1-1-2010

The experience of adjunct and full-time faculty participation in a public university teacher education department

Crystal Marie Aker
Walden University

Walden University

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

This is to certify that the dissertation by

Crystal Aker

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Cheryl Keen, Committee Chairperson, Education Faculty
Dr. Janice Garfield, Committee Member, Education Faculty
Dr. Edward Garten, Committee Member, Education Faculty
Dr. Glenn Ayres, University Reviewer, Education Faculty

Chief Academic Officer

David Clinefelter, Ph.D.

Walden University
2010

Abstract

The Experience of Adjunct and Full-Time Faculty Participation in a Public University Teacher Education Department

by

Crystal Marie Aker

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Education

Walden University

August 2010

Abstract

Higher education has recently experienced a shift from an input-based accountability system (curriculum and instruction) to one that is now output-based (assessment). Faculty members are the intermediaries who prepare curriculum and instruction to meet the requirements of teacher education departments and to demonstrate results through the achievement of students. The purpose of this study was to understand how adjunct and full-time faculty members experience participation in a public university teacher education department and if faculty members' experience of participation influences instruction. Theories of systems, teacher education, faculty work, and communities of practice formed the study's conceptual framework. Data for the interpretive phenomenological case study included 7 interviews of adjunct and full-time faculty as well as key artifacts and observations of 2 faculty meetings. The data were coded using first- and second-order constructs and analyzed to answer the research question. All full-time faculty members believed their participation in the department affected their instruction whereas the adjunct faculty members did not. Moreover, faculty members had distinct trajectories in a community of practice that may or may not be tied to their status as adjunct or full-time. Increased facilitation of these faculty trajectories by deans and chairs may result in better utilization of faculty professional skills and knowledge. This study's findings may increase knowledge by higher education leadership about their faculty's community of practice and thus create positive social change through the improvement of instruction by faculty and through it, student achievement.

The Experience of Adjunct and Full-Time Faculty Participation in a Public University Teacher Education Department

by

Crystal Marie Aker

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Education

Walden University

August 2010

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to all of my former and future students. I devote this study and all the work I will ever do, to you. You are my everlasting inspiration to improve education for all.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the following individuals, as this would not have been possible without them:

- My chair, Dr. Cheryl Keen, for all of her warmth, support, and encouragement. There are no words to describe her commitment to helping me get this finished, but I thank her with all of my heart.

- My committee members, Dr. Edward Garten and Dr. Janice Garfield, who are model educational scholars and who provided great support to me during this project. I am so honored to have worked with them.

- My university reviewer, Dr. Glenn Ayres, for his appreciated perspective and suggestions to improve this dissertation.

- My university of study's faculty members, support staff, chair, and dean, who are exemplars of teacher education. I hope this study gives back to them as much as it gave to me.

- My parents, Charles and Susan Aker, for their unwavering support of their favorite first daughter. Dad – for reminding me that my sense of scholarship runs in the family (it took only 6 years to complete this degree which was really just a way to procrastinate going to Austria and buying you that beer I owe you) and Mom – for constantly asking if I was finished with school yet (which is mostly true after earning this degree).

- My younger sister and brother, Amy Aker Burton and David Aker, for providing me with my first experience as a leader – who may now call me Dr. Aker for the rest of their lives (or else).

- My nieces and nephews — Halee, Calum, Jaina, and Jayden — who I can assure that school is finally over and I now can go outside and play.

- My love, Christopher Cornute, whom I adore with every part of my being and who gave me great support by commuting every weekend so I could sleep more, provided me with Doctor Who and other science fiction sustenance during the little bit of downtime I had, and gave me much needed care and affection.

- My friend and mentor, Margaret Frey, in the spirit of Hypatia and all the noblest female scholars throughout history, who I owe my deepest gratitude for a life formed and shaped by the greatest ideas and thoughts. I promise that I will take all of my learning and change the world (which I tried to do with this dissertation but thankfully, she would not let me).

- My friend, Denny Russell, who is a brilliant philosopher, writer, and religious scholar, who reminds me every so often that he is three IQ points higher than me.

- My friend, Jennifer Scott, who provided great support during my dissertation by checking up on me as well as hanging out with me in DC while I attended two of my residencies. Our travels throughout DC planted a seed for my future professional aspirations.

- My friend Eric Henderson, who would call me and seek my advice as to whether he should watch a movie, read a book, or go outside (because he could not decide what to do) while I was in the midst of intense writing and researching.

- My friends, Josh Keaton, Will Breeding, Tom Breeding, Greg Parks, Dustin Collins, and Larry Goldenberg, who kept me well nourished on intellectual conversation,

jokes of the variety which will not be mentioned in this professional publication, and vanilla bean blended crèmes at our Sunday coffee klatches.

- My friend, Jennifer Pumphrey, who went on long hikes with me so my muscles would not atrophy sitting at my desk all day.

- My friend Jason Wannemacher, who is my oldest-sibling-in-crime and who kept me elated with his great sense of humor (Betty's apple pies!).

- My friends, Ricky and Susie Riggs, for keeping me nourished by taking me to dinner throughout my studies as well as providing me with much needed laughter.

- My friends, Jason Lefebvre, Kelly Bolton, Amy Van Dyke, Jodi Brun, Christopher Bailey, Michael Malinovsky, Greg Meyer, Aubry Jones, Jacob Jones, Adam Cicora, Sarah Cicora, Phillip Berwanger, and Charlotte Berwanger, who are one of my endless sources of comic relief and adventures around the world.

- My friends, Cory Ryan, Kirk Foltz, Catherine Gardner, Andy Pak, Alisa Courtney, David Courtney, Beth Scott, and the lovely Anna, who are my pillars of fun and awesomeness.

- My colleagues, Elena Ackerson, Judy Lewis, Sharon Reaven, Kathy Rickord, Mitzi Roeker, Cristina Sanchez, Paul Schneider, Dona Starrett, and Jeff Thompson, for checking in on my progress and keeping me motivated.

- My colleagues Nena Dorsey, Lydia Pizner, and Georgette Rasor, for providing empathy and support as my doctorate degree cohort.

- My other wonderful friends and family, including Linda Inzer, Rose Rahn, John Rahn, and Joslin Kies, who are now relieved of editing and proofreading my dissertation…until my next doctorate degree.

- To all of my former teachers, both formal and informal, this document represents the gifts of knowledge you have provided me and for which I am eternally grateful.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Introduction

Systems, including those of education, thrive based upon the extent to which they meet the expectations of society or other environments (Banathy, 1973). A system that coexists with the environment is called adaptive and self-regulating. A system can modify its transformations based upon the needs of the environment and thus ensure that the output created is the output expected. A system that is constantly communicating with its environment has the greatest chance of continued existence in society.

Systematic change, with an emphasis on input and output, has played a critical role in recent higher education history, particularly as it relates to educational funding. Legislation, such as the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 and the Higher Education Act of 1965, were input-intensive (Anderson, 2007; Zumeta, 2005). These legislative acts provided funding resources to universities and school districts with few or no stipulations about the expectations of their educational outputs. Education systems were more self-regulating during this time.

As the years passed, output data from reports such as *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) and *Measuring Up* (National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, 2006) illuminated learning inconsistencies and deficiencies in these educational systems. With these reports, accountability for the outputs of educational systems became increasingly evident in more recent reauthorizations of both the Higher Education Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Anderson, 2007; Zumeta, 2005). As representatives for the public,

legislators wanted to ensure that monies spent were resulting in student achievement and therefore called on federal and state departments of education to define how that would be measured in institutions of higher education.

This shift in expectations and the increased influence of members of society on higher education as a system have changed the way that colleges and universities operate. Faculty members have always acted as components of university education systems that perform the function of formal and informal teaching, as well as research and development, ultimately enhancing student learning. Acting as a medium between departments and students, faculty members are agents who seek to ensure that learning occurs. So how does the work of faculty members support this new level of accountability of higher education institutions? In order to answer this question, the experience of faculty members in a university must first be understood. This study addressed the experience of faculty in this output-sensitive higher education system and, more specifically, sought to understand how various types of faculty members experience their work in a teacher education department.

Problem Statement

In order to be accredited by organizations such as the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), colleges and universities with teacher education departments must demonstrate the level of their students' academic achievement through numerous assessment measures. This performance-based approach to accreditation was adopted by NCATE in 2001 in response to the standards and accountability movement of the latter part of the 20th century (NCATE, 2007). Successful

teacher education, as defined by NCATE, had previously been measured on what the university provided in terms of curriculum and instruction rather than assessment of student learning outcomes. Despite this shift to assessment, curriculum and instruction are still important aspects of the educational process. The problem is that the curricular and instructional antecedents that lead to the academic results must be understood in order to achieve results that can be replicated.

Doug Reeves (2002) described four types of relationships of organizational results as compared to their antecedents: lucky, losing, learning, and leading. One type of relationship is that of the lucky organization, which attains success but is not aware of how it did so; this means replication is highly unlikely. Another type is that of the losing organization, which achieves poor results but does not understand how it did so. A learning organization is one that achieves poor results but knows how it happened. In order to be a leading organization, teacher education departments must not only attain high achievement results but also be able to describe the approach it took to attain these results so replication in the future is possible.

Teacher education has struggled at times to coexist with other professional disciplines (Labaree, 2004). Teacher education subsists in an academic environment that rewards professions such as the sciences. The environment rewards researchers or instructors that are theoretical and produce pure research rather than those that are practical and produce applied research (under which teacher education falls). Labaree described the rewarding, yet self-defeating, task of teacher educators:

> The aim is to enable students to get on with life under their own power and to free themselves from dependency on schools and teachers. By doing things this way, teachers demystify their own expertise and thus willingly abandon the source of power over the client that other professions guard so jealously. (p. 59)

Boyer's (1990) four types of scholarship (discovery/research, application/service, integration, and teaching) provide an anchor for understanding the type and extent of work engaged in by faculty members. Any of the four types of scholarship, singularly or in combination, comprise the experience of faculty members, but teaching is the focus of this study due to the outcomes-based nature of higher education accountability.

This study addressed how adjunct and full-time faculty members—both central to the teaching and learning carried out in a university department's undergraduate courses—perceive participation in a teacher education department's academic practices, including instruction. Elements such as the formation of an identity or the construction of meaning of the participants' work were examined. While faculty members are pivotal in higher education's attempt to improve outcomes, full-time and adjunct faculty are situated differently in this community of practice due to their work responsibilities and have different perceptions of the teaching and learning process.

