THE INFLUENCE OF FACULTY STATUS AND NATIVE LANGUAGE ON SATISFACTION FOR ONLINE FACULTY AT A FOR-PROFIT INSTITUTION

Michael J. Curran, Strayer University, michael.curran@strayer.edu
Lucas Curran, Community College of Allegheny County, lcurr0f@ccac.edu
Peter Draus, Robert Morris University, draus@rmu.edu
Ann Jabro, Robert Morris University, jabro@rmu.edu

ABSTRACT

For-profit institutions have seen considerable growth in the last decade, and much of that growth has been accomplished with an expansion of online course offerings. Faculty satisfaction is a critical element in any academic institution, and this study looked at the influence of five demographic variables (faculty status, age, teaching experience, gender, and language status) on satisfaction for online faculty. This study analyzed data from 241 surveys of online faculty at a for-profit institution. Findings indicated that faculty status (defined as full-time or part-time teaching exclusively at the for-profit school and full-time or part-time teaching at other institutions including the for-profit) and language status influenced satisfaction, but other demographic variables had no significant influence. The authors also discuss the implications of faculty status as an emerging issue at for-profit institutions.

Keywords: faculty satisfaction, for-profit institution, demographic variables, ANOVA, faculty status, language status

INTRODUCTION

Online education has increased dramatically in the last ten years and continues to grow. Much of the growth of online education has been driven by for-profit institutions. These institutions have unique characteristics and cultures that provide a different faculty experience compared to traditional universities [19,20]. Many for-profit schools traditionally have stressed the importance of 'real-world' experience as an integral element of faculty, [21, 22], which may draw a different staff to these institutions. Additionally, for-profit institutions traditionally have relied on a larger percentage of adjunct faculty compared to not-for-profit schools [16,34,35]. Whatever differences exist within institutional cultures, faculty satisfaction remains a critical dimension for the success of any online learning program. If for-profit institutional cultures are different, and they recruit online faculty with diverse educational and work experience backgrounds, it is possible that demographic factors that are traditionally associated with online faculty satisfaction may be unique to these types of institutions. Therefore, this study examined demographic factors to assess the influence that these factors had on satisfaction for online faculty at a for-profit institution.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Online Faculty Satisfaction and Demographics

There have been many studies on different variables that influence faculty satisfaction with online teaching. Green, Alejandro, & Brown [10] studied reasons that affect faculty decisions to participate in online courses, using an online survey. They used four faculty groups (tenured, tenure-track, full-time non-tenured, and part-time) as demographic variables. Motivating factors for the overall population included flexible working conditions, technology usage, and opportunity to share knowledge. There were some differences for part-time faculty; they were discouraged by lack of financial support for the online workload and quality of students. Bolliger & Wasilik [7] evaluated factors that influence satisfaction for online faculty and concluded that it was based on three factors (student-related, institution-related, and instructor-related), with student-related factors being most influential.

There are also many studies on demographic variables that influence satisfaction for faculty. Many of these deal with the emergence of part-time faculty in online teaching [2,12,27,32]. Each of these studies looked at the part-time faculty role and the different experiences that create satisfaction for this group. Findings indicated that part-time faculty generally were satisfied and that demographics (including age, race, gender, and online experience)

played little role in overall satisfaction [8,9]. Antony & Valdez [4] assessed factors that contribute towards faculty satisfaction, and their findings indicated that part-time faculty have high levels of motivation, especially in regard to interactions with students [11,25].

The increasing importance of part-time faculty status as an emerging factor in education also has ramifications regarding the growing power of this demographic group. Job security continues to be a prominent issue for part-time faculty [1,15,33,36]. This has caused faculty status to become an increasing concern for colleges, and the issue of unionization of part-time faculty at a college and even a national level has been addressed [13,14,28,30].

