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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the attraction of a given type of adjunct faculty to teach online via Penn State World Campus and extrinsic and intrinsic motivators, as well as the relationship between a given type of adjunct faculty’s decision to continue teaching online via Penn State World Campus and extrinsic and intrinsic motivators. Do the incentives that attract and retain adjunct faculty to teach online via Penn State World Campus vary depending on that faculty member’s adjunct career typology?

A survey was sent to all individuals who have taught at least one online course for Penn State World Campus in the last three years. The survey included demographic questions that enabled respondents to self-identify as full-time faculty and staff or one of five adjunct career type populations: Graduate Students, Aspiring Academics, Freelancers, Practitioners, and Loaners. Respondents were asked to indicate which of 25 extrinsic and intrinsic motivators attracted them to begin to teach online via Penn State World Campus. They were also asked to indicate which of the same 25 extrinsic and intrinsic motivators influenced them to continue teaching online via Penn State World Campus.

An analysis of the survey responses indicates that 13 of the 25 incentives appear to differently impact various adjunct career types decision to begin to teach via Penn State World Campus. With regard to the incentives that impact one's decision to continue to teach via Penn State World Campus, an analysis of the survey responses indicates that there 14 of the 25 incentives appear to differently impact various adjunct career types decision.

Finally, a list of the top five incentives that attract each adjunct career type to begin to teach via Penn State World Campus was developed based on the data collected, as well as a list of the top five incentives that attract each adjunct career type to continue to do so.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Online learning in higher education has grown tremendously in the past decade. According to the Sloan Consortium’s February 2016 report of online education among U.S. institutions of higher education, in 2014 more than 5.8 million students enrolled in at least one online course (Allen & Seaman, 2016, p. 4). Of those, 2.85 million students (14% of all higher education students) were taking all of their courses online (p.4). In addition, a little more than 63% of academic leaders of higher education institutions reported that online learning is a critical part of their long-term strategy (p. 5). The number of higher education institutions with no online offerings now represents a small minority, serving only 2.1% of all higher education students (p. 23).

The trend in the growth of enrollments in online education has been particularly evident at Penn State. The size of Penn State’s student enrollment has grown significantly since the introduction of Penn State World Campus in 1998 (The Pennsylvania State University, 2013a). Penn State World Campus is a special purpose campus tasked by the University with the delivery of all academic programs offered at a distance to students who would otherwise not be able to attend one of the University’s physical campuses due to their geographical location or life circumstances (The Pennsylvania State University, 2006). In other words, Penn State World Campus has brought new students, largely adult learners, to the institution. The World Campus works in partnership with academic units to achieve its mission and has no faculty of its own.
Between Summer 2015 and Spring 2016, 17,660 students were identified as World Campus students through their campus location, making Penn State World Campus the campus with the second highest enrollments within the University (The Pennsylvania State University, 2016a). There are more than 130 online undergraduate and graduate certificate and degree programs available through Penn State World Campus. The growth that has taken place since the launch of the World Campus in 1998, in combination with the University’s more than one hundred years of experience in distance education, has made Penn State a recognized leader in distance teaching and learning. In 2013, a Penn State News article announced the University’s investment of $20 million from World Campus revenues to grow the World Campus to a student population of 45,000 in the next decade (The Pennsylvania State University, 2013b).

The biggest challenge to institutions like Penn State is identifying, attracting, and retaining enough instructors who are qualified and available to meet increased online student enrollment demands. A case in point can be found in the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences (EMS) at Penn State. The College of EMS enrolls approximately 2,500 resident instruction students at the undergraduate and graduate level (The Pennsylvania State University, n.d.). The College’s World Campus student population has added more than 1,500 students to that count. Assuming the workloads of the faculty currently teaching in the College are at 100% capacity, there are three primary options for the College to meet the increased enrollment demand: (a) increase course enrollment caps, (b) change the instructional design of the courses to keep the faculty workload stable while increasing the number of students in each course, or (c) hire more qualified individuals and/or teaching assistants to meet student enrollment demands.
In their research studies on class sizes in higher education, Cheng (2011), Mandel and Sussmuth (2011), and Monks and Schmidt (2011) found that increasing class size had a negative impact on student ratings of courses and instructors. In online education, this result can be detrimental; dissatisfied students can easily switch from one institution to the next with the click of their mouse.

Changing the instructional design of a course can also enable one to increase enrollments while keeping the size of the instructional team unchanged. Automating assessments and reducing the amount of faculty-to-student interaction required in a course are two common ways to increase enrollments without having to increase teaching load. Traditional higher education institutions, however, pride themselves on low student-faculty ratios and high levels of interaction in the classroom, whether online or face-to-face, do not commonly embrace this strategy. This is particularly evident when one looks at the ranking criteria used by organizations like the *U.S. News and World Report* in their annual college rankings, which favor small class size and low student-faculty ratios (Morse & Brooks, 2015).

Without increasing class size or dramatically changing the way faculty teach, and assess, our students, this leaves colleges like Earth and Mineral Sciences to hire more individuals and/or teaching assistants to meet growing enrollment demands.

The College of Earth and Mineral Sciences is not the only academic unit at Penn State to face faculty capacity constraints, as academic units across Penn State have seen similar dramatic rises in their student population due to growing Penn State World Campus enrollments. So important is the issue of adequate faculty capacity, that Penn State formed a “Faculty Capacity Implementation Team” to address the recommendations
outlined in its 2010 World Campus Task Force on Faculty Capacity. One of the outcomes of the team’s work was the 2012 launch of a now popular annual Faculty Capacity Planning Workshop that brings together individuals from around the University to share concerns, experiences, and best practices regarding recruiting and hiring faculty to teach World Campus courses.

Key to the success of Penn State’s online courses and programs are the faculty who develop, teach, and oversee the curriculum. Identifying, attracting, and retaining highly qualified individuals to teach in the growing number online programs and courses, on either a full- or part-time basis, is a growing challenge at Penn State and across higher education institutions like Penn State that are enjoying increased demand for their services. Only a small amount of research has been published that looks at the specific factors that attract new faculty to an institution, whether full- or part-time, for the purpose of teaching online. It is more common to find research studies like those by Chapman (2011), Maguire (2005), Parker (2003) and Schifter (2000) that focus on how to attract existing faculty to leave the physical classroom in order to teach in the digital one. Identifying best practices for attracting new instructors, and for keeping them engaged with the institution, is needed in order to help program administrators to be successful in their hiring and retention efforts.

Re-envisioning the Faculty Workforce

Institutions like Penn State are striving to meet the faculty capacity demands brought on by the growth of online education. Tightened state funding and the growing
costs of higher education have played a role in limiting the number of new tenure-line faculty who can be hired to meet these demands. Enter the part-time faculty hire.

Commonly referred to as “adjunct faculty,”¹ part-time faculty have enabled institutions like Penn State to staff their online courses in a flexible manner, adding and subtracting course instructors as needed without the need for permanent funding lines.

Hiring adjunct faculty is not unique to online education. There has been a general increase in the use of part-time faculty across higher education. According to a 2012 article by The Chronicle of Higher Education, “about 70% of instructional faculty at all colleges is off of the tenure track, whether as part-timers or full-timers” (June, para. 7). This proportion has crept increasingly higher over the past decade. The Condition of Education 2015 (Kena et al., 2014) reports:

> From fall 1993 to fall 2013, the number of full-time faculty in degree-granting postsecondary institutions increased by 45 percent (from 545,700 to 791,400), while the number of part-time faculty increased by 104 percent (from 369,800 to 752,700). As a result of the faster increase in the number of part-time faculty, the percentage of faculty who were part time increased from 40 to 49 percent during this period. (p. 226)

As evidenced by the rise in the use of adjunct faculty, the scope of the faculty workforce is being broadened from the traditional concept of tenure line faculty. In their chapter for International Handbook of Education for the Changing World of Work, Jacobs and Hawley (2009) suggest that there are five groups of individuals that comprise a workforce: those emerging into being employed, those who are currently employed full or part-time, those who are undergoing transitions in their employment (e.g., job seekers, workers, retirees).

---

¹ As defined by “The Adjunct Project,” for the purpose of this paper the term “adjunct” will be used to mean “faculty, lecturers, and instructors who do not hold permanent or full-time positions” (“About this project | Adjunct Project,” n.d.).
unemployed, and those returning to the workplace), those who have been employed
previously but are not currently (e.g., retirees, prison inmates), and those who have been
recruited from one location to another (e.g., guest workers, immigrants, and invited
permanent residents). To meet faculty capacity demands in higher education, institutions
will need to move beyond the traditional tenure-line model to incorporate all five of the
groups of individuals described by Jacob and Hawley, many of whom may be seeking
employment on a part-time basis or who do not have the academic credentials that are
traditionally sought for tenure-line positions.

Increased globalization—defined by Jacobs and Hawley (2009) as the unrestricted
flow of people and information across national borders—has also had a huge impact on
higher education, particularly online teaching and learning. Higher education is
increasingly accessible across the globe through online classrooms. No longer do students
and faculty have to physically move from one location to another to teach and learn.
Globalization has enabled institutions like Penn State to hire faculty who might be
physically located halfway across the globe to teach online. It also means, however, that
it is just as easy for these faculty to leave their institution if they are dissatisfied.

Furthermore, as market needs change, traditional faculty may not always have the
necessary background to teach as the disciplines and the credentials being sought by
students are becoming more applied in focus. Degrees such as a Master of Professional
Studies and professionally focused certificate programs, for example, may call for
teaching faculty who bring substantial professional experience to the classroom. To meet
market needs and compete at a national and international level, faculty are increasingly
needed “…whose exceptional professional experience is core to teaching innovation and scholarship of teaching in their unit. They are appointed primarily to teach, are not evaluated on their research productivity, and are not appointed in tenure-line positions (University Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, 2007, p. 2).” Such individuals are often drawn from an institution’s prestigious alumni base or are esteemed colleagues of their tenure-line faculty who are employed outside of academia. Attracting these individuals to teach on a part-time basis, which often means they are doing so on top of a full-time job outside of academia, can be challenging.

**Purpose**

In the process of examining why institutions would reach out to adjunct faculty to meet their teaching demand, one may also wonder what motivates these individuals to seek part-time teaching roles in the first place. Casual observers often speculate that the majority of adjunct faculty do so for multiple institutions in order to cobble together a full-time position. This can indeed be the case, as evidenced by the findings of large surveys such as The Adjunct Project (“About this project | Adjunct Project,” n.d.) and a similar survey conducted in Australia by the National Tertiary Education Union (*Casual teaching and research staff survey 2012: Summary of key results*, 2012). The latter found that “A large number of casual academics are struggling to put together an income, with many having had more than one appointment during the survey period and a significant number having as many as four separate jobs in multiple universities” (Rae, 2012). The

---

2 Emphasis from original
plight of the adjunct faculty member is frequently heard in the press. For example, a *Salon* article in 2014 that is widely cited shared this tale:

“The most shocking thing is that many of us don’t even earn the federal minimum wage,” said Miranda Merklein, an adjunct professor from Santa Fe who started teaching in 2008. “Our students didn’t know that professors with PhDs aren’t even earning as much as an entry-level fast food worker. We’re not calling for the $15 minimum wage. We don’t even make minimum wage. And we have no benefits and no job security.” (Saccaro, 2014, para. 2)

However, in an analysis of the data from the 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, Monks (2009) found that only half of part-time faculty reported having another full-time position and that only 35% reported that they would have preferred a full-time faculty position. In other words, Monks’ study suggested that a majority of adjunct faculty are *not* seeking full-time academic employment. So who are adjunct faculty?

When considering adjunct faculty, a seminal typology was introduced as the result of Gappa and Leslie’s 1993 study of adjunct faculty at seventeen colleges and universities in the United States and one university in Canada. In their analysis, Gappa and Leslie identified four sub-populations of adjunct faculty, based on their career types:

- *Aspiring Academics*—individuals hoping to obtain a full-time position and/or wish to be recognized as fulltime.
- *Career-Enders*—individuals retired from another field.
- *Freelancers*—individuals whose career is a composite of all the part-time jobs they hold including one teaching position.
- *Specialists, Experts, or Professionals*—individuals with full-time employment elsewhere. (p. 47).

Although this career typology has been used by many researchers since its introduction, the experience of this researcher and that of my colleagues at Penn State who are responsible for hiring large numbers of adjunct faculty to teach online through
Penn State World Campus suggests a slightly modified typology is needed, one that reflects those who already hold a full-time teaching position at one institution while teaching part-time online at another institution, as well as graduate students who serve as course instructors, either as part of an assistantship or as a supplemental experience. Furthermore, Gappa and Leslie’s “Career Enders” and “Specialists, Experts, or Professionals” can be combined into a single category that includes all individuals who hold a full-time job outside of academia, or who are retired from such a position, and are being hired due to their “working knowledge” of a particular discipline. To account for these adjustments, the following career typology was used for this study:

- **Graduate Students**—Individuals who study full-time at the graduate level while teaching online, either as part of a graduate assistantship or as supplemental income.
- **Aspiring Academics**—Individuals who do not currently have a full-time job who are hoping to obtain a full-time position in higher education and/or who wish to be recognized as full-time in higher education. (This does not include current graduate students.)
- **Freelancers**—Individuals who do not currently have a full-time job and who do not wish to have a full-time job, whose career is a composite of all the part-time jobs they have held.
- **Practitioner Faculty**—Individuals who have a full-time job outside of higher education or are retired from such a position (includes some of Gappa and Leslie’s “Specialists, Experts, or Professionals,” as well as their “Career Enders”).
- **Loaners**—Individuals who have a full-time job at another academic institution (K-12 or higher education) or are retired from such a position (includes some of Gappa and Leslie’s “Specialists, Experts, or Professionals”).

As these categories of individuals come from different living and working contexts, each category may be attracted to teach online on a part-time basis for different reasons. For example, a Freelancer might be most attracted by the pay being offered, the Graduate Student might primarily be seeking teaching experience to prepare for the academic job market, and the Practitioner may be lured by a perceived prestige associated with working in academia.
Just as each category of adjunct faculty may differ in terms of what attracts them to teach online, each category may continue teaching online for different reasons. For example, Loaners may wish to have an ongoing online teaching position at another institution because doing so provides them with a desired opportunity that is not available at their home institution. Practitioner faculty, however, might enjoy an ongoing teaching opportunity because it enables them to be part of an academic setting that is quite different from their “day job” and that provides a way for them to give back to their profession.

A great deal of research has been conducted to explore the reasons for people's actions, desires, and needs, which has led to numerous theories related to motivation. Some of these theories posit that evolution has programmed us to behave in certain ways (instinct theory), while others suggest that we behave in certain ways to reduce an internal tension caused by unmet needs (drive theory). Maslow’s “hierarchy of needs” further suggests that we have different levels of needs that must be met and each are motivated by different factors, beginning with a necessity to meet basic biological needs and culminating with a need for self-actualization. Most pertinent to this research study, however, is incentive theory. Incentive theory suggests that one’s behavior is motivated by a desire for reinforcement or incentives. Specifically, incentive theory examines the impact of extrinsic and intrinsic motivations:

Extrinsic motivations are those that arise from outside of the individual and often involve rewards such as trophies, money, social recognition or praise. Intrinsic motivations are those that arise from within the individual, such as doing a complicated crossword puzzle purely for the personal gratification of solving a problem. (Cherry, 2016)
Some of the incentives used to attract and retain adjunct faculty to teach online are extrinsically motivating (i.e., provide a tangible reward or avoids a negative consequence), which others are intrinsically motivating in nature (i.e., are personally rewarding). The purpose of this study was not to build on or test incentive theory. Rather, the purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the attraction of a given type of adjunct faculty to teach online via Penn State World Campus and extrinsic and intrinsic motivators, as well as the relationship between a given type of adjunct faculty’s decision to continue teaching online via Penn State World Campus and extrinsic and intrinsic motivators. Do the incentives that attract and retain adjunct faculty to teach online via Penn State World Campus vary depending on that faculty member’s adjunct career typology?