NCATE, as well as other teacher education and regional accrediting agencies and state departments of education, further compound pressures on faculty. Faculty members are limited in their freedom to make curricular and instructional decisions due to the intense focus on output. In this study, these pressures affected how faculty members

participated in the teacher education department, and their participation had an impact on their instruction.

A review of the empirical and theoretical literature reveals that aspects of adjunct and full-time faculty experience have been compared and studied, but not in conjunction with the idea of communities of practice. Research on communities of practice has addressed faculty members on different tracks within a department (Jawitz, 2007), beginning lecturers in a professional development program (Warhurst, 2006), and learning in a marginalized community of practice (Merriam, Courtenay, & Baumgartner, 2003). Research on the differences between part- and full-time faculty members' course outcomes suggested that collaboration is necessary to align grading practices (Barriga, Cooper, Gawelek, Butela, & Johnson, 2008). Faculty members' level of trust in fellow faculty members has been shown to diminish with the increase in rank (Smith & Shoho, 2007).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to understand how adjunct and full-time faculty members perceive their participation in a public university teacher education department. This study addressed a gap in the research on student achievement in higher education by examining the faculty work context. The goal was to understand the similarities and differences between the two types of faculty as well as the nature of a community of practice in a teacher education department, independent of each type of faculty.

Nature of the Study

This study required a qualitative methodology to answer the research questions. A phenomenological case study design was employed for this study due to the need to understand how faculty members experience a phenomenon in their professional practice. Furthermore, the study followed the interpretive, or hermeneutic, tradition of the phenomenology of Martin Heidegger (1962), Hans-Georg Gadamer (1975), and Paul Ricoeur (1976). Because the participants of the study were within one university and data from more than one source were gathered, the case study design was utilized.

Data were gathered via interviews, artifacts, and an observation of a faculty meeting to answer the research questions. Seven full-time and adjunct faculty members who taught undergraduate and graduate education courses in the previous year were interviewed. These faculty members teach at a large, research-intensive university that serves over 1,200 undergraduate students in its teacher education program.

The interview data were analyzed and then member-checked to confirm the interpretation of the data. The analysis consisted of determining first- and second-order constructs of the interview, artifact, and observation data and determining emerging concepts. I kept a reflective journal to document preunderstandings, note participant body language, and record impressions of interview data. Artifacts that the participants wished to share in order to demonstrate their experience in the department were also analyzed. A program meeting and a departmental meeting among faculty members were observed.

Research Questions

The research question that this study sought to answer was as follows: How do adjunct and full-time faculty members experience participation in a public university teacher education department? The subquestions of this research question were as follows:

1. What aspects of a community of practice, as perceived by the faculty members of a teacher education department and evidenced in artifacts and observations, are experienced by adjunct and full-time faculty members?
2. What influences the participation of faculty members in a community of practice?
3. Do adjunct and full-time faculty members perceive that their participation within the department affects their instruction? If so, to what extent and in what way does their participation affect their instruction?

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework of this study comprises an intersection of two areas: systems theory used to understand university faculty and teaching and communities of practice.

Systems Theory

Because functions, components, and actors of a university education system are the foci of this study, a discussion about systems theory is in order. Operating within a larger systematic environment, the teacher education department comprises actors, such as faculty members, chairs, and deans, who perform functions such as teaching and

leading. A system is created with a series of inputs that need to be transformed into outputs that suit the needs of the environment that hosts the system (Banathy, 1973). For this study, what is of interest is the role of faculty participation (function) in curricular and instructional decisions (input) that produce student learning (output) in response to feedback from the teacher education department (environment).

The role of feedback for the survival of any system is critical. According to Kuhn (1975), once an output is generated by a system, feedback about the output is created by the environment. Feedback can either be positive or negative. Positive feedback is found in a system that exhibits disequilibrium because the environment wants the system to increasingly transform desired inputs into outputs. Learning is one example of a positive feedback loop because learning begets more learning. Similarly, collaboration among faculty members can lead to more collaboration in the future. A system with equilibrium is composed of negative feedback which occurs when a change to an input results in a converse change to the output. For example, eating to satiate hunger is an example of a negative feedback loop.

Faculty participation in the teacher education department system, when increased, decreased, or revised, will result in both equilibrium and disequilibrium in some aspects of educational practice, for example, curricular design or assessment scoring calibration among faculty members. When a system achieves an optimal level of functioning, it becomes a self-actualizing system that demonstrates "doing for the sake of doing…learning for the sake of learning…talking for the sake of talking" (Kuhn, 1975, p. 67). If the transformation of inputs to outputs satisfies the environment, then the system

will be motivated to symbolize inner processes outwardly. For example, in a teacher education department, expertise about teaching methodologies may lead to the formation of a course for undergraduate students.

Another aspect of systems theory is the concept of a learning organization (Senge, 1990). Participation is a form of professional development. One of the five disciplines offered by Senge is the concept of team learning, where a group has more resources than the individual. Within this discipline, learning can either be adaptive or generative. Adaptive learning occurs when the survival of resources, ideas, or people is at stake and generative learning occurs when individuals become creative for the sake of improving their work. Adaptive and generative learning are critical to the expansion and effectiveness of faculty participation.

Communities of Practice

Within a community, members participate in a common venture. Lave and Wenger (1991) labeled this circumstance a *community of practice*. A community of practice comprises various degrees of expertise of its members, who can be newcomers, journey folk, or masters. *Legitimate peripheral participation* is another term coined by Lave and Wenger, where "learners inevitably participate in communities of practitioners and…the mastery of knowledge and skill requires newcomers to move toward full participation in the sociocultural practices of a community" (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 29). The key to the concept of communities of practice is that all members can become masters within an accomplished community if they are provided the opportunity to move from a peripheral level in the community to one that is more central.

In order to form an identity and construct meaning within the community of practice, members experience elements of participation and reification (Wenger, 1998). By participating within a community, individuals build an identity. Reification is the process of members making the abstract concepts or processes of the community of practice into concrete artifacts.

Beyond participation and reification, Wenger (1998) described how communities of practice engage in three actions: mutual engagement, joint enterprise, and shared repertoire. Mutual engagement is purposeful participation with other members to improve a practice. Members who are mutually engaged do so around a joint enterprise or goal of the practice. Shared repertoire consists of tools and processes that are used by a mutually engaged community of practice working on a joint enterprise. These actions, along with the processes of participation and reification and the movement from the periphery to center of a community of practice, were examined through interviews with faculty members, their artifacts, and observations.

Definition of Terms

The following terms and definitions will assist readers as they navigate this study:

Accreditation: for the purposes of this study, the process mandated by state departments of education to ensure the quality of education offered at its higher education institutions.

Adjunct faculty: those faculty members of a university who are engaged primarily only in the teaching mission of a college or department. These members can teach either part-time or the equivalent of full-time for a short or long-term appointment.

Community of practice: "Participation in an activity system about which participants share understandings concerning what they are doing and what that means in their lives and for their communities" (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 98).

Explicit knowledge: knowledge that can be transmitted in words and numbers (Nonaka, 1994).

Full-time faculty: those faculty members of a university who are engaged in teaching and teaching-related activities as well as other forms of faculty scholarship of a college or department. These members can teach either part-time or the equivalent of full-time for a short- or long-term appointment. They also may secure other employment compensation such as increased pay, sabbaticals, tenure, and benefits.

Hermeneutics: interpretation theory. For this study, a modern form of hermeneutics was adopted that uses spoken text as a source for interpretation of experience. (Lopez & Willis, 2004; Sundin, Jansson, & Norberg, 2002)

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE): a professional accrediting organization for schools, colleges, and departments of education in the United States. NCATE is engaged by the university of this study to accredit its teacher education programs. NCATE certifies that the university's undergraduate program is meeting professional standards.

Tacit knowledge: knowledge that hard to articulate (Polanyi, 1969).

Teacher education: the teacher preparation program offered by higher education institutions.

Assumption

The following assumption of the study must be acknowledged:

1. The participants spoke candidly about their professional experiences within the teacher education department.

Limitations

Limitations of the study include the following:

1. Data were gathered from a small sample from one university so application to other universities or cases is limited.

2. I have been an adjunct instructor at the university that is the site of the study, albeit of graduate courses of a different department, while the faculty members interviewed teach undergraduate and graduate courses. I have also been a student of both graduate and undergraduate courses at the university. All efforts, including the creation of semistructured interview questions to be asked of all participants and a reflective journal, were made to eliminate bias and remain objective from design to analysis.

3. The working atmosphere for adjunct and full-time faculty may be unique due to issues such as university and state budget cuts and departmental politics..

Delimitations

Data collection for this study was from a purposeful sampling of seven adjunct and full-time faculty members (until saturation of data was achieved) from one large public research university (research intensive) over a period of 2 months. The university contains a teacher education department that teaches 1,200 undergraduate students. A delimitation of the study involved the inclusion of only a portion of the faculty members

of the single university department. Teacher education was the sole discipline studied. The decision to focus on only one discipline of student courses was one of simplification.

Significance of the Study

By uncovering how participation in a public university teacher education department may contribute to departmental functions, the findings of the study might suggest a rationale for altering the roles of some faculty members to promote educational goals. For instance, scheduling departmental meetings so that all faculty members can attend may be one way roles may change. Furthermore, this inquiry could increase the curiosity of program coordinators, chairs, and deans of education colleges and departments, as well as other professional colleges and departments, about their own communities of practice. Department leaders might modify the nature of faculty interaction and participation in departmental decisions and program implementation to positively affect student learning—an aim of higher education accountability.

Regarding social change, this study can add to the growing body of research about experiences within a community of practice. Implications include the improvement of higher educational leadership and possibly of instruction for students. Knowledge about communities of practice can increase awareness of purpose and growth within an organization.

Summary

How adjunct and full-time faculty members perceive participation in a community of practice was the focus of this study. By considering this question from a perspective that integrates a conceptual framework of systems theory and communities of practice,

this study illuminates this type of faculty experience, which may have an impact on faculty members' teaching efforts. Using interviews, artifacts, and observations, the perception of full-time and adjunct faculty experience in a teacher education department emerged.