For-Profit Faculty

While there is ample literature on satisfaction for online faculty in general terms [24,29,31], there is less understanding of online faculty satisfaction in for-profit institutions. While these institutions have a long history [6], they have not been the subject of much inquiry until the last decade [5,23]. Much of the literature suggests that these institutions have very unique cultures and are vastly diverse, even among themselves [17]. If this is the case, there may be differences in factors of satisfaction for this group [3,18]. The purpose of this study was to see if separate domains of satisfaction (instructor-related, student-related, and institution-related as measured by the survey instrument) were influenced by demographic variables.

METHODOLOGY

This study collected primarily quantitative data using a survey instrument. The survey was an adapted version of the Online Faculty Satisfaction Survey (OFSS) developed by Bolliger & Wasilik [7], see Appendix A. This survey was designed to assess factors of satisfaction for online faculty and had previously been used on not-for-profit faculty. It was used in this study to collect data on factors that influence satisfaction for online faculty as well as demographic information. Each statement in the survey was coded to correspond to one of the four dimensions of online faculty satisfaction assessed by this instrument (student-related, instructor-related, institution-related, and general). Each dimension is treated in this study as a separate component of satisfaction that can independently be influenced by demographic factors [7]. This instrument has been evaluated, and its reliability and validity are high.

A survey link was sent to all regional online faculty at a large for-profit institution (n = 495). Data was collected for two months and 243 were returned. Two surveys were discarded due to errors in the data, leaving 241 (48.7% return) usable surveys. Data was analyzed using SSPS (version 21). The survey segmented satisfaction into four grouped dimensions-student-related, instructor-related, institution-related, and general satisfaction. This was done through Principal Component Analysis. The data conformed to all parameters necessary for factorability and the results included a slight shifting of a few variables. After establishing factor components, each demographic variable was crosstabbed with each survey statement and grouped satisfaction factors. Additional analysis was done to explore relationships between demographic variables and grouped satisfaction factors. Analysis included comparison of means, ANOVA, chi-square analysis, and measurement of effect size.

RESULTS

Analysis of the data included ANOVA tests comparing demographic factors (faculty status, gender, age, teaching experience, and language status) and four factors of satisfaction (student-related, institution-related, instructor-related, and general satisfaction). Significant relationships were analyzed.

Analysis of Faculty Status
Faculty status was the first variable analyzed. Faculty were grouped based on both full and part-time status with the for-profit university, as well as the degree of exclusivity of teaching at the for-profit institution. The demographic breakdown of this variable is displayed in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographics on variable of faculty status

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Full-time faculty that teach exclusively at the for-profit institution	42	17.4	17.4	17.4
Full-time faculty that teach at other schools in addition to the for-profit	26	10.8	10.8	28.2
Part-time faculty that teach exclusively at the for-profit institution	93	38.6	38.6	66.8
Part-time faculty that teach at other schools in addition to the for-profit	80	33.2	33.2	100.0
Totals	241	100.0	100.0	

Faculty status appeared to have a relationship with satisfaction for each of the grouped factors (Table 2). Significance ($p < .05$) was reached for student-related, institution-related, and instructor-related grouped factors. The F value was high, especially for student-related, institution-related, and general satisfaction. This indicated that the independent variable (faculty status) was a source of variability in influencing satisfaction for this population. It should also be pointed out that faculty status, in this study, meant whether they were employed full- or part-time. In addition, it was taken into account whether the participant taught exclusively at the for-profit university under study or if they taught at other schools, as well. Faculty status, in this case, had nothing to do with positional rank, which is generally not a part of institutional culture at for-profit universities [19,20].

Table 2: ANOVA for faculty status and Grouped Satisfaction Variables (grouped variables include all survey responses that were coded as for either student-related, instructor-related, or institution-related)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Total Student	Between Groups	4062.828	3	1354.276	29.594	.000
	Within Groups	10845.504	237	45.762		
	Total	14908.332	240			
Total Instructor	Between Groups	82.178	3	27.393	6.128	.000
	Within Groups	1059.490	237	4.470		
	Total	1141.668	240			
Total Institution	Between Groups	383.071	3	127.690	49.715	.000
	Within Groups	608.722	237	2.568		
	Total	991.793	240			
Total General	Between Groups	189.233	3	63.078	40.867	.000
	Within Groups	365.805	237	1.543		
	Total	555.037	240			