A survey was developed to collect the data needed for this analysis, sent to all individuals who have taught at least one online course for Penn State World Campus in the last three years. The survey included demographic questions that enabled respondents to self-identify as full-time faculty and staff or one of five adjunct career type populations: Graduate Students, Aspiring Academics, Freelancers, Practitioners, and Loaners. Respondents were asked to indicate the extrinsic and intrinsic motivators that attracted them begin to teach online via Penn State World Campus. They were also asked to indicate the extrinsic and intrinsic motivators that influenced them to continue (if applicable) teaching online via Penn State World Campus.
Research Questions

Research Question 1 (RQ1): What is the relationship between the identification by adjunct faculty of the extrinsic and intrinsic motivators to teach online via Penn State World Campus and their adjunct faculty career typology?

Research Question 2 (RQ2): What is the relationship between the identification by adjunct faculty of the extrinsic and intrinsic motivators that attract them to continue to teach online via Penn State World Campus and their adjunct faculty career typology?

Research Question 3 (RQ3): What are the extrinsic and intrinsic motivators that are most likely to attract each adjunct career type to teach online via Penn State World Campus?

Research Question 4 (RQ4): What are the extrinsic and intrinsic motivators that are most likely to attract each adjunct career type to continue to teach online via Penn State World Campus?

Significance of the Study

By shedding light on the specific extrinsic and intrinsic motivators that attract and retain each of five career types of adjunct faculty to teach via Penn State World Campus, this study can help Penn State program administrators be more effective in their hiring and retention efforts by suggesting effective ways to attract and retain specific types of this increasingly important workforce.
Chapter 2

Review of Related Literature

Thanks to the U.S. Postal Service, institutions like Penn State have been offering courses at a distance since the late 1800s. Early “correspondence study” courses consisted of printed materials exchanged between student and instructor via mail service. Later technologies such as videotapes, audiotapes, cable television, and even the telephone began to be used to support education at a distance. It was not until the Internet came to be commonplace in the 1990s, however that distance education became more widespread at U.S. institutions of higher education, first in the form of courses delivered by two-way audio and video systems and then in the form of online course offerings. Today, the term “distance education” can refer to many different delivery mechanisms, all related by the ability to enable students and their instructors to be separated by geographic distance. According to a report by the National Center for Education Statistics:

The percentage of 2- and 4-year degree-granting institutions offering distance education courses rose from 33 to 44 percent between 1995 and 1997, and the number of such courses nearly doubled. In 1997, one-fifth of the nation’s 2- and 4-year degree-granting institutions also planned to start offering distance education courses in the next 3 years. (Sikora & Carroll, 2002, p. iii)

A report by the National Center for Education Statistics further conveyed that 6% of instructional faculty and staff across the U.S. reported teaching at least one course at a distance in fall 1998 and that, on average, the full-time faculty who taught at a distance were teaching at least one class or section more than their non-distance educator
colleagues (Bradburn & Zimbler, 2002). As the number of distance education course offerings was rising, so were the workloads of higher education faculty. More faculty participation would be needed to meet distance education course offering demands. Knowledgeable observers shared concerns that it would be difficult to find enough faculty who would be interested in teaching at a distance to meet workforce needs (Passmore, 2001).

Researchers have been examining the impact of incentives on faculty decisions to teach at a distance for many years in order to learn more about what works, and what does not, in terms of motivating faculty to teach outside of the face-to-face classroom. This section will review their work through an exploration of the literature by institutional type and full-time status. First, studies will be reviewed that have focused on full-time faculty employed at mid- to large-size institutions. Next, studies focused on full-time faculty at small institutions will be reviewed to explore whether findings based on those institutions vary from those based on larger institutions.

Once studies focused solely on full-time faculty motivation to teach at a distance have been reviewed, this section will turn to studies that have focused on the incentives that motivate and inhibit adjunct faculty to teach at a distance, comparing those findings with what has been learned about full-time faculty motivations. Finally, studies will be reviewed that have analyzed the impact of incentives on hiring and retention of both populations.
Full-Time Faculty Participation in Distance Education

Mid- to Large-Size Institutions

Research began in the late 1990s that attempted to shed light on the factors that influence “traditional” full-time faculty to teach at a distance so that higher education administrators could utilize this information to motivate more of their faculty to join them. The first well-known study of this kind was conducted by Betts (1998) in which full-time faculty and deans who were contracted for the 1998 Spring semester at George Washington University were surveyed to identify the factors that motivated faculty who were already teaching online (“participating”), would motivate those who were not already teaching online (“non-participating”), or were perceived to be motivating to both of these groups of faculty by their administrators. Betts found that the participating faculty were more intrinsically motivated than non-participators. They reported having sought incentives such as the ability to reach new audiences, opportunity to develop new ideas, personal motivation to use technology, intellectual challenge, and overall job satisfaction. The non-participants said they would seek incentives such as increase in salary, monetary support for participation (e.g., stipend, overload), opportunity to develop new ideas, working conditions (e.g., hours, location), and intellectual challenge.

In terms of the factors that would inhibit participation, participators cited lack of technical support, concern about faculty workload, lack of release time, lack of grants for materials/expenses, and concern about the quality of courses. Non-participators indicated inhibitors as concern about faculty workload, lack of technical support, lack of release time, concern about the quality of courses, and lack of grants for materials/expenses.
Interestingly, in comparing these findings with the responses from the academic deans who were surveyed, Betts found no significant difference between what these deans reported they thought would motivate faculty participation in distance education and what the faculty reported. However, the deans who responded were not aware of the significance of inhibiting factors on faculty participation.

The following year, Rockwell, Schauer, Fritz, and Marx (1999) surveyed faculty and administrators in two colleges at a single land grant university. Like Betts, Rockwell et al. asked respondents to rank both incentives and obstacles to teaching at a distance. Once again, the top ranked incentives (by both faculty and administrators) were intrinsic in nature: providing innovative instruction, applying new teaching techniques, self-gratification, fulfilling a personal desire to teach, recognition of work, and peer recognition. Interestingly, student costs and monetary rewards were found to neither motivate nor inhibit participation. In terms of obstacles to participation for faculty, the study found that time requirements, assistance or support needs, time taken from research, training requirements, and developing effective technology skills were the top factors that would inhibit faculty from teaching at a distance. It would have been interesting to learn whether the responses of the faculty differed from those of the administrators surveyed, but unfortunately the researchers did not tease out that information in their write-up of the study.

In 2000, Schifter reported findings from another study that examined the factors that motivate full-time faculty to teach at a distance. Schifter modified the survey created by Betts’ (1998) and invited all full-time faculty and 25 deans and senior administrators at a large urban, Research I, state-related institution to participate. Participants were
asked to rate the extent to which they believe each of 29 factors motivated or would motivate faculty to participate in distance education and also which of 17 factors would inhibit them from participating.

Schifter compared top five motivating/inhibiting factors across participants, non-participants, and administrators. All three groups reported that “personal motivation to use technology” was a top motivating factor for faculty participation. However, unlike Betts’ 1998 findings, Schifter found that faculty and administrators did not agree on whether intrinsic or extrinsic factors were better motivators of faculty participation. Faculty, whether participants or non-participants in distance education, indicated primarily intrinsic factors as motivators, such as a personal motivation to use technology or an opportunity to develop new ideas. Administrators felt that extrinsic factors were the best motivators, such as additional money or credit toward promotion and tenure.

There was more agreement across all three groups in terms of the factors that inhibit faculty participation in distance education. The top five rated inhibiting factors were all extrinsic in nature, including a lack of technical support, workload concerns, and a lack of merit pay. In considering the findings of this study, it should be noted that there was no differentiation in the analysis with regard to various faculty ranks or the stage one was at in one’s academic career. Furthermore, like Betts (1998) and Rockwell et al. (1999), this study used a broad definition of distance education that included interactive TV and satellite delivery in addition to Web-based instruction.

Another study published the same year focus solely on online course delivery. McKenzie, Mims, Bennett, and Waugh (2000) sought to not only identify factors that influence faculty to participate in distance education (specifically online), but they also
examined a number of other elements of online teaching practice, such as hours of training received, tools used, and time spent preparing and delivering an online course. The population for their survey research consisted of instructors at the State University of West Georgia who taught online during the fall 1999 semester. Of the 31 survey respondents, the majority held the ranks of assistant professor or professor. No mention was made of part-time faculty, so presumably the respondents were primarily full-time faculty.

As part of the survey, respondents were asked to rate the reasons why they chose to teach online. Once again, the factors identified were primarily intrinsic in nature. The top five reasons reported were a desire to get students more involved with technology, an opportunity to use technology more innovatively to enhance course quality, an opportunity to meet the needs of students at a distance, increased flexibility in working hours and location, and a response to students asking for online educational opportunities.

Continuing the exploration of the factors that motivate and inhibit faculty to teach at a distance, Gannon-Cook (2003) returned to the work of Betts (1998) for a dissertation study. Adapting the Betts survey instrument, Gannon-Cook focused the study on faculty at an urban public university in the southwestern United States, where more than one-half of the survey respondents had already participated in distance education delivery. No differentiation was made between full-time and part-time faculty, and “distance education” was a broad term that included non-Internet based delivery.

An analysis of the survey responses ranked five items as important factors that influence faculty participation: traditional service, monetary rewards, insufficient rewards, technical and administrative support, and professional prestige. Overall,
Gannon-Cook found that the faculty strongest motivations were intrinsic in nature: to teach and to provide student services. However, it was further noted that those factors were not different than those that motivate faculty to teach in the traditional classroom and that different motivators may be needed to influence a "second generation" of distance education adopters. Therefore, Gannon-Cook recommended that administrators focus on extrinsic motivators when trying to influence faculty participation, including monetary and other rewards (e.g., release time, promotion, royalties), technical and administrative support, and professional prestige.

Giannoni and Tesone (2003) also returned to the work of Betts (1998), as well as that of Rockwell et al. (1999), Schifter (2000), and others to conduct a comparative analysis that focused solely on senior, full-time faculty from various institutions of higher education who were known to the researchers to see if previous findings regarding the factors that motivate and inhibit faculty participation in distance education (specifically online learning) rings true for those later in their careers. Using a phone survey that was a modified version of the 1998 Betts instrument, Giannoni and Tesone reported that "the conclusions of the data analysis were surprisingly consistent with the findings from the literature" (p. 13), finding that release time, technical support, intellectual challenge, and personal satisfaction were the top motivators to senior faculty participation in online learning.

In a dissertation study, Schopieray (2006) also built upon the work of previous researchers including Betts (1998), Rockwell et al. (1999), Schifter (2000), and Gannon-Cook (2003) in order to study full-time faculty in the College of Education at Michigan State. Using both survey and interview methods, Schopieray also sought to identify the
factors that motivate and inhibit faculty participation in distance education, specifically online teaching. Forty-five percent of the survey respondents had taught an online course at Michigan State or another institution. Interviewees were selected from the survey respondents based on their experience teaching online courses and the nature of their responses to open-ended survey questions in order to gain additional insights. Overall, survey respondents indicated the following top factors for teaching an online course in the future: effective technical support provided in the college, an opportunity to enrich one’s teaching by drawing on web resources, intellectual challenge of learning a new way of teaching, and ability to have flexible teaching hours and locations while teaching online courses. Although this was a very limited study that only looked at a small group of faculty within a single academic discipline, Schopieray’s findings were fairly consistent with the findings of Betts (1998) and Schifter (2000).

On a much larger institutional scale, Panda and Mishra (2007) conducted survey research of 150 full-time faculty employed at the headquarters of Indira Gandhi National Open University (IGNOU) in India. The institution, and its faculty, have a long history of mixed-mode delivery of distance education and had begun to offer online programming. The researchers created their own survey instrument to learn more about the attitudes of the faculty toward online education and the factors that would motivate and inhibit them from participating. The findings from the study were comparable to those found by previous researchers like Betts (1998) and Schifter (2000): both intrinsic and extrinsic motivators were found to be important to faculty participation in online teaching. Top motivating factors at IGNOU were personal interest to use the technology and intellectual challenge.
Betts joined with Heaston (2014) to conduct a survey of faculty and deans at Armstrong Atlantic State University (part of the University System of GA), a public comprehensive institution enrolling approximately 7,500 students, to identify factors that influence faculty participation in distance education and compare the results with those from Betts' 1998 study at George Washington University. Surveys were sent to three groups: faculty who participate in distance education (defined here as online and hybrid courses), faculty who do not participate in distance education, and deans. The surveys examined 29 motivating and 20 inhibiting factors related to faculty participation in distance education.

Their findings were similar to Betts' own 1998 study at George Washington University: participating faculty reported having been motivated primarily by intrinsic factors, including personal motivation to use technology, greater course flexibility for students, greater course flexibility for faculty, ability to reach students who cannot come to campus, and overall job satisfaction. The factors identified by non-participants, however, were more extrinsic in nature, such as financial compensation, release time, access to adequate equipment to support teaching, opportunity to increase access to students with disabilities, and technical support. The deans who responded identified extrinsic factors along the same line as indicated by the non-participants, including release time, technical support, financial compensation, technology incentives, and access to adequate equipment.

Inhibitors similarly varied among these three groups, with participants identifying inhibiting factors such as lack of adequate equipment, lack of technical support, concern about workload, lack of release time, and concern about quality of courses. Non-
participants identified inhibiting factors such as lack of professional prestige, lack of credit toward promotion and tenure, concern about negative press, lack of a technological background, and lack of recognition and awards. Deans indicated a lack of support and encouragement from program director/chair, departmental colleagues, institution's administrators, and deans, as well as lack of professional prestige as the top inhibiting factors.

As with the other studies covered up to this point, Betts and Heaston made no mention of adjunct faculty in their report. Presumably their participants were all full-time faculty. Furthermore, no differentiation was made in their in analysis among various faculty ranks and stage in career.

**Smaller Four-year Institutions**

In addition to the studies outlined above, which focused on mid- to large-size higher education institutions, several studies found in the literature looked at the factors that motivate and inhibit faculty participation in distance education at smaller institutions. For example, Bruner (2007) administered a survey to 91 attendees during an all-faculty meeting at a single small, private college that was new to distance education. A total of 66 individuals completed the survey; only five reported having any experience with distance education. On the survey, participants were asked to indicate how strongly they agreed or disagreed with a series of statements regarding their involvement in distance education (defined as “instruction in which both distance and time separate the teacher from the students, as in an asynchronous distance education model,” para. 3). Unlike
many other studies of this kind, however, there was no way for participants to indicate how the various motivating or inhibiting factors compared to one another in terms of their impact on the individual's decision whether or not to participate in distance education.

