-faculty interactions contingent faculty can participate or to what degree are they able to take advantage of mentor/mentee relationships or open dialogues. While certain realities affect and limit the roles of contingent faculty, sometimes structurally and sometimes incidentally, what has emerged in many institutions are stratified systems that afford and accord certain privileges to some faculty while withholding them from others, despite faculty often having comparable bona fides in both groups (Maynard & Joseph, 2006).

Writing programs are not exempt here and indeed offer some of the richest case study for comparisons. In developing a contingent faculty research award in their writing program, Lind and Mullin (2017) confronted the longstanding issues surrounding "Rank and privilege, with the accompanying hierarchy," and their ability to promote "exclusion and abuse [and] to trump democratization and collegiality" (p.22). Similarly, in their work to build community and solidarity within their writing program, Lalicker & Lynch-Binieck (2017) identified and proposed several principles to guide their institution in faculty conversions to tenure-track positions. Chief among these included a call to care for and attend to their contingent faculty's "long-term collegial and scholarly" roles in ways commensurate with tenure-track faculty roles (2017, p. 95).

Collegiality, Job Satisfaction, and Self-Efficacy

Viewing postsecondary writing program faculty experiences through Deci and Ryan's Self-Determination Theory (SDT), one can begin to disentangle and treat separately the environmental factors that affect faculty job satisfaction and self-efficacy in teaching writing and that psychological components of motivation that likely mediate these relations. Moreover, researchers have shown that environmental factors function as extrinsic motivators while higher education faculty tend to derive job satisfaction from intrinsic motivators; thus these psychological components merit individual study. Connecting these faculty work aspects within an SDT framework, I examined the role of basic psychological needs as potentially mediating environmental factors' effects on job satisfaction and perceived self-efficacy in teaching writing.

Conceptual Model



Chapter Summary

In this second chapter, I have reviewed key research themes that frame the study at hand. I first provided context for the study I propose by briefly detailing the history of writing program

administration and the changing faculty composition of higher education. Paired with this context, I then supplied definitions for and previous research on the key aspects of this study, collegiality behaviors, job satisfaction, and self-efficacy for postsecondary faculty. Calling on Deci and Ryan's Self-Determination Theory, I then offered a frame through which to see how these three aspects are connected.

Chapter 3: Method

Research Questions

The current study was guided by the following research question:

1. Is faculty collegiality related to faculty job satisfaction in teaching writing or faculty self-efficacy on the teaching of writing?

Study Design

While each of these three aspects of faculty life (collegiality, job satisfaction, and self-efficacy) has been examined individually or in pairs, I sought to place all three into a more holistic model. This non-experimental study employed a quantitative approach by determining any relations between the constructs of interest (i.e., paths; Creswell, 2014) by gathering responses from participants about (i) writing program faculty collegiality behaviors in teaching, research, and service; (ii) writing program faculty collegiality beliefs about the significance of teaching, research, and service in their roles; (iii) job satisfaction for teaching writing; and (iv) self-efficacy for teaching writing.

Participants

Because writing instruction varies by institution, I limited the kinds of institutions surveyed to ensure as much consistency as possible across the solicited sample. For instance, while community or state colleges have widely varying types of writing programs, larger comprehensive institutions that grant master's and doctoral-level degrees share a greater number of commonalities, such as an accelerated credit mechanism, a significant number of transfer students (arriving primarily at the beginning of the sophomore and junior years), and a reliance

on various faculty types. Moreover, each state maintains its own definition, arrangement, and articulation of P-20 education, so this study is limited to a single state's public institutions, as these operate with a similar policy framework of funding, admission, and general education requirements. Since this study focused on a specific phenomenon that concerns one population, I employed a homogeneous sampling technique (Calder, Phillips, & Tybout, 1981). This technique leveraged the specific theoretical framework at hand (i.e., Self-Determination Theory) and allowed the solicitation of responses to compare the constructs of competence, autonomy, and relatedness across faculty ranks. Simultaneously, this choice ensured that each respondent belongs to a specified population (e.g., graduate assistant). However, because of the particular challenges associated with those specified subpopulations for this study—e.g., part-time faculty and graduate assistants—a snowball technique was also employed to ensure that those who might lack consistent access to their email from semester to semester could have access to the survey (e.g., in the event that they were not teaching in the semester the survey was deployed).

Considering these limitations, I emailed and invited writing program faculty at all state universities in the State University System of Florida (SUS Florida) with active, available email addresses listed on their institution's website ($n=587$). These institutions include Florida A&M University, Florida Atlantic University, Florida Gulf Coast University, Florida International University, Florida Polytechnic University, Florida State University, New College of Florida, University of Central Florida, University of Florida, University of North Florida, University of South Florida, and University of West Florida. The introductory email provided a stable link to a survey constructed in Qualtrics.

Data Collection

I obtained Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval for this study and administered a web-based survey through Qualtrics to collect responses from the subpopulation of writing program faculty I described in the preceding section. Each of the state's public four-year institutions' writing program faculty email addresses was recorded and compiled into a comprehensive list of potential respondents from the respective University public website. The emailed invitation solicited participation and brought respondents to an informed consent page and, upon their affirmation of consent, the beginning of the survey. I anonymized subsequent responses through the Qualtrics settings to ensure that each respondents' data set was anonymous.

Instrumentation

I combined and adapted two existing survey instruments. This included adding additional items that measured faculty collegiality behaviors and beliefs. The first portion of the survey was drawn from Hoyt et al.'s (2007) *Part-time Faculty Job Satisfaction (PTJFS)* instrument that identified eight constructs and offered four statements with corresponding 6-point Likert-type scales for a total of 36 statements; however, rather than employing the 6-point Likert-type scales, in this study I employed visual analogue scales (VAS) to solicit responses to concepts that are resistant to interval scaling or force respondents to hierarchize the Likert-type responses (Lee & Kieckhefer, 1989). In the second portion of the survey, I reproduced Chang et al.'s (2011) postsecondary teacher self-efficacy framework and employed their 28-question survey items. I adapted these items to focus on the respondents' sense of teaching self-efficacy in the domain of postsecondary writing, also employing VAS in place of the original instrument's Likert-type

scales. In creating the final section, I reviewed all SUS institutions' collective bargaining agreements (CBAs) to collect information about faculty collegiality behaviors and beliefs. In this process, I reviewed each CBA's sections on faculty evaluation to identify common behaviors that institutions used to evaluate faculty's teaching, scholarship and research, and service. These documents set the expectations for faculty performance, and across each of these 12 institutions three themes were consistent in how institutions assess faculty: teaching performance, contributions to new knowledge, and service. For this reason, I constructed items that asked respondents to describe the degree to which they performed teaching, research/scholarship/creative acts, and service as part of their faculty positions. To account for the risk of performative bias in these responses, I also asked respondents to describe how important they believed each teaching, research/scholarship/creative act, and service item was to their faculty positions.

Measures

Job Satisfaction

Hoyt et al.'s (2007) *Part-time Faculty Job Satisfaction* (PTFJS) identified constructs (i.e., Autonomy, Teaching Schedule, Pay, Work Preference, Faculty Support, Recognition, Status, Classroom Facilities, Quality of Students, and Job Security) and survey questions form the basis for latent variable of job satisfaction. Hoyt et al. (2007) did not find every variable they tested to be equally significant in predicting overall job satisfaction, ultimately removing several variables and reducing their set of constructs to seven: teaching schedule, autonomy, quality of students, faculty support, classroom facilities, honorarium, and recognition. Job Security and Status were removed from their model and subsequent scale. In the present study, Classroom Facilities items

were removed as a construct here as classroom instruction in the state of Florida had switched to fully online due to the COVID-19 pandemic when the survey was deployed. Negative-worded questions were also removed to avoid contaminating responses through potentially confusing language. Each of the remaining six constructs was measured through four-item sets of statements that I converted to 100-point (1-100) visual analogue scales (VAS; see Table 1 for List of Job Satisfaction constructs and items). Hoyt et al.'s survey was developed and validated with data from part-time faculty at a private university. I have employed their PTFJS instrument here to capture the most common feature across faculty rank: teaching. These items were then combined to create an overall job satisfaction scale.

Table 1.

Job Satisfaction Measures

Measure	Items
Autonomy	<p>I am completely satisfied with the level of autonomy that I have in teaching my courses.</p> <p>I have a lot of freedom to develop and modify course content to meet the needs of my students.</p> <p>I have a satisfactory level of autonomy to select material and texts for my courses.</p>
Teaching Schedule	<p>The times scheduled for my class(es) have been convenient to my schedule.</p> <p>I have been very satisfied with my teaching schedule.</p> <p>The times that I teach my classes work well with my personal or other family commitments.</p>
Quality of Students	<p>I am completely satisfied with the quality and caliber of students in my classes.</p> <p>Students in my classes are very well prepared academically to take my courses.</p> <p>Students here are highly engaged and very interested in their academic work.</p>

Table 1. Continued

Measure	Items
Recognition	<p>I am often thanked for teaching here.</p> <p>I feel well respected as a faculty member.</p> <p>Part-time faculty are recognized for their teaching contribution in my department.</p> <p>A part-time faculty job is a valued position in my department.</p>
Faculty Support	<p>I receive very helpful advice and support from academic department faculty to improve my teaching.</p> <p>Faculty in my academic department(s) take a sincere interest in my success as a faculty member.</p> <p>I feel very comfortable requesting assistance from academic department faculty when I have questions about my courses or students.</p>
Honorarium	<p>The payment I receive for my faculty role is adequate.</p> <p>I feel that I am well compensated for my faculty work.</p> <p>I am paid fairly for the amount of work I do.</p> <p>I believe I can select appropriate teaching material.</p>

Self-efficacy Teaching Writing

I employed this portion of the survey to measure perceived sense of self-efficacy in six specific areas of self-efficacy, as developed by Chang et al.'s (2011). These areas included (i) course design, (ii) instructional strategies, (iii) technology use, (iv) classroom management, (v) interpersonal relationships with students, and (vi) learning assessment. I provided respondents with a 100-point (1-100) visual analogue scale to score each of Chang et al.'s 28 self-efficacy statements (see Table 2 for these items). These items were then factor analyzed to create a total self-efficacy scale.

Table 2.