Mean score data for faculty status and Questions 29, 30, and 31 (How satisfied are you with the online teaching in relation to your experiences with students? How satisfied are you with online teaching in relation to your experiences with the for-profit institution? How satisfied are you with the online teaching in relation to your own personal experiences?) were examined to determine if further analysis was warranted (Table 3). A common factor of similarity within the demographic groups was whether a given faculty member taught at a school other than the for-profit school that was studied. Mean scores on each subscale were similar, based on that one factor alone.

Table 3: Comparison of Mean Scores (1 to 5 scale, 1 being not satisfied and 5 being very satisfied)

	Online faculty that teach exclusively at one for-profit school		Online faculty that teach at multiple schools, including the for-profit	
	Full-time faculty teaching exclusively at the for-profit institution	Part-time faculty teaching exclusively at the for-profit institution	Full-time faculty at the for-profit institution that also teach at other schools	Part-time faculty at the for-profit institution that also teach at other schools
How satisfied are you with the online teaching in relation to your experiences with students?	3.7143	3.9892	2.9615	3.0875
How satisfied are you with the online teaching in relation to your experiences with the for profit institution?	3.3333	3.8817	2.2692	2.1000
How satisfied are you with the online teaching in relation to your own personal experiences?	4.1429	4.3011	3.7692	3.7949

Having determined that there was a significant difference in the means of variables related to faculty status and student-related, institution-related, and instructor-related factors, the next issue was to determine the size of the effect (Table 4). This was done by comparing the differences in the means, using the statistical measure called eta squared to determine the size of the effect. In this case, the dependent variable was satisfaction with online teaching, and the effect being measured was each of the factors (student-related, instructor-related, and institution-related) of satisfaction. The effect sizes for each variable are listed in Table 4. The ranges for effect sizes are generally .01 for a small effect size, .06 represents a medium effect size and anything above .138 represents a large effect size [26].

Table 4: Effect Size of Faculty Status and Factors of Satisfaction

Factor	Eta Squared	Analysis of Relationship
Student-Related	.2725	High
Instructor-Related	.0719	Moderate
Institution-Related	.3862	High
General Satisfaction	.3409	High

It appears that student-related and institution-related factors had important influence on overall satisfaction and that instructor-related factors were of only moderate importance.

Analysis of Language Status

Language status was also assessed as a potential factor for satisfaction among online faculty at this for-profit institution. The institution studied had a large number of non-native English speakers (21.6%), which was reflective of the school's commitment to a diverse faculty.

Language status did appear to be a factor that had some influence on overall satisfaction for this population. Significance was reached with all subscale factors (Table 5). Overall, those that identified themselves as non-native English speakers exhibited a higher level of satisfaction with the online experience than those who were native English speakers. This was especially true in relation to student-related factors.

Table 5: ANOVA for Language Status and Grouped Satisfaction Variables

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Total Student	Between Groups	3255.485	1	3255.485	66.770	.000
	Within Groups	11652.847	239	48.757		
	Total	14908.332	240			
Total Instructor	Between Groups	56.254	1	56.254	12.387	.001
	Within Groups	1085.414	239	4.541		
	Total	1141.668	240			
Total Institution	Between Groups	74.896	1	74.896	19.523	.000
	Within Groups	916.896	239	3.836		
	Total	991.793	240			
Total General	Between Groups	92.529	1	92.529	47.814	.000
	Within Groups	462.509	239	1.935		
	Total	555.037	240			

Since language status did have a significant difference among the means, the effect size was determined by comparing the means and calculating eta squared (Table 6):

Table 6: Native Language Status and Factors of Satisfaction: Analysis of effect size

Factor	Eta Squared	Analysis of Relationship
Student Related	.2184	High
Instructor Related	.0493	Low
Institution Related	.0755	Medium
General Satisfaction	.1667	High