Chapter 2 will expand upon the conceptual framework and link it to an analysis of recent research that will inform the study's purpose and methodology. Chapter 3 will describe the study's methodological components. Chapter 4 will exhibit the findings of the study. An interpretation of these findings as well as the implications for social change and further research will be explored in chapter 5.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

In order to address the study's research question, How do adjunct and full-time faculty members perceive their participation in a university teacher education department?, as well as the research subquestions, a literature review was conducted. The review provides a context for the study by reviewing the discipline of teacher education, higher education faculty practices and categories, as well as communities of practice. Tacit knowledge and hermeneutic phenomenology were also explored to provide a philosophical background for the study's primary methodology.

Several sets of search terms and research databases were used to find the most comprehensive sources of theoretical texts and recent research. Terms used to search the literature included community of practice, communities of practice, situated cognition theory, legitimate peripheral participation, part-time faculty, adjunct faculty, contingent faculty, full-time faculty, nontenure track, tenure track, university faculty, tacit knowledge, explicit knowledge, scholarship of teaching, teacher education, hermeneutic, hermeneutical, phenomenology, phenomenological, hermeneutic phenomenology, and systems theory. EBSCO – Higher Education, Academic Search Complete, Education Research Complete, and ERIC were the primary databases.

Teacher Education

Teacher education is the content area expertise of the participants of the study as well as the aim of the university department to be studied. The history of teacher education, up to its modern day difficulties, is outlined in the following sections.

Teacher Education History

Teacher education schools formed because of the pressure to employ teachers and, to this day, these schools still grapple with this necessity. Normal schools, which formed in the late 1800s as the first schools for teacher educators, had to produce a group of teachers who were trained with cost-effective and efficient techniques (Labaree, 2004) due to the shortages caused by a pattern of female teachers who taught an average of only 6 years then resigned their positions to marry. Not all teacher candidates had to attend normal schools to become certified to teach; some states awarded untrained teacher candidates certificates in order to address shortages. These circumstances led to setbacks in teacher education, such as short tenures and less prestige as a discipline.

When normal schools became embedded in universities, teacher education faced even more setbacks (Labaree, 2004). The urgent need to award degrees to fill teaching positions led to more dilution of universities' education major requirements. Any normal schools that remained private and unaffiliated with a university or college mostly trained elementary school teachers, whereas those affiliated with universities or colleges certified secondary school teachers and administrators, creating a fissure between these levels and sources of teacher education. This lack of unity prolonged the time teacher education could form as a coherent discipline.

Modern Teacher Education

Darling-Hammond (2006) summed up how the need to address teacher shortages is still a challenge today:

> In every occupation that has become a profession during the 20th century, the strengthening of preparation was tied to a resolve to end the practice of allowing untrained individuals to practice. Teaching is currently where medicine was in 1910, when doctors could be trained in programs ranging from 3 weeks of training featuring memorized lists of symptoms and cures to Johns Hopkins University graduate school's preparing doctors in the sciences of medicine and in clinical practice in the newly invented teaching hospital. (p. 312)

High poverty neighborhoods and the neediest students are most often assigned teachers who are streamlined into positions that need to be filled (Darling-Hammond, 2006). These same teachers take accelerated coursework as well as evening classes (which are not integrated with schools due to the time of the day of the courses) and most often are taught by adjunct faculty members.

Darling-Hammond (2006) echoed concerns raised by department chairs and full-time faculty members about adjuncts who are separated from the "faculty-wide conversation" (p. 310) about teacher preparation. This concern supports the need to discover how adjunct and full-time faculty members perceive participation in a university department in order to understand how this conversation is (or is not) taking place.

Perceptions about Teacher Educators

From these historical beginnings, college-level teacher education programs have been perceived as lower in status than programs in other social sciences and law. Labaree (2004) listed factors as part of this perception: teacher education involves the transmission of practical knowledge versus theoretical knowledge, unlike other sciences;

most teachers are women and working class individuals with few promotional opportunities; and the served population is mostly children. Other reasons listed by Labaree for this perception of teacher education's lower status include the fact that everyone has had teachers (unlike having lawyers or doctors in some cases), funding is decided publicly through voting, and teachers are publicly employed. All of these factors have contributed to the perception in the academic community that teacher education is less scholarly or rigorous than education in other disciplines. This perception provides a context that participants may mention during the interviews.

Nature of Teacher Education

Teacher educators are charged with assisting candidates in successfully helping children learn. Aside from the outcomes-based assessment practices valued by NCATE (2007), teacher educators have to instill in their students principles and practices that are still not agreed upon by teacher educators (Labaree, 2004). Over the years, very few educational principles and practices have been found that work for all students all the time. Multiple goals need to be taught and aligned, and the clients are not only students, but also parents and society as a whole. According to Labaree,

> We ask teacher education programs to provide ordinary college students with the imponderable so they can teach the irrepressible in a manner that pleases the irreconcilable, and all without knowing clearly either the purposes or the consequences of their actions. (p. 56)

It may be possible that adjunct and full-time faculty members, if they increase their time collaborating, can bring a varied but unified perspective to the process of deciding what

knowledge and skills teacher education students need to demonstrate in order to meet specified outcomes.

Lack of content expertise in teacher candidates—that is the charge of other content areas in a university—is also typically blamed on teacher educators. When a teacher candidate takes a mathematics methods course, for instance, the course may be infused with the learning of pedagogical strategies and content standards but may not teach every math principle the teacher candidate needs to know. Collaboration between mathematics teacher educators and mathematics educators could eliminate this gap in content expertise.

Teacher candidates (like students of other disciplines) on average have experienced through their own education over 13,000 hours of observing teachers at work, benefiting from the processes and products of that work rather than understanding the decisions that had to be made to create those products (Labaree, 2004). Through a systems theory lens, students may enter the educational system and exit as learned individuals, but they have little professional evidence of how they transformed from one to the other (Banathy, 1973). Because all teacher candidates receive an elementary and secondary education, there is a perception that these educational levels are ordinary and easy. Teacher educators have to deepen this perceived experience and tacit knowledge of teacher candidates so that they can be prepared for what teaching entails. Furthermore, the perception of the work being ordinary and easy belittles the profession itself, thus posing a problem for the building of the teacher education community of practice.

Higher Education Faculty Practices and Categories

Higher education faculty members have various missions to fulfill in a university community of practice. The work of adjuncts and full-time faculty members is centered on four practices or forms of scholarship, as described by Boyer (1990): discovery/research, application/service, integration, and teaching.

Throughout the history of American higher education, the work of university professors has focused on different missions (Boyer, 1990). The colonial college focused on the teaching of the students. Colleges and universities of the 1800s explored service and practical applications of higher education. Research has been the primary focus of many universities since the late 1800s and remains the focus to this day. Furthermore, the student body has changed and grown over the years. With the publication of a report by President Truman's Commission on Higher Education in 1947, college changed from an "elite to mass system" (Boyer, 1990, p. 11) of education, where more students could afford to attend school. Oddly, "at the very time America's higher education institutions were becoming more open and inclusive, the culture of the professorate was becoming more hierarchical and restrictive" (Boyer, 1990, p. 12) with the development of the research-focused university. Boyer proposed that the modern professor and higher education institution reconsider this limited focus and integrate and reward not only research but also three other kinds of scholarship: teaching, integration, and application.

Teaching and Teaching-Related Activities

The transmission of knowledge and skills to others embodies the scholarship of teaching (and learning). A teaching load of 10 to 12 hours a week may seem light,

according to Boyer (1990), but the preparation and work to sustain those hours extends the time dedicated to teaching. When it comes to evaluation of university and college professors, more than 60% of professors believe teaching should be the primary mission on which they are evaluated (1990, p. 29). Learning is not limited to the students in a faculty member's classroom alone, but the faculty member learns as well. Teaching-related activities such as curricular planning and assessment design also fall under this practice.

Discovery/Research

The scholarship of discovery, or research, by professors is meant to expand the intellectual capital of the university as well as the communities that benefit from the research (Boyer, 1990). Professors also contribute to and gain from this endeavor. In regards to tenure review, journal articles are an easily quantifiable way to justify employment of faculty members by university leaders.

Integration

The mission of interdisciplinary work characterizes the scholarship of integration (Boyer, 1990). Integration picks up where discovery stops; the research findings of a discovery form of scholarship are then interpreted and expanded through integration. Collaborating and educating across the disciplines is the aim of this type of scholarship. As Lucas (2000) explained, working in isolation is outdated due to the current move by universities and colleges to outcomes-based assessment. As universities find more innovative ways to help students learn, interdisciplinary scholarship will help students make vital connections in their learning that aids the current outcomes-based higher

education accountability environment. For instance, faculty members from education and mathematics departments who collaborate on the design of a mathematics education course can ensure both content and pedagogy are learned by students.

Application/Service

This type of scholarship is the service that faculty members provide to both the higher education institution and the larger community (Boyer, 1990). This type of service is "not just a one-way street" (Boyer, 1990, p. 23) where the faculty member affects the community only. Theory and practice can be equally shaped by the experience of service.

The scholarship of application, and to some extent the scholarship of teaching, discovery, and integration, directly relates to service learning. Zlotkowski (1998) explained that service learning is an intersection among the common good, expertise, the sponsoring agency of the service, and student needs. This type of scholarship work conducted by faculty members directly impacts values development, pedagogical strategies, academic culture, and community partners.

Faculty Categories

The roles of both full-time and adjunct faculty have been changing since the Great Depression (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). The promise of tenure has diminished with rising college costs that have resulted in the hiring of more adjunct faculty to take on more teaching duties. Adjuncts are less costly to the university in terms of less financial obligation, faculty development involvement, collective bargaining, recruitment and retention, and evaluation, not to mention office space and clerical support. They have the

ability to carry heavier teaching loads, which allows full-time faculty engaged in other missions to thrive.

Duration of work and involvement in a department define the status of adjunct faculty, who comprise full-time and part-time members (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Full-time adjuncts usually work on average one term to one year for a college or university (p.152). Some colleges involve adjuncts in bargaining units, but this involvement usually was restricted to full-time adjuncts (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Anderson, 2002). Most part-time adjuncts, according to Jaschik (2009), do not participate in committees, so governance issues rarely have an adjunct voice, though some schools are negotiating union contracts with adjunct faculty that allow them to participate in these committees.