Self-efficacy Teaching Writing Measures

Measure	Items (stem: <i>I believe I...</i>)
Course Design	<p>can select appropriate teaching material.</p> <p>have sufficient professional ability to teach the courses I am teaching.</p> <p>can establish comprehensive teaching objectives.</p> <p>can arrange appropriate timeline for the curricular progress.</p> <p>can prepare my teaching material before class sessions.</p>
Instructional Strategies	<p>have confidence in inspiring and maintaining students' learning motivation.</p> <p>can utilize various inquiring skills to stimulate students' higher level thinking skills and discussions</p> <p>can teach according to students' various levels of readiness.</p> <p>can use effective teaching methods to improve students' grades.</p> <p>can modify my teaching activities during class sessions to sustain students' attention.</p>
Technology Use	<p>know how to use technology to enhance my teaching.</p> <p>can employ software relevant to my teaching.</p> <p>can select appropriate teaching media to enhance my teaching.</p> <p>know how to produce relevant teaching media.</p> <p>know how to operate various types of teaching technologies or equipment such as overhead projectors and computer consoles.</p>
Course Design	<p>can select appropriate teaching material.</p> <p>have sufficient professional ability to teach the courses I am teaching.</p> <p>can establish comprehensive teaching objectives.</p> <p>can arrange appropriate timeline for the curricular progress.</p> <p>can prepare my teaching material before class sessions.</p>
Class Management	<p>can nurture a pleasant learning environment.</p> <p>can promote a democratic environment in class.</p> <p>can maintain a good relationship with my students.</p> <p>can share my personal experiences with students to promote emotional bonding between the students and myself.</p> <p>can listen to my students to understand their thoughts.</p>
Interpersonal Relations	<p>can provide assistance to students whenever they encounter difficulties in learning.</p> <p>can co-assess learning results with my students and advise them on improvement.</p> <p>can provide appropriate assistance to my students if they are incapable of completing an assignment.</p>

Table 2. Continued

Measure	Items (stem: <i>I believe I...</i>)
Learning Assessment	can use a variety of assessment methods to evaluate students' learning results. the assessment methods I use agree with my teaching objectives. provide students the opportunities for exercise to refine the concept they have learned. assess students' performance with positive methods. can improve my teaching according to assessment results.

Collegiality Behaviors and Beliefs

To contextualize faculty roles within the university, I reviewed collective bargaining agreements (CBAs) for all SUS Florida institutions and identified discrete actions that faculty traditionally undertake. I also reviewed the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) instrument to confirm the typicality of these behaviors. In examining both sets of documents, I created a list of behaviors common across these sources. I subsequently used factor analysis and construct validity assessments to ensure that the six constructs that emerged were stable and reliable. The items included in the faculty collegiality behavior section asked faculty to rate how frequently they participated in or enacted specific faculty behaviors. Items for faculty collegiality behaviors demonstrated an acceptable construct validity as evidenced by their faculty loadings in analyses (see Table 3 for list of collegiality behavior items). The items included in the faculty collegiality beliefs section of the survey asked faculty to rate how much they believed that specific faculty behaviors are important to their current faculty role. Items for faculty collegiality beliefs also demonstrated an acceptable construct validity as evidenced by their factor loadings in analyses (see Table 4 for list of collegiality belief items).

Table 3

Collegiality Behavior Measures

Measure	Item (stem: <i>Currently, I regularly...</i>)
Collegiality-Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> prepare instructional materials deliver instruction hold office hours to meet with students review and grade/score student work attend workshops on teaching methods and pedagogy
Collegiality-Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> research & produce scholarship or creative works secure funding to support scholarship or creative works attend conferences conduct other research-, scholarship-, or creative writing-related work
Collegiality-Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> participate in writing program committee work participate in departmental committee work participate in university committee work (shared governance) participate in student mentorship participate in colleague mentorship (as mentor) participate in extracurricular activities on campus participate in advising or supporting a student organization(s)/club(s) participate in writing letters of recommendation for students participate in peer/classroom observations participate in conversations with my colleagues about undergraduate student learning participate in conversations with my colleagues about effective teaching practices participate in conversations with my colleagues about effective use of technology participate in conversations with my colleagues about non-work-related matters

Table 4

Collegiality Belief Measures

Measure	Item (stem: <i>In my faculty role, I believe it's important that I...</i>)
Collegiality-Teaching	prepare instructional materials deliver instruction
Collegiality-Research	research & produce scholarship or creative works secure funding to support scholarship or creative works attend conferences research & produce scholarship or creative works
Collegiality-Service	participate in writing program committee work participate in departmental committee work participate in university committee work (shared governance) participate in student mentorship participate in colleague mentorship engage in conversations with my colleagues about teaching practices engage in conversations with my colleagues about undergraduate student learning engage in conversations with my colleagues about non-work-related matters

Demographics and Respondent Attributes. This set of measures consisted of questions relating to respondents' gender, age, ethnicity, years teaching postsecondary writing courses, highest level of education, academic discipline, current institution, faculty job class (e.g., part-time, full-time non-tenure track, full-time tenure track), and voluntary or involuntary nature of employment. These items were included to gather demographic information about the participants as well as to provide data to group respondents by faculty type and to address Research Question 2.

Data Analysis

I used IBM SPSS Statistics version 26 to analyze the data collected from participants in this study. Because the collegiality constructs and items were latent, I used factor loadings and Coefficient *H* to ensure construct validity of each latent construct. This procedure was repeated

for the job satisfaction constructs and self-efficacy. I modeled the set of collegiality behavior and belief constructs as independent variables in a regression analysis in two separate models to determine the amount of variance each model and identify which factors were associated with job satisfaction and self-efficacy teaching writing in this population.

Validity and Reliability

Both of the original surveys that comprised the adapted instrument in the current study have shown acceptable psychometric properties in past research. Specifically, Hoyt et al. (2007) established comparably high reliability when identifying part-time faculty job satisfaction factors, as those alphas ranged from .69 to .94. Additionally, their model was able to account for 65% of total variance. Chang, Lin, and Song (2011), too, were able to measure faculty self-efficacy reliably and with acceptable validity evidence through their instrument, as their factors accounted for nearly 74% of the total variance in their study. Additionally, the reliabilities ranged from .86 to .95. While the current instrument reproduces a widely used and examined pair of instruments, I also employed factor analysis to test the internal consistency of responses in mapping each survey item's responses for each respective construct and in turn for the composite scales of overall job satisfaction teaching writing and sense of self-efficacy. Across this sample, each factor loaded in ways similar to the original's findings. This new psychometric evidence is discussed at length in Chapter 4.

Limitations & Delimitations

At least two areas of concern emerged that may limit the quality and generalizability of the study. First, only 52 writing program faculty responded to the call to participate. This low response rate may have resulted from the effects of the then-newly emergent COVID-19

pandemic. Due to this restriction of a reduced sample size, I was not able to address the original two research questions as proposed. Instead, I was forced to leave the second research question unaddressed. Specifically, without a sufficiently large data set, I was unable to examine difference among various faculty populations or by sociodemographic traits (gender, age, race/ethnicity). To ensure I was still able to address the first research question, I relied more heavily on a model building, rather than model testing approach, using appropriate statistical methods for smaller sample sizes.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I explained the non-experimental, quantitative design of this study in light of the two guiding research questions. I described how I identified and contacted writing program faculty employed at State University System of Florida institutions for their responses to survey instrument. I also described the steps I took to derive this instrument, combining existing survey instruments (Chang et al., 2011; Hoyt et al., 2007) with language common to existing documents (collective bargaining agreements and COACHE) that describe faculty labor in terms of teaching, research and scholarship, and service. Next, I explained the statistical method I used to examine the survey data via regression analyses of two independent variables (faculty collegiality behaviors and faculty collegiality beliefs) on two dependent variables (job satisfaction teaching writing and self-efficacy teaching writing). I accounted for the historic validity and reliability of the two existing survey instruments connected to job satisfaction and teaching self-efficacy before describing the need to validate and determine the reliability of the items I developed connected to faculty collegiality behaviors and beliefs. Finally, I offered a brief overview of the limitations to this study, namely the low response rate and inability to

pursue Research Question 2, and my efforts to delimit those, which included shifting from model testing to model building.

Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of this study was to use Self-Determination Theory (SDT) as a framework to explore the relations among writing program faculty collegiality in their work (i.e., teaching, research/scholarship, and service), their job satisfaction in teaching writing courses in postsecondary settings, and their sense of self-efficacy for that teaching. To explore these relations, I sought to provide evidence toward answering two research questions:

1. Is faculty collegiality related to faculty job satisfaction in teaching writing or faculty self-efficacy on the teaching of writing?
2. Is there a difference in the relations between faculty collegiality for these two areas (i.e., job satisfaction and self-efficacy) when modeled for different faculty populations (i.e., part-time, full-time non-tenure-track, and full-time tenure-track faculty)?

Due to the small sample size – potentially related to the COVID-19 pandemic—I was unable to address the second research question, so all analyses in this chapter relate to the first research question. Next, I review my data preparation steps before describing the steps I undertook to analyze the data with an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and multiple linear regression.

Data Preparation

In the survey as described in Chapter 3, respondents were given the option to participate in the survey or decline. I removed respondents ($n=3$) who declined to participate. Several respondents began the survey but did not complete the initial set of questions ($n=9$), and I removed these respondents case-wise from the dataset as well. With these two groups removed from the dataset, 52 respondents remained who had completed the survey. These respondents' demographic data are included in Table 5.

Table 5

Respondent Characteristics

Characteristic	<i>n</i>	%
Faculty Class (n = 52)		
Tenure-track		
Assistant Professor	4	7.7
Associate Professor	4	7.7
Full Professor	6	11.5
Contingent		
Instructor/Lecturer	21	40.4
Part-time Faculty	10	19.2
Visiting Faculty	3	5.8
Graduate Assistants	2	3.8
Other	2	3.8
Gender (n = 52)		
Female	31	59.6
Male	20	38.5
Prefer not to state	1	1.9
Age (n=52)		
26-30	7	13.5
31-35	11	21.2
36-40	5	9.6
41-45	8	15.4
46-50	6	11.5
51-55	4	7.7
56-60	3	5.8
61-65	1	1.9
66-70	3	5.8
71-75	4	7.7
Ethnicity/Race (n=52)		
Black, Afro-Caribbean, or African American	5	9.6
Hispanic or Latino	3	5.8
Native American/American Indian	1	1.9
White/Caucasian	40	76.9
Other	1	1.9
Prefer not to state	2	3.8

Table 5. Continued

Characteristic	<i>n</i>	%
Primary Assignment (n = 52)		
Administration	2	3.8
Research	8	15.4
Teaching	42	80.8
Degree (n = 52)		
Doctoral level	28	53.8
Master's level	24	46.2
Degree Field (n = 52)		
Communication	1	1.9
Composition & Rhetoric	6	11.5
Education	1	1.9
English	23	44.2
Literature	5	9.6
Other	16	30.8
Prefer not to state	2	3.8

Factor Analysis

To explore the possible relations among writing program faculty perceptions of collegiality, their job satisfaction teaching writing, and sense of self-efficacy in teaching writing, I used an exploratory factor model (EFA) approach. EFA allows a researcher to reduce numerous variables into fewer variables (i.e., factors) and allows a researcher to point to underlying or latent constructs (Williams, Onsmann, & Brown, 2010). Participants responded to 97 questions that asked them to rate an item on a visual-analog scale of 0-100 to indicate the degree of their agreement or disagreement with each statement. With these responses, I examined the collegiality items to determine the suitability of the items for each theoretical construct – i.e., faculty collegiality behaviors and faculty collegiality beliefs. Next, I identified factors for job satisfaction for teaching writing and sense of self-efficacy for teaching writing to determine if they corresponded with previous studies' results.