The results of the study indicated that only two of the demographic variables had any significant relationship with overall satisfaction with the online teaching experience for this population. Several demographic factors seemed to have little to no influence on satisfaction. These included gender, years of online teaching, and age. Language status seemed to be a factor in overall satisfaction. A cross tab of language status with each of the overall satisfaction questions (29, 30, and 31) illustrate this (Tables 7, 8, and 9):

Table 7: Crosstab of Language Status * Satisfaction with online students

	How satisfied are you with the online teaching in relation to your experiences with students? (1 being very dissatisfied and 5 being very satisfied)						Total
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	
Native English speakers	1	29	68	76	15	3.40	189
Non-Native English speakers	0	2	8	29	13	4.02	52
Total	1	31	76	105	28	3.53	241

For native English speakers, only 91 out of 189 gave a positive response (either a 4 or 5), which equated to 48.1%, with 68 (36.0%) giving a neutral response. For non-native English speaking faculty, 42 out of 52 respondents (80.8%) gave a positive response. A Chi-square test for independence indicated a potential association between language statuses on overall satisfaction with students in the online environment; the results indicated that difference was significant (p < .000). This may be because, in the online environment, language barriers are not as pronounced, so it may allow faculty that are not native English speakers a better overall experience with their students. Additionally, cultural barriers may seem less pronounced online than in a traditional classroom. This may also account for an increase in satisfaction for non-native English speakers in relation to students.

Table 8: Crosstab of Language Status * Satisfaction with for-profit institution

	How satisfied are you with the online teaching in relation to your experiences with the for profit institution? (1 being very dissatisfied and 5 being very satisfied)						Total
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	
Native English speakers	22	77	22	56	12	2.78	189
Non-Native English speakers	0	5	6	31	10	3.88	52
Total	22	82	28	87	22	3.02	241

A Chi-square test for independence indicated a significant association between language status and satisfaction with the for-profit institution, and results indicated that the difference was significant (p < .000). In regards to issues relating to working for the for-profit institution, again, language status yielded some interesting results. Only 68 of the 189 (36.0%) responses for native English speakers gave a positive response to this question, indicating that this group of faculty did not regard the institution itself as a means of overall satisfaction. However, 41 of the 52 (78.9%) non-native English speakers did. For this population it appears that non-native English speakers have a more positive relationship with the for-profit institution. There could be a number of reasons for this. Certainly, having a situation in which the faculty have better relationships with students (as seems clear from the first crosstab) would have a collateral effect on their overall satisfaction with the institution. Another factor that may be involved is cultural fit. The organization studied has a strong commitment to a diverse workforce, which is evident by the large percentage (21.6%) of non-native English speakers. A strong organizational commitment to these non-native English speakers may also be a factor in their satisfaction with the institution.

Table 9: Crosstab of Language Status * Satisfaction with Personal Factors in Online Teaching

	How satisfied are you with the online teaching in relation to your own personal experiences? (1 being very dissatisfied and 5 being very satisfied)						Total
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	
Native English speakers	0	4	29	129	25	3.94	187
Non-Native English speakers	0	0	2	24	26	4.46	52
Total	0	4	31	153	51	4.05	239

A Chi-square test for independence was also calculated and indicated a potential relationship between language status and overall satisfaction at a personal level, and results indicated that the difference was significant (p < .000). In regard to the instructor-related issues, both groups illustrated a high level of satisfaction in this area. This may be somewhat related to each faculty member's own sense of personal value and is consistent with much of the literature on satisfaction for faculty in general and online faculty in particular.

DISCUSSION

The demographic segment that was the most surprising was faculty status. What emerged from this was the appearance of two very distinct groups, at both the full- and part-time level. When part-time faculty are looked at as a whole they appear to have an almost equal number of satisfied and dissatisfied members, especially in relationship to the for-profit institution. However, when looked at separately, the faculty who teach at other schools (both full-time and part-time) emerge as unique groups with different levels of satisfaction. A crosstab analysis (Tables 10, 11, and 12) demonstrates the degree to which faculty status influenced the satisfaction level of these distinct subgroups. The first issue addressed was the degree to which this factor impacted faculty satisfaction in regard to student factors (Table 10). A Chi-square test for independence indicated a possible association between faculty status and overall satisfaction with online student factors, and the results indicated that the difference was significant ($p < .000$).