Perceptions of adjuncts by full-time faculty and department chairs are mixed (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Full-time faculty members empathize with adjuncts that are segregated from the departmental mission. Some department chairs appreciate the newer practices and pedagogy demonstrated by adjunct faculty, but some believe adjuncts are too disconnected from the theoretical base that many full-time faculty members consider essential. Gappa and Leslie further reported that adjunct faculty members themselves feel alienated due to lack of governance participation or understanding the necessary skills and knowledge to retain their position.

Landrum and Lisenbe (2008) surveyed alumni students to determine the quality level of classes designed by full-time and adjunct faculty members. Students felt that full-time faculty members offered higher quality courses, but the adjunct courses did not lessen the perception of the quality of the university department's course offerings.

In another study, Sonner (2000) expanded upon this idea, finding that most full-time faculty were discovered to have higher education levels than adjunct faculty members. In Sonner's study, adjuncts gave higher grades, possibly because of the need to secure future employment. In a study conducted by Lei (2008), full-time faculty exhibited a variety of assessment techniques in their courses, whereas adjunct faculty emphasized exams, which are cognitively less demanding and easier to score. Lei did not make any explicit connections between the data gathered but noted that adjunct faculty members teach more undergraduate courses where enrollment is high, thus making scoring of more cognitively demanding tests difficult. Lei also noted that adjuncts do not list a faculty teaching and learning center as one of the places they learned their assessment techniques, whereas full-time faculty did cite the center. Grade distribution in a community college was more varied between faculty members with an increase in their educational degrees (Fike & Fike, 2007), as well as between colleges within a university (Barriga, Cooper, Gawelek, Butela, & Johnson, 2008).

Satisfaction is higher among voluntary adjunct and full-time faculty members than among involuntary adjuncts, which are those adjuncts that would prefer to be full-time faculty members (Maynard & Joseph, 2008). Using a questionnaire of organizational commitment, both types of adjunct faculty reported slightly more affective commitment to their universities than did members of the full-time faculty (Maynard & Joseph, 2008). The authors of this study had hypothesized that voluntary adjunct and full-time faculty members would have a higher affective commitment to the university, but the results showed otherwise.

Communities of Practice

The primary research question of the study sought to discover how adjunct and full-time faculty members experience participation in a teacher education department. What encompasses a community of practice (of which a teacher education department may have one or several) and what processes constitute a community of practice? A community of practice is "a set of relations among person, activity, and world, over time and in relations with other tangential and overlapping communities of practice" (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 98). Wenger (1998) discussed four essential components that serve as learning functions for its members: community, identity, practice, and meaning. These components are prevalent in groups such as families, playgrounds, and work settings, including teacher education departments. Warhurst (2006) found that new lecturers experienced some aspect of each of these components as they collaborated with other new lecturers in a college education course. The dialogue among the lecturers in the course helped them construct meaning about their work through topics such as instructional strategies and curriculum and helped them to construct identities as researchers and lecturers.

Community

In order to belong to a community, an individual or newcomer must gain some level of access to its masters, resources, and opportunities. Lave and Wenger (1991) studied apprentices and how they became experts in different trades by moving from the periphery of a community of practice to the center. An individual experiences legitimate peripheral participation when (a) the learning he or she is acquiring is related to the

community's practice, (b) the learning is empowering due to the individual's ability to move to the center, and (c) participation is full. In some low-functioning communities of practice, learning is not related to the community's practice, membership can be disempowering (one cannot move to the center), and/or full participation is not possible.

The premise supporting these ideas is that the "world is socially constituted; objective forms and systems of activity, on the one hand, and agents' subjective and intersubjective understandings of them, on the other, mutually constitute both the world and its experienced forms" (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 51). Learning is situated in these communities of practice, and belonging in the community affects this learning. According to the authors, the traditional view of learning as a passive activity by the student has been supplanted by an active strategy in which the student co-constructs his or her world. As an example of the difficulty between moving from a passive to active learning construct, Bathmaker and Avis (2005) studied how new full-time faculty members experienced marginalization rather than legitimate peripheral participation in a community college setting. Citing political and management causes, the researchers found that novices and experts alike experienced problems in actively co-constructing their community of practice.

Identity

An individual's identity within a community of practice evolves and influences the evolution of the community of practice's identity. Learning is more than just acquiring skills but is also developing an "increasing sense of identity as a master practitioner" (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 111). Identity formation, according to Wenger

(1998) is reconciled every time one moves to a new community of practice and is defined by the communities of practice in which one does and does not participate.

Identity is formed by the memberships in various communities of practice one belongs to as well as the paths or trajectories of the individual within each membership (Wenger, 1998). Institutions such as a university are considered "constellations" (Wenger, 1998, p. 127) that house several communities of practice. Individuals can also participate in several communities of practice, each with a different trajectory. The types of participation include insider (full participation), outsider (full non-participation), peripherality (voluntary non-participation), and marginality (involuntary non-participation) (p. 167). Interestingly, when a community of practice needs to reflect upon its practice, Wenger suggested that marginalized participants should be listened to first because of their outside perspective and experience with conflict in the community of practice. Trajectories sought by members can be peripheral (seeking full membership is not the goal), inbound (seek full membership), insider (possessing full membership and constantly learning and improving the community of practice), boundary (connects communities of practice to each other), and outward (leaving full membership) (pp. 154-155).

Recent studies have illustrated change in identity (or the lack thereof) through participation and trajectories. Due to the perception that Wiccans were understood to possess regarding their marginalization amongst other mainstream spiritual communities of practice, researchers studied how membership is kept secret and how movement from non-full to full status is rigorous and formalized (Merriam, Courtenay, & Baumgartner,

2003). Anderson (2007) revealed how adjunct faculty continue to learn in a community of practice despite the lack of faculty development resources to which they have access, and find that the learning is consequently limited due to their marginalization. Combining semistructured focus groups and individual interviews, the researcher further discovered that adjuncts experience initial and continuing academic struggles, such as the lack of induction into higher education teaching, little to no communication with full-time faculty members about course teaching and learning outcomes, and lack of participation in department meetings. Kahveci, Southerland, and Gilmer (2008) studied how certain programs aided women in moving from marginalized participation in the community of practice of science and mathematics to insider participation. The research of Poyas and Smith (2007) described how former elementary and secondary teachers who moved into roles as teacher educators struggled to find new professional identities. Although they were hired for their expertise in the classroom, they did not have experience or resources at the collegiate level with which to forge this new identity.

Practice

An individual cannot simply belong to or form an identity within a community of practice; they must learn by constructing the community's practice. There are three types of practice in which a member becomes involved: mutual engagement, joint enterprise, and shared repertoire. It is the participation in these endeavors, in varying degrees, that defines the work of a community of practice.

Mutual engagement is the practice of engaging with others in both agreements and disagreements about how the work of the community progresses. As Wenger (1998)

explained, “It draws on what we do and what we know, as well as on our ability to connect meaningfully to what we don't do and what we don't know—that is, to the contributions and knowledge of others” (Wenger, 1998, p. 75). Communities of practice with healthy mutual engagement are complex, multifaceted, and constantly evolving.

The focus that is negotiated by all the members of the community of practice embodies a joint enterprise (Wenger, 1998). This focus can be heavily shaped by an outside entity, but the processes in which the community will respond to external influences also constitute the joint enterprise. Accountability to the enterprise is another aspect in which the members hold each other responsible for the negotiated focus and make changes accordingly.

A shared repertoire involves “routines, words, tools, ways of doing things, stories, gestures, symbols, genres, actions, or concepts that the community has produced or adopted in the course of its existence, and which have become part of its practice” (Wenger, 1998, p. 82). This repertoire reflects the community’s history as well as its capabilities for future practice and development. Jawitz (2007) discussed how the lack of a shared repertoire diminished the chances of new faculty members to move into the research community of practice in a university. The idea of a community of practice’s joint enterprise is explored in Price’s (2005) study. The development of common assessment standards in a higher education department was examined through the lens of community of practice work, and the researcher found that the success of the enterprise was diminished due to the lack of consistent membership practices.

Briggs (2007) showed how the work of curriculum development in a university setting is better suited to a community of practice framework (including the development of a shared repertoire) than to a traditional model of teamwork. Briggs claims that the formal structure of a team, with its various forms of hierarchy and structure, weakens the collaborative work that can be accomplished organically. Warhurst (2006) researched what happened when new professors participated in a faculty development program while involved in an intense teaching experience. Faculty members who had the chance to participate in this program as well as discuss and reify their practice benefited from their participation in the program. Interestingly, these faculty members reported they learned more from each other than from instructors of the program. This illustrates how an informal community of practice can be highly productive, emphasizing Briggs' (2007) notion about the power of communities of practice over that of formal teams.

Meaning

In order to learn through experience, individuals in a community of practice must develop a duality of meaning (Wenger, 1998). This duality of meaning consists of participation and reification in a community of practice. Participation can be an individual or collaborative venture as an individual practices within a community. Reification is the process of making the abstract recognizable by way of products and processes. "Making, designing, representing, naming, encoding, and describing as well as perceiving, interpreting, using, reusing, decoding, and recasting" (Wenger, 1998, p. 59) are examples of reifying processes of the community.

As extensions of identity and practice, participation and reification must stay balanced in order to construct meaning (Wenger, 1998). For example, dispatching an employee with diplomatic skills to secure a contract with a company illustrates how participation can balance reification. Too much participation and not enough reified artifacts or documents can lead to misunderstanding about a task, and too much reification and not enough participation can lead to increased alienation and suspicion among its members.

Continuity and discontinuity of participation and reification are important dynamics of a community of practice (Wenger, 1998). Members leaving or retiring from a community, for example, results in discontinuity in participation. When a new process is reified, this disrupts the continuity of the community. Maintenance of the same individuals and processes results in continuity, which can be both positive and negative for a community of practice, depending on the needs of the environment.

Laksov, Mann, and Dahlgren (2008) illustrated how the process of making scholarly discussions an agenda item for departmental meetings led to increased participation and further reification of academic discussions. This case study used data such as interviews and course evaluations to show how faculty members constructed meanings through these discussions. As in the work of Briggs (2007) and Warhurst (2006), the increase in faculty meaning seemed to result from the organizer of the departmental meetings stepping back and letting the faculty members guide the discussion themselves.