Faculty Collegiality

Respondents completed 43 items that addressed their behaviors and beliefs pertaining to collegiality for three aspects of their positions: teaching, research, and service. As a result, six factors were examined: *faculty collegiality-teaching behaviors*, *faculty collegiality-research behaviors*, *faculty collegiality-service behaviors*, *faculty collegiality-teaching beliefs*, *faculty collegiality-research beliefs*, and *faculty collegiality-service beliefs*. Each of these factors demonstrated acceptable internal factor structure, except for *faculty collegiality-teaching beliefs*. This factor was removed from the model due to its low factor loading and, thus, inability to account for variance in that variable (see Table 6 for Faculty Collegiality Construct Factor Loadings).

Table 6

Factor Loadings for Collegiality Constructs (n=52)

Construct	Factor Loadings
<i>Faculty Collegiality-Teaching Behaviors</i>	
Currently, I regularly...	
prepare instructional materials	.96
deliver instruction	.96
hold office hours to meet with students	.89
review and grade/score student work	.93
attend workshops on teaching methods and pedagogy	.31
<i>Faculty Collegiality-Research Behaviors</i>	
Currently, I regularly...	
research & produce scholarship or creative works	.81
secure funding to support scholarship or creative works	.80
attend conferences	.62
conduct other research-, scholarship-, or creative writing-related work (please identify):	.78
conduct other research-, scholarship-, or creative writing-related work (please identify):	.65

Table 6. Continued

Construct	<i>Factor Loadings</i>
<i>Faculty Collegiality-Service Behaviors</i>	
Currently, I regularly participate in...	
writing program committee work	.43
departmental committee work	.55
university committee work (shared governance)	.59
student mentorship	.71
colleague mentorship (as mentor)	.58
colleague mentorship (as mentee)	.39
extracurricular activities on campus	.29
advising or supporting a student organization(s)/club(s)	.20
writing letters of recommendation for students	.85
peer/classroom observations	.59
conversations with my colleagues about undergraduate student learning	.85
conversations with my colleagues about effective teaching practices	.85
conversations with my colleagues about effective use of technology	.71
conversations with my colleagues about non-work-related matters	.75
<i>Faculty Collegiality-Teaching Beliefs</i>	
In my faculty role, I believe it's important that I...	
prepare instructional materials	.39
deliver instruction	.57
<i>Faculty Collegiality-Research Beliefs</i>	
In my faculty role, I believe it's important that I...	
research & produce scholarship or creative works	.82
secure funding to support scholarship or creative works	.75
attend conferences	.83
<i>Faculty Collegiality-Service Beliefs</i>	
In my faculty role, I believe it's important that I participate in...	
writing program committee work	.71
departmental committee work	.75
university committee work (shared governance)	.61
student mentorship	.46
colleague mentorship	.67
participate in student mentorship	.46
colleague mentorship	.67
engage in conversations with my colleagues about teaching practices	.79
engage in conversations with my colleagues about undergraduate student learning	.86
engage in conversations with my colleagues about non-work-related matters	.52

With two items removed from the *faculty collegiality-service behaviors* due to poor factor loading, I ran a reliability analysis for each of these six constructs (see Table 9). Items associated with collegiality behavior constructs of teaching, research, and service demonstrated alphas ranging from .78 to .87. Instrument items associated with collegiality beliefs, however, provided a greater range of alphas ranging from .71 to .82 with *faculty collegiality-teaching beliefs* removed from the model. These constructs reflected an internal consistency coefficient greater than .70 and for this reason an acceptable internal consistency (George & Mallery, 2003). Moreover, I used Coefficient *H* to assess the reliability of these latent constructs, where Coefficient *H* values greater than .70 are taken as acceptable to demonstrate the validity of the constructs (Hancock & Mueller, 2001). These constructs reflected Coefficient *H* values of greater than .85, thus suggesting that these latent constructs adequately measure the variables of interest.

Job Satisfaction Teaching Writing

I took similar steps for survey items relevant to job satisfaction teaching writing. These items were adapted from an existing, validated instrument (Hoyt et al., 2007), and I assessed the factor loading for each construct. Across each of the constructs, each set of items demonstrated acceptable factor loadings of greater than .30 (see Table 7). Concerning reliability and construct validity, I assessed the internal reliability in the form of alpha and the latent construct validity with Coefficient *H*. Coefficients ranged from .64 to .92 (see Table 9), reflecting an internal consistency coefficient greater than .60 and for this reason an acceptable internal consistency for exploratory research (Nunally & Bernstein, 1994). I also investigated the latent construct validity and found that each construct reported Coefficient *H* values greater than .84, thus suggesting that

these constructs adequately measure the variable of interest through the included items (Hancock & Mueller, 2001). As researchers in the earlier studies did, I then treated each construct as a sub-scale and combined them into a total scale: *Overall Job Satisfaction*. I combined the sub-scales of Work Preference, Autonomy, Teaching Schedule, Quality of Students, Recognition, Faculty Support, and Honorarium into a single scale for overall job satisfaction, which reported an alpha of .85 and Coefficient *H* value of .99.

Table 7

Factor Loadings for Job Satisfaction Teaching Writing (n=52)

Construct	Factor Loadings
<i>Work Preference</i>	
I really enjoy teaching courses.	.89
I almost always look forward to teaching classes.	.88
If I had the choice, I would rather teach than do other types of work.	.58
<i>Autonomy</i>	
I am completely satisfied with the level of autonomy that I have in teaching my courses.	.90
I have a lot of freedom to develop and modify course content to meet the needs of my students.	.96
I have a satisfactory level of autonomy to select material and texts for my courses.	.92
<i>Teaching Schedule</i>	
The times scheduled for my class(es) have been convenient to my schedule.	.93
I have been very satisfied with my teaching schedule.	.85
The times that I teach my classes work well with my personal or other family commitments.	.90
<i>Quality of Students</i>	
I am completely satisfied with the quality and caliber of students in my classes.	.94
Students in my classes are very well prepared academically to take my courses.	.88
Students here are highly engaged and very interested in their academic work.	.92
<i>Recognition</i>	
I am often thanked for teaching here.	.63
I feel well respected as a faculty member.	.70
Part-time faculty are recognized for their teaching contribution in my department.	.84
A part-time faculty job is a valued position in my department.	.74

Table 7. Continued

Construct	<i>Factor Loadings</i>
<i>Faculty Support</i>	
I receive very helpful advice and support from academic department faculty to improve my teaching.	.82
Faculty in my academic department(s) take a sincere interest in my success as a faculty member.	.80
I feel very comfortable requesting assistance from academic department faculty when I have questions about my courses or students.	.80
<i>Honorarium</i>	
The payment I receive for my faculty role is adequate.	.95
I feel that I am well compensated for my faculty work.	.96
I am paid fairly for the amount of work I do.	.96

Self-efficacy Teaching Writing

As with the items and constructs for job satisfaction teaching writing, I examined the factor loadings, reliability, and construct validity of the self-efficacy teaching writing items and constructs. These items and constructs were adapted from Chang et al.'s (2011) study, and across each of the constructs measured, each set of items demonstrated acceptable factor loadings of greater than .30 (see Table 8). I then assessed the reliability of these six constructs in the form of alpha. These constructs' coefficients were each greater than .70 (see Table 9), reflecting an acceptable internal consistency (George & Mallery, 2003). I also investigated the latent construct validity, finding that each construct demonstrated a Coefficient *H* value greater than .85, thus suggesting that these constructs adequately measure the variable of interest through the included items (Hancock & Mueller, 2001). I followed Chang et al.'s (2011) process and next combined the sub-scales of Course Design, Instructional Strategies, Technology Use, Class Management, Interpersonal Relations, and Learning Assessment into a single scale for overall self-efficacy teaching writing. This scale demonstrated an alpha of .92 and Coefficient *H* value of .98.

Table 8

Factor Loadings for Self-efficacy Teaching Writing (n=52), "I believe I..." stems

Construct	Factor Loadings
<i>Course Design</i>	
- can select appropriate teaching material.	.75
- have sufficient professional ability to teach the courses I am teaching.	.89
- can establish comprehensive teaching objectives.	.74
- can arrange appropriate timeline for the curricular progress.	.58
- can prepare my teaching material before class sessions.	.81
<i>Instructional Strategies</i>	
- have confidence in inspiring and maintaining students' learning motivation.	.85
- can utilize various inquiring skills to stimulate students' higher level thinking skills and discussions	.83
- can teach according to students' various levels of readiness.	.75
- can use effective teaching methods to improve students' grades.	.46
- can modify my teaching activities during class sessions to sustain students' attention.	.77
<i>Technology Use</i>	
- know how to use technology to enhance my teaching.	.92
- can employ software relevant to my teaching.	.80
- can select appropriate teaching media to enhance my teaching.	.52
- know how to produce relevant teaching media.	.71
- know how to operate various types of teaching technologies or equipment such as overhead projectors and computer consoles.	.81
<i>Class Management</i>	
- can nurture a pleasant learning environment.	.88
- can promote a democratic environment in class.	.71
- can maintain a good relationship with my students.	.90
- can share my personal experiences with students to promote emotional bonding between the students and myself.	.39
- can listen to my students to understand their thoughts.	.78
<i>Interpersonal Relations</i>	
- can provide assistance to students whenever they encounter difficulties in learning.	.84
- can co-assess learning results with my students and advise them on improvement.	.88
- can provide appropriate assistance to my students if they are incapable of completing an assignment.	.85

Table 8. Continued

Construct	<i>Factor Loadings</i>
<i>Learning Assessment</i>	
- can use a variety of assessment methods to evaluate students' learning results.	.76
- the assessment methods I use agree with my teaching objectives.	.77
- provide students the opportunities for exercise to refine the concept they have learned.	.57
- assess students' performance with positive methods.	.83
- can improve my teaching according to assessment results.	.33

Table 9

Measures, Items, and Item Reliabilities

Measure	Items (stem: Currently, I regularly...)	Reliability
Collegiality-Teaching (Behaviors)	prepare instructional materials deliver instruction hold office hours to meet with students review and grade/score student work attend workshops on teaching methods and pedagogy	.79
Collegiality-Research (Behaviors)	research & produce scholarship or creative works secure funding to support scholarship or creative works attend conferences conduct other research-, scholarship-, or creative writing-related work (please identify): conduct other research-, scholarship-, or creative writing-related work (please identify): - Text conduct other research-, scholarship-, or creative writing-related work (please identify): conduct other research-, scholarship-, or creative writing-related work (please identify): - Text	.78
Collegiality-Service (Behaviors)	participate in writing program committee work participate in departmental committee work participate in university committee work (shared governance) participate in student mentorship participate in colleague mentorship (as mentor) participate in colleague mentorship (as mentee) participate in extracurricular activities on campus participate in advising or supporting a student organization(s)/club(s)	.87