Considering that the participants had limited exposure to distance education, it is interesting to note that Bruner found that the most selected inhibiting factor for faculty participation in distance education was related to what Bruner termed the “hassle factor” (Summary and Conclusions section, para. 1), indicating factors that related to increased faculty workload, time and effort required to implement distance education, and the potential for frequent frustrations with technology. In other words, he found a perception that distance education was a lot of work. The study did seem to indicate that younger faculty were more likely to be motivated by financial incentives (extrinsic motivators), such as additional pay, summer stipends, or release time. Bruner also found that 40% of the respondents agreed that distance education would give the institution a way to reach more/new students (an intrinsic motivation). This was, however, a limited study that focused on a single, small institution that was new to distance education. Since the survey did not ask respondents to rank each motivating or inhibiting factor against the others, it is difficult to make any generalizations about which factors are more or less likely to impact faculty participation.

More recently, Hoffman (2013) also examined the factors that motivate and inhibit full-time faculty participation in distance education at a small university, this time focusing on a liberal arts institution, St. Bonaventure, that was relatively new to online education. Hoffman surveyed 229 faculty, which comprised the entire faculty of the University less those who participated in a pilot study. Participants included tenure track,
non-tenured, full professors, adjunct professors, and instructors from various different disciplines.

Hoffman found some variation from the research findings of previous studies, which Hoffman theorized was due to the fact that St. Bonaventure is a much smaller institution and one that has little experience in online education, as compared to the subjects of previous studies. For example, Hoffman did find that some extrinsic factors influenced faculty participation, such as flexibility and monetary awards. However, as was the case with previous studies, intrinsic factors were found to be more influential than extrinsic. At St. Bonaventure, these intrinsic factors included the faculty member’s opinion of online education, opportunity for professional growth, and desire to increase student access. Hoffman concluded that:

While efforts to encourage faculty participation in online education should be broad and include both extrinsic and intrinsic motivators, higher education administrators should consider emphasizing efforts to focus on intrinsic motivators, as doing so will likely result in a higher impact (p. 108).

Community Colleges

Three additional “smaller school” studies focused on full-time faculty participation at the community college level. In 1999, Husmann & Miller conducted survey research that focused on community college faculty (primarily full-time employees) in order to see if the incentives that attract community college faculty to teach at a distance were similar to the incentives that had been found to motivate and attract faculty to teach in traditional settings.
Hussman and Miller created a survey similar to Betts (1998), but based primarily on the work of Michael G. Moore (1993, 1995) from Penn State. The survey instrument included from Moore’s work 17 incentives and motivators to participate in distance education, asking respondents to rate the impact each had on their own decision to teach at a distance. The researchers found that the incentives and motivators for full-time community college faculty teach at a distance were intrinsic in nature, similar to those for face-to-face teaching. These included self-fulfillment, an enjoyment of teaching, professional challenges, and meeting student needs.

More than a decade later, Hiltz, Shea, and Kim (2010) conducted focus groups with experienced online teaching faculty at two institutions: a medium size technological university and a small community college. The latter was included to examine the generalizability of the findings from university settings to the community college environment.

Hiltz et al. found agreement among the faculty participants about the top motivators for teaching online, as well as their sources of dissatisfaction and frustration related to online teaching. Leading motivators included flexible schedules, better and more personal interaction and improved pedagogy, challenge/creativity/professional development, ability to reach more diverse students, and better course management. The leading demotivators were a perception that online teaching is more work and problems encountered with the delivery medium. Many reported feeling that their efforts were not rewarded and were even devalued by their institution and colleagues. Unfortunately, their study was small and lacked information about the demographic make-up of the participants, making generalization to other populations difficult.
In a more recent dissertation study of faculty participation in online education at the community college level, Beck (2012) examined the perceived effects of ten different incentives on community college faculty member enthusiasm to teach online. Beck surveyed faculty using an instrument that was based on previous literature, including the same ten incentives utilized by Giannoni et al. (2003), and also conducted interviews and focus groups.

Beck’s study population included 174 faculty members, three administrators, and 28 faculty/administrators from Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Level 1 community colleges. Of the respondents, 117 had taught online before and 57 had not.

Beck wanted to see if there were relationships between demographic variables such as age, gender, ethnicity, and discipline in terms of the exposure faculty had to various incentives to teach online and their enthusiasm for teaching online. Beck also sought to learn which incentives community college faculty thought would promote online teaching to faculty. This final research question is most relevant to the current study. Beck found that release time was the incentive thought to be the best way to promote teaching online to community college faculty. As has been the case with many of the studies reviewed here, unfortunately Beck did not collect data that would determine whether respondents were employed full- or part-time, so it is difficult to know whether “release time” is an incentive that would appeal to part-time faculty. It is doubtful that it would, as release time is usually not applicable to that population.
Before we turn to studies that examined the factors that motivate and inhibit adjunct faculty participation in distance education, there is an additional study of interest related to the factors that motivate and inhibit full-time faculty participation. In 2013, Hoyt and Oviatt sought to determine the current status of policies and practices, and the impact of those, related to the organization and oversight of online courses, the incentives provided by institutions to faculty to author/teach online, and course ownership. Their survey was sent to nationally to administrators who oversee online learning at 297 doctorate-granting institutions. A total of 110 (37%) institutions responded.

Responses to the Hoyt and Oviatt survey varied widely both among and within institutions, but the most common campus-wide incentives were providing a share of the revenue with academic departments, providing extra compensation for authoring and/or teaching online, and making online courses part of a full-time faculty member's teaching load.

The researchers also looked at how willing faculty were to develop and teach online courses. Only about 25% reported having faculty who were willing or very willing to develop online courses and 30% were willing or very willing to teach online. T-tests were used to see whether incentives had a positive and significant effect on faculty willingness. A reduced teaching load and a positive impact on promotion and tenure decisions were both found to have a positive and significant effect on willingness to develop and teach online courses. Release time and extra compensation only had a positive and significant effect on faculty willingness to develop online courses.
Generalizations from this broad study are difficult, because the institutions varied on many factors, including public versus private, large versus small, and varying amounts of involvement in online education. Furthermore, only administrators were surveyed. Their answers reflected their perceptions of what incentivizes faculty. (Recall that Schifter’s 2000 study indicated that administrators are not necessarily in tune with what faculty want.) As stated by the Hoyt and Oviatt, "this study identified a range of possibilities and raises more questions than it answers" (p. 177).

**Adjunct Faculty Participation in Distance Education**

The literature reviewed thus far has explored factors that have been found to motivate and inhibit primarily *full-time* faculty to teach at a distance at institutions of varying sizes and focus. While relying on existing full-time faculty to staff distance education courses is commonplace, as distance education continues to grow new instructors will be need to be added to the faculty workforce to meet growing demand. It is with that need that this review turns to studies that have focused on factors that motivate and inhibit *adjunct* faculty participation in distance education.

Ross (2003) conducted survey, interview, and focus group studies of adjunct faculty at Pepperdine University. Ross’ survey of 52 adjunct faculty looked specifically at the role of various intrinsic and extrinsic motivators in motivating adjunct faculty to teach face-to-face. While not focused on distance education, Ross’ study provides important base-line information. Ross found that once an adjunct's basic needs were met in terms of having the necessary facilities, technological teaching aids, and administrative
support to fulfill their duties, they were motivated to teach by primarily the intrinsic factors of self-satisfaction and knowledge sharing. Additional income and recognition were found to be secondary motivators for the adjunct population at this private, not-for-profit institution.

Building on the work of previous researchers including Ross (2003) and Schopieray (2006), Runyon (2008) conducted a survey of adjunct faculty at faculty at an institution referred to as "Midwest University Online" to explore the factors that motivate and inhibit its adjunct faculty participation in online teaching. Two hundred and ninety individuals were invited to participate, with a 112 doing so (a 38.6% response rate). Runyon built a 25 item online survey based on the work of Ross (2003), who looked at the motivation of adjunct faculty in general and Schopieray (2006), who looked at the motivation of full-time faculty who teach online.

Runyon found the two factors that ranked highest in terms of what motivated these adjuncts to teach online were ability to work from anywhere and flexible hours. Intellectual challenge, sharing knowledge with others, self-satisfaction, interest in technology, and compensation were also rated highly. The survey also asked respondents to indicate the factors that would increase their motivation to teach online. Increased monetary compensation, guaranteed scheduling of classes, and increased number of classes each term were all ranked highly.

While demographic questions were asked of participants, none shed light on the types of adjunct faculty that participated in the study. Runyon stated, "As each individual is unique, so is his/her opinion on what motivates him/her to serve in the role of online
adjunct faculty member. Each individual is motivated more or less for his/her own reason" (p. 75).

Schroeder (2008) also examined factors that motivate and inhibit adjunct faculty participation in distance education in a dissertation study that focused on adjunct faculty who taught at least one online course, undergraduate or graduate, at a Midwestern university. Schroeder conducted a survey of 140 adjunct faculty at the institution using a modification of the instrument created by Betts (1998). Among the 64 respondents, the key motivating factors identified by respondents were primarily intrinsic in nature, with nine of the 11 top factors including intellectual challenge, opportunity to teach, opportunity to reach students at a distance who cannot attend class on campus, and opportunity to develop new ideas. Those factors rated most highly by respondents overall were flexibility and location (extrinsic), followed by intellectual challenge, opportunity to teach and reach students, and the opportunity to develop new ideas (intrinsic).

Schroeder’s results differed from Betts’s (1998) study, as none of the top six extrinsic factors matched Betts’s top six extrinsic factors. As Betts's study looked at full-time faculty, this suggests that the factors that motivate adjunct faculty to teach online are different than those that motivate full-time faculty.

In another dissertation study, Shiffman (2009) surveyed adjunct faculty employed by two virtual universities, one for-profit and one non-profit, to explore their demographic profile, job satisfaction, and motivations. A total of 1,402 surveys were distributed with a response rate of 49.7%. Instead of looking at adjuncts as a single demographic, Shiffman gathered demographic data and asked questions of the
participants that enabled a breakdown of responses by the four types of adjunct faculty introduced in Gappa and Leslie’s (1993) study of part-time faculty: Aspiring Academics; Career-Enders; Freelancers; and Specialists, Experts, or Professionals (p. 47).

Shiffman’s study found three top motivations among all adjuncts at these two institutions: a joy of teaching, personal satisfaction, and a flexible work schedule. Least motivating to these adjunct faculty were job security, advancements, and benefits. Financial compensation was found to be a neutral factor for all respondents except Aspiring Academics.

Interestingly, when Shiffman analyzed results across the various types of adjuncts, differences were found regarding what was least likely to motivate them to teach online. For example, Specialists indicated that benefits, career advancement, and job security were the least important factors that influenced their decision to teach online, while Aspiring Academics indicated that the challenge of applying information technology, a challenging work environment, and input to course content/curricula were their least important factors influencing their decision to teach online (p.67). All types of adjuncts did, however, indicate common motivating factors of flexibility, convenience, and lifestyle (p. 87). In fact, Shiffman found that “Despite their original motivations to teach, the underlying factor that continues to propel online adjunct faculty to teach is flexibility” (p. 95).

Finally, Wolf (2012) conducted a study focused on adjunct faculty that was based on the work of Betts (1998), Schopieray (2006), Runyon (2008), Schroeder (2008), and Shiffman (2009). Each of the previous studies was conducted at institutions that offer
face-to-face, online, or a combination of face-to-face and online courses. Wolf’s study sought to examine adjunct faculty at two institutions that offer only online courses.

Wolf’s data analysis revealed several factors found to motivate part-time faculty to teach online for an online institution: flexible working conditions, opportunity to teach, opportunity to reach students who cannot attend class on campus, not driving to a campus to teach an on-ground class, and an increase in income (p. 125). Factors found to inhibit part-time faculty participation included lack of training; support and development from the institution, dean, chair and colleagues; negative comments made by colleagues about distance education; and the lack of grants for materials and expenses (p. 125).

Wolf found some differences in motivating factors based on age, education level, and sex. Faculty who were over the age of 50 and had higher levels of education were more focused on intrinsic factors of motivation and demotivation, while those who were under the age of 50 and had undergraduate degrees focused more on extrinsic factors of motivation and demotivation. As compared to men, women were found to be more concerned with stronger emotional support systems.

Although Wolf did not differentiate among the types of adjunct faculty, Wolf did examine a unique set of adjunct faculty. The part-time instructors in the study were either tenured or tenure-track at their institution. Part-time instructors are not eligible to be on a tenure track at more traditional institutions like Penn State, making comparisons with the adjunct groupings in this study difficult. "Aspiring Academics" may be the grouping most similar to the population in Wolf's study.
Comparing Full-Time and Adjunct Faculty Participation in Distance Education

The final group of studies reviewed looked at the factors that motivate and inhibit both full-time and adjunct faculty participation in distance education. These studies, because they included both populations, were able to compare the two broad groups.

Shea (2007) studied experienced online faculty who taught at one of 36 institutions in a single state system of higher education. Shea constructed a survey that included the factors reported in the literature that motivate and inhibit faculty from teaching at a distance. Of the 506 surveys collected, there were 386 usable responses. (When a respondent followed a link to the survey, but didn’t answer any of the questions and exited, a blank survey was produced. This resulted in 119 blank surveys among the 506 collected.)

Among all of the faculty who responded, the most highly rated motivating factor was a more flexible work schedule, followed by taking on a new challenge, addressing student needs, learning about technology and pedagogy, and providing access to new student populations. Monetary and other professional benefits were not rated highly (pp. 77-78).

Shea also analyzed the data by age, full-time status, whether one was a volunteer participant, computer skill level, and type of institution. In doing so, Shea found that context does seem to make a difference in motivating factors. For example, women are more motivated than men by flexibility in accommodating other life needs, and younger faculty were more motivated by opportunities to experience with new pedagogy. Of most interest to the current study, Shea found that, like women, part-time faculty were
motivated by flexibility in terms of accommodating other life needs, the ability to have more free-time for other professional activities, and reduced commuting time or hassle. Part-time faculty were also more motivated than full-time faculty by the chance to teach a new subject area and possible job security. However, no differentiation was made among the types of adjunct faculty who participated in the study.

In terms of demotivating factors, overall the most highly rated demotivating factors had to do with compensation for course development, revision, and teaching, as well as concerns about students' access to the online environment. Again, there were variations when demographic data was analyzed more closely. Interestingly, faculty who were not on the tenure track reported that there was inadequate compensation for course development, delivery, and revision. Shea theorized, however, that this might have been due to a lack of any compensation at all at some institutions.

Green, Alejandro, and Brown (2009) conducted a similar, but larger scale, study of online distance education faculty across the United States to see what factors encourage or discourage them from continuing to teach online. In a sample drawn from members of the Distance Education Online Symposium listserv, as well as online faculty employed at East Carolina University and the California State University-Fullerton, Green et al. received survey results from 135 individuals employed at 23 different institutions.

Green et al. examined their findings by breaking respondents into four groups: (1) tenured, (2) tenure-track, (3) full-time non-tenured or fixed term, and (4) part-time/adjunct. Each group was represented fairly equally in the response pool. Most of the respondents had been teaching at a distance for one to six years. Approximately 40% of
respondents reported teaching solely online, with the remaining 60% teaching both online and face-to-face.