Table 10: Crosstab of Faculty Status * Satisfaction with Online Students

	How satisfied are you with the online teaching in relation to your experiences with students? (1 being very dissatisfied and 5 being very satisfied)					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Full-time faculty that teach exclusively at the for-profit institution	0	3	13	19	7	42
Full-time faculty that teach at other schools in addition to the for-profit	0	6	15	5	0	26
Part-time faculty that teach exclusively at the for-profit institution	0	5	9	61	18	93
Part-time faculty that teach at other schools in addition to the for-profit	1	17	39	20	3	80
Total	1	31	76	105	28	241

This finding proved highly interesting. In relation to satisfaction with students, 56% of faculty gave a positive score and only 13.3% a negative one (1 or 2 on the scale). This would indicate that, overall, faculty are satisfied in their relationships with online students. This conclusion is consistent with the literature on faculty/online faculty satisfaction [7]. However, when viewed separately, a different image of faculty satisfaction emerged. Full-time faculty who taught exclusively at the for-profit institution were slightly positive (61.9%), and part-time faculty who taught exclusively were overwhelmingly positive in their satisfaction with student-related factors (84.9%). On the other hand, full-time faculty who taught at other schools as well only responded with a positive score in 19.2% of the cases, and part-time faculty who taught at other schools were favorable in only 28.8% in the cases.

One possibility is that those who teach only for one institution have no other frame of reference in which to evaluate their experiences with students, and therefore, their work at the one for-profit institution may become normative for them. Also, those who teach at multiple schools may have experiences with different student cultures as well. One issue that has been mentioned in the literature regarding for-profit schools is the lack of educational preparedness on the part of students. This may account for some of the differences in satisfaction among faculty who also experience students at traditional universities. Whatever the reasons, it does appear that this distinct group of part-time online faculty teaching at multiple schools had significantly less satisfying experiences with online teaching than any other demographic group.

It does appear that part-time faculty teaching at multiple institutions had different experiences from their fellow part-time faculty who taught exclusively at the for-profit university in this study. This difference is highlighted by examining the crosstabulation between faculty status and the question from the survey that specifically addressed this issue (Table 11).

Table 11: Crosstab of Faculty Status * Satisfaction with the For-profit Institution

	How satisfied are you with the online teaching in relation to your experiences with the for profit institution? (1 being very dissatisfied and 5 being very satisfied)					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Full-time faculty that teach exclusively at the for-profit institution	1	10	11	14	6	42
Full-time faculty that teach at other schools in addition to the for-profit	3	16	4	3	0	26
Part-time faculty that teach exclusively at the for-profit institution	2	7	6	63	15	93
Part-time faculty that teach at other schools in addition to the for-profit	16	49	7	7	1	80
Total	22	82	28	87	22	241

In this crosstab, faculty status was evaluated in relation to their experiences with the for-profit institution. A Chi-square test for independence indicated a significant association between faculty status and satisfaction with the for-profit institution, Chi-square = 132.80 and was significant at .000. The relationship between faculty satisfaction and the for-profit institution itself was among the most illuminating findings of this study. Both groups who taught exclusively at the for-profit were either moderately satisfied (full-time faculty responded positively at 47.6%) or highly satisfied (part-time faculty teaching exclusively at the for-profit institution were satisfied with the institution at 83.9%). This level of satisfaction with the employer was extraordinary, especially at the part-time level. Reasons for such high levels of satisfaction may not, in some cases, really have a lot to do with the organization itself. For part-time faculty, the reason that they do not teach elsewhere may indicate a high level of financial security. The part-time employment may be a result of their desire for extra money, so their satisfaction, in large part, is a more personal issue rather than a strong sense of organizational commitment. Generally, one would have expected organizational commitment to be strongest among full-time faculty, which was not the case here.