Table 9. Continued

Measure	Items	Reliability
Collegiality-Service (Behaviors, continued from above)	participate in writing letters of recommendation for students participate in peer/classroom observations participate in conversations with my colleagues about undergraduate student learning participate in conversations with my colleagues about effective teaching practices participate in conversations with my colleagues about effective use of technology participate in conversations with my colleagues about non-work- related matters	
Collegiality- Research (Beliefs)	In my faculty role, I believe it's important that I... research & produce scholarship or creative works secure funding to support scholarship or creative works attend conferences	.71
Collegiality- Service (Belief)	In my faculty role, I believe it's important that I... participate in writing program committee work participate in departmental committee work participate in university committee work (shared governance) participate in student mentorship participate in colleague mentorship engage in conversations with my colleagues about teaching practices engage in conversations with my colleagues about undergraduate student learning engage in conversations with my colleagues about non- work-related matters	.82
Work Preference	I really enjoy teaching courses. I almost always look forward to teaching classes. If I had the choice, I would rather teach than do other types of work.	.64
Overall Job Satisfaction	I am completely satisfied with my job teaching courses as a faculty member. Based on my experience teaching as faculty member, I would highly recommend the job to others. Considering everything, I have an excellent job as a faculty member teaching courses.	.82

Table 9. Continued

Measure	Items	Reliability
Autonomy	I am completely satisfied with the level of autonomy that I have in teaching my courses. I have a lot of freedom to develop and modify course content to meet the needs of my students. I have a satisfactory level of autonomy to select material and texts for my courses.	.92
Teaching Schedule	The times scheduled for my class(es) have been convenient to my schedule. I have been very satisfied with my teaching schedule The times that I teach my classes work well with my personal or other family commitments.	.87
Quality of Students	I am completely satisfied with the quality and caliber of students in my classes. Students in my classes are very well prepared academically to take my courses. Students here are highly engaged and very interested in their academic work.	.90
Recognition	I am often thanked for teaching here I feel well respected as a faculty member. Part-time faculty are recognized for their teaching contribution in my department. A part-time faculty job is a valued position in my department.	.70
Faculty Support	I receive very helpful advice and support from academic department faculty to improve my teaching. Faculty in my academic department(s) take a sincere interest in my success as a faculty member. I feel very comfortable requesting assistance from academic department faculty when I have questions about my courses or students.	.72
Honorarium	The payment I receive for my faculty role is adequate. I feel that I am well compensated for my faculty work. I am paid fairly for the amount of work I do.	.95

Table 9. Continued

Measure	Items	Reliability
Course Design	I believe I can select appropriate teaching material. I believe I can establish comprehensive teaching objectives. I believe I can arrange appropriate timeline for the curricular progress.	.77
Instructional Strategies	I have confidence in inspiring and maintaining students' learning motivation. I believe I can utilize various inquiring skills to stimulate students' higher level thinking skills and discussions I believe I can teach according to students' various levels of readiness. I believe I can use effective teaching methods to improve students' grades. I believe I can modify my teaching activities during class sessions to sustain students' attention.	.76
Technology Use	I believe I know how to use technology to enhance my teaching. I believe I can employ software relevant to my teaching. I believe I can select appropriate teaching media to enhance my teaching. I believe I know how to produce relevant teaching media. I believe I know how to operate various types of teaching technologies or equipment such as overhead projectors and computer consoles.	.81
Classroom Management	I believe I can nurture a pleasant learning environment. I believe I can promote a democratic environment in class. I believe I can maintain a good relationship with my students. I believe I can share my personal experiences with students to promote emotional bonding between the students and myself. I believe I can listen to my students to understand their thoughts.	.81
Interpersonal Relations	I believe I can provide assistance to students whenever they encounter difficulties in learning. I believe I can co-assess learning results with my students and advise them on improvement. I believe I can provide appropriate assistance to my students if they are incapable of completing an assignment.	.81

Table 9. Continued

Measure	Items	Reliability
Learning Assessment	I believe I can use a variety of assessment methods to evaluate students' learning results. I believe the assessment methods I use agree with my teaching objectives. I believe I provide students the opportunities for exercise to refine the concept they have learned. I believe I assess students' performance with positive methods. I believe I can improve my teaching according to assessment results.	.71

Results of Regression Analysis

With these factor analysis steps, three distinct sets of constructs emerged as stable variables to answer Research Question 1. I used the factor scores from the factor analysis for Faculty Collegiality, Job Satisfaction, and Self-efficacy to run a linear regression analysis to detect any relation among these variables. Two models emerged in which Faculty Collegiality Behaviors and Faculty Collegiality Beliefs acted as the independent variables. In the first model, Job Satisfaction Teaching Writing served as the dependent variable. In the second model, Self-efficacy Teaching Writing served as the dependent variable. Based on the results of the linear regression analysis, the first model was not significant ($F=1.21$, $p=.34$, $R^2_{adj}=.048$) in predicting Job Satisfaction Teaching Writing (see Table 10). However, the second model was significant ($F=4.14$, $p=.008$, $R^2_{adj}=.43$) (see Table 11).

Table 10

Results of Linear Regression Predicting Collegiality to Affect Job Satisfaction Teaching Writing

	<u>Unstandardized Coefficients</u>		<u>Standardized</u>	<i>t</i>	Sig.
	<i>B</i>	Std. Error	β		
(Constant)	.09	.18		.52	.61
Collegiality Behaviors					
Teaching	-.21	.16	-.30	-1.39	.18
Research	.59	.26	.68	2.28	.03
Service	-.03	.29	-.04	-.11	.91
Collegiality Beliefs					
Research	-.650	.26	-.79	-2.48	.02
Teaching	-.142	.41	-.09	-.35	.73
Service	.422	.28	.46	1.49	.15

Table 11

Results of Linear Regression Predicting Collegiality to Affect Self-efficacy Teaching Writing

	<u>Unstandardized Coefficients</u>		<u>Standardized</u>	<i>t</i>	Sig.
	<i>B</i>	Std. Error	β		
(Constant)	-.08	.15		-.49	.63
Collegiality Behaviors					
Teaching	-.07	.13	-.09	-.57	.58
Research	.09	.22	.10	.45	.66
Service	.57	.24	.57	2.39	.03**
Collegiality Beliefs					
Research	-.45	.22	-.51	-2.06	.05*
Teaching	.43	.34	.25	1.26	.22
Service	-.01	.24	-.01	-.04	.97

Note. $R^2 = .566$ at $p < .01$

* denotes p-value less than .10

** denotes p-value less than .05

Summary of Findings

In this study, I sought evidence to begin answering two research questions. Because of a small sample size, the second research question, which addressed variation in job satisfaction and self-efficacy among faculty populations teaching writing, was not one I was able to attend to in this study. As a result, only the first research question was addressed. Two models emerged in which I assessed if and how faculty collegiality behaviors and beliefs about teaching, research, and service related to their job satisfaction teaching postsecondary writing courses and self-efficacy in the same. Faculty collegiality behaviors and beliefs did not have any predictable relation with faculty job satisfaction teaching writing in this sample. However, faculty

collegiality behaviors and beliefs did have a predictable relation with self-efficacy teaching writing in this sample. As respondents reported higher faculty collegiality-service behaviors, their self-efficacy in teaching writing increased ($\beta=.57, p<.05$). At the same time, as respondents reported greater faculty collegiality-research beliefs, their self-efficacy in teaching writing decreased ($\beta =-.51, p<.10$).

Chapter 5: Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Shifts in higher education are part and parcel of the postsecondary landscape as institutions have continued to evolve over the years to meet various missions (Scott, 2006). In the past half-century, many postsecondary institutions have increasingly come to rely on hiring contingent faculty to meet the sometimes-swelling, sometimes-ebbing enrollments of students in that same period. However, the budgetary elasticity that comes from such hiring practices has calcified into formal processes in many institutions. Indeed, in many postsecondary disciplines, nearly three in four faculty are non-tenure-track faculty (i.e., contingent faculty) and half of these are part-time faculty who work without the security of contracts longer than a semester and routinely without any benefits beyond their per-course pay (AAUP, 2018). Despite this long-trending shift towards a new faculty majority composed of contingent faculty, there remains too little research that investigates and identifies those contingent faculty needs as they relate to supporting their job satisfaction in teaching or their self-efficacy. Researchers *have* investigated the self-efficacy needs and supports of K-12 educators in abundance (see, e.g., Bandura, 1997; Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). And, increasingly, scholars have begun to investigate the needs of part-time faculty (see, e.g., Antony & Valadez, 2002; Jolley, Cross, & Bryant, 2014; Kezar & Sam, 2013). In this work, however, researchers have focused almost exclusively on the teaching role of part-time faculty as this role tends to be the reason for their employment. Further, scholars have tended to construe their development needs and well-being through a lens of teaching rather than through a more holistic faculty lens that has included research and service as identity markers of faculty—contingent or otherwise. On one hand, such

focus appears reasonable: part-time and contingent faculty are generally hired with the express purpose of teaching. On the other hand, such narrow focus risks mistaking these contingent faculty as *only* teachers who *only* need to be supported in their teaching instead of acknowledging that their contingency is limited to their contracts and not their desire to participate in the larger arena of collegiality, to wit: scholarship/research and service.

In this study, I sought to gather evidence regarding the relation between a more diverse conceptualization of faculty work and their job satisfaction and self-efficacy teaching for contingent faculty. Specifically, I surveyed writing program faculty across the state of Florida's public institutions of higher education to collect information about their behaviors and beliefs as they related to teaching, research/scholarship/creative work, and service. Two research questions guided this study: the first addressed the possible relations among faculty collegiality and job satisfaction in teaching writing or faculty self-efficacy around the teaching of writing, and the second concerned discerning a difference in the relations between faculty collegiality for these two areas (i.e., job satisfaction and self-efficacy) for different faculty populations. The study was limited in its responses ($n=52$), so the resultant data analyses produced findings that describe only the data for this sample and were insufficient to address the second research question. Specifically, in these analyses, I found, first, that faculty service behavior was associated with faculty self-efficacy teaching writing ($\beta=.57, p<.05$). Second, I found that faculty research belief was also associated with faculty self-efficacy teaching writing, though in a negative direction ($\beta =-.51, p<.10$).