The work of Fuller, Hodkinson, Hodkinson, and Unwin (2005) justified as well as challenged the notions of communities of practice put forth by Lave and Wenger. Using case studies, the authors demonstrate how Lave and Wenger's ideas such as social learning, peripheral trajectories to the center, and induction into a community of practice are observable. However, the authors present results that challenge Lave and Wenger's (1991) dismissal of the role of teaching in a community of practice, traditional learning by members, and the resources brought to a community of practice by newcomers. The authors of the study contend that Lave and Wenger devalue the possibility that there are experts who have the capacity to teach others in the workplace. Traditional learning can be useful if the community of practice embraces it, explain the authors, whereas Lave and Wenger wished to open up the definition of traditional learning to become more active than passive. In addition, the authors disputed Lave and Wenger's notion that every newcomer is a blank slate that is influenced by a new community of practice. Fuller et al. suggested that novice members have histories, perceptions, and understandings that can sway the community.

Theoretical Assumptions and the Choice of Qualitative Methods

Tacit Knowledge

Tacit knowledge has been defined by Polanyi (1969) as that knowledge which is hard to articulate. Theoretical texts and research have since shown that it is possible to illustrate tacit knowledge, albeit with difficulty. Tacit knowledge is pertinent for this study due to the relevance of such knowledge of the participants about their experience in

a teacher education department as well as my strategies to elicit what I assumed would be tacit knowledge.

Tacit knowledge is the idea that "we know more than we can tell" (Polanyi, 1969, p. 172). Polanyi introduced the concept of tacit knowledge in questioning the exclusivity of explicit knowledge, or knowledge that can be easily conveyed through writing or speech, in scientific research. When explaining specifics in relation to the whole, or the whole in relation to specifics, Polanyi believed that not everything can be transmitted explicitly. For example, a child can recognize the mother's face in a sea of faces, but may be unable to describe her face to someone else so that he or she can identify the mother, making that knowledge explicit.

Research has been conducted to study how tacit knowledge relates to managerial learning styles (Anis, Armstrong, & Zhu, 2004) and the use of tacit knowledge in problem solving situations of school principals (St. Germain & Quinn, 2005). No one has directly studied the tacit knowledge or participation in a community of practice of both adjunct and full-time faculty. The researcher assumes that what participants share in an interview may be the emergence of understanding that was tacit until that moment. The interview itself therefore becomes an act of building a community of practice in a wider realm, in which the researcher, as an educator, also participates by actively listening and probing.

Interpretive Phenomenology

The methodology of this study is an interpretive (or hermeneutic) phenomenology case study. This phenomenology is steeped in philosophical tradition.

Definition. Most philosophy of knowledge is encapsulated among three types that span a continuum from the objective to subjective: empirical, interpretive, and descriptive. Empirical knowledge claims that knowledge is objective and can only be acquired through methodologies that distance the researcher from the participant. The subjective knowledge of participants is the primary aim of descriptive researchers who conduct qualitative studies such as phenomenology and ethnographies. Interpretive or hermeneutic research bridges the subjective and objective through the lens of the researcher (Polkinghorne, 1983). According to Odman & Kerdeman (1997), hermeneutic phenomenology increases understanding about individuals as well as the understanding of the researcher.

Origin and philosophy. Hermeneutics, etymologically, has Greek origins from the words *hermeneuein* (meaning to interpret) and *hermeneia* (interpretation) and is based on the Greek messenger of the gods Hermes (Odman & Kerdeman, 1997). Hermeneutics formed as a means to study ancient texts and evolved to understand the meanings intended by the texts' authors. Phenomenology is the study of a phenomenon experienced by a group of individuals. According to Bontekoe (1996), the combination of hermeneutics and phenomenology was first explored by Martin Heidegger, a 20th-century philosopher.

Heidegger asserted that when text is analyzed, the researcher's experience cannot be negated, which is counterintuitive to empirical research as well as descriptive research (Bontekoe, 1996). Phenomenology required that the researcher simply report the data of the phenomenon without any interpretation or influence by the researcher. Heidegger

explained that the researcher possesses forestructures of understanding, which consist of involvements in the world (fore-havings), points of view (fore-sights), and reflections in language (fore-conceptions). These forestructures are projected on an object or event, which in turn confirm or disconfirm the forestructures, and the cycle repeats ad infinitum.

Hans-Georg Gadamer, Heidegger's protégé, expanded upon these ideas. Using a metaphor, Gadamer explained that art is not only about what the artist portrays and means in a painting, but also about how the viewer interprets the art. Gadamer explained that without the researcher, a "non-living relationship" (Bontekoe, 1996, p. 98) exists between the participant and the phenomenon. Prejudices, which are Gadamer's terms for forestructures, constitute a horizon that is constantly changing with new experiences. The aim of a hermeneutic phenomenology, according to Gadamer, is to fuse the horizons of the author of the text and the interpreter.

Paul Ricouer, a contemporary of Gadamer, expanded upon the idea of what hermeneutics involves. Ricouer (1976) stated that if "a written text is a form of discourse…then the conditions of the possibility of discourse are also those of the text" (p. 23). By expanding text to include communication and other artifacts of humankind, Ricouer opens up possibilities for hermeneutic research. According to Bontekoe (1996), in order to interpret this type of text, the structure or language of the text must be analyzed as well as the text's function or author's meanings.

Summary

The topics of higher education scholarship and roles, teacher education, communities of practice, tacit knowledge, and hermeneutic phenomenology were the

theoretical and research energy driving this research study. The experiences of teacher education faculty in a community of practice were gathered through the tacit, explicit, and reflective knowledge shared in interviews. Hermeneutic phenomenology as a methodology enabled the filtering of the experience of the participants through the conceptual framework that grounded this study.

The next chapter details the methodology of the study. The qualitative research design, research questions, as well as the role of the researcher, research setting, and selection of participants will be discussed. Access to the population, protection of human participants, data collection strategies, interviews, data analysis strategies, and the rigor of the methodology, including credibility and transferability, will also be reviewed.

Chapter 3: Research Method

Introduction

Chapter 3 describes the method for the study, which was designed to understand how full-time and adjunct faculty members perceived their participation in a teacher education department. The data collection methods of the study (faculty interviews, artifacts, and observations of faculty meetings) as well as the credibility and transferability employed to make the study rigorous will be discussed. The transcription of the data, the hermeneutic phenomenological process, and the dissemination of the findings will also be detailed. This approach is intended to uncover data to illuminate how adjunct and full-time faculty work in the department and how the work may contribute to a measure of student achievement in a teacher education program.

Research Design and Approach

Five principal qualitative methods include biographies, phenomenologies, grounded theory studies, ethnographies, and case studies (Creswell, 2009). A phenomenology and case study were selected to explore how two groups of higher education faculty in one university department understood a phenomenon. When deciding between a descriptive or hermeneutic phenomenology, I did extensive research to understand the philosophical underpinnings of the debate, and chose the hermeneutic tradition due to the need to acknowledge the role of the interpreter in a phenomenology. A biography would not have involved enough individuals to understand the phenomenon. My prior possession of theoretical and personal knowledge entailed that grounded theory, which is designed to start with data collection first in order to discover knowledge, would

not suffice. Ethnography would have added many more sociocultural elements to the study than were necessary to understand the phenomenon.

Qualitative data can fall into the following categories: people, organizations, texts, settings, objects, and events (Mason, 2002). For this study, people, texts, and settings were the primary sources. Participants were interviewed, asked for any documents that illustrated their experience in the teacher education department, and events were observed.

In addition to a hermeneutic phenomenology, a case study design was employed for this study. According to Merriam (1998), a case study provides "intensive descriptions and analyses of a single unit or bounded system, such as an individual, program, event, group, intervention, or community" (p. 19). Because this study occurs in one university that contains a finite number of adjunct and full-time faculty members, a case with boundaries was present. Furthermore, the variety of data collected intensified the study of the phenomenon of faculty participation.

Research Questions

The research question this study sought to answer was: How do adjunct and full-time faculty members experience participation in a university teacher education department? The subquestions of this research question were:

1. What aspects of a community of practice, as perceived by the faculty members of a teacher education department and evidenced in artifacts and observations, are experienced by adjunct and full-time faculty members?

2. What influences the participation of faculty members in a community of practice?
3. Do adjunct and full-time faculty members perceive that their participation within the department affects their instruction? If so, to what extent and in what way does their participation affect their instruction?

Role of the Researcher

I was an adjunct instructor at this university. My higher education experience has been in mathematics teacher education, as well as in teaching various topics of graduate education, including data analysis for teachers and standards-based education, at the institution chosen for this study. This experience has evolved from 2001. The opportunities afforded by the university have prompted the interest in this study as well as my desire to give back to the field of higher education. I have had no prior or current contact with the participants and reported all conclusions of the study despite possible negative impact on future employment prospects at the university of the study.

Due to my experience, a process of reflective journaling was used to eliminate bias and to maintain objectivity throughout the research study. This journal was used to record interpretations of participant answers and body language, as well as reflections on research design and ideas for future research. The literature review conducted for this study has also influenced my ideas about university accountability, the nature of teacher education, as well as the struggles of full-time faculty members, which has further reduced bias.

Setting and Sample

A large research university with high research activity was chosen as the setting for this research study. The university serves over 1,200 undergraduate students in its teacher education department, which employs 33 full-time and 15 adjunct faculty members. Faculty with joint appointments and those who have been my professors were not included in the pool of participants, reducing the number of full-time faculty who were potential participants to 20. All of the 15 adjunct faculty were considered potential participants. The number of participants included seven faculty members, with three adjuncts and four full-time members, who have held short- and long-term appointments at the university. This university was chosen because of my desire to give back in compensation for my positive experiences as one of the university's students and instructors.

Selection of Research Participants

Research participants for this study were selected using a purposeful sampling process of three strata. Onwuegbuzie and Leech (2007) described this process as first dividing a sample into strata, or categories, and then purposefully choosing participants from each subgroup. Participants were first categorized as members of either the adjunct or full-time faculty. I then chose adjunct or full-time faculty members who have taught at least three quarters in the teacher education department, reaching for greatest variety possible in years of service. The department was primarily comprised of white females but every effort was made to select participants who were also male and minority faculty of the department.

Access to the Population

The dean of the university department consented to the study with a letter of cooperation (see Appendix A). The university of study then approved this study through their IRB committee. Once Walden's IRB approval was secured (IRB Approval Number 02-16-10-0292574), I contacted the dean of the college and chair of the teacher education department and requested the email addresses for adjunct and full-time faculty members. Each adjunct and full-time faculty member was then contacted through email with a letter of participation (see Appendix B). A hard copy of the email was retained and all sent and received agreements to participate were deleted from the email server. The participant was also encouraged to do the same to secure the correspondence.