Looking at faculty as a whole, Green et al. found that faculty are motivated most by flexible working conditions, the opportunity to use technology, the opportunity to share knowledge with others, intellectual challenge, career development/advancement, and the opportunity to gain teaching experience. The majority of this collective group also cited concerns about time commitment as a possible discouragement. They also listed a lack of sufficient financial compensation in comparison to their workload, concerns about workload, and a lack of institutional support as possible discouraging factors.

In order to continue to teach online, faculty sought continuous training by the university, fair financial compensation in comparison to workload, increased institutional support, an opportunity to assist with course/program development, and mentoring from veteran distance education instructors.

When examining only the responses from adjunct faculty, Green et al. further found they were similar to the whole in their motivations, but unlike other faculty groups, they were motivated by the possibility of increasing their personal income and their sense of loyalty to the university. Adjuncts were especially motivated by fair financial compensation in comparison to workload, increased institutional support, and the opportunity to assist with course/program development. Adjuncts were discouraged by a lack of sufficient financial compensation in comparison to workload and concerns about the quality of students.
In 2011, Chapman also conducted a study of the motivations and incentives to teach distance education courses, this time surveying 142 instructors who taught at least one distance education course at a single, large Southeastern university. Unlike the work of Green et al., this study examined the differences between two broad faculty groups: (a) tenure-line and (b) contingent faculty. The latter were defined as “non-tenure-track and adjunct faculty” (Growth of Contingent Faculty section, para. 1). Distance education courses were defined by Chapman as “off-campus education which can include online or face-to-face education at remote locations” (Definitions, para. 1).

Chapman’s study found that the factors that motivate both groups of faculty were similar: Flexible scheduling, self-satisfaction, financial rewards, and the opportunity to enhance one’s online teaching skills. However, the incentives desired by the two groups to continue to teach at a distance were more varied, something administrators would want to keep in mind when encouraging individual faculty to continue in their distance education teaching roles. Both groups valued higher pay, free professional development opportunities, and enhanced technical support. Tenure-line faculty also valued stipends for professional development and increased health care benefits. Contingent faculty, however, valued online communities with other distance education faculty and programs for certification in online instruction. The contingent faculty were also more likely to feel a pressure to teach online from department heads.

Tenzer (2012) replicated Chapman’s study, focusing this time on full-time and adjunct faculty who teach online at a for-profit applied arts college, the Art Institute of Pittsburgh-Online Division. Tenzer specifically sought to show whether Chapman’s (2011) findings regarding the motivations and incentives of full-time and adjunct faculty
at a publicly funded land-grant institution could be generalized to a for-profit faculty population. As was the case with Chapman’s study, however, Tenzer did not differentiate among the different types of adjuncts.

Tenzer found that, as with Chapman's 2011 study, flexibility was a primary motivator for both adjunct and full-time faculty. Beyond that, however, what motivates these two groups of faculty to teach online varied. Adjunct faculty were more likely to be motivated by career-related needs. In terms of tangible incentives, both populations indicated “higher pay” as the top incentive. But again, beyond that, the incentives that attract each population varied. Full-time faculty reported wanting job security, access to new technologies, and stipends for professional development. Adjunct faculty reported wanting professional development opportunities.

Finally, in 2014, Glanz examined motivating factors related to teaching online at St. John’s University, a private, metropolitan institution. Glanz modified Betts' 1998 survey for the study, inviting 200 faculty who taught online in Spring 2014 to complete the instrument. One hundred and twelve individuals responded: 66 full-time and 46 adjunct faculty.

Of the 30 motivating items listed on the survey, 12 were "intrinsic" and 18 were "extrinsic." Glanz found that intrinsic motivators had more influence than extrinsic in motivating both groups of faculty to teach online. Like Betts' (2014) and Schifter (2000), Glanz found that a personal motivation to use technology was the top ranked motivator for both full-time and adjunct faculty. Other top factors were the opportunity for scholarly pursuit, opportunity to use personal research as a teaching tool, opportunity to
develop new ideas, and visibility for jobs at other institutions/organizations. Factors related to compensation ranked in the bottom half of the list.

Demotivating factors were also examined through 16 factors on the instrument. Only three of the factors included on the survey were intrinsic (concern about workload, qualify of students, and qualify of courses). All of the intrinsic demotivating factors were ranked higher than the extrinsic for both full-time and adjunct faculty. Interestingly, lack of monetary support and lack of merit pay did not rank high as demotivating factors. In comparing these results with those of similar studies suggests that faculty teach online for similar reasons they teach face-to-face: for intrinsic rewards.

**A Summary of Research Findings from the Literature**

In this chapter, 24 research studies have been reviewed, each studying the factors that motivate and inhibit faculty participation in distance education. This review explored the literature by institutional type and full-time status. Examined were studies of full-time faculty employed at mid- to large-size institutions, full-time faculty at small institutions, and administrators’ perspectives of what attracts full-time faculty to participate in distance education. We also explored studies that have focused on the incentives that motivate and inhibit adjunct faculty to teach at a distance, as well as studies that compared both populations.

Findings from these studies revealed, as a whole, that there is a lot of variability across faculty motivators and inhibitors when it comes to distance education. In general, however, intrinsic factors were reported to be stronger motivators than extrinsic ones in
motivating faculty to teach at a distance. Examples of oft-cited intrinsic factors related to teaching at a distance include the attraction of a flexible schedule and workplace, a personal motivation to use technology, the opportunity for intellectual challenge, and overall job satisfaction. Inhibiting factors were generally found to be extrinsic factors, such as lack of extra compensation or merit pay, lack of technical support, concern about workload, and lack of release time.

Interestingly, several studies found that faculty who already teach at a distance were more intrinsically motivated than those who have not. This suggests that “early adopters” and “second generation” distance educators may be differently motivated, with the latter more influenced by extrinsic factors such as compensation and release time.

Studies revealed that adjunct faculty are similar to their full-time peers in terms of their motivations to teach online, but that context does matter. As a whole, adjunct faculty may be more motivated by career-needs. Few of the studies reviewed analyzed the possibly unique needs of different types of adjunct faculty. Shiffman’s 2009 study was the only one discovered that specifically analyzed the factors that motivate Aspiring Academics; Career-Enders; Freelancers; and Specialists, Experts, or Professionals. Schiffman’s findings revealed that there were common motivating factors across these four groups in terms of what was most likely to motivate them to teach, but there were differences in terms of what least likely to motivate them. Schiffman found common ground, however, when analyzing the factors that retain adjunct in online teaching roles: all continue to be attracted by the flexibility of distance education.

These findings were not surprising based on my experience over the past 23 years working in distance education. However, this study builds upon the work of these
predecessors, most importantly on the work of Shiffman, to analysis the factors that attract, and retain, specific career types of adjuncts to teach online.
Chapter 3

Method

Purpose of the Study

This study examined the relationship between the extrinsic and intrinsic incentives identified by adjunct faculty as motivating them to teach online via Penn State World Campus and the career type of those adjunct faculty. I specifically explored whether the incentives identified as influencing one to teach online (the dependent variable) varied by type of adjunct faculty (the independent variable).

Likewise, I examined the relationship between the extrinsic and intrinsic incentives identified by adjunct faculty as motivating them to continue to teach online via Penn State World Campus and the taxonomic classification of those adjunct faculty. Did the incentives identified as influencing one to continue to teach online (the dependent variable) vary by type of adjunct faculty (the independent variable)?

This study also sought to identify those extrinsic and intrinsic incentives most likely to attract each adjunct career type to teach online via Penn State World Campus and those most like to attract each adjunct career type to do so.

A survey was conducted, using an instrument that was based on similar studies from the literature, to collect the data needed for the analysis. This survey was sent to all
individuals who have taught at least one online course for Penn State World Campus in the last three years.

**Target Population and Sample**

The target population for this survey research was adjunct faculty who taught via Penn State World Campus during the 2013-14, 2014-15, or 2015-2016 academic years. As course instructor information is publicly available, an inspection of World Campus course offerings listed on the University’s Schedule of Courses for the timeframe being studied was conducted to obtain a listing of all faculty who have taught at least one course via Penn State World Campus during the timeframe studied. Unfortunately, it was not possible to discern which of these individuals were full-time Penn State employees and which were among those considered adjunct faculty. The University’s directory information was then utilized to obtain current contact information for each of these individuals. For those I was unable to locate in the University’s directory, I contacted the academic unit for whom they taught to try to obtain contact information.

Using the information obtained through the inspection of the Schedule of Courses, this survey research was a census of all faculty who have taught at least one course via Penn State World Campus during the 2013-14, 2014-15, or 2015-16 academic years. The three-year timeframe maximizes the size of the target population—adjunct faculty—by including those who may only teach courses that are taught every other year. Based on data from the World Campus (The Pennsylvania State University, 2016b), the number of adjunct faculty who taught in the budget academic year (BAY) 2014-15 was
approximately 329. Due to the small size of the target population, a desire to maximize the number of adjunct faculty respondents, and the low cost of conducting a web-based survey, sampling was not done. This reduced coverage and sampling error (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2014, p. 82).

The total number of individuals found to have taught via Penn State World Campus during the 2013-14, 2014-15, or 2015-16 academic years was 1,312. However, contact information could not be located for 63 of these individuals who represented 13 different colleges. Therefore, the total population invited to participate in this study was 1,249 individuals. Information available for these individuals included full name, Penn State email address, the academic department and college for whom the individual taught at least one course via Penn State World Campus, the courses the individual taught, and the semesters in which the individual taught during the 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16 academic years.

Data Collection

To conduct this study, the Qualtrics survey platform was utilized (“Qualtrics,” 2016). This powerful software was used to create a web-based survey instrument that included simple multiple choice and text entry items, as well as the ability to branch questions based on a given response (“Question Types Guide | Qualtrics University,” n.d.).

The survey instrument included demographic questions that enabled results to be differentiated between full-time and adjunct faculty so that the target population could be
identified from the results. These questions also enabled results to distinguish among the five career types of adjunct faculty: Graduate Students, Aspiring Academics, Freelancers, Practitioner Faculty, and Loaners. Demographic questions were also used to learn more about the respondents’ frequency and nature of online teaching, as well as their educational background. These additional data will be utilized in future studies that expand on this research.

Respondents were asked to indicate which of 25 extrinsic and intrinsic motivators attracted them to teach online via Penn State World Campus in the first place. They were then asked to indicate which of those same 25 extrinsic and intrinsic motivators influenced them to continue (if applicable) teaching online via Penn State World Campus.

To create the survey, validated demographic questions from the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) survey instrument (“HERI Faculty Survey,” 2016) were utilized, as well as a list of extrinsic and intrinsic motivators from Chapman’s study (2011). Questions for the survey instrument can be found in Appendix A.

By asking demographic questions that make it possible to differentiate responses from among the five career types of adjunct faculty, comparisons were able to be made across these populations in order to investigate possible differences with regard to the extrinsic and intrinsic motivators that attracted each population to teach online for Penn State (RQ1) and those that keep them doing so (RQ2).

Each member of the study population was first sent a brief email, explaining the purpose and intent of the research study and inviting them to complete the online survey. One week later, a second email message was sent to these individuals via Qualtrics,
containing a link to the survey itself. After another week, a reminder email was sent via Qualtrics to those who the system indicated had not yet completed the survey. Three additional follow-up email reminders were later sent via Qualtrics to those who the system indicated had not yet responded, encouraging them to do so. This schedule can be summarized as follows:

- Week 1 – Email sent explaining the purpose and intent of the study
- Week 2 – Survey invitation with unique link to the online instrument sent via email
- Week 3 – Reminder email sent to only those individuals who have not yet completed the survey
- Week 4 – Reminder email sent to only those individuals who have not yet completed the survey
- Week 4 ½ – Reminder email sent to only those individuals who have not yet completed the survey
- Week 5 – Final reminder email sent to only those individuals who have not yet completed the survey

This schedule utilizing multiple points of contact with the survey population was designed to maximize the response rate (Dillman et al., 2014, p. 22).

**Variables**

**Dependent Variables**

The dependent variables for this study consisted of 25 incentives—including both intrinsic and extrinsic motivators—that have been found to influence one’s decision to teach at a distance or to continue to teach at a distance. These incentives were adapted from Chapman’s 2011 study. Chapman gleaned these incentives from the literature, and then validated them with a two-person panel of distance education faculty who were not affiliated with Chapman’s study, and then pilot tested with a group of five distance
education faculty from the university Chapman was studying. The 25 incentives, with minor modifications from Chapman’s original list to make them institution-specific, are as follows:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>To enhance my online teaching skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Self-satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Opportunities to use new technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Opportunities to develop new competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Sense of empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>To better balance work and family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>To pass on experiential knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>To work with adult learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Intellectual stimulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>For the social connections with Penn State faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>For the social connections with Penn State students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>For the opportunity to give back to my community of practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Opportunity to give back to my alma mater, Penn State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>To be a member of the Penn State community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Financial rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Flexible schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>As a potential entry point for a teaching career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Pressure from my department head/supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Pressure from my peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>To enhance my professional career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>To supplement my other career/job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>A lack of permanent employment elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>As an avenue for full-time employment at Penn State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>For the professional connections with Penn State faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>For the professional connections with Penn State students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the survey itself, these incentives were presented in two separate questions:

- “I am interested in learning more about why you began to teach online via Penn State World Campus. Think back to when you were first considering teaching online for Penn State World Campus. Below is a list of incentives that might attract one to teach online. For each incentive listed, please indicate whether that incentive attracted you to teach online via Penn State World Campus when you first began to do so.”
- “I am interested in learning more about what influences your decision to continue to teach online via Penn State World Campus. Think about the reasons you want to continue to teach online for Penn State World Campus. Below is the same list of incentives presented previously. For each incentive listed, please indicate whether that incentive positively influences you to continue to teach via Penn State World Campus.”

In the case of both questions, for each incentive there were two checkboxes available, one box for “Yes” and another box for “No.” Responses were coded “1” if a
respondent selected “Yes” to the statement and “0” if “No” was selected. Figure 3.1 is an illustration of what the first question looked like as presented on the survey. Due to space constraints here, the entire matrix of incentives is not shown.

![Survey Question Matrix](image)

**Figure 3-1:** First part of survey question 8.
Independent Variables

The independent variables for this study were career types self-classified by adjunct faculty. As described in Chapter 1, five adjunct career types include:

- **Graduate Students**—Individuals who study full-time at the graduate level while teaching online, either as part of a graduate assistantship or as supplemental income.
- **Aspiring Academics**—Individuals who do not currently have a full-time job who are hoping to obtain a full-time position in higher education and/or who wish to be recognized as full-time in higher education. (This does not include current graduate students.)
- **Freelancers**—Individuals who do not currently have a full-time job and who do not wish to have a full-time job, whose career is a composite of all the part-time jobs they have held.
- **Practitioner Faculty**—Individuals who have a full-time job outside of higher education or are retired from such a position.
- **Loaners**—Individuals who have a full-time job at another academic institution (K-12 or higher education) or are retired from such a position.

For the purpose of data analysis, five indicator variables were established. Adjunct faculty respondents were coded “1” if they reported a particular career type and “0” otherwise. For instance, respondents who indicated that they are Graduate Students were coded “1” for a graduate student indicator variable and “0” for all other career type indicator variables. And, as another example, respondents who reported being Freelancers were coded “1” for a freelancer indicator variable and “0” for all other career type indicator variables.