Discussion of the Findings

Two findings emerged from these analyses of the writing program faculty responses. In addressing the first research question, I found that for this sample—which included an aggregate of tenure-track and contingent faculty—faculty reported higher levels of self-efficacy teaching writing as they reported participating in a greater volume of service. Faculty service is typically an aspect of faculty labor that researchers examine in light of job satisfaction and not self-efficacy. Indeed, faculty service is generally an understudied aspect of faculty labor (Neumann & Terosky, 2007), so little scholarship seems to have addressed any quantitative relation between faculty service behavior and faculty members' sense of self-efficacy in a given domain like teaching or scholarship.

However, this finding fits with the underlying theoretical basis of this study that faculty who participate in service as conceptualized here have a greater sense of self-efficacy elsewhere (Deci & Ryan, 2020), as in teaching writing. As faculty engage in program, department, and university committee work, student and colleague mentorship, extracurricular activities/student organizations, writing letters of recommendation, class observations, and conversations with colleagues, they participate in public-facing acts beyond their scholarship and teaching. In these ways, faculty engage in behaviors associated with Deci and Ryan's notion of relatedness, or the opportunities to feel connected with and supported by others. Such opportunities have been shown to support individuals' autonomous motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000), self-efficacy (Ryan & Deci, 2017), and well-being (Seipel & Larson, 2018). Moreover, previous studies show that faculty who were unable to engage in relatedness behaviors reported lower levels of motivation (Eagan, Jaeger, & Grantham, 2015). Equally important here, faculty whose intrinsic needs are

being met—here, relatedness needs—demonstrate greater self-efficacy in their teaching (Holzberger et al., 2014)

Conversely, in this sample, I found that faculty research beliefs had a negative association with faculty sense of self-efficacy in teaching writing. Unlike the study of faculty service behaviors and beliefs, the study of faculty research behaviors and beliefs is expansive, no doubt due to the primary emphasis on research that marks tenure-track faculty assignments (Alperin et al., 2019; O’Meara, Kuvaeva, & Nyunt, 2017). It is well documented that tenure-track faculty are routinely measured by their research and scholastic contributions and are likely to prioritize their research over teaching and service (O’Meara, 2010). However, this emphasis is primarily relegated to tenure-track faculty, while contingent faculty who are most often contracted only to teach are not evaluated for any ongoing research. In fact, evaluations of contingent faculty are often based on simpler tools than those used for their tenure-track colleagues—frequently by self-narrative of teaching work and student evaluations (Heller, 2012; Waltman et al., 2012).

Respondents who rated these activities as having greater importance had lower self-efficacy for the teaching of writing. This finding reflects at least two possible interpretations. First, it is possible that as writing faculty spend time researching and participating in scholarship, they may intuit or rationalize that they have more to learn in the way of teaching. Second, it is possible that such faculty are pursuing scholarship unrelated to the courses they teach and, as a result, they may be more likely to report a lower sense of self-efficacy in their teaching work than those who report lower beliefs about the significance of research to their work. Writing program faculty often come from varied educational backgrounds (Mcleod, 2007). In this

sample, most writing program faculty surveyed possessed a graduate degree in English, literature, or creative writing (63.5%) while only a small number (11.5%) reported a graduate degree in composition and rhetoric—the field more closely associated with the scholarship of writing instruction. In this way, writing program faculty may arrive in the writing classroom less well prepared to teach composition and rhetoric and equate their insecurities associated related to their content knowledge and preparation with an ability to teach effectively.

Second, because these faculty are spending time beyond their compensated teaching work performing research, they may also require more time to increase their self-efficacy in teaching writing. This latter scenario might make sense especially in describing part-time faculty new to teaching who have not yet developed their teaching self-efficacy (Tyndall, 2016) but who often teach many courses with little notice (Yakoboski, 2016). For instance, a student may graduate from a graduate program and take up a part-time faculty position while continuing their scholarship from their graduate program. In such a scenario, it is possible that in moving into a new position with new expectations and constraints—and one that has been demonstrated likely to be undersupported—that faculty might be overwhelmed by the volume of the labor required to develop and teach new courses and maintain an existing research agenda. Here, Ryan and Deci's (2000) conceptualization of competence comes to the fore. Insofar as competence denotes one's sense of personal mastery of a domain and ability to grow in it, writing program faculty who are just beginning their post-graduate careers need ample support to develop their competence as teachers and researchers. Without that support, such faculty may experience struggle and report lower self-efficacy in teaching despite pursuing their ongoing research, scholarship, or creative works.

Limitations to Generalization

Fifty-two sets of responses were received for the study across three calls for participation. For this reason, the results of the data analyses are limited in terms of generalizability. While two variables were found to be associated significantly with self-efficacy, these two findings can only be understood across these 52 cases. At the same time, we should understand the absence of significance across the rest of the models' variables as applicable to these same 52 cases. It is possible that across a larger data set that the models might demonstrate a significant relation. And, in considering the demographics of respondents, 27% reported a tenure-track position to 73% in contingent positions. While these numbers align with national trends (AAUP, 2018), the small sample size complicates how their responses might be compared statistically. Moreover, 81% reported a primary teaching role to 19% who reported an administrative or research-first role, a distinction that offers a tantalizing next set of questions to investigate. However, as with the tenure-track and contingent faculty distinctions, not enough samples exists to allow breaking these data into smaller groups for more pointed questions.

This simple linear regression approach positioned faculty collegiality behavior and belief against job satisfaction and self-efficacy by treating all faculty the same despite known variations between tenure-track and contingent faculty. Without a sufficiently large sample to power the model and take advantage of different between and within groups like tenure-track and contingent faculty, or gender, years teaching, etc., in this study I was only able to offer a model-building approach to examine any potential relations among the larger constructs of faculty collegiality behaviors and beliefs and job satisfaction and self-efficacy teaching writing.

Moreover, concerning the make-up of respondents, it is possible that more service-minded individuals responded to the survey and as a result skewed the dataset in that direction. Consequently, any results that speak to faculty beliefs about service or participation in service behaviors should be weighed carefully and generalizations limited to the sample being examined. Nonetheless, the data from this study offer a valuable opportunity to examine faculty perceptions at the outset of worldwide crisis. A year into the COVID-19 pandemic, these data may afford a point of comparison point with faculty beliefs and behaviors over time, especially as it concerns their well-being.

Implications for Practice

Noting again that these findings are limited in how we might generalize from them, I do see a handful of practical applications of these findings concerning both how writing program administrators (WPAs) approach faculty service and their relations with their scholastic and creative work. WPAs are able to argue for increased pay for their faculty but are unlikely to individually achieve such raises. While many no doubt continue that work, here, my findings point to ancillary means to support faculty, means that might otherwise go unconsidered given the primary importance of pay, as well as areas of concern that WPAs should be attentive to.

If faculty service behaviors do contribute to their overall sense of self-efficacy in teaching writing, WPAs have an opportunity to investigate and understand which particular service behaviors support that self-efficacy. Those researching contingent faculty have made clear that contingent faculty need more supports and specific kinds of development or enhancement opportunities that transcend the classroom (Antony & Valadez, 2002; Meixner, et al., 2010). They have begun to show, too, that when these needs are thwarted, faculty well-being

can suffer (Seipel & Larson, 2018). Relatedness, in particular, is a crucial factor in how faculty are able to perform their work (i.e., be self-efficacious), so WPAs should create opportunities for contingent faculty to collaborate and feel involved in ongoing program and departmental work. For instance, depending on their particular faculty needs, WPAs can offer periodic collaborative sessions in which contingent faculty can have a space to share their work with their peers, identify and set aside funds to support contingent faculty scholarship (e.g., virtual conference attendance, registration fees, etc.), and routinely survey their faculty's personal and professional interests and needs. Such work is already interwoven into the overflowing nature of the WPA's challenging role, but in these findings we can locate a reminder that as contingent faculty populations grow, their ongoing support is central to a program's success.

In constructing service as a latent construct for this study, I attempted to capture service through specific behaviors that included program, department, and university committee work, student and colleague mentorship, extracurricular activities/student organizations, writing letters of recommendation, class observations, and conversations with colleagues about various topics. Across this list, no one method emerges to engage writing program faculty, but at the same time, across these kinds of activities, WPAs have existing structures to call on to support their faculty's self-efficacy and well-being. WPAs should take care, though, to consider the non-financial costs of offering service opportunities to contingent faculty, as service is often unpaid work that takes up time faculty might otherwise use for their scholarship or creative works agenda, supplementary or primary employment, and general free time. With contingent faculty who participate across these kinds of service opportunities in their departments and programs, with students and colleagues, if their self-efficacy in teaching writing improves, WPAs may have

a stronger rationale for requesting additional funds for faculty in the form of pay or stipends for their additional work, as well.

In such work, too, WPAs can develop collaborative initiatives across their campuses to put their faculty into various working groups with others, such as ensuring faculty have access to department conversations and, more widely, faculty governance. Frequently, non-tenure-track faculty report feelings of disenfranchisement and disrespect in their positions (Waltman et al., 2012). Such opportunities to engage their campus and colleagues may offer faculty a new vantage point of their work while placing individuals with often-unheard voices into places where decisions are made. In such a position, then, contingent faculty may enhance their teaching in a number of ways, such as innovating interdisciplinary efforts in their classrooms, as in developing Writing across the Curriculum or Writing in the Disciplines relations with other faculty. They would also be in a position to grow their sense of relatedness across a larger faculty population than they might otherwise experience in their programs and department. With such access to other faculty and faculty events, they might find important supports already exist such as professional development opportunities and other under-publicized events. Faculty relatedness, then, through various acts of faculty service behaviors, should be a driving concern for WPAs as they consider how to hire, staff, train, and retain faculty and provide opportunities to support faculty well-being. In taking such care and considering responsible ways to provide contingent faculty opportunities, WPAs not only support their colleagues but student learning as well (e.g., Knowles, 1999; Rutz et al., 2012). At a time when the higher education landscape continues to shift in its faculty staffing and against a backdrop of an international pandemic, the methods we use to approach faculty well-being—or do not—can have long-lasting repercussions.

Implications for Future Study

Beyond practical implications, these findings point to several possibilities for future inquiry. First and foremost, based on the initial findings in this study and its small sample size, I would argue that a second version would be useful to test the findings across a larger sample size. I surveyed faculty at the start and across the height of COVID-19 while many faculty already in a precarious position worked to figure out their next steps and perhaps were unable to make time to complete the survey. A second iteration, whether across the same SUS writing program faculty, or more widely applied, would offer the opportunity to confirm or disconfirm the findings.

Through this study, new constructs emerged that can contribute to the ongoing study of faculty well-being in the ways of job satisfaction and self-efficacy. As Bess (1992) makes clear, faculty collegiality is an amorphous term that denotes various meanings depending on usage and audience. However, if faculty behaviors and beliefs can be operationalized to create stable constructs, researchers may be better able to assess faculty collegiality across more quantitative studies. Future research is also needed to address how collegiality might work across gender, race and ethnicity, and faculty type (i.e., tenure-track and non-tenure track). Moreover, as Daumiller et al. (2020) have made clear, while self-efficacy beliefs for research is a well-studied topic, more is needed to examine self-efficacy beliefs for teaching and for service. Much is known about tenure-track faculty experiences and well-being, and increasingly more is known about adjunct faculty experiences and well-being. What remains unaddressed is those in between: the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty.