Equally instructive were the responses of faculty that teach at other schools. Full-time faculty responded positively to this statement at only 11.5%, and part-time faculty responded positively at 10.0%. This indicates that both full-time and part-time faculty who are teaching at other schools have, at best, a somewhat strained relationship with the for-profit university, when it comes to overall satisfaction. One of the most striking examples of this relationship is in the area of pay, which is examined in Table 12.

Table 12: Crosstab: Faculty Status * I receive fair compensation for online teaching

	I receive fair compensation for online teaching				Total
	SD	D	A	SA	
Full-time faculty that teach exclusively at the for-profit institution	0	4	34	4	42
Full-time faculty that teach at other schools in addition to the for-profit	0	7	19	0	26
Part-time faculty that teach exclusively at the for-profit institution	1	7	72	13	93
Part-time faculty that teach at other schools in addition to the for-profit	13	49	15	3	80
Total	14	67	140	20	241

Both faculty who taught exclusively at the for-profit seem very satisfied in relation to their compensation (full-time responded positively in 90.5% of cases and part-time at 91.4%). While full-time faculty teaching at other schools

seemed relatively satisfied with compensation (73.1%), the part-time faculty did not find compensation to be very satisfying, with only 22.5% responding positively to that statement. There are many possible reasons for part-time faculty teaching at different schools to have such low satisfaction, regarding their relationship with the for-profit institution. This demographic will certainly have different, and sometimes competing priorities from several different employers. This would most likely be a source of stress for these faculty and contribute to their lack of strong attachment to the for-profit institution.

The results indicate that, among the demographic variables, faculty status emerged as a key factor in overall satisfaction. It appears that for this population, those who taught exclusively at the for-profit were more satisfied. They also had more in common with part time faculty who were exclusive to the for-profit than with other full-time faculty who taught elsewhere. Those who taught at this for-profit institution, as well as others, whether part-time or full-time, appear to have lower levels of satisfaction on almost all grouped and individual factors in this study. Financial pressures, conflicting priorities, and a general lack of attachment to any one of their multiple employers could account for these differences and may constitute an important area for future study.

CONCLUSIONS

The most striking aspect of this study was the degree to which faculty status impacted overall satisfaction among all dimensions analyzed. As a whole, part-time faculty seemed moderately satisfied and reflected the current literature on faculty satisfaction. However, when faculty status was divided into those who taught exclusively at the for-profit university studied and those who taught at multiple schools, a different portrait of the online faculty experience emerged. The degree of dissatisfaction on the part of the group teaching at multiple schools on all metrics was far greater than anticipated. The high levels of satisfaction for part-time faculty exclusively teaching at the for-profit was also not expected. Online part-time faculty seemed divided into two distinct subcultures, one very satisfied and the other highly dissatisfied. This division, based on faculty status was, to a lesser degree, evident among full-time faculty members, as well. Further analysis on this phenomenon at other universities might provide greater insight into this discovery. Additionally, language status also appeared to be a significant satisfaction variable for this population, with non-native English speakers having higher satisfaction levels on all measured dimensions.

Identifying factors that influence satisfaction for online faculty at for-profit institutions is important in helping them carry out their business and educational missions. The emergence of faculty status and language status as key variables in overall satisfaction for online faculty at a for-profit university presents institutions with new insights into what influences faculty satisfaction. These are important considerations when understanding the role faculty play in the developing area of online education, as well as in the increasingly large role that for-profit institutions play in higher education. This study adds to the body of knowledge in both domains and provides context for further study of online faculty satisfaction. Furthermore, the identification of factors that influence satisfaction for online faculty at for-profit institutions provides a framework for strategic recruitment, training, and development of faculty within this business model. Consideration of these factors may allow these institutions to contribute more effectively toward the education of their students.