Analysis

The goal of reproducible research is to tie specific instructions to data and data analysis so that analyses can be recreated, better understood, and verified (Kuhn, 2015). All analyses of data for this study were completed through R, an open source
software program for statistical computing and graphics (“R,” 2016) in RStudio, a popular integrated development environment for R (“R Studio,” 2016). Annotated R code for all analyses conducted in this study, as well as the data analyzed (stripped of direct or indirect personal identifiers), are available at https://osf.io/trsfc.

Research Question 1

*Research Question 1 (RQ1):* What is the relationship between the identification by adjunct faculty of the extrinsic and intrinsic motivators to teach online via Penn State World Campus and their adjunct faculty career typology?

Estimated in this study were percentages of each career type of adjunct faculty who responded “yes” to each of 25 statements about the incentives that attract one to begin to teach online via Penn State World Campus. Point estimates, as well as interval estimates around each point estimate, were constructed around these percentages using bootstrap methods developed originally by Efron (1979; see also Efron & Tibshirani, 1993). Bootstrapping involves independently sampling from the observed distribution a number of times to create a distribution of estimates. Then, summary statistics are calculated from these samples that were re-sampled from the original sample. Bootstrapping of estimates is especially useful when small numbers of data points are available, as in this study, and when distributional assumptions typically made about summary statistics probability are not reasonable.

First, using data from the survey, the percentage of “yes” responses to each of the incentive statements were sampled 10,000 times to form a sampling distribution for each percentage. Next, the mean of the sampling distribution of the 10,000 samples was
calculated to provide a point estimate of the percentage of the population endorsing a motivator. And, last, 95% confidence intervals around the point estimates were calculated. The lower real limit of the 95% confidence intervals was assigned as the value at the 2.5 percentile point of the empirical distribution of the 10,000 bootstrapped percentages estimated. Symmetrically, the upper real limit was assigned from the 97.5% of the distribution of the bootstrapped percentages. The empirical distribution is not necessarily symmetric (as a theoretical normal distribution is symmetric), which is why the bootstrapping approach is used rather than a formal equation-based calculation, for estimating confidence intervals in this study.

**Research Question 2**

*Research Question 2 (RQ2):* What is the relationship between the identification by adjunct faculty of the extrinsic and intrinsic motivators that attract them to continue to teach online via Penn State World Campus and their adjunct faculty career typology?

Responses were analyzed for Research Question 2 in the same manner as for Research Question 1, this time using the responses participants made to each of 25 statements about the incentives that attract one to continue to teach online via Penn State World Campus.
Research Question 3

Research Question 3 (RQ3): What are the extrinsic and intrinsic motivators that are most likely to attract each adjunct career type to begin to teach online via Penn State World Campus?

For Research Question 3, the data from the analysis conducted for Research Question 1 was once again utilized, this time to produce a plot for each adjunct career type of point estimates and confidence intervals for all 25 extrinsic and intrinsic motivators to reveal response patterns.

Research Question 4

Research Question 4 (RQ4): What are the extrinsic and intrinsic motivators that are most likely to attract each adjunct career type to continue to teach online via Penn State World Campus?

For Research Question 4, the data from the analysis conducted for Research Question 2 was once again utilized, this time to produce a plot for each adjunct career type of point estimates and confidence intervals for all 25 extrinsic and intrinsic motivators to reveal response patterns.
Chapter 4

Results

This study examined the relationship between the extrinsic and intrinsic incentives identified by adjunct faculty as motivating them to teach online via Penn State World Campus and the career type of those adjunct faculty. I specifically explored whether the incentives identified as influencing one to teach online (the dependent variable) varied by type of adjunct faculty (the independent variable). Likewise, I examined the relationship between the extrinsic and intrinsic incentives identified by adjunct faculty as motivating them to continue to teach online via Penn State World Campus and the taxonomic classification of those adjunct faculty. Did the incentives identified as influencing one to continue to teach online (the dependent variable) vary by type of adjunct faculty (the independent variable)?

Finally, this study sought to identify those extrinsic and intrinsic incentives most likely to attract each adjunct career type to teach online via Penn State World Campus and those most like to attract each adjunct career type to do so. The results of this study are presented here.
Response Rates

Participants

The total number of individuals found to have taught via Penn State World Campus during the 2013-14, 2014-15, or 2015-16 academic years was 1,312. However, contact information could not be located for 63 of these individuals who represented 13 different colleges. Therefore, the total sample population invited to participate in this study was 1,249 faculty members. The survey distribution was done through Qualtrics. A total of six email addresses bounced when the system initiated the survey, leaving 1,243 faculty in the accessible sample population. A total of 610 individuals responded to the survey, for an overall response rate of 49%. Of these respondents, 215 identified themselves as one of five career types of adjunct faculty, with the remaining 381 individuals self-identifying as full-time employees. The remaining 13 individuals did not self-identify as either full-time or adjunct. The number of responses by adjunct career type is shown in Figure 4-1.
Figure 4-1: Number of respondents by career type.

Question 7 on the survey read “For which Penn State academic unit do you most frequently teach Penn State World Campus course offerings?” The number of respondents representing each Penn State college by career type is shown in Table 4-1. Knowing how many respondents represent each college can be useful when analyzing the survey results, as the incentives that attract one to teach via Penn State World Campus may vary by discipline.

For example, it has been suggested by some of my Penn State colleagues that engineering practitioners might seek lucrative financial compensation, but a solar energy practitioner might be more likely to seek an opportunity to influence the next generation of energy consumers. In other words, the incentive(s) that attract individuals—even those with the same career type—may vary based on the field in which each individual studied and/or works. Given the small number of responses, which is further restricted by the breakdown of adjunct respondents into one of five career types, the results of this study
will not be sufficient to make generalizations by academic discipline. Still, an analysis of the results by college could reveal potential response bias related to academic discipline.

Table 4-1. Number of Survey Responses by College and Career Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Grad Student</th>
<th>Aspiring Academic</th>
<th>Freelancer</th>
<th>Practitioner</th>
<th>Loaer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Architecture</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smeal College of Business</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Communications</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Earth and Mineral Sciences</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health and Human Development</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Information Sciences and Technology</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the Liberal Arts</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Nursing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eberly College of Science</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abington College, at the Penn State Abington campus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona College, at the Penn State Altoona campus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behrend College, at the Penn State Erie campus</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks College, at the Penn State Berks campus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital College, at the Penn State Harrisburg campus</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College, at the 14 other campuses not represented above</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 379 67 40 26 62 19 593

Note: These data comprise 610 survey respondents who have taught via Penn State World Campus during the 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16 academic years.
Non-Respondents

Within several hours of sending out an email with the link to the survey, two problems emerged. First, several invited participants wrote to me to point out that they are employed at Penn State as full-time staff, yet that was not a response option for survey Question 4, which said “There are many types of teaching faculty who teach via Penn State World Campus. Which of the following best describes you?” These individuals asked whether they should still complete the survey, to which I responded affirmatively and told them to select the “full-time faculty” response option. However, it is possible that more staff may have been included in the survey population and either ignored my invitation completely or quit the survey at Question 4, believing they were not the correct target population. As I am not able to obtain information regarding the individual appointments (i.e., faculty, staff, or graduate students) of the individuals included in the survey population, I do not know how many staff members received my survey invitation. As staff who teach via Penn State World Campus are typically full-time, this issue likely had no impact on this study of adjunct faculty.

Second, several other invited participants wrote to me to point out that the final question on the faculty survey, which asked “What, if any, degree are you currently working on?” did not include a response option for “Not Applicable.” They wrote to ask me what they should do or to let me know that they simply selected nothing for that question and exited the survey upon completion. Fortunately, that question was not required. Still, apparently some participants found the lack of a “Not Applicable” response option to be confusing and this could have led some to quit the survey without
exiting by navigating away from the survey itself, resulting in non-completion. There were a total of 23 survey responses that were begun but not completed. A review of the records for these 23 partial responses showed that none of these respondents got as far as this final question before exiting the survey, so despite possible confusion, this issue did not seem to impact survey completion.

There were several additional factors that may have contributed to non-response, where individuals may have felt they received the survey invitation in error and were not actually part of the target population:

- **Retirees** – One such individual wrote to me, saying “I retired from Penn State in January so didn't respond to the survey because I thought it was inappropriate to do post-teaching online” (Faculty Respondent 13, personal communication, October 12, 2016). As with staff, these individuals would not have been in the target population for this survey. Future analysis of the full-time data collected as part of Survey 1, however, might be impacted if a significant number of retirees did not respond.

- **Graduate Students** – I received an email from an invited participant who said “[I] just wanted to let you know that I don't fit the bill for your project, since I am a grad student instructor who is not actual faculty” (Faculty Respondent 2, personal communication, October 23, 2016). If more invited graduate students felt the same way and simply didn’t complete my survey, this would have the effect of reducing the number of respondents in the “Graduate Student” career type.

- **Part-time Faculty** – For example, one individual wrote “I want to let you know that I resigned my FT1 position effective June 30. I am still teaching in the iMPS-HLS Program, but in a FT2 status. Therefore, I'm not sure if you want me to participate in your survey.” (Faculty Respondent 4, personal communication, October 19, 2016). “FT2 status” indicates faculty who are in part-time positions. Since the focus of this study was adjunct (i.e., part-time) faculty, if more faculty were similarly confused, this could have lowered the potential response rate.

- **Individuals not currently teaching via World Campus** – For example, one individual emailed me to say “Unfortunately, I do not teach any online courses this semester” (Faculty Respondent 5, personal communication, October 12, 2016). As this study population included anyone who had taught via Penn State World Campus at any point in the past three years, if other invited participants also felt they weren’t eligible to take the survey because they were not currently teaching via Penn State World Campus, that could have also lowered the potential response rate.

---

3 To retain the anonymity of the survey respondents, actual names are not used.
In each case where an individual wrote to me with one of these reasons for not completing the survey, I responded to explain that they were, indeed, part of the target population and to urge them to complete the survey. Most wrote back to say that they did so! However, each of the scenarios outlined above represent potential reason for non-response and the impact of that non-response could bias my results.

Finally, in order to see if additional non-response bias might be present in my results (i.e., when the responses of the participants differs from the possible responses of those who did not participant), I could compare factors I know about the sample population with those same factors known about the respondents. Because I had no information about many of the attributes of my invited participants (e.g., sex, full-time vs. part-time, faculty or staff, retired or employed, graduate student, freelancer, loaner, practitioner, or aspiring academic), I was not able to analyze whether non-response bias along those lines might be present in my results along any of those lines.

Research Questions

Research Question 1

*Research Question 1 (RQ1):* What is the relationship between the identification by adjunct faculty of the extrinsic and intrinsic motivators to teach online via Penn State World Campus and their adjunct faculty career typology?

As reported in Chapter 3, estimated in this study were percentages of each career type of adjunct faculty who responded “yes” to each of 25 statements about the incentives that attract one to *begin* to teach online via Penn State World Campus. Point estimates, as
well as interval estimates around each point estimate, were constructed around these percentages using bootstrap methods developed originally by Efron (1979; see also Efron & Tibshirani, 1993). Bootstrapping involves independently sampling from the observed distribution a number of times to create a distribution of estimates. Then, summary statistics are calculated from these samples that were re-sampled from the original sample. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 4.2.
Table 4-2. Relationship Between the Identification by Adjunct Faculty of the Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivators to Teach Online via Penn State World Campus and Adjunct Faculty Career Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentive</th>
<th>n responding</th>
<th>Graduate Student</th>
<th>Aspiring Academic</th>
<th>Freelancer</th>
<th>Practitioner</th>
<th>Loaner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Skills</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td>[68.7, 88.1]</td>
<td>[55.0, 83.8]</td>
<td>[30.8, 69.6]</td>
<td>[55.9, 80.0]</td>
<td>[47.4, 89.5]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-satisfaction</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td>[16.4, 37.3]</td>
<td>[37.5, 67.5]</td>
<td>[45.9, 80.8]</td>
<td>[66.1, 86.9]</td>
<td>[47.4, 89.5]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Schedule</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td>[83.6, 97.0]</td>
<td>[69.2, 92.5]</td>
<td>[59.2, 96.2]</td>
<td>[77.4, 93.6]</td>
<td>[52.6, 94.7]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Rewards</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td>[56.7, 79.1]</td>
<td>[57.5, 85.0]</td>
<td>[53.8, 88.5]</td>
<td>[69.4, 88.7]</td>
<td>[42.1, 84.2]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure from my dept. head/supervisor</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td>[9.0, 26.9]</td>
<td>[2.6, 23.5]</td>
<td>[0.0, 24.0]</td>
<td>[1.6, 13.6]</td>
<td>[0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure from my peers</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td>[0.0, 4.5]</td>
<td>all responded “no”</td>
<td>all responded “no”</td>
<td>all responded “no”</td>
<td>all responded “no”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to use new technologies</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td>[29.9, 53.7]</td>
<td>[50.0, 77.5]</td>
<td>[30.8, 69.2]</td>
<td>[35.1, 61.0]</td>
<td>[36.8, 84.2]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to develop competencies</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td>[56.7, 79.1]</td>
<td>[62.5, 89.7]</td>
<td>[53.9, 88.5]</td>
<td>[62.1, 84.5]</td>
<td>[52.6, 94.7]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of empowerment</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td>[1.5, 13.4]</td>
<td>[20.0, 50.0]</td>
<td>[15.4, 50.0]</td>
<td>[13.8, 36.7]</td>
<td>[21.1, 63.2]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>Aspiring Academic</td>
<td>Freelancer</td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>Loaner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enhance my professional career</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n responding</td>
<td></td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>[74.6, 92.5]</td>
<td>[62.2, 89.5]</td>
<td>[38.5, 76.0]</td>
<td>[73.3, 91.8]</td>
<td>[47.4, 89.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To better balance work and family</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n responding</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>[37.3, 61.2]</td>
<td>[33.3, 64.9]</td>
<td>[38.8, 69.2]</td>
<td>[23.7, 48.3]</td>
<td>[10.5, 47.4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a potential entry point for teaching career</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n responding</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>[38.8, 62.7]</td>
<td>[41.0, 72.5]</td>
<td>[4.0, 34.6]</td>
<td>[26.7, 51.6]</td>
<td>[5.3, 36.8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To supplement my other career/job</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n responding</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>[14.9, 34.3]</td>
<td>[53.9, 83.8]</td>
<td>[7.7, 38.5]</td>
<td>[3.3, 18.1]</td>
<td>[0.0, 16.0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lack of permanent employment elsewhere</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n responding</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>[11.9, 31.3]</td>
<td>[29.7, 60.5]</td>
<td>[7.7, 38.5]</td>
<td>[3.3, 18.1]</td>
<td>[0.0, 16.0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To pass on experiential knowledge</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n responding</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>[16.4, 37.3]</td>
<td>[41.4, 72.5]</td>
<td>[50.0, 84.6]</td>
<td>[61.7, 84.5]</td>
<td>[36.8, 79.0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To work with adult learners</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n responding</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>[16.4, 37.3]</td>
<td>[39.5, 70.3]</td>
<td>[33.3, 72.0]</td>
<td>[43.4, 69.0]</td>
<td>[26.3, 68.4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n responding</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>[22.4, 44.8]</td>
<td>[45.0, 75.0]</td>
<td>[57.7, 88.5]</td>
<td>[59.0, 82.0]</td>
<td>[42.1, 84.2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As an avenue for full-time employment at Penn State</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n responding</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0, 9.0]</td>
<td>[32.5, 64.1]</td>
<td>[0.0, 19.2]</td>
<td>[11.5, 31.7]</td>
<td>[0.0, 26.3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the social connections with Penn State faculty</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n responding</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0, 4.5]</td>
<td>[13.5, 42.1]</td>
<td>[4.0, 33.3]</td>
<td>[6.7, 24.6]</td>
<td>[10.5, 47.4]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To further analyze the data shown in Table 4-2, plots were created using R and R Studio so a visual comparison of responses by adjunct career type could be made for each incentive. If the confidence interval around a point estimate for one adjunct career type overlapped with the confidence interval around a point estimate for another adjunct career type, then no relationship between the dependent and independent variable was
inferred. In other words, there appeared to be no difference in the level of impact of that incentive on one's decision to teach via Penn State World Campus between the adjunct career types. If, however, the confidence intervals for two or more adjunct career types did not overlap, then a relationship between the dependent and independent variable was inferred. In other words, there appeared to be a difference in the level of impact of that incentive on one's decision to teach via Penn State World Campus between career types. The plots created from the data from Table 4-2 are shown in Figure 4-2, Figure 4-3, Figure 4-4, Figure 4-5, and Figure 4-6.
Figure 4-2: Percent responding "Yes" to the first set of five incentives to begin to teach online via Penn State World Campus by adjunct career type.
Figure 4-3: Percent responding "Yes" to the second set of set of five incentives to begin to teach online via Penn State World Campus by adjunct career type.
Figure 4-4: Percent responding "Yes" to the third set of set of five incentives to begin to teach online via Penn State World Campus by adjunct career type.
Figure 4-5: Percent responding "Yes" to the fourth set of set of five incentives to begin to teach online via Penn State World Campus by adjunct career type.
Figure 4-5: Percent responding "Yes" to the fifth set of set of five incentives to begin to teach online via Penn State World Campus by adjunct career type.
A visual inspection of Figures 4-1, 4-2, 4-3, 4-4, and 4-5 reveals that there is overlap among the confidence intervals around a point estimate for all adjunct career types for the following 12 incentives:

- To enhance my online teaching skills
- Flexible schedule
- Financial rewards
- Pressure from my department head or supervisor
- Pressure from my peers
- Opportunities to use new technologies
- Opportunities to develop competencies
- To enhance my professional career
- To better balance work and family
- To work with adult learners
- For the social connections with Penn State faculty
- For the social connections with Penn State students

This suggests that, for these 12 incentives, there is no relationship between the dependent and independent variables was inferred. In other words, there appeared to be no difference in the level of impact of these incentives on one's decision to teach via Penn State World Campus among the adjunct career types.

However, the visual inspection of Figures 4-1, 4-2, 4-3, 4-4, and 4-5 did reveal that there were some instances where there was no overlap among the confidence intervals around a point estimate for all adjunct career types for some incentives. In these cases, this suggests that a relationship between the dependent and independent variables can be inferred. In other words, there appears to be a difference in the level of impact of some incentives on one's decision to teach via Penn State World Campus between two or more adjunct career types.
In total, there were 13 incentives where the various adjunct career types appear to be differently impacted. For six of the 13 incentives, only Graduate students appear to be less impacted than all other adjunct career types:

- **Self-satisfaction**—Graduate students appear to be less impacted by this incentive than all other adjunct career types.
- **Sense of empowerment**—Graduate students appear to be less impacted by this incentive than all other adjunct career types.
- **To pass on experiential knowledge**—Graduate students appear to be less impacted by this incentive than all other adjunct career types.
- **For the professional connections with Penn State students**—Graduate students appear to be less impacted by this incentive than all other adjunct career types.
- **For the opportunity to give back to my community of practice**—Graduate students appear to be less impacted by this incentive than all other adjunct career types.
- **To be a member of the Penn State community**—Graduate students appear to be less impacted by this incentive than all other adjunct career types.

For the remaining seven of the 13 incentives where there appears to be a different in the level of impact of an incentive on one's decision to teach via Penn State World Campus, the adjunct career types that appear to be differently impacted varies as follows:

- **As a potential entry point for teaching career**—Loaners and Freelancers appear to be less impacted by this incentive than Aspiring Academics and Graduate Students. The confidence interval for Practitioners spans both sets of adjunct career types.
- **To supplement by other career or job**—Freelancers and Graduate Students appear to be less impacted by this incentive than Practitioners and Aspiring Academics. The confidence interval for Loaners is too wide to compare the level of impact with the other adjunct career types.
- **A lace of permanent employment elsewhere**—Loaners and Practitioners appear to be less impacted by this incentive than Aspiring Academics. Freelancers and Graduate The confidence interval for Graduate Students spans both sets of adjunct career types.
- **Intellectual stimulation**—Graduate students appear to be less impacted by this incentive than Practitioners and Freelancers. Graduate students may also be less impacted by this incentive than Loaners and Aspiring Academics, as well, but there is a slight overlap in confidence intervals between the upper limit for Graduate Students and the lower limit for both Loaners and Aspiring Academics.
- **As an avenue for full-time employment at Penn State**—Aspiring Academics appear to be more impacted by this incentive than all other adjunct career types.
- **For the professional connections with Penn State faculty**—Graduate students appear to be less impacted by this incentive than Loaners, Practitioners, and Aspiring
Academics. The confidence interval for Freelancers spans both sets of adjunct career types.

- *Opportunity to give back to my alma mater*—Graduate students appear to be less impacted by this incentive than Practitioners and Aspiring Academics. The confidence interval for Loaners and Freelancers spans both sets of adjunct career types.

**Research Question 2**

*Research Question 2 (RQ2):* What is the relationship between the identification by adjunct faculty of the extrinsic and intrinsic motivators that attract them to continue to teach online via Penn State World Campus and their adjunct faculty career typology?

As reported in Chapter 3, estimated in this study were percentages of each career type of adjunct faculty who responded “yes” to each of 25 statements about the incentives that attract one to *continue* to teach online via Penn State World Campus. Point estimates, as well as interval estimates around each point estimate, were constructed around these percentages using bootstrap methods developed originally by Efron (1979; see also Efron & Tibshirani, 1993). Bootstrapping involves independently sampling from the observed distribution a number of times to create a distribution of estimates. Then, summary statistics are calculated from these samples that were re-sampled from the original sample. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 4.3.
Table 4-3. Relationship Between the Identification by Adjunct Faculty of the Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivators that Attract Them to Continue to Teach Online via Penn State World Campus and Adjunct Faculty Career Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentive</th>
<th>n responding</th>
<th>Graduate Student</th>
<th>Aspiring Academic</th>
<th>Freelancer</th>
<th>Practitioner</th>
<th>Loaner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Skills</td>
<td>n responding</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td>[46.7, 71.7]</td>
<td>[65.0, 90.0]</td>
<td>[46.2, 80.8]</td>
<td>[57.4, 80.3]</td>
<td>[53.7, 94.4]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-satisfaction</td>
<td>n responding</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td>[21.7, 45.8]</td>
<td>[55.0, 82.5]</td>
<td>[57.7, 88.5]</td>
<td>[67.2, 86.9]</td>
<td>[50.0, 94.4]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Schedule</td>
<td>n responding</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td>[85.2, 98.4]</td>
<td>[72.5, 95.0]</td>
<td>[76.9, 100.0]</td>
<td>[77.1, 95.1]</td>
<td>[66.7, 100.0]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Rewards</td>
<td>n responding</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td>[67.2, 88.3]</td>
<td>[67.5, 92.5]</td>
<td>[53.9, 88.5]</td>
<td>[70.5, 90.2]</td>
<td>[55.6, 94.4]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure from my dept. head/supervisor</td>
<td>n responding</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td>[1.7, 15.0]</td>
<td>[0.0, 15.0]</td>
<td>[0.0, 11.5]</td>
<td>[0.0, 8.2]</td>
<td>all responded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure from my peers</td>
<td>n responding</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td>all responded</td>
<td>[0.0, 7.5]</td>
<td>all responded</td>
<td>all responded</td>
<td>all responded</td>
<td>all responded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to use new technologies</td>
<td>n responding</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td>[27.9, 52.5]</td>
<td>[52.5, 80.0]</td>
<td>[23.1, 61.5]</td>
<td>[45.9, 70.5]</td>
<td>[52.9, 94.4]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to develop competencies</td>
<td>n responding</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td>[46.7, 71.7]</td>
<td>[52.5, 82.5]</td>
<td>[54.6, 73.1]</td>
<td>[59.0, 82.0]</td>
<td>[55.6, 94.4]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Empowerment</td>
<td>n responding</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td>[11.5, 31.2]</td>
<td>[32.5, 62.5]</td>
<td>[19.2, 53.9]</td>
<td>[23.0, 47.5]</td>
<td>[16.7, 61.1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>Aspiring Academic</td>
<td>Freelancer</td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>Loaner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enhance my professional career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n responding</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[56.7, 80.0]</td>
<td>[60.0, 87.5]</td>
<td>[26.9, 65.4]</td>
<td>[57.4, 80.3]</td>
<td>[44.4, 88.9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To better balance work and family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n responding</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[51.7, 75.9]</td>
<td>[52.5, 80.0]</td>
<td>[26.9, 65.4]</td>
<td>[27.9, 52.5]</td>
<td>[5.6, 44.4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a potential entry point for teaching career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n responding</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[33.9, 59.0]</td>
<td>[37.5, 67.5]</td>
<td>[3.8, 26.9]</td>
<td>[31.2, 57.4]</td>
<td>[0.0, 27.8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To supplement my other career/job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n responding</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[29.5, 54.2]</td>
<td>[50.0, 77.5]</td>
<td>[11.5, 46.2]</td>
<td>[60.7, 83.6]</td>
<td>[50.0, 94.4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lack of permanent employment elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n responding</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>all responded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[25.0, 49.2]</td>
<td>[32.5, 62.5]</td>
<td>[7.7, 42.3]</td>
<td>[3.3, 19.7]</td>
<td>&quot;no&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To pass on experiential knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n responding</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[20.3, 44.1]</td>
<td>[42.5, 72.5]</td>
<td>[50.0, 84.6]</td>
<td>[63.9, 85.3]</td>
<td>[44.4, 88.9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To work with adult learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n responding</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[24.6, 49.2]</td>
<td>[45.0, 77.5]</td>
<td>[46.2, 80.8]</td>
<td>[47.5, 72.1]</td>
<td>[38.7, 83.3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n responding</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[22.0, 45.8]</td>
<td>[60.0, 87.5]</td>
<td>[50.0, 84.6]</td>
<td>[54.1, 78.7]</td>
<td>[55.6, 94.4]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### n and % Responding "Yes" by Adjunct Faculty Career Type

(95% CI of % “Yes”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentive</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Graduate Student</th>
<th>Aspiring Academic</th>
<th>Freelancer</th>
<th>Practitioner</th>
<th>Loaner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As an avenue for full-time employment at Penn State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n responding</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[9.8, 29.5]</td>
<td>[32.5, 62.5]</td>
<td>[0.0, 19.2]</td>
<td>(11.5, 31.1)</td>
<td>[5.6, 44.4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the social connections with Penn State faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n responding</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0, 10.2]</td>
<td>[6.7, 25.4]</td>
<td>[19.2]</td>
<td>[37.7, 63.9]</td>
<td>[55.6, 94.4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the professional connections with Penn State faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n responding</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[3.3, 17.0]</td>
<td>[27.5, 57.5]</td>
<td>[23.1]</td>
<td>[24.6, 49.2]</td>
<td>[33.3, 77.8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the opportunity to give back to my community of practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n responding</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[11.5, 31.2]</td>
<td>[45.0, 75.0]</td>
<td>[38.5, 76.9]</td>
<td>[44.3, 68.9]</td>
<td>[44.4, 88.9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to give back to my alma mater, Penn State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n responding</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1.7, 15.3]</td>
<td>[17.5, 45.0]</td>
<td>[3.9, 34.6]</td>
<td>[14.8, 36.1]</td>
<td>[5.6, 44.4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be a member of the Penn State community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n responding</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95 % CI of %]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[6.6, 23.7]</td>
<td>[42.5, 72.5]</td>
<td>[30.8]</td>
<td>[27.9, 54.1]</td>
<td>[66.7, 100.0]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. These data comprise 215 self-identifying adjunct faculty who taught via Penn State World Campus during the 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16 academic years.
To further analyze the data shown in Table 4-3, plots were created using R and R Studio so a visual comparison of responses by adjunct career type could be made for each incentive. If the confidence interval around a point estimate for one adjunct career type overlapped with the confidence interval around a point estimate for another adjunct career type, then no relationship between the dependent and independent variable was inferred. In other words, there appeared to be no difference in the level of impact of that incentive on one's decision to continue to teach via Penn State World Campus between the adjunct career types. If, however, the confidence intervals for two or more adjunct career types did not overlap, then a relationship between the dependent and independent variable was inferred. In other words, there appeared to be a difference in the level of impact of that incentive on one's decision to continue to teach via Penn State World Campus between career types. The plots created from the data from Table 4-3 are shown in Figure 4-7, Figure 4-8, Figure 4-9, Figure 4-10, and Figure 4-11.
Figure 4-7: Percent responding "Yes" to the first set of set of five incentives to continue to teach online via Penn State World Campus by adjunct career type.
Figure 4-8: Percent responding "Yes" to the second set of set of five incentives to continue to teach online via Penn State World Campus by adjunct career type.
Figure 4-9: Percent responding "Yes" to the third set of set of five incentives to continue to teach online via Penn State World Campus by adjunct career type.
Figure 4-10: Percent responding "Yes" to the fourth set of set of five incentives to continue to teach online via Penn State World Campus by adjunct career type.
Figure 4-11: Percent responding "Yes" to the fifth set of set of five incentives to continue to teach online via Penn State World Campus by adjunct career type.
A visual inspection of Figures 4-7, 4-8, 4-9, 4-10, and 4-11 reveals that there is overlap among the confidence intervals around a point estimate for all adjunct career types for the following incentives:

- To enhance my online teaching skills
- Flexible schedule
- Financial rewards
- Pressure from my department head or supervisor
- Pressure from my peers
- Opportunities to use new technologies
- Opportunities to develop competencies
- Sense of empowerment
- To enhance my professional career
- To work with adult learners
- For the social connections with Penn State students

This suggests that, for these incentives, there is no relationship between the dependent and independent variables was inferred. In other words, there appeared to be no difference in the level of impact of these incentives on one's decision to continue to teach via Penn State World Campus among the adjunct career types. It should be noted that this list is almost identical to those incentives found to have no relationship between the dependent and independent variables for Research Question 1, with the exception of "Sense of empowerment" (not present in the list for RQ1) and "To better balance work and family" as well as "For the social connections with Penn State faculty" (present in the list for RQ1 but not for RQ2).