Deci and Ryan's Self-Determination Theory (STD) has emerged as a macro theory that provides a framework for scholars to study this population's needs as they relate to motivation and well-being. The study at hand answers the call from Seipel and Larson (2018) to support non-tenure-track faculty well-being. This includes developing indicators other than job satisfaction to investigate faculty well-being. While the current data collection is limited in its scope, the constructs of faculty collegiality behaviors and beliefs emerged as potentially useful constructs for future study. Five of the six constructs captured aspects of faculty's relations to their various kinds of work, and these constructs merit future application especially in furthering how scholars use STD to examine faculty's innate needs of relatedness, autonomy, and competence.

References

- American Association of University Professors (AAUP). (2006). Policy and Document Reports (10th Ed.), American Association of University Professors: Washington, DC.
- American Association of University Professors (AAUP). (2013). Issues: Tenure. Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/issues/tenure>
- American Association of University Professors (AAUP). (2018). Data Snapshot: Contingent Faculty in US Higher Ed. Retrieved from <https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/10112018%20Data%20Snapshot%20Tenure.pdf>
- Alleman, N. F., Allen, C. C., & Haviland, D. (2017). *Collegiality and the Collegium in an Era of Faculty Differentiation: ASHE Higher Education Report* (Vol. 43, No. 4). John Wiley & Sons.
- Alperin, J. P., Nieves, C. M., Schimanski, L. A., Fischman, G. E., Niles, M. T., & McKiernan, E. C. (2019). Meta-Research: How significant are the public dimensions of faculty work in review, promotion and tenure documents? *ELife*, 8.
- Andalib, M. A., Ghaffarzagdegan, N., & Larson, R. C. (2018). The postdoc queue: A labour force in waiting. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 35(6), 675-686.
- Antony, J. S., & Valadez, J. R. (2002). Exploring the satisfaction of part-time college faculty in the United States. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26(1), 41-56.
- Astin, A. (1975). *Preventing Students from Dropping Out*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Bailey, J. G. (1999). Academics' motivation and self-efficacy for teaching and research. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 18(3), 343-359.

- Baldwin, R. G., & Wawrzynski, M. R. (2011). Contingent faculty as teachers: What we know; what we need to know. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 55(11), 1485-1509.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological review*, 84(2), 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational psychologist*, 28(2), 117-148.
- Bandura, A. (2006). Toward a psychology of human agency. *Perspectives on psychological science*, 1(2), 164-180.
- Baum, S., Kurose, C., & McPherson, M. (2013). An overview of American higher education. *The Future of Children*, 23(1), 17-39.
- Bean, J. P. (1983). The application of a model of turnover in work organizations to the student attrition process. *The review of higher education*, 6(2), 129-148.
- Bess, J. L. (1992). Collegiality: Toward a clarification of meaning and function. *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research*, 8, 1-36.
- Bloemer, W., Day, S., & Swan, K. (2017). Gap Analysis: An Innovative Look at Gateway Courses and Student Retention. *Online Learning*, 21(3), 5-14.
- Bode, R. K. (1999). Mentoring and collegiality. *Faculty in new jobs: A guide to settling in, becoming established, and building institutional support*, 118-144.
- Bolitzer, L. A. (2019). What We Know (and Don't Know) about Adjunct Faculty as Teachers at Four-Year Institutions. *The Review of Higher Education*, 43(1), 113-142.
- Bowen, B. E. (1980). *Job satisfaction of teacher educators in agriculture*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus.

- Bozeman, B., & Gaughan, M. (2011). Job satisfaction among university faculty: Individual, work, and institutional determinants. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 82(2), 154-186.
- Brown, G. (1993). Effective teaching. *Quality assurance for university teaching*, 211-232.
- Brown, S. C. (2002). Applying ethics: A decision-making heuristic for writing program administrators. *The Writing Program Administrator's Resource: A Guide to Reflective Institutional Practice*, 155-63.
- Cakiroglu, J., Capa-Aydin, Y., & Hoy, A. W. (2012). Science teaching efficacy beliefs. In *Second international handbook of science education* (pp. 449-461). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Calder, B. J., Phillips, L. W., & Tybout, A. M. (1981). Designing research for application. *Journal of consumer research*, 8(2), 197-207.
- Cano, J., & Castillo, J. X. (2004). Factors explaining job satisfaction among faculty. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 45(3), 65-74.
- Carino, P. (1995). Early writing centers: Toward a history. *The Writing Center Journal*, 15(2), 103-115.
- Caruth, G. D., & Caruth, D. L. (2013). Adjunct faculty: Who are these unsung heroes of academe? *Current Issues in Education*, 16(3).
- Cassuto, L. (2016, November 22). RIP, William G. Bowel - and the Bowen Report, Too. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.chronicle.com/article/RIP-William-G-Bowen-and/238470>
- Chace, W. M. (2009). The decline of the English department: How it happened and what could be done to reverse it. *The American Scholar*, 78(4), 32-42.

- Chang, T. S., Lin, H. H., & Song, M. M. (2011). University faculty members' perceptions of their teaching efficacy. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 48(1), 49-60.
- Childress, H. (2019). *The adjunct underclass: How America's colleges betrayed their faculty, their students, and their mission*. University of Chicago Press.
- Cipriano, R. E., & Buller, J. L. (2012). Rating faculty collegiality. *Change: The magazine of higher learning*, 44(2), 45-48.
- Cotten, S. R., & Wilson, B. (2006). Student–faculty interactions: Dynamics and determinants. *Higher Education*, 51(4), 487-519.
- Cox, A., Dougherty, T. R., Kahn, S., LaFrance, M., & Lynch-Binieck, A. (2016). The Indianapolis Resolution: Responding to Twenty-First-Century Exigencies/Political Economies of Composition Labor. *College Composition and Communication*, 68(1), 38.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *A concise introduction to mixed methods research*. SAGE publications.
- Crick, K. A., Larson, L. M., & Seipel, M. T. (2020). Non-tenure track faculty satisfaction: A self-determination model. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 28(3), 425-445.
- Daumiller, M., Stupnisky, R., & Janke, S. (2020). Motivation of higher education faculty: Theoretical approaches, empirical evidence, and future directions. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 99.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (Eds.). (2004). *Handbook of self-determination research*. University Rochester Press.
- Deci, E. L., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2004). Self-determination theory and basic need satisfaction: Understanding human development in positive psychology. *Ricerche di psicologia*.

- Desrochers, D. M., & Kirshstein, R. (2014). Labor Intensive or Labor Expensive? Changing Staffing and Compensation Patterns in Higher Education. Issue Brief. *Delta Cost Project at American Institutes for Research*.
- Dolan, V. L. (2011). The isolation of online adjunct faculty and its impact on their performance. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 12(2), 62-77.
- Dougherty, K. J., Jones, S. M., Lahr, H., Natow, R. S., Pheatt, L., & Reddy, V. (2014). Performance funding for higher education: Forms, origins, impacts, and futures. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 655(1), 163-184.
- Dougherty, K. J., & Natow, R. S. (2015). *The politics of performance funding for higher education: Origins, discontinuations, and transformations*. JHU Press.
- Eagan, M. K., & Jaeger, A. J. (2008). Closing the gate: Part-time faculty instruction in gatekeeper courses and first-year persistence. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2008(115), 39-53.
- Eagan, M. K., & Jaeger, A. J. (2009). Effects of exposure to part-time faculty on community college transfer. *Research in Higher Education*, 50(2), 168.
- Ehrenberg, R. G., & Zhang, L. (2005). Do tenured and tenure-track faculty matter? *Journal of Human Resources*, 40(3), 647-659.
- Elder, S. J., Svoboda, G., Ryan, L. A., & Fitzgerald, K. (2016). Work factors of importance to adjunct nursing faculty. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 55(5), 245-251.
- Ellis, R. A. (2015). Performance-Based Funding: Equity Analysis of Funding Distribution among State Universities. *Journal of Educational Issues*, 1(2), 1-19.

- Finkelstein, M. J., Conley, V. M., & Schuster, J. H. (2016). *The faculty factor: Reassessing the American academy in a turbulent era*. JHU Press.
- Gappa, J. M., & Austin, A. E. (2010). Rethinking academic traditions for twenty-first-century faculty. *AAUP Journal of Academic Freedom*, 1(1), 1-20.
- Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1993). *The Invisible Faculty. Improving the Status of Part-Timers in Higher Education*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Gow, L., & Kember, D. (1993). Conceptions of teaching and their relationship to student learning. *British journal of educational psychology*, 63(1), 20-23.
- Hagedorn, L. S. (2000). Conceptualizing faculty job satisfaction: Components, theories, and outcomes. *New directions for institutional research*, 2000(105), 5-20.
- Hancock, G. R., & Mueller, R. O. (2001). Rethinking construct reliability within latent variable systems. *Structural equation modeling: Present and future*, 195-216.
- Hardré, P. L. (2012). Community college faculty motivation for basic research, teaching research, and professional development. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 36(8), 539-561.
- Harrington, C., & Schibik, T. (2004). Caveat Emptor: Is There a Relationship between Part-Time Faculty Utilization and Student Learning Outcomes and Retention? Professional File. Number 91, Spring 2004. *Association for Institutional Research (NJ1)*.
- Hearn, J. C., Warshaw, J. B., & Ciarimboli, E. B. (2016). Privatization and accountability trends and policies in US public higher education. *Egitim ve Bilim*, 41(184).
- Herzberg, F. (2008). *One more time: How do you motivate employees?* Harvard Business Review Press.

- Hillman, N. W., Tandberg, D. A., & Fryar, A. H. (2015). Evaluating the Impacts of "New" Performance Funding in Higher Education. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 37(4), 501-519.
- Hirsch-Keefe, J. (2015). Community College Adjuncts: From Information Seeking to Identity Formation. (Doctoral dissertation. University of Central Florida).
- Hoyt, J. E., Howell, S. L., & Eggett, D. (2007). Dimensions of Part-Time Faculty Job Satisfaction: Development and Factor Analysis of a Survey Instrument. *Journal of Adult Education*, 36(2), 23-34.
- Jacoby, D. (2006). Effects of part-time faculty employment on community college graduation rates. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(6), 1081-1103.
- Jaeger, A. J., & Hinz, D. (2008). The effects of part-time faculty on first semester freshmen retention: A predictive model using logistic regression. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, 10(3), 265-286.
- Jolley, M. R., Cross, E., & Bryant, M. (2014). A critical challenge: The engagement and assessment of contingent, part-time adjunct faculty professors in United States community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 38(2-3), 218-230.
- Kahn, J.H., & Scott, N.A. (1997). Predictors of research productivity and science-related career goals among counseling psychology graduate students. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 25(1), 38-67. doi: 10.1177/0011000097251005.
- Kahn, S., Lalicker, W. B., & Lynch-Binieck, A. (2017). *Contingency, exploitation, and solidarity: Labor and action in English composition*.