Protection of Human Participants

Efforts to seek participation by the participants were held to the highest ethical and confidential standards. I was available through email and phone contact for any questions the participants had prior to, during, and after the study. The consent form was shared with the participant prior to the interview as an email attachment so he or she had an opportunity to review the terms of the relationship and ask questions before signing it. I retained a hard copy of the emailed consent form and then all email messages sent by the participants were deleted (and I encouraged the participants to do the same). If the participant consented to the study, I retained a copy of the signed consent form and gave one to the participants, if they requested one.

The university with which the participants are affiliated was not disclosed in any part of the study. Participants were not identified by name in the study and were

identified as members of the adjunct or full-time faculty, when necessary. When specific quotes by the participants were needed, the participants were given androgynous pseudonyms and no potentially identifying information was listed in any of their data. I retained a key to the androgynous names for clarification and member checking. When not being used for analysis, all data was locked in a file cabinet at the university of the study.

Data Collection and Analysis

Using a hermeneutic phenomenological case study design, the interview data gathered became the discourse text to be analyzed. The phenomenon of interest is the experience of teacher education faculty members, both full-time and adjunct, in a university department. Specifically, the community trajectory of participants and their involvement in the mutual engagement, joint enterprise, and shared repertoire of the department were explored. I gathered data regarding the perceptions of participants.

Data Collection Strategies

According to Kvale and Brinkmann (2009), "the qualitative research interview attempts to understand the world from the subjects' point of view, to unfold the meaning of their experiences, to uncover their lived world prior to scientific explorations," (p. 1). These authors proposed that interviews could take on metaphoric aspects of mining or traveling. The *miner* seeks to reveal what is hidden within the interviewee, whereas the *traveler* canvasses several interviewees to build a story to share upon returning home. This study explored aspects of both, attempting to elicit insights/data from the

interviewee, as well as build a narrative of common experiences of and among full-time and adjunct faculty members.

Semistructured interviews were conducted with each of the participants, lasting for about 30–90 minutes, and were recorded. The interview questions (see Appendix C) were mapped to the research questions to ensure alignment to the study (see Appendix D). The purpose of the semistructured nature is to ensure that certain topics are broached in the interview and that the interviewee has many opportunities to detail his or her experience. Participants were also asked to provide copies of any documents, for example, syllabi or course curricula that symbolized their participation in the teacher education department.

Interview topics focused primarily on the ideas of communities of practice. The interview questions were formatted to ease into difficult questions, reduce defensiveness by asking what and how questions before asking why questions, and close procedures by thanking the participant and asking if future contact was permissible to clarify questions and member check (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009; Rubin & Rubin, 2005). The various probes sought to tap into the tacit knowledge of the participants and make that knowledge explicit.

Each interview was transcribed. The transcription was then sent to the participant via email to ensure that it was accurate and that all points the participant wanted to express in the interview were conveyed. If the participant wanted to meet in person to review the transcription, that request was honored. Further member checking occurred by

providing participants with access to their interpreted data to ensure that the participant's statements were properly represented.

I also conducted two observations: one of the entire teacher education department and the other a program meeting. Extensive notes were taken, and if an agenda was available, I collected those as well. Faculty data was also gathered to link the observation data with the type of faculty members who contributed to the meeting's content.

Data Analysis Strategies

The data analysis procedures for this study were inspired by the work of Edwards and Titchen (2003) as well as Ajjawi and Higgs (2007). In the phenomenological work of Edwards and Titchen, a process was utilized that recorded first-order constructs that were identified by the participants and second-order constructs that were the researcher's reactions to the first-order constructs. In a descriptive phenomenology, which is the type of phenomenology implemented by Edwards and Titchen, the second-order constructs were bracketed, which means acknowledging them but not using them to influence the analysis of the results.

Ajjawi and Higgs (2007), in their interpretive phenomenology, used Edwards and Titchen's (2003) method of first- and second-order constructs, but utilized the second-order constructs to interpret the first-order constructs with references to theoretical and research literature. Both studies then followed the same path, grouping the first- and second-order constructs into constructs that emerge about interview, artifact, and observation data. In this research study, Ajjawi and Higgs's methodology was

implemented to identify the phenomenon of participation by adjunct and full-time faculty members in a teacher education department.

Rigor

In order to ensure methodological rigor, two types of actions were taken. The first included ensuring rigor through the process of the interpretation itself. The second involved addressing qualitative versions of standard validity and reliability in the form of credibility, confirmability, dependability, and transferability.

Interpretation

Madison (1988) identifies nine principles that hermeneutic researchers must adhere to as they interpret texts. *Coherence* must be honored by ensuring that any contradictions in the text are clarified. Making sure the whole text is analyzed embodies the principle of *comprehensiveness*. The interpretation has to be deep, or demonstrate *penetration*, in order to justify using the text. All of the researcher's questions must be answered by the text, which illustrates its *thoroughness*. *Appropriateness* is the idea that the text and interpretation are aligned. The context of the text must always be considered in the principle of *contextuality*. As much as possible, the interpretation must also be in *agreement* with the author. *Suggestiveness* encompasses an interpretation that sheds new light on the original work and prompts future research. The principle of *potential*, similar to suggestiveness, requires that the interpretation of the text can be extended. I needed to ensure that these principles guided the interpretation of the interviews.

Qualitative Validity and Reliability

Credibility, *confirmability*, and *transferability* were secured to ensure the study was valid (Tobin & Begley, 2004). *Credibility* is the process of depicting the most accurate data of the study. Discrepant data, data that counter the majority of the data presented, was included in the findings as well as all other emerging data. *Confirmability*, similar to *credibility*, means that the interpretation of the interviews, artifacts, and observations were drawn from the data presented. For this study, no data were utilized that cannot be justified through the process of analysis described above. The means by which a study can be generalized to other studies embodies the idea of *transferability*. In qualitative studies, transferability depends on the similarity to the other study's case and methodology.

In order for the study to have reliability, a clearly delineated process must be documented and must be able to be accessed in order to replicate the study (Tobin & Begley, 2004). This research is supplemented with all of the documents used to collect and analyze data as well as those used to access and secure the participants. All data will be kept for a minimum of 5 years after the study for future reference, if necessary.

Dissemination of Findings

The findings of this study will be disseminated by two methods: sharing of the dissertation with the study participants and the publication of a journal article. Upon the conclusion of the study, I will seek publication of the research study in a scholarly journal. I also will send each of the participants a copy of the dissertation.

Summary

The methodology of the research study outlined in this chapter examined the decisions and processes guided by the research questions. The qualitative paradigm of phenomenology and other aspects of the research study were reviewed with a focus on setting, participants, data collection and analysis, and rigor. Chapter 3 concludes the organization of the study by describing the method.

The next chapter will detail the findings of the study. The interpretation process used with the interviews will be discussed. Interview, artifact, and observation data will be dispersed throughout the findings to support the constructs that emerged from the participants' experiences.

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

This chapter is organized into four sections: one that focuses on the data collection, another on data organization and analysis, one that outlines the evidence of quality, and the last that focuses on the findings of the study. A review of the data collection, including the selection of participants and methodology, will be explored in the first section. In the second section, the discussion of data analysis will include organization of the data and the reflective process I utilized throughout the process. The study's attention to validity, reliability, and the interpretative model itself will be portrayed in the third section. The findings, organized by the constructs that emerged, will be presented in the fourth section.

Data Collection

This study aimed to understand how adjunct and full-time faculty members experience participation in a public university teacher education department. Merging elements of communities of practice, systems theory, teacher education, and faculty work, an interpretive phenomenological case study design was employed to answer the research question, How do adjunct and full-time faculty members experience participation in a university teacher education department? and the following subquestions:

1. What aspects of a community of practice, as perceived by the faculty members of a teacher education department and evidenced in artifacts and observations, are experienced by adjunct and full-time faculty members?

2. What influences the participation of faculty members in a community of practice?
3. Do adjunct and full-time faculty members perceive that their participation within the department affects their instruction? If so, to what extent and in what way does their participation affect their instruction?

Participants

The targeted number of participants was 6 to 8 for this case study, using a stratified purposeful sampling process. Rather than send letters asking for participation to all faculty members in the department, I started with writing 10 faculty members, 5 to each type of faculty, anticipating that some of the 5 might not reply. When fewer than 3 members replied from each type of faculty, 2 more letters were emailed to each group. By the completion of this cycle, all 15 adjunct faculty members and 11 full-time faculty members had been invited to participate. Seven faculty members, 3 adjunct and 4 full-time, agreed to participate in the study. I ensured that an equivalent proportion (1/5) of each type of faculty was interviewed (3 of 15 adjunct faculty and 4 of 20 full-time faculty participated). Male faculty members and those of minority status were targeted in every iteration. I stopped contacting more participants once it was apparent that each faculty member had his or her own story and further interviews would yield little or no new data. All participants were provided with androgynous pseudonyms. The adjunct faculty members interviewed were Alex, Cameron, and Drew, and the full-time faculty members were Addison, Dominique, Jordan, and Kelly.

Interviews

Once consent was obtained, I met with each participant in his or her office on the university campus. The semistructured interviews were audio-recorded with two digital recorders, one serving as a backup. I utilized probing questions and paraphrasing to ensure full understanding of the participants' responses. Each participant agreed to be available for further clarification and member checking.

Artifacts

The participants were asked to bring artifacts to the interview that symbolized their experience in the teacher education department. These artifacts included four syllabi, one set of meeting minutes, one research document, and one classroom document. All artifacts that the participants brought to the interview were discussed in the interview.

Observations

Furthermore, the researcher acted as a participant observer in two departmental meetings. The first was a program meeting centered on middle childhood topics and only involved faculty who taught in that program. The second meeting included faculty members and staff from the entire teacher education department. The former meeting focused on instructional issues and the latter on departmental functions and governance issues. I was provided an agenda for both meetings as well as minutes from the previous meetings. Notes were taken about the content of the meeting as well as any communication dynamics and body language of the participants. Addison and Dominique attended both meetings. No other study participants attended either of the meetings.