However, the visual inspection of Figures 4-7, 4-8, 4-9, 4-10, and 4-11 did reveal that there were some instances where there was no overlap among the confidence intervals around a point estimate for all adjunct career types for some incentives. In these cases, this suggests that a relationship between the dependent and independent variables can be inferred. In other words, there appears to be a difference in the level of impact of
some incentives on one's decision to continue to teach via Penn State World Campus between two or more adjunct career types.

In total, there were 14 incentives where the various adjunct career types appear to be differently impacted. For six of the 14 incentives, only Graduate students appear to be less impacted than all other adjunct career types:

- **Self-satisfaction**—Graduate students appear to be less impacted by this incentive than all other adjunct career types.
- **To pass on experiential knowledge**—While there is very slight overlap between the upper limit for Graduate Students and the lower limit for Aspiring Academics, Graduate students appear to be less impacted by this incentive than all other adjunct career types.
- **Intellectual stimulation**—Graduate students appear to be less impacted by this incentive than all other adjunct career types.
- **For the professional connections with Penn State students**—Graduate students appear to be less impacted by this incentive than all other adjunct career types.
- **For the opportunity to give back to my community of practice**—Graduate students appear to be less impacted by this incentive than all other adjunct career types. Practitioners appear to be less impacted by Loaners, but similarly impacted as Freelancers and Aspiring Academics.
- **To be a member of the Penn State community**—Graduate students appear to be less impacted by this incentive than all other adjunct career types. Practitioners appear to be less impacted by Loaners, but similarly impacted as Freelancers and Aspiring Academics.

For the remaining eight of the 14 incentives where there appears to be a different in the level of impact of an incentive on one's decision to continue to teach via Penn State World Campus, the adjunct career types that appear to be differently impacted varies as follows:

- **To better balance work and family**—Loaners appear to be less impacted by this incentive than Aspiring Academics or Graduate Students. The confidence intervals for Practitioners and Freelancers span both sets of adjunct career types.
- **As a potential entry point for teaching career**—Loaners and Freelancers appear to be less impacted by this incentive than all other adjunct career types.
- **To supplement by other career or job**—Freelancers, and possibly Graduate Students, appear to be less impacted by this incentive than Loaners, Practitioners, and Aspiring Academics.
• A lack of permanent employment elsewhere—Loaners and Practitioners appear to be less impacted by this incentive than Aspiring Academics and Graduate Students. The confidence interval for Freelancers spans both sets of adjunct career types.

• As an avenue for full-time employment at Penn state—Freelancers appear to be less impacted by this incentive than Aspiring Academics. The confidence intervals for Loaners, Practitioners, and Graduate Students span both sets of adjunct career types.

• For the social connections with Penn State faculty—Graduate Students appear to be less impacted by this incentive than Loaners or Aspiring Academics. The confidence intervals for Practitioners, and Freelancers span both sets of adjunct career types.

• For the professional connections with Penn State faculty—Graduate students appear to be less impacted by this incentive than Loaners, Practitioners, and Aspiring Academics. The confidence interval for Freelancers spans both sets of adjunct career types.

• Opportunity to give back to my alma mater—While there is very slight overlap between the upper limit for Graduate Students and the lower limit for Practitioners, Graduate students appear to be less impacted by this incentive than both Practitioners and Aspiring Academics. The confidence intervals for Loaners and Freelancers span both sets of adjunct career types.

It should be noted that this list is very similar to those incentives found to have no relationship between the dependent and independent variables for Research Question 1, with the exception of two incentives. "To better balance work and family" and "For the social connections with Penn State faculty" did not appear to be differently impacted for RQ1.

Research Question 3

Research Question 3 (RQ3): What are the extrinsic and intrinsic motivators that are most likely to attract each adjunct career type to begin to teach online via Penn State World Campus?

As reported in Chapter 3, for Research Question 3, the data from the analysis conducted for Research Question 1 was once again utilized, this time to produce a plot for each adjunct career type of point estimates and confidence intervals for all 25
extrinsic and intrinsic motivators to reveal response patterns. These plots are shown in Figure 4-12, Figure 4-13, Figure 4-14, Figure 4-15, and Figure 4-16.
Figure 4-12: Percent of Graduate Students responding "Yes" to each of the 25 incentives to begin to teach online via Penn State World Campus.
Figure 4-13: Percent of Aspiring Academics responding "Yes" to each of the 25 incentives to begin to teach online via Penn State World Campus.
Figure 4-14: Percent of Freelancers responding "Yes" to each of the 25 incentives to begin to teach online via Penn State World Campus.
Figure 4-15: Percent of Practitioners responding "Yes" to each of the 25 incentives to begin to teach online via Penn State World Campus.
Figure 4-16: Percent of Loaners responding "Yes" to each of the 25 incentives to begin to teach online via Penn State World Campus.
Examining each of the figures just presented, the top five incentives that attract each adjunct career type to begin to teach via Penn State World Campus, as indicated by the upper limits of the confidence intervals, are shown in Table 4.4.

Table 4-4. Top Five Incentives That Attract One to Begin to Teach via Penn State World Campus by Adjunct Career Type, as Indicated by the Upper Limits of the Confidence Intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjunct Career Type</th>
<th>Top Five Incentives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>1. Flexible schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. To enhance my professional career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. To enhance my online teaching skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Opportunities to develop competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Financial rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspiring Academic</td>
<td>1. Flexible schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Opportunities to develop competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. To enhance my professional career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Financial rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. To supplement my other career or job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freelancer</td>
<td>1. Flexible schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Intellectual stimulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Opportunities to develop competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Financial rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. To pass on experiential knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>1. Flexible schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. To enhance my professional career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Financial rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Self-satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. To pass on experiential knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaner</td>
<td>1. Opportunities to develop competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Flexible schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. To enhance my professional career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Self-satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. To enhance my online teaching skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. These data comprise 215 self-identifying adjunct faculty who taught via Penn State World Campus during the 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16 academic years.
Research Question 4

Research Question 4 (RQ4): What are the extrinsic and intrinsic motivators that are most likely to attract each adjunct career type to continue to teach online via Penn State World Campus?

As reported in Chapter 3, for Research Question 4, the data from the analysis conducted for Research Question 2 was once again utilized, this time to produce a plot for each adjunct career type of point estimates and confidence intervals for all 25 extrinsic and intrinsic motivators to reveal response patterns. These plots are shown in Figure 4-17, Figure 4-18, Figure 4-19, Figure 4-20, and Figure 4-21.
Figure 4.17: Percent of Graduate Students responding "Yes" to each of the 25 incentives to continue to teach online via Penn State World Campus.
Figure 4-18: Percent of Aspiring Academics responding "Yes" to each of the 25 incentives to continue to teach online via Penn State World Campus.
Figure 4-19: Percent of Freelancers responding "Yes" to each of the 25 incentives to continue to teach online via Penn State World Campus.
Figure 4-20: Percent of Practitioners responding "Yes" to each of the 25 incentives to continue to teach online via Penn State World Campus.
Figure 4-21: Percent of Loaners responding "Yes" to each of the 25 incentives to continue to teach online via Penn State World Campus.
Examining each of the figures just presented, the top five incentives that attract each adjunct career type to continue to teach via Penn State World Campus, as indicated by the upper limits of the confidence intervals, are shown in Table 4.4.

Table 4.5. Top Five Incentives That Attract One to Continue to Teach via Penn State World Campus by Adjunct Career Type, as Indicated by the Upper Limits of the Confidence Intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjunct Career Type</th>
<th>Top Five Incentives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Graduate Student    | 1. Flexible schedule  
                        | 2. Financial rewards  
                        | 3. To enhance my professional career  
                        | 4. To better balance work and family  
                        | 5. Opportunities to develop competencies |
| Aspiring Academic   | 1. Flexible schedule  
                        | 2. Financial rewards  
                        | 3. To enhance my online teaching skills  
                        | 4. Intellectual stimulation  
                        | 5. To enhance my professional career |
| Freelancer          | 1. Flexible schedule  
                        | 2. Financial rewards  
                        | 3. Self-satisfaction  
                        | 4. Intellectual stimulation  
                        | 5. To pass on experiential knowledge |
| Practitioner        | 1. Flexible schedule  
                        | 2. Financial rewards  
                        | 3. Self-satisfaction  
                        | 4. To pass on experiential knowledge  
                        | 5. To supplement my other career or job |
| Loaner              | 1. To be a member of the Penn State community  
                        | 2. Flexible schedule  
                        | 3. For the professional connections with Penn State faculty  
                        | 4. Intellectual Stimulation  
                        | 5. To supplement my other career or job |

Note. These data comprise 215 self-identifying adjunct faculty who taught via Penn State World Campus during the 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16 academic years.
Chapter 5

Discussion

Summary of the Literature

As discussed in Chapter 2, findings from the 24 studies examined revealed, as a whole, that there is a lot of variability across faculty motivators and inhibitors when it comes to distance education. In general, however, intrinsic factors—such as flexible schedule and workplace, a personal motivation to use technology, the opportunity for intellectual challenge, and overall job satisfaction—were reported to be stronger motivators than extrinsic ones—such as extra compensation or merit pay, technical support, and release time—in motivating faculty to teach at a distance.

Studies revealed that adjunct faculty are similar to their full-time peers in terms of their motivations to teach online, but that context does matter. As a whole, adjunct faculty may be more motivated by career needs. Few of the studies reviewed analyzed the possibly unique needs of different types of adjunct faculty. Shiffman’s 2009 study was the only one discovered that specifically analyzed the factors that motivate different adjunct career types. Shiffman’s findings revealed that there were common motivating factors across these four groups in terms of what was most likely to motivate them to teach, but there were differences in terms of what least likely to motivate them. Schiffman found common ground, however, when analyzing the factors that retain
adjunct in online teaching roles: all continue to be attracted by the flexibility of distance education.

These findings were not surprising based on my experience over the past 23 years working in distance education. However, this study built upon the work of these predecessors, most importantly on the work of Shiffman, to analysis the factors that attract, and retain, specific career types of adjuncts to teach online.

**Summary of the Results**

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the attraction of a given type of adjunct faculty to teach online via Penn State World Campus and extrinsic and intrinsic motivators, as well as the relationship between a given type of adjunct faculty’s decision to continue teaching online via Penn State World Campus and extrinsic and intrinsic motivators. Do the incentives that attract and retain adjunct faculty to teach online via Penn State World Campus vary depending on that faculty member’s adjunct career typology?

A survey was sent to all individuals who have taught at least one online course for Penn State World Campus in the last three years. The survey included demographic questions that enabled respondents to self-identify as full-time faculty and staff or one of five adjunct career type populations: Graduate Students, Aspiring Academics, Freelancers, Practitioners, and Loaners. Respondents were asked to indicate which of 25 extrinsic and intrinsic motivators attracted them to begin to teach online via Penn State World Campus. They were also asked to indicate which of the same 25 extrinsic and
intrinsic motivators influenced them to continue teaching online via Penn State World Campus.

An analysis of the survey responses indicates that 13 of the 25 incentives appear to differently impact various adjunct career types decision to begin to teach via Penn State World Campus. For six of the 13, the only adjunct career type that appears to be impacted differently is Graduate Students. For each of these incentives, Graduate Students appear to be less impacted than all other adjunct career types:

- Self-satisfaction
- Sense of empowerment
- To pass on experiential knowledge
- For the professional connections with Penn State students
- For the opportunity to give back to my community of practice
- To be a member of the Penn State community

For the remaining seven of the 13 incentives, the adjunct career types that appears to be differently impacted varies:

- As a potential entry point for teaching career
- To supplement by other career or job
- A lace of permanent employment elsewhere
- Intellectual stimulation
- As an avenue for full-time employment at Penn State
- For the professional connections with Penn State faculty
- Opportunity to give back to my alma mater

With regard to the incentives that impact one's decision to continue to teach via Penn State World Campus, an analysis of the survey responses indicates that there 14 of the 25 incentives appear to differently impact various adjunct career types decision. For six of the 14, the only adjunct career type that appears to be impacted differently is Graduate Students. For each of these incentives, Graduate Students appear to be less impacted than all other adjunct career types:
• Self-satisfaction
• To pass on experiential knowledge
• Intellectual stimulation
• For the professional connections with Penn State students
• For the opportunity to give back to my community of practice
• To be a member of the Penn State community

For the remaining eight of the 14 incentives, the adjunct career types that appear to be differently impacted varies:

• To better balance work and family
• As a potential entry point for teaching career
• To supplement by other career or job
• A lack of permanent employment elsewhere
• As an avenue for full-time employment at Penn State
• For the social connections with Penn State faculty
• For the professional connections with Penn State faculty
• Opportunity to give back to my alma mater

Finally, a list of the top five incentives that attract each adjunct career type to begin to teach via Penn State World Campus was developed based on the data collected, as well as a list of the top five incentives that attract each adjunct career type to continue to do so. These lists are shown in Table 4-6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjunct Career Type</th>
<th>Top Five Incentives to Begin</th>
<th>Top Five Incentives to Continue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>1. Flexible schedule</td>
<td>1. Flexible schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. To enhance my professional career</td>
<td>2. Financial rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. To enhance my online teaching skills</td>
<td>3. To enhance my professional career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Opportunities to develop competencies</td>
<td>4. To better balance work and family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Financial rewards</td>
<td>5. Opportunities to develop competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspiring Academic</td>
<td>1. Flexible schedule</td>
<td>1. Financial rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Opportunities to develop competencies</td>
<td>2. Financial rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. To enhance my professional career</td>
<td>3. To enhance my online teaching skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. To supplement my other career or job</td>
<td>5. To enhance my professional career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freelancer</td>
<td>1. Flexible schedule</td>
<td>1. Financial rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>2. Financial rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Opportunities to develop competencies</td>
<td>3. Self-satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. To pass on experiential knowledge</td>
<td>5. To pass on experiential knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>1. Flexible schedule</td>
<td>1. Financial rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. To enhance my professional career</td>
<td>2. Financial rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Self-satisfaction</td>
<td>4. To pass on experiential knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. To pass on experiential knowledge</td>
<td>5. To supplement my other career or job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaner</td>
<td>1. Opportunities to develop competencies</td>
<td>1. To be a member of the Penn State community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Flexible schedule</td>
<td>2. Flexible schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. To enhance my professional career</td>
<td>3. For the professional connections with Penn State faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. To enhance my online teaching skills</td>
<td>5. To supplement my other career or job</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. These data comprise 215 self-identifying adjunct faculty who taught via Penn State World Campus during the 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16 academic years.
Discussion and Implications

As was found by the researchers whose work this study is built upon, my own findings reveal a good deal of variability across faculty with regard to the incentives that attract them to teach at a distance. Personal context does seem to matter. While this study looked at a small sample of adjunct faculty at a single Research 1 institution, patterns seen in the data were similar to those found be previous studies, suggesting that one size indeed does not fit all. This suggests that it would be prudent to consider the unique needs and motivators of each adjunct faculty member during the hiring and retention process. The results reported here can serve as a helpful starting point, but, as the saying goes, "your mileage may vary." Factors such as academic discipline (e.g., hiring a psychology instructor versus an engineer), for example, may have an impact on whether a given incentive motivates one to begin or continue teaching online that could not be detected here due to the small sample size.