- Kasemsap, K. (2017). Examining the roles of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the global workplace. In *Handbook of research on human resources strategies for the new millennial workforce* (pp. 148-176).
- Kezar, A., DePaola, T., & Scott, D. T. (2019). *The Gig Academy: Mapping labor in the neoliberal university*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2011). Understanding non-tenure track faculty: New assumptions and theories for conceptualizing behavior. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 55(11), 1419-1442.
- Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2013). Institutionalizing equitable policies and practices for contingent faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 84(1), 56-87.
- Laden, B. V., & Hagedorn, L. S. (2000). Job Satisfaction among Faculty of Color in Academe: Individual Survivors or Institutional Transformers? *New directions for institutional research*, 27(1), 57-66.
- Lang, D. (2015). Clark's Triangle and Fiscal Incentives: Implications for Colleges. *College Quarterly*, 18(3), n3.
- Larson, L. M., Seipel, M. T., Shelley, M. C., Gahn, S. W., Ko, S. Y., Schenkenfelder, M., ... & Heitmann, M. M. (2019). The academic environment and faculty well-being: The role of psychological needs. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 27(1), 167-182.
- Lechuga, V. M. (2014). A motivation perspective on faculty mentoring: the notion of “non-intrusive” mentoring practices in science and engineering. *Higher Education*, 68(6), 909-926.
- Lechuga, V. M., & Lechuga, D. C. (2012). Faculty motivation and scholarly work: Self-determination and self-regulation perspectives. *Journal of the Professoriate*, 6(2).

- Leslie, D., & Gappa, J. (1994). Education's new academic work force. *Planning for Higher Education*, 22(4), 1–6.
- Lee, K. A., & Kieckhefer, G. M. (1989). Measuring human responses using visual analogue scales. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 11(1), 128-132.
- Levin, J. S., & Hernandez, V. M. (2014). Divided identity: Part-time faculty in public colleges and universities. *The Review of Higher Education*, 37(4), 531-557.
- Li, A. Y. (2016). *The renaissance of performance funding for higher education: Policy adoption, implementation, and impacts* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Lund, J., Boyce, B. A., Oates, R., & Fiorentino, L. (2010). Faculty dispositions: Seeking clarity while looking at muddy waters. *Quest*, 62(3), 268-286.
- Mamiseishvili, K., & Rosser, V. J. (2011). Examining the Relationship between Faculty Productivity and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of the Professoriate*, 5(2).
- Mehdinezhad, V. (2012). Faculty members' understanding of teaching efficacy criteria and its relation to their characteristics. *International Journal of Instruction*, 5(2).
- Mendenhall, A. S. (2014). The composition specialist as flexible expert: Identity and labor in the history of composition. *College English*, 77(1), 11.
- Modern Language Association. (2009). MLA Issue Brief: The Academic Workforce. *MLA*.
- Mangiardi, J. R., & Pellegrino, E. D. (1992). Collegiality: what is it? *Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 68(2), 292.
- Maynard, D. C., & Joseph, T. A. (2008). Are all part-time faculty underemployed? The influence of faculty status preference on satisfaction and commitment. *Higher education*, 55(2), 139.

- McBeth, M., & McCormack, T. (2017). An Apologia and a Way Forward: In Defense of the Lecturer Line in Writing Programs. *Contingency, Exploitation, and Solidarity: Labor and Action in English Composition*, 41-55.
- Mueller, B., Mandernach, B. J., & Sanderson, K. (2013). Adjunct versus full-time faculty: Comparison of student outcomes in the online classroom. *Journal of online learning and teaching*, 9(3), 341.
- Ozder, H. (2011). Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Novice Teachers and Their Performance in the Classroom. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(5), 1-15.
- Özpehlivan, M., & Acar, A. Z. (2015). Assessment of a multidimensional job satisfaction instrument. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 210, 283-290.
- Parkison, P. (2015). Catharsis in Education: Rationalizing and Reconciling. *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue: Vol. 17# 1 & 2*, 121.
- Penrose, A. M. (2012). Professional Identity in a Contingent-Labor Profession: Expertise, Autonomy, Community in Composition Teaching. *WPA: Writing Program Administration-Journal of the Council of Writing Program Administrators*, 35(2).
- Reips, U. D., & Funke, F. (2008). Interval-level measurement with visual analogue scales in Internet-based research: VAS Generator. *Behavior research methods*, 40(3), 699-704.
- Rhoades, G. (2008). The centrality of contingent faculty to academe's future [Electronic Version]. *Academe Online*, Nov/Dec 2008. Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2008/ND/Feat/rhoa.htm>

- Rhoades, G. (2019). Taking College Teachers' Working Conditions Seriously: Adjunct Faculty and Negotiating a Labor-based Conception of Quality. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 1-26.
- Robertson, L. R., Crowley, S., & Lentricchia, F. (1987). The Wyoming conference resolution opposing unfair salaries and working conditions for post-secondary teachers of writing. *College English*, 49(3), 274-280.
- Robinia, K. A. (2008). Online teaching self-efficacy of nurse faculty teaching in public, accredited nursing programs in the state of Michigan. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI.
- Rosen, C. C., Ferris, D. L., Brown, D. J., Chen, Y., & Yan, M. (2013). Perceptions of organizational politics: A need satisfaction paradigm. *Organization Science*, 25(4), 1026-1055.
- Ruiz Avila, C. A. (2015). Job Satisfaction of Adjunct Faculty Who Teach Standardized Online Courses (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Florida).
- Rutherford, A., & Rabovsky, T. (2014). Evaluating impacts of performance funding policies on student outcomes in higher education. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 655(1), 185-208.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American psychologist*, 55(1), 68.
- Schuster, J. H., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. JHU Press.

- Seigel, M. L., & Miner-Rubino, K. (2009). Measuring the value of collegiality among law professors. *Faulkner Law Review*, *1*, 257.
- Seipel, M. T., & Larson, L. M. (2018). Supporting non-tenure-track faculty well-being. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *26*(1), 154-171.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). Discourse analysis in professional contexts. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, *11*, 103-114.
- Taylor, B. J., Cantwell, B., & Slaughter, S. (2013). Quasi-markets in US higher education: The humanities and institutional revenues. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *84*(5), 675-707.
- Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of educational research*, *45*(1), 89-125.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and teacher Education*, *23*(6), 944-956.
- Tyndall, C. L. (2017). Called to teach: A mixed methods exploration of community college adjunct faculty's teaching self-efficacy.
- Umbrecht, M. R., Fernandez, F., & Ortagus, J. C. (2015). An examination of the (un)intended consequences of performance funding in higher education. *Educational Policy*. doi: 10.1177/0895904815614398.
- Van den Broeck, A., Ferris, D. L., Chang, C. H., & Rosen, C. C. (2016). A review of self-determination theory's basic psychological needs at work. *Journal of Management*, *42*(5), 1195-1229.

- Wang, H., Hall, N. C., & Rahimi, S. (2015). Self-efficacy and causal attributions in teachers: Effects on burnout, job satisfaction, illness, and quitting intentions. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 47*, 120-130.
- Wells, C. A. (2015). *Adjunct faculty experiences in a comprehensive development program: A single-site case study* (Doctoral dissertation, Colorado State University.).
- White-Farnham, J., & Finer, B. S. (2017). Writing Program Architecture: An Introduction with Alternative Table of Contents. *Writing Program Architecture: Thirty Cases for Reference and Research, 3-24*.
- Williams, B., Onsman, A., & Brown, T. (2010). Exploratory factor analysis: A five-step guide for novices. *Australasian journal of paramedicine, 8*(3).
- Wood, O. R. (1973). *An analysis of faculty motivation to work in the North Carolina community college system*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, Raleigh.
- Zusman, A. (2005). Challenges facing higher education in the twenty-first century. *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges, 2*, 115-160.

Appendix A

IRB Approval



Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
1 UNF Drive
Jacksonville, FL 32224-2665
904-620-2455 FAX 904-620-2457
Equal Opportunity/Equal Access/Affirmative Action Institution

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 27, 2020

TO: Mr. David MacKinnon

VIA: Dr. Daniel Dinsmore
Foundations & Secondary Education

FROM: Dr. Jennifer Wesely, Chairperson
On behalf of the UNF Institutional Review Board

RE: Declaration of Exempt Status for IRB#1352619-1
"Postsecondary Writing Program Collegiality, Job Satisfaction, and Self-efficacy Teaching Writing: A Quantitative Analysis Using Self-Determination Theory"

UNF IRB Number: <u>1352619-1</u> Exemption Date: <u>03-27-2020</u> Processed on behalf of UNF's IRB 2223 .

Your research study, "Postsecondary Writing Program Collegiality, Job Satisfaction, and Self-efficacy Teaching Writing: A Quantitative Analysis Using Self-Determination Theory" was reviewed on behalf of the UNF Institutional Review Board has been declared "Exempt" under category 2.

Please be advised that any subject complaints, unanticipated problems, or adverse events that occur are to be reported to the IRB as soon as practicable, but no later than 3 business days following the occurrence. Please use the [Event Report Form](#) to submit information about such events.

While the exempt status is effective for the life of the study, any substantive changes must be submitted to the IRB for prospective review. In some circumstances, changes to the protocol may result in alteration of the IRB review classification.

To submit an amendment to your exempt protocol, please complete an [Amendment Request Document](#) and upload it along with any updated materials affected by the changes via a new package in IRBNet. For additional guidance on submitting an amendment, please contact the IRB administrator.

Upon completion of this study, please submit a [Closing Report Form](#) as a new package in IRBNet. Please maintain copies of all research-related materials for a minimum of 3 years following study closure. These records include the IRB-approved protocol, approval memo, questionnaires, survey instruments, consent forms, and all IRB correspondence.

Should you have questions regarding your study or any other IRB issues, please contact the Research Integrity unit of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs by emailing IRB@unf.edu or calling (904) 620-2455.

Appendix B

Recruitment Email

From: David MacKinnon
To: Potential Participant
Date: 1 April 2020
Subject: Invitation to Participate in Research Study on Faculty Collegiality

Greetings,

My name is David MacKinnon, and I am a doctoral student at the University of North Florida. I am conducting a research study on faculty collegiality to explore the relations among writing program faculty collegiality in their work (i.e., teaching, research/scholarship, and service), their job satisfaction in teaching writing courses in postsecondary settings, and their sense of self-efficacy in that teaching.

If you take part in my project, you will complete a survey that we expect to take approximately 15-20 minutes of your time. Your responses will be anonymous, and only authorized personnel will have access to your responses.