REFERENCES

1. Adams, M., Dority, K., & Distance Education and Training Council, W. C. (2005). Part-time faculty: Building a quality team. DETC occasional paper Number 24. *Distance Education And Training Council*.
2. AFT Higher, E. (2010). American academic: A national survey of part-time/adjunct faculty. Volume 2. *American Federation of Teachers*.
3. Allen, I., Seaman, J., & Babson Survey Research, G. (2012). Digital faculty: Professors, teaching and technology, 2012. *Babson Survey Research Group*.
4. Antony, J., & Valadez, J. R. (1998). An exploration of the job satisfaction of American part-time college faculty. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
5. The academic mission: Teaching and learning in the for-profit sector. (2006). *ASHE Higher Education Report*, *31*(5), 81-96.
6. Beaver, W. (2009). For-profit education: A social and historical analysis. *Sociological Viewpoints*, *25*53-73.
7. Bolliger, D. U., & Wasilik, O. (2009). Factors influencing faculty satisfaction with online teaching and learning in higher education. *Distance Education*, *30*(1), 103-116.

8. The faculty of the future: Leaner, meaner, more innovative, less secure. (2009). *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *55*(41), B24-B26.

9. Fike, D. S., & Fike, R. (2007). Does faculty employment status impact developmental mathematics outcomes?. *Journal of Developmental Education*, *31*(1), 2-11.

10. Green, T., Alejandro, J., & Brown, A. H. (2009). The retention of experienced faculty in online distance education programs: Understanding factors that impact their involvement. *International Review of Research In Open And Distance Learning*, *10*(3), 1-15.

11. Howell, S. L., & Hoyt, J. (2007). *Part-time faculty job satisfaction in higher education: A literature review*. Online Submission.

12. 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.

13. Hubbard, B., Smith, C., & American Federation of Teachers, W. C. (2003). The growth of full-time nontenure-track faculty: Challenges for the union. Item Number 36-0700. *American Federation of Teachers*.

14. June, A. (2009). An activist shoulders the weight of a new adjunct group. (Cover story). *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *56*(4/5), A1-A9.

15. Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2013). Institutionalizing equitable policies and practices for contingent faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, *84*(1), 56-87.

16. Kezar, A., Maxey, D., Association of American Colleges and, U., & University of Southern California, P. (2012). The changing faculty and student success: National trends for faculty composition over time. *Pullias Center For Higher Education*.

17. Kinser, K. (2006). What Phoenix doesn't teach us about for-profit higher education. *Change 38* (4), 24-29.

18. Lechuga, V.M. (2006). *The changing landscape of the academic profession: The culture of faculty at for-profit colleges and universities*. New York: Routledge.

19. Lechuga, V. M. (2008). Assessment, knowledge, and customer service: Contextualizing faculty work at for-profit colleges and universities. *Review of Higher Education*, *31* (3), pp. 287-307.

20. Lechuga, V.M. (2010). Who are they and what do they do? In G. C. Hentschke, V. M. Lechuga & W. G. Tierney (Eds.), *For-profit colleges and universities: Their markets, regulation, performance, and place in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

21. Lefebvre, L. A. (2008). Demographics, employment motivations, and roles of part-time faculty at virtual universities. *New Directions for Higher Education*, (143), 37-44.

22. Levin, J. S. (2007). Multiple judgments: Institutional context and part-time faculty. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, (140), 15-20.

23. Mangu-Ward, K. (2008). Education for profit. *Reason*, *40*(3), 38-45.

24. McLawhon, R., & Cutright, M. (2012). Instructor learning styles as indicators of online faculty satisfaction. *Educational Technology & Society*, *15*(2), 341-353.

25. Meixner, C., Kruck, S. E., & Madden, L. T. (2010). Inclusion of part-time faculty for the benefit of faculty and students. *College Teaching*, *58*(4), 141-147. doi:10.1080/87567555.2010.484032.

26. Pallant J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for windows* (3rd edn). New York: McGraw Hill.

27. Rhoades, G. (2008). The centrality of contingent faculty to academe's future. *Academe*, *94*(6), 12-15.

28. Ruiz, E. A. (2007). The stone that struck Goliath: The part-time faculty association, Washington state community and technical colleges, and class-action lawsuits. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, (140), 49-54.