Data Organization, Analysis, and Reflection

An interpretive phenomenology requires that the experiences of the participants be represented but are also filtered through the theoretical knowledge and perceptions of those of the researcher (Ajjawi & Higgs, 2007). In Ajjawi and Higgs's study, the researchers' theoretical and personal knowledge were used to interpret the participants' experience of the phenomena. In this study, however, I only used the theoretical lenses of communities of practice, teacher education, and faculty work that were explored in chapter 2, and not personal knowledge.

First- and second-order constructs, first developed by Edwards and Titchen (2003) and utilized by Ajjawi and Higgs (2007), were employed as a data organizing strategy in this study. To begin, the alignment of the interview questions to the research questions was consulted to organize a spreadsheet file first by research question. I then read an interview (see Appendices E and F for a sample transcript and observation meeting notes), extracted quotes of text (first-order constructs) that signified the participant's experience in the teacher education department, and then pasted them into the spreadsheet under the appropriate research question (see Appendix G for a sample spreadsheet). The document numbers and the type of faculty member were listed next to each excerpt or quote. Similar text was pasted in adjoining cells and separated from other clusters of similar text. This process was utilized for each interview, observation, and artifact. Once the clusters were organized in the program, I identified second-order constructs in the form of codes developed from the research presented in the literature review.

Once the extracted quotes were all coded, a summary sheet was created that summarized the contributions of each participant to each code (see Appendix H for a selection of the coding). Similar to the spreadsheet, the codes were organized under the research questions. A percent total was calculated to determine the distribution of that coded experience among the participants, sometimes for the whole group and other times for the types of faculty.

Upon the creation of these two documents, I analyzed the documents for organization and grouping of codes. Some codes were found to be subcodes of others and collapsed. For instance, *compensation* was a subcode of *job description and related issues*. Quotes in the spreadsheet not based on their experience but rather represented commentary on an aspect of the community of practice that the participants were not part of were not coded.

Once the organization was complete, I returned to the research questions to determine how to answer them based upon the coded data. The codes were further collapsed into larger concepts (Appendix I). Using these concepts and the statistics of the summary sheet, findings emerged that answered the research questions through the lens of the theoretical framework.

Throughout the process of data collection, organization, and analysis, I used a journal to take notes and reflect upon individuals, events, and the study overall (Appendix J). Using the miner and traveler concept of Kvale and Brinkmann (2009), reflections were made that looked deep into an individual's experience (the miner) and

across types and the collective set of individuals' experiences (the traveler). Reflections were made from the time of the first interview through the analysis stage of the findings.

Evidence of Quality

Measures were in place to ensure that the validity, reliability, and proper interpretation of the interviews, artifacts, and observations were secured. Each type of research quality has components that are addressed below.

Interpretation

Referring to Madison's (1988) work, interpretive phenomenologists must consider several factors in order to interpret the data accurately. *Coherence* is honored by listing discrepant observations that appear throughout the data. The interpretation of this study's data was both *comprehensive* and *penetrative,* as each piece of data was read thoroughly for deep understanding. Each of the research questions was answered by the data, demonstrating *thoroughness*, and the fact that the questions were answered reveals alignment between the text and the interpretation (*appropriateness*). Elaborating upon teacher education in the literature review and referring to it throughout the interpretation gives the study *contextuality*. Because the interview transcripts and subsequent interpretations were member-checked, *agreement* was reached between the participant and researcher. In the fifth chapter of this study, *suggestiveness* and *potential* are portrayed through recommendations for future studies.

Validity

Credibility, *confirmability*, and *transferability* are qualitative components of validity that occur in this study (Tobin & Begley, 2004). By adhering to the interpretation

components mentioned above, this study demonstrates *credibility* by depicting the most accurate data. For instance, once the interviews were transcribed, they were sent to each of the participants to ensure accuracy. Any quotes that were used were also sent to each participant, as well as the contexts for each quote, to member check for proper conveyance of their discussion of different topics. As noted in the data collection, organization, and analysis sections, only the data that were gathered in the study were used to construct and support the findings, thus conveying *confirmability*. The possibility of this study being generalized to other communities of practice and higher education faculty is likely, thus establishing its *transferability*.

Reliability

Because the details of the research process have been conveyed and several documents have been included in the appendices, this study has a high probability for accurate replication, increasing its reliability. The process noted in the methodology and findings section of this document is meticulously outlined so future researchers can replicate and expand upon the study should they wish.

Researcher Bias

Despite being familiar with the program and faculty of the university of study, I worked to suppress any accumulated worldviews or assumptions that would augment or diminish the collection of the data. Though some interpretive phenomenologies allow personal knowledge to enter the data analysis process, this element of the method was disallowed due to my ties with the university of study. Interview questions were created to be open-ended so both adjunct and full-time faculty members could explore the

phenomenon of experience in a teacher education department. The interview questions were strictly adhered to unless questions were needed to clarify participant statements. The only interpretation of the data is through a lens of research that can be substantiated. Chances for bias to enter the research arena were diminished by the research design and process.

Findings About the Participants

Teacher education departments hire individuals to fulfill several functions and roles, which can be understood using Boyer's (1990) types of faculty scholarship. All of the adjuncts in this study (Alex, Cameron, and Drew) were hired to fulfill a teaching function only, but Alex and Cameron have volunteered for some application/service functions. Two full-time faculty members, Jordan and Addison, were hired to fulfill teaching, application/service, and integration functions. The other two full-time faculty members (Kelly and Dominique) fulfill teaching, application/service, research, and integration functions. While the original decision was to select two types of faculty member from the participant pool, it became evident that there were several types of faculty if trajectories, level of engagement, and faculty functions were considered. Table 2 summarizes the assigned responsibilities of each faculty member in the study using Boyer's (1990) types of faculty scholarship:

Table 1

Summary of Faculty Responsibilities

Faculty Member	Type	Teaching	Discovery/ Research	Integration	Application/ Service
Addison	Full	X		X	X
Dominique	Full	X	X	X	X
Kelly	Full	X	X	X	X
Jordan	Full	X		X	X
Alex	Adjunct	X			
Cameron	Adjunct	X			
Drew	Adjunct	X			

Another aspect to consider is the length of appointment of each individual. Both Kelly and Dominique had secured tenure and were meeting requirements to increase their rank. Addison and Jordan had short-term appointments and were seeking new contracts in the department. All of the adjunct faculty members were hired quarter to quarter and their loads varied from one to four classes a quarter. It is evident that the responsibilities and appointments of each individual vary, which influences how each one participates in the teacher education department.

Each faculty member was on a different trajectory in relation to the teacher education department. Alex, an adjunct faculty member, was interested in full-time work with certain work restrictions (she wanted no involvement in NCATE accreditation) but was also comfortable staying on the periphery due to personal commitments. Staying on the periphery was adjunct faculty member Drew's aim in the community due to professional and personal commitments. Cameron, another adjunct faculty member,

enjoyed being on the periphery due to personal commitments but had considered a full-time position. Kelly, a full-time member, fully participated in departmental projects and processes but did not participate in departmental meetings due to a previous leadership position. Dominique, Jordan, and Addison, other full-time members, fully participated as insiders in the department.

Findings on Aspects of a Community of Practice

The first research subquestion regarding the aspects of a community of practice experienced by adjunct and full-time faculty members is explored in this section. All seven participants experienced three of the four aspects of a community of practice, as defined by Wenger (1998): *meaning*, *identity*, and *community*. The second finding saw five of the seven participants experiencing the aspect of *practice*. The conceptual framework provided a lens for identifying participants' experience of each of these four aspects of the teacher education department.

Meaning

In order to experience meaning, members of a community of practice must experience participation and make abstract concepts concrete through reification (Wenger, 1998). All of the faculty members reported participating in some form within the department, some fully and some in other ways. Three of the four full-time faculty members experienced full participation in the department. The other full-time faculty member purposefully stayed on the periphery due to prior history in a leadership role. None of the three adjuncts experienced full participation. One of the adjuncts enjoyed

being on the periphery exclusively, whereas the other two members enjoyed the periphery as well but also indicated a desire to participate more fully.

All participants experienced meaning through the reification of a product of some sort for the department. Products mentioned were syllabi (both current and those to be used in the future), field placement forms, by-laws, research studies, and other documents. For example, Dominique and Addison, two full-time faculty members, attended a meeting where all participants became peer reviewers for each other's future syllabi. Cameron, an adjunct faculty member, noted another example of how she reviewed the previous professor's syllabus and transformed it to meet her professional needs:

> They had given me his previous information on how he taught the class. And I looked it over. And I thought, this does not sound like me. He was still teaching kind of a textbook style and doing things that just — that just did not really relate to me. So after I studied his notes and looked over it, I thought, I am going to have to make it my own, which I did.

Another adjunct faculty member, Alex, mirrored how she modified aspects of a course to accommodate their teaching style:

> I had syllabi from previous professors and so I pretty much stayed with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions...I also had a couple of really good assessments that I basically lifted from other professors who had taught the courses, and have just slightly modified those for my style.

Most of the participants provided artifacts that demonstrated reified products. These products included syllabi, program reviews, and assessment data. Processes were reified in meeting minutes of the observed meetings. Most faculty members provided syllabi but only full-time faculty members provided products that related to meetings.

Identity

All of the full-time faculty members indicated full participation in departmental functions and one of the adjunct faculty members had been asked to be involved in another department on campus. Full participation in meetings is evident in Dominique's dialogue, "It's pretty much open. You have this…council, which is held certain Fridays of the quarter. Everyone can come…everything is really, really pretty open." Jordan, another full-time faculty member, shared meeting agenda minutes that highlighted the meeting and task below:

> They have been working on moving…over to semesters. Right now, we are on quarters. So they are talking about moving to semesters. And each department had to come up with reshuffling those classes and changing their credits for them, so they can meet the semester kind of calendars. So, I have participated in those meetings…Some of the classes we had to combine. So, some we did have to combine, and kind of rewrite the syllabus form, the overall syllabus. We did a master syllabus, I would say.

Addison elaborated:

> I feel like I am very involved. I am a member of the faculty and a program advisor for a very large program. Due to the program advisor responsibility, I

> must attend many additional meetings and work with several different faculty members across colleges.

Alex, an adjunct, attended several workshops in a faculty development center on campus that has led to her being invited to do more:

> And you are invited to everything and they welcome you. I would say in a way they've kind of become my little family, you know my place to belong.…In fact, they've asked me if I would like to be on part of the – do some of the teaching for them and be part of – they have an advisory group and they wanted to know if I wanted to help with some of the development of the courses.