Although we cannot offer direct benefits or compensation for taking part in this study, others may benefit from the information we learn from the results of this study. In particular, results from this study may be used to advance faculty development initiatives across faculty ranks.

An informed consent agreement will appear on the first screen page of the survey. Additionally, no foreseeable risks exist for your participation in this project. Your participation is voluntary, and no penalties exist if you decide not to participate, to skip questions, or to withdraw your participation.

If you have any questions or concerns about this project, please contact me, my faculty advisor, or the University of North Florida's IRB. Please print a copy of this form for your records.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant or if you would like to contact someone about a research-related injury, please contact the chair of the UNF Institutional Review board by calling (904) 620-2498 or emailing irb@unf.edu.

Follow this link to the Survey:

`{l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}`

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:

http://unf.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/preview/SV_8kLHttnJCPwlebb?Q_CHL=preview

Sincerely,

David MacKinnon

Doctoral Student

Email: david.mackinnon@unf.edu

Dr. Daniel Dinsmore

Faculty Advisor

Phone: 904-620-2610

Email: daniel.dinsmore@unf.edu

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:

[Click here to unsubscribe](#)

Appendix C

Informed Consent Language

Hi, my name is David MacKinnon, and I am a doctoral student at the University of North Florida. I am conducting a research study on faculty collegiality in order to explore the relations among writing program faculty collegiality in their work (i.e., teaching, research/scholarship, and service), their job satisfaction in teaching writing courses in postsecondary settings, and their sense of self-efficacy in that teaching

If you take part in my project, you will complete a survey that we expect to take approximately 15-25 minutes of your time. Your responses will be anonymous, and only authorized personnel will have access to your responses.

Although we cannot offer direct benefits or compensation for taking part in this study, others may benefit from the information we learn from the results of this study. In particular, results from this study may be used to advance faculty development initiatives across faculty ranks. Additionally, no foreseeable risks exist for your participation in this project. Your participation is voluntary, and no penalties exist if you decide not to participate, to skip questions, or to withdraw your participation

If you have any questions or concerns about this project, please contact me, my faculty advisor, or the University of North Florida's IRB. Please print a copy of this form for your records.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant or if you would like to contact someone about a research-related injury, please contact the chair of the UNF Institutional Review board by calling (904) 620-2498 or emailing irb@unf.edu.

In selecting the option "I agree to participate in this study" below, you affirm your consent and will be prompted to begin the survey.

In clicking "I do not agree to participate in this study" below, your browser will exit this survey.

Sincerely,

David MacKinnon
Doctoral Student
Email: david.mackinnon@unf.edu

Dr. Daniel Dinsmore
Faculty Advisor
Phone: 904-620-2610
Email: daniel.dinsmore@unf.edu

Appendix D

Curriculum Vitae

EDUCATION

Doctor of Education, Educational Leadership

University of North Florida, Jacksonville, FL April 2021
 Dissertation: Postsecondary Writing Program Collegiality, Job Satisfaction, and
 Self-efficacy Teaching Writing: A Quantitative Analysis Using Self-Determination
 Theory | Chair: Dr. Daniel Dinsmore

Master of Arts, English

University of North Florida, Jacksonville, FL May 2008
 Thesis: From Sovereign to Self: Placing the Politics of Prose for Aphra Behn

Bachelor of Arts, English

University of North Florida, Jacksonville, FL April 2005

WORK EXPERIENCE

University of North Florida Jacksonville, FL

Associate Instructor, Department of English 2020-Present

Director, Writing Center

Co-Director, Quality Enhancement Plan

- Reports directly to the Writing Advisory Council and will be the leads on the action items
- Coordinates and effects the action items listed in the 2019-20 QEP under the purview of the Writing Advisory Council
- Develops and promotes a collaborative community of engaged faculty, students, and staff
- Coordinates faculty writing and assessment instruction
- Communicates updates and news to the university community
- Coordinates the assessment of first-year and program-specific writing samples
- Monitors the QEP budget judiciously
- Reports on the progress of the Quality Enhancement Plan to the university population

Instructor, Department of English 2019-2020

Assistant Director, Writing Program & Center

- Assisted Writing Program Director to coordinate program initiatives, including budgetary planning, faculty outreach coordination, and common clerical processes
- Developed and piloted large in-person and online first-year writing courses
- Grew writing center traffic through engaging faculty and academic programs to advertise writing program and center offerings
- Assisted Quality Enhancement Plan Team (QEP) to integrate QEP efforts into writing program
- Supported graduate assistants to develop pedagogies and practices and to support writing program curriculum
- Supported part-time faculty to adapt curriculum to their interests and abilities to support students in writing program courses
- Designed and assessed program curricula for first-year, technical, and professional writing course sequences

Instructor, Department of English

2012-2016

Coordinator, Writing Program & Center

- Developed and implemented first-year writing curriculum redesign
- Developed comprehensive Writing Program online-learning model for General Education writing courses
- Developed and conducted discipline-specific writing courses such as Writing for Engineers and Professional Communications for Advertising
- Developed and conducted online-learning writing instruction for technical writing and first-year composition courses
- Trained and coordinated graduate students to facilitate online writing courses and general tutoring
- Developed university writing placement exam for incoming first-year students
- Designed and offered first-year and technical/professional communication writing courses
- Trained part-time faculty in common course syllabi and materials
- Assisted Writing Program Director to develop and implement writing program initiatives, as outreach to professional colleges and coordinating with College of Arts & Sciences administration to pilot a university writing center

Adjunct Instructor, Department of English

2009-2012

- Instructed first-year writing courses, to include Freshman Composition, Introduction to Literature, Style and Grammar, Technical Writing, and Writing for Engineers
- Consulted with UNF's Engineering program as part of Writing Program outreach and provided writing seminars to Senior Engineering Design students
- Developed ENC 2127 - Style and Grammar course and materials for Writing Program
- Developed Writing Program rubrics to assess and document student writing skills

Office Manager, Department of English

2010-2012

- Created, monitored, and amended departmental budget alongside department chair
- Communicated information to faculty, staff, and external departments and agencies
- Prepared documents such as contracts, requisitions, and travel reimbursements for guest lecturers and guest entertainers
- Hired, trained, and supervised departmental secretary and student assistants in day-to-day office activities

Administrative Secretary, Department of English

2009-2010

- Provided point of first contact for office visitors, and guided students, faculty, and guests to appropriate information and destinations
- Drafted, proofed, and edited various departmental correspondence and publications
- Assisted department chair in maintaining calendar and coordinating meetings
- Received and maintained confidential material for national job search candidates and current departmental faculty and staff
- Assisted office manager in maintaining Department of English's website
- Scheduled, coordinated, and facilitated departmental meetings as well as for guest lectures

COURSES TAUGHT

ENC1101 - INTRODUCTION TO RHETORIC & WRITING
 ENC1130 - INTENSIVE WRITING
 ENC1143 - INTRODUCTION TO RHETORIC & NARRATIVE
 ENC1991 - WRITING STYLES: APA
 ENC1993 - BASIC STYLE
 ENC2127 - STYLE & GRAMMAR
 ENC2210 - TECHNICAL WRITING
 ENC2463 - WRITING ABOUT ENGINEERING
 ENC3246 - PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION: ENGINEERING
 ENC3250 - PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION
 LIT2000 - INTRODUCTION TO LITERATURE
 SLS1990 - FIRST-YEAR SEMINAR

ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES / PRESENTATIONS

Faculty Association Executive Secretary	2020-2022
Department of English Writing Program Committee Chair	2020-2021
Faculty Association Campus Distance Learning Committee	2019-2021
Faculty Association Faculty Enhancement Committee	2019-2021
Faculty Association Executive Secretary (<i>pro tem</i>)	May-Dec 2019
Department of English Steering Committee	2018-2019
Faculty Association Adjunct Affairs Committee (Chair)	2017-2019
Faculty Association Executive Committee Representative	2017-2019
First-year student faculty advisor for summer and fall orientation sessions	2017-2019
Lead-author of University's selected Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) - "Writing Around the Curriculum"	2017
Served on Department bylaws committee to review and recommend operating procedures	2016
Served on Three Department of Search Committees	2015
Served on Department Search Committee	2014
Outstanding Undergraduate Teaching Award Nominee	2013
Outstanding Undergraduate Teaching Award Nominee	2012
Served as Co-Copyeditor for <i>Journal of Applied Social Sciences</i>	2010-2011
Indexed <i>Poetics of Old English</i> (Routledge) for Tiffany Beechy, PhD	2010

COLLEGIALITY, JOB SATISFACTION, & SELF-EFFICACY TEACHING WRITING 113

Proofread manuscript of <i>Remembrance, emulation, imagination: The Chinese and Chinese American Catholic ancestor memorial service</i> for Beverly Butcher, PhD	2009
Communications Lab Student Success Workshops: reading and writing about poetry, working with grammar (Florida Community College, Jacksonville, FL)	2007-2008
ENC 0021 Exit Writing Exam Grader (Florida Community College, Jacksonville, FL)	2007
Served on Learning Services Open House Committee (Florida Community College, Jacksonville, FL)	2007-2008
Served on Hiring/Screening Committee, Communications Lab, Instructional Assistant position (Florida Community College, Jacksonville, FL)	2007

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

2020 VALUE Institute Certified Scorer - Written Communication	2020
Recipient of Semester-long Professional Development Leave - Spring 2020	2018
The Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Summer Institute for Quality Enhancement and Accreditation	2018
The Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Annual Meeting	2016
UNF Teaching Online Seminar (TOL 6100) – Online Course Development Training to develop ENC 2210 (Technical Writing) course (Proposal accepted for summer 2014 seminar)	2014
UNF Teaching Online Seminar (TOL 4100) – Training for Online Instruction	2012
National Association of Fellowship Advisors (NAFA) Conference (Seattle, WA)	2010
Adjunct Faculty Workshop – Summer WORKS workshop (University of North Florida, Jacksonville, FL)	2009
Aleph Training Seminar (Florida Community College, Jacksonville, FL)	2007

STUDENT MENTORSHIP

English Graduate Assistants
Michaela Tashjian, 2019-2020
Holly Seaver, 2017-2019
Paige Perez, 2017-2019
Max Cohen, 2017-2019
Kayla Hilliar, 2015-2017
Misty Fuller, 2014-2016
Brian Duggan, 2014-2016

PUBLICATIONS

MacKinnon, D. (2017). Towards Care, Consideration, Competence, & Confidence: An Introduction to First-year Writing at UNF. In L. Howell (Ed.), *First Expressions*. Southlake, TX: Fountainhead Press.

MacKinnon, D., Perez, P., & Seaver, H. (2019). Walking into the Leadership Role: Interpersonal and Introspective Leadership Practices. In M. Ohlson (Ed.), *Leading with Joy*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

REFERENCES

Available upon request.