As was found in previous studies, my findings suggest that intrinsic incentives—such as "flexible schedule," "intellectual stimulation," "opportunities to develop competencies," and "enhancing my professional career"—are stronger motivators for both starting and continuing to teach online. The only extrinsic motivator that appears in each adjunct career type's "top five" was "financial reward." Interestingly, that incentive doesn't appear at all on the top five list for Loaners, it is last on the list for Graduate Students, it is fourth on the list for Aspiring Academics and Freelancers, and it is third on the list for Practitioners. This coincides with my own professional observations in working with these adjunct career types that, while important, money is not the primary
reason one agrees to teach online on a part-time basis. Interestingly, however, is the observation that when looking at the lists of top five incentives for continuing to teach online, "flexible schedule" remains high on all lists, but "Financial Rewards" moves up in importance for all adjunct career types but Loaners (where it still does not appear in the top five).

At the same time, a great deal of common ground was found across adjunct career types in this study in terms of the incentives that attract them to teach online in the first place. "Flexible schedule," "to enhance my professional career," "opportunities to develop competencies," and "financial rewards" were on the top five list of incentives that impact one's decision to begin teaching online at Penn State for at least four of the five adjunct career types. This commonality suggests that those responsible for staffing these courses focus on these four incentives when trying to attract adjunct faculty in general.

Less commonality was seen when examining the top five lists of incentives that motivate one to continue to teach online. "Flexible schedule" and "financial rewards" were the only incentives that appeared on the lists for at least four of the five adjunct career types, with those two incentives at the top of the list for all but Loaners. This suggests that there is more variability across adjunct career types when it comes to the incentives that motivate them to keep teaching online. Individuals responsible for retaining adjunct faculty would again be wise to consider the unique needs and motivators of each adjunct faculty member when trying to retain these individuals.
Future Research

Exploring Differences Across Academic Disciplines

While this study provided useful information that can help guide the hiring and retention of adjunct faculty at Penn State, more research is needed to explore this topic more fully. For example, it would be useful to learn more about how the incentives impact different adjunct career types across disciplines. The estimated number of adjunct faculty who teach via Penn State World Campus, as reported in Chapter 1, is 329. There were 215 adjunct respondents for this survey, for a 65% response rate. While that is an impressive response rate, even if all 329 responded the break down by adjunct career type would yield a number of respondents per type that still be too small to make a meaningful discipline-specific analysis possible. A study that encompassed a larger sample population would be necessary. To minimize other mitigating factors that could make results less generalizable, I suggest conducting a similar study across multiple Research 1 institutions that have large online education programs. Responses could then be analyzed not only across adjunct career types, but could also examine results across academic disciplines within those adjunct career types.

Comparing Incentives that Attract and Retain Adjunct Career Types with the Incentives Used by Program Administrators

It would also be useful to explore the use of incentives to attract and retain each adjunct career type by administrators. At the same time, university program
administrators often have the challenging task of identifying and attracting qualified individuals to join their institution to teach online as adjunct faculty. From writing job advertisements to making job offers, these individuals make decisions about which strategies to employ when trying to convince the prospective online instructor to accept a teaching job. Among the many incentives promoted when trying to attract faculty are competitive pay, flexibility in scheduling, access to professional development opportunities, a chance to return to one’s alma mater to work alongside former faculty, and the opportunity to be affiliated with an institution of higher education that the individual deems to be prestigious. Depending on which category of adjunct faculty one wishes to attract, a different incentive might be promoted by the program administrator. For example, a program administrator might try to attract a Practitioner by touting the prestige of the institution and the opportunity it would give the Practitioner to be part of it, while the same program administrator might stress competitive pay when trying to attract an Aspiring Academic or a Freelancer.

The incentives that program administrators use to retain their adjunct online teaching faculty may also vary from one category of adjunct to another. Program administrators might try to convince Graduate Students, for example, that an ongoing opportunity to teach online will enhance their ability to secure a teaching position upon graduation. Offering a stable paycheck, however, might be seen as the key to retaining an Aspiring Academic.

Future research might survey both adjunct faculty and program administrators, then compare findings across those two groups. Did the incentives used to attract and retain adjunct faculty vary depending by adjunct career type? Are program administrators
promoting the most effective incentives to each career type of adjunct faculty, both
during the initial hiring process and in their attempts to retain adjunct faculty?

**Conducting a Natural Experiment**

Of course, this study and those studies just suggested all rely on memory and
perception of past behavior. For example, adjunct faculty respondents do their best to
recall the incentives that attracted them to teach online in the first place, while program
administrators do their best to consider the incentives they use to attract and retain these
individuals. But in neither case are these individuals faced with an actual point of
decision making. We know what people *say* they are attracted by, but we don’t know
what they actually did or would do in the future. A natural experiment might be a better
way to learn about the true impact of various incentives on the decisions of adjunct career
types and program administrators. Such studies could entail recruiting volunteers,
presenting them with different scenarios and incentives, and then asking them what they
would do in that situation. To encompass not only the five adjunct career types but also
various academic disciplines, such research would need a large body of volunteers and
would be a significant undertaking.

**Missing incentives?**

As noted previously, the dependent variable for both surveys consisted of 25
incentives that have been found to influence one’s decision to teach at a distance or to
continue to teach at a distance. These incentives were adapted from Chapman’s 2011 study, which were gleaned from the literature, validated with a two-person panel of distance education faculty who were not affiliated with Chapman’s study, then pilot tested with a group of five distance education faculty from the university Chapman was studying. Despite utilizing such a well-vetted list of incentives, it is entirely possible that the list does not reflect all of the possible incentives that might attract or retain faculty to teach online. In fact, three full-time faculty members wrote to me directly to share their thoughts about the incentive options that were presented. The first of these wrote:

I see the main advantages of teaching through the world campus as accruing to the students (we can reach people in many places, at many stages in their careers and lives) as well as to the department (funds returned to the department, support for student assistants and instructors). For me personally, these are not big payoffs, but they contribute to the larger mission. Your options almost entirely missed the “I do this to do my job better” options, the “I’m not doing this to move me ahead, but to move them ahead” options, as I read them. (Faculty Respondent 1, personal communication, October 12, 2016)

The second faculty member wrote:

I was surprised that the survey did not include anything close to the #1 incentive that impelled me into online teaching and keeps me involved: not enough enrollments in residential courses. Had my traditional residential graduate classes continued to draw enough enrollments to make, I never would have looked elsewhere. So the positive incentive would be something like “access to larger numbers of students in my courses”. (Faculty Respondent 2, personal communication, October 5, 2016)

The third faculty member told me:

In my department we don't have a choice to teach online or not. It is assigned to us (not unlike resident instruction). We weren't pressured to teach online, we were told to. I don't mind, but the survey doesn't quite

---

4 To retain the anonymity of the survey respondents, actual names are not used.
represent what occurs in my department. (Faculty Respondent 3, personal communication, October 5, 2016)

The first two of these suggest that additional incentives may need to be added to the original 25 in order to provide a more complete list to respondents. The third suggests that one of the incentives included in the survey, “pressure from my department head/supervisor,” might be revised to something like “Pressure or a requirement from my department head/supervisor” or that a separate incentive be added along the lines of “Required for my position.”

Concluding Remarks

While it is helpful to learn more about the incentives that attract and retain adjunct faculty to teach online, an important first step is the identification of the "right" individual for the task. This study did not explore the competencies and qualifications of "effective" online teaching faculty. That would be found in a separate body of research. However, by shedding light on the specific extrinsic and intrinsic motivators that attract and retain each of five career types of adjunct faculty to teach via Penn State World Campus, I hope that the results of this study can help Penn State program administrators be more effective in their hiring and retention efforts by suggesting effective ways to attract and retain specific types of this increasingly important workforce.

Given the similarity in the findings shared here with the findings of previous researchers, program administrators at other higher education institutions may also find this information to be useful to their efforts. Before generalizing to institutions beyond Penn State, however, I recommend one also review previous studies that are focused on a
context most similar to your own. Chapter 2 provided a summary of findings by institutional context that will hopefully aid such a review.
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Appendix A

Survey
Survey 1

Q1 Thank you for taking this brief survey! Your responses will help those who are responsible for hiring and retaining faculty to teach online via Penn State World Campus ensure that they are meeting faculty needs. It is estimated that this survey will take you less than 15 minutes to complete. You are encouraged to complete the survey in a single sitting.

Q2 How many times have you taught online, in total, for Penn State World Campus? (For example, if you taught one course different three times, you would say "3"; if you taught two different courses one time each, you would say "2," and so on.)
   ☑ 0 (0)
   ☑ 1 (1)
   ☑ 2 (2)
   ☑ 3 (3)
   ☑ 4 or more (4)
   If 0 Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey

Q3 In what year did you start teaching via Penn State World Campus? (Please use the format YYYY in your response)

Q4 There are many types of teaching faculty who teach via Penn State World Campus. Which of the following best describes you?
   ☑ Full-time member of the Penn State faculty (or retired from this position). (1)
   ☑ Graduate student who teaches online, either as part of a graduate assistantship or as supplemental income. (0)
   ☑ Individual who does not otherwise hold a full-time job in academia but who aspires to, earning a primary source of income by teaching part-time for one or more institutions. (This does not include current graduate students.) (2)
   ☑ Individual who does not otherwise hold a full-time job with any given organization and does not aspire to do so - this includes individuals meeting this description who are retired from academia. (3)
   ☑ Individual who holds a full-time job outside of academia or is retired from such a position. (4)
   ☑ Individual who teaches full-time at another academic institution. (5)

Q5 Besides Penn State, at how many other institutions do you currently teach, whether online or face-to-face?
   ☑ 0 (0)
   ☑ 1 (1)
   ☑ 2 (2)
   ☑ 3 (3)
   ☑ 4 or more (4)

Q6 How many courses are you teaching this term? (Include all institutions at which you teach.)
   ☑ 0 (0)
   ☑ 1 (1)
   ☑ 2 (2)
   ☑ 3 (3)
   ☑ 4 or more (4)
Q7 What types of courses do you teach online? (Check all that apply)
- Undergraduate credit courses (1)
- Graduate credit courses (2)
- Non-credit courses (3)

Q8 For which Penn State academic unit do you most frequently teach Penn State World Campus course offerings?
- College of Agricultural Sciences (1)
- College of Arts and Architecture (2)
- Smeal College of Business (3)
- College of Communications (4)
- College of Earth and Mineral Sciences (5)
- College of Education (6)
- College of Engineering (7)
- College of Health and Human Development (8)
- College of Information Sciences and Technology (9)
- College of the Liberal Arts (10)
- College of Nursing (11)
- Eberly College of Science (12)
- Abington College, at the Penn State Abington campus (13)
- Altoona College, at the Penn State Altoona campus (14)
- Behrend College, at the Penn State Erie campus (15)
- Berks College, at the Penn State Berks campus (16)
- Capital College, at the Penn State Harrisburg campus (17)
- University College, at the 14 other campuses not represented above (18)

Q9 I am interested in learning more about why you began to teach online via Penn State World Campus. Think back to when you were first considering teaching online for Penn State World Campus. Below is a
list of incentives that might attract one to teach online. For each incentive listed, please indicate whether that incentive attracted you to teach online via Penn State World Campus when you first began to do so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentive</th>
<th>Yes (1)</th>
<th>No (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To enhance my online teaching skills (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-satisfaction (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible schedule (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial rewards (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure from my department head/supervisor (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure from my peers (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to use new technologies (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to develop new competencies (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of empowerment (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enhance my professional career (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To better balance work and family (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a potential entry point for a teaching career (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To supplement my other career/job (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lack of permanent employment elsewhere (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To pass on experiential knowledge (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To work with adult learners (16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual stimulation (17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As an avenue for full-time employment at Penn State (18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the social connections with Penn State faculty (19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the professional connections with Penn State faculty (20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the social connections with Penn State students (21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the professional connections with Penn State students (22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the opportunity to give back to my community of practice (23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to give back to my alma mater, Penn State (24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be a member of the Penn State community (25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10 Would you like to continue teaching via Penn State World Campus in the future?
- Yes (1)
- Maybe (2)
- No (0)

Display This Question:
If Would you like to continue teaching via Penn State World Campus in the future? No Is Selected

Q11 For each item on the list below, please check all of the reasons you do not plan to continue teaching via Penn State World Campus.
- My contract has not been renewed (1)
- Workload was too demanding (2)
- Insufficient professional development opportunities (3)
- Insufficient teaching support (e.g., learning designer, teaching assistants) (4)
- Insufficient clerical/administrative support (5)
- Lack of personal control over the curriculum (6)
- Lack of recognition (7)
- Insufficient compensation (8)
- Poor academic program leadership (9)
- Lack of available time (10)
- Lack of intellectual stimulation (11)
- No avenue for full-time employment at Penn State (12)
- Lack of social connections with Penn State faculty (13)
- Lack of professional connections with Penn State faculty (14)
- Lack of social connections with Penn State students (15)
- Lack of professional connections with Penn State students (16)
- Disappointment regarding the quality of the teacher/student relationship in the online environment (18)
- Other (please specify) (20) ____________________

Display This Question:
If Would you like to continue teaching via Penn State World Campus in the future? Yes Is Selected
Or Would you like to continue teaching via Penn State World Campus in the future? Maybe Is Selected

Q12 I am interested in learning more about what influences your decision to continue to teach online via Penn State World Campus. Think about the reasons you want to continue to teach online for Penn State World Campus. Below is the same list of incentives presented previously. For each incentive listed,
please indicate whether that incentive positively influences you to continue to teach via Penn State World Campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentive</th>
<th>Yes (1)</th>
<th>No (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To enhance my online teaching skills (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-satisfaction (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible schedule (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial rewards (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure from my department head/supervisor (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure from my peers (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to use new technologies (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to develop new competencies (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of empowerment (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enhance my professional career (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To better balance work and family (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a potential entry point for a teaching career (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To supplement my other career/job (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lack of permanent employment elsewhere (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To pass on experiential knowledge (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To work with adult learners (16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual stimulation (17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As an avenue for full-time employment at Penn State (18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the social connections with Penn State faculty (19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the professional connections with Penn State faculty (20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the social connections with Penn State students (21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the professional connections with Penn State students (22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the opportunity to give back to my community of practice (23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to give back to my alma mater, Penn State (24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be a member of the Penn State community (25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q13 What is the highest degree you have earned?
☑ Bachelor’s (B.A., B.S., etc.) (1)
☑ Master's (M.A., M.S., M.Ed., etc.) (2)
☑ M.F.A. (3)
☑ M.B.A. (4)
☑ LL.B., J.D. (5)
☑ M.D., D.D.S., or equivalent (6)
☑ Other first professional degree beyond B.A. (D.D., D.V.M., etc.) (7)
☑ Ed.D. (8)
☑ Ph.D. (9)
☑ Other degree (please specify) (10) _______________

Q14 What, if any, degree are you currently working on?
☑ Bachelor's (B.A., B.S., etc.) (1)
☑ Master's (M.A., M.S., M.Ed., etc.) (2)
☑ M.F.A. (3)
☑ M.B.A. (4)
☑ LL.B., J.D. (5)
☑ M.D., D.D.S., or equivalent (6)
☑ Other first professional degree beyond B.A. (D.D., D.V.M., etc.) (7)
☑ Ed.D. (8)
☑ Ph.D. (9)
☑ Other degree (please specify) (10) _______________
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