29. Satterlee, A. G. (2010). Online faculty satisfaction and quality enhancement initiatives. *Online Submission*.

30. Schmidt, P. (2011). Unions confront the fault lines between adjuncts and full-timers. (Cover story). *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *58*(14), A1-A6.

31. Shepherd, C., Alpert, M., & Koeller, M. (2007). Increasing the efficacy of educators teaching online. *International Journal Of Social Sciences*, *2*(3), 173-179.

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

33. The report on part-time faculty compensation and salary survey, house bill 384. (2007). *New Mexico Higher Education Department*.

34. Thedwall, K. (2008). Nontenure-track faculty: Rising numbers, lost opportunities. *New Directions for Higher Education*, (143), 11-19.

35. Thompson, K. (1994). *Central contingencies: Part-time faculty and the future of higher education*.

36. Wagoner, R. L. (2007). Part-time faculty satisfaction across missions and disciplines. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, (140), 75-81.

APPENDIX A

Survey Instrument – Survey statements in adapted version of Online Faculty Satisfaction Survey (OFSS). Student-related factors are coded with an (S), Instructor-related factors are coded with a (T), Institution-related factors are coded with an (I), and General Satisfaction is coded with a (G). All codes are based on post Principal Component Analysis.

1. The level of my interactions with students in the online course is higher than in a traditional face-to-face class (S)
2. The flexibility provided by the online environment is important to me. (T)
3. My online students are actively involved in their learning. (S)
4. I incorporate fewer resources when teaching an online course as compared to traditional teaching.* (S)
5. The technology I use for online teaching is reliable. (T)
6. I have a higher workload when teaching an online course as compared to the traditional one.* (I)
7. I miss face-to face contact with students when teaching online.* (S)
8. I do not have any problems controlling my students in the online environment.(T)
9. I look forward to teaching my next online course. (G)
10. My students are very active in communicating with me regarding online course matters. (S)
11. I appreciate that I can access my online course any time it is convenient to me. (T)
12. My online students are more enthusiastic about their learning than their traditional counterparts. (S)
13. I have to be more creative in terms of the resources used for the online course.* (I)
14. Online teaching is often frustrating because of technical problems.* (T)
15. It takes me longer to prepare for an online course on a weekly basis than for a face-to-face course.* (I)
16. I am satisfied with the use of communication tools in the online environment (e.g., chat rooms, threaded discussions, etc.). (S)
17. I am able to provide better feedback to my online students on their performance in the course. (S)
18. I am more satisfied with teaching online as compared to other delivery methods. (G)
19. My online students are somewhat passive when it comes to contacting the instructor regarding course related matters.* (S)
20. It is valuable to me that my students can access my online course from any place in the world. (S)
21. The participation level of my students in the class discussions in the online setting is lower than in the traditional one.* (S)
22. My students use a wider range of resources in the online setting than in the traditional one. (T)
23. Technical problems do not discourage me from teaching online. (T)
24. I receive fair compensation for online teaching. (I)
25. Not meeting my online students face-to-face prevents me from knowing them as well as my on-site students.* (S)
26. I am concerned about receiving lower course evaluations in the online course as compared to the traditional one.* (S)
27. Online teaching is gratifying because it provides me with an opportunity to reach students who otherwise would not be able to take courses. (S)
28. It is more difficult for me to motivate my students in online environment than in the traditional setting.* (S)
29. How satisfied are you with the online teaching in relation to your experiences with students?
30. How satisfied are you with the online teaching in relation to your experiences with the for profit institution?
31. How satisfied are you with the online teaching in relation to your own personal experiences?
32. What do you like least about teaching online?
33. What do you like the most about teaching online?
34. Is there anything else you wish to share?
35. How many years have you taught online courses?
36. What is your current age?
37. Faculty status.
38. What is your gender?
39. Is English your native language?

*Denotes a recoded scale item