Despite Alex's invitation for full participation in another department, she and the other two adjunct faculty members did not participate fully in the teacher education department. These members did not attend meetings on a regular basis and had only one individual or a small cohort of colleagues that they regularly consulted.

Two of the adjunct faculty members and one full-time faculty member expressed elements of peripheral participation. Alex enjoyed the flexibility of only having to teach at the university, "And that's one of the good things about an adjunct position because you can do as much as you want to do, but your responsibilities are certainly much less. Because really beyond your teaching anything else is purely voluntary." Drew, an adjunct, also preferred to participate peripherally in the department: "I'm okay with having the freedom within what they give me to do what I want to do. To me, that's enough creativity." Kelly, another full-time faculty member, experienced peripherality in

a different way. Because she had a previous leadership role in the department, she had been asked to keep some distance by her successor.

Two of the adjunct faculty members explained that they have a marginal role in the teacher education department. Cameron explained:

> Because I feel like I am still kind of on the fringes. I do not – I mean, I know the people in the [adjunct] office. But we do not interact with other full-time faculty much at all. …I mean, I realize that I am kind of [the] low man on the totem pole. And I would not be invited to many things.

Alex remembered a specific incident that made her feel marginal:

> And you know, I used to attend more than do…but there was a little push back from the fact that I was attending and was asked to help revise the [undisclosed] course. One of the full-time faculty members did not think that she should have to work with an adjunct.

This situation resulted in Alex being less inclined to participate fully in the department. This marginality was evident in the observed meetings where no adjunct faculty members were present.

Regardless of the way that members of a community of practice participate, they may also have trajectory goals for a different type of participation in the community (Wenger, 1998). All of the adjuncts and one full-time faculty member who felt they were on the periphery were content in the department. The three adjunct members had several reasons for preferring less involvement in the department. Alex cited changes in upper level organizations that require constant upkeep:

> I would be kind of uncomfortable doing that [full-time work] now too because things change so quickly at the…Department [of Education] that I would have to be tied in like I used to be with the…Department in order to give good information to the student teachers.

Cameron's projects kept her content with a peripheral stance in the department: "if I can have the best of both worlds, it would be working part-time…So that's why I'm kind of where I'm at." Drew did not want to move further into the community: "I'm not an insider in this community. I kind of prefer to be an outsider." Addison was first hired as an adjunct and had no plans of becoming full-time:

> Well, I was an adjunct first, so that experience allowed me to become familiar with the culture of the department and to get to know some of the people here who were full-time…I anticipated that I would teach in an adjunct capacity for a short while and then maybe return to regular public school classroom teaching. I did not think this was going to be my path at all.

Half of the full-time faculty and two of the adjunct faculty desired more involvement in the department. Full-time faculty members Jordan and Addison had contracts that were ending and wished to be further involved. Even though Cameron expressed sentiments to work on the periphery, she stated that she would also be open to full-time work:

> There was a position that I thought I would be good for. And I wanted to know if that was available to me. And I think it may have been something that I thought I was qualified for.…But they said, no, I could not. I was not qualified to teach it.

> So – because the description sounded like I was somebody that could have taught it. But apparently you had to have a Ph.D. or something to even teach that. I do not – I am not sure.…Yeah, it would be nice if there was an in. But I do not know where that in is.

Alex would also have agreed to a full-time position with conditions:

> But I would like to stay as long as I can. There may be a full-time position opening and I would certainly apply for that.…But I've also told the department chair that I didn't want to do anything administrative, so it would be just a purely faculty appointment. It would be okay to be on committees, but I do not want to be chair. Or even assistant chair. Or NCATE accreditor or coordinator.

All full-time faculty members worked to improve the department as insiders. Kelly identified a gap in the teacher education program and improved it:

> We have a commitment to diversity and preparing our candidates to work with diverse student populations, and so we make sure that they have an urban placement and a suburban placement –And so my thinking was that, "When do they have the opportunity to process their experiences?" So a few years ago, I initiated an online practicum seminar.

Jordan felt appreciated for her collaboration with her faculty peers: "When we're sitting in meetings, they're very courteous to make sure that my opinion is valued, when we're sitting in meetings. So, I do appreciate that. We work well together." Full-time faculty member Dominique talked about the identification of her assets by upper management and how she had been on a fast track to strengthen the program: "Well, at the beginning

they try not to keep you so busy because you're trying to get tenured.…But reality is that I was forced my first or second year here, I was just told, you will write the program report." Addison stated something similar, "I feel like when you are given a task or you do something and you do it well, then you're asked to do more. And I feel like that is kind of what happened…They keep asking me to do more and more and more. That's kind of what has happened." Addison provided program materials that illustrated this increased involvement.

Two of the adjunct faculty members expressed that their work in the teacher education department was enhanced by the work they did in the PK-12 education field, indicating a trajectory that was on the boundary of two communities of practice. Cameron stated:

> But in reality, the fact that I am working full-time…but working in the field.… I frequently bring in "guess what happened at school the other day?" And that is real – to me, that is what is good. Yeah, I am bringing my experience into it and the diversity issues and what to say and what not to say. And I try to bring all that into my class.

Drew also iterated that his work in PK-12 supplemented his university teaching because he shared his classroom experiences with his students. In the observed meetings, full-time faculty indicated that this is one of the reasons they valued adjuncts.

Community

The participants utilized various individuals and resources in the teacher education department. All of the adjunct faculty members and one of the full-time faculty

indicated they had individuals they consulted if they needed something. Alex cited the chair of the department:

> The department chair has really just bent over backwards to accommodate my schedule to make sure that I have a schedule that's doable [and] that's focused on what I like to do… And she also makes sure that I have three or four courses a quarter, so she has been great.

Drew cited two full-time faculty members who were helpful:

> I mean, if I have a problem…they are good about helping…I have a mentor teacher…who is the head of the [program]. She is more than willing to sit down with me, and work me through, or give me resources that I need. There is another instructor who is a former adjunct. We adjuncted together. Now she is an instructor on staff, and she is another person I go to for help.

Jordan, who cited several individuals, explained, "Because honestly…I've basically run to those professors who have extended their hands to me. So, I just mostly run to them." None of the other three full-time faculty members noted anyone in particular whom they rely on (but they were not asked specifically in the interview).

All seven faculty members listed materials or services that they had access to that enhanced their work. Kelly cited technology: "Well, definitely the technology. The college provides good computers. They replace them, I believe – do they do it every 3 years? They definitely have a cycle of updating and replacing computers." Addison believed administrative assistants were helpful, "Departmental information, basically, I mean anything that I need that I can't find online I ask our administrative assistants."

Jordan noted classroom supplies: “So they've assisted me by giving me materials to use that they've used in other classes that they've taught.” A syllabus provided by Addison detailed how books bought by the department were provided for students to use for a class project.

Practice

The kind of practice, or work, of the faculty members varied throughout the participants’ experiences. Three of the four full-time faculty members and one of the three adjunct faculty members collaborated with other members of the faculty on various projects and the rest claimed they did not collaborate on products with others. Addison collaborated on program issues in one of the observed meetings:

> Collaboration is sometimes difficult due to finding the common time to work together. Typically, a project that needs completing may have a volunteer to start the process or revisions. Then that volunteer reports back to the group or committee and others add their thoughts. In order to accomplish tasks, my experience has shown me that a few people need to volunteer to begin the needed work.

Kelly, a full-time faculty member, collaborated with another full-time faculty member on pedagogy for enhancing the skills of new students seeking more coursework in advanced science and mathematics. Alex cotaught with another faculty member, which also improved her professional relationship with that colleague:

> One of the other professors in the…[undisclosed class] has a diversity experience every quarter and he invited my students to that, and that was great. So to have a

> full-time person include adjuncts' classes in interesting activities is a really good thing. And he and I have a real good working relationship now partly because of that.

Even though some participants did not collaborate with others, they still reified products as evidenced by some of the artifacts they provided.

Findings on Influences on Participation

What influenced the participation of faculty members in the community is the focus of the second research subquestion and this section. All of the seven participants cited accountability, workload, budget restrictions, time, and/or other commitments as influences that are described below. Several of the faculty members had a variety of reasons that influenced how they did and did not participate in the teacher education department. Overall, full-time faculty members were obligated to attend meetings of their programs for the main purpose of accountability. Adjunct faculty members had no obligation to participate in the department and cited reasons why they did not participate.

Accountability

All full-time faculty members cited accountability as one of the main reasons for their participation in the community of practice. One of the adjunct faculty members was knowledgeable about the current status of higher education accountability but not as a result of participation in the department. NCATE was mentioned specifically by full-time faculty member Kelly:

> The work that we do to prepare for accreditation – and I am actually now on the Unit Accreditation Board of NCATE, the National Council for Accreditation of

> Teacher Education. So now that that has evolved from looking at inputs to outputs, you have to demonstrate that you impact student learning.

Full-time faculty member Addison elaborated:

> I have had to write program reports for accreditation and several key assessments and accompanying scoring guides for the program. I also have assisted in designing scoring guides to use for assessments that are assigned across the college.

Alex infused NCATE requirements into her class curriculum despite not being involved with the university's NCATE work. Dominique alluded to her involvement in meeting the state and department accountability requirements in which she was involved:

> [Undisclosed] changed the law to require phonics….There were all these new requirements. And they needed reports read… We are in this era of mistrust where people have to prove they are doing their jobs…I am just saying, you can make yourself always look better on paper than you really are. And to say that this is effective, I have to question. So you find out what hoops you need to jump through, and you write these things and you do these reports, fill in these boxes. You just play the game.

From the interviews, observations, and artifacts, it is evident that the full-time faculty members are entrenched in developing accountability measures for other entities such as the state as well as internally to the university and college. Dominique, in her statement above, expressed the weariness, which was palpable in spending time with full-time faculty.

Accountability was also consistently part of the observed meetings as well as those that faculty mentioned in the interviews. Two of the full-time faculty indicated they were involved with faculty governance meetings. Governance in the teacher education department was questioned by Dominique:

> Like I've had some bad experiences, now twice, on the promotional and tenure committee...what I've witnessed as being a member of the committee and seeing the way things transpired, just didn't seem very just and very fair. So I do not have a lot of faith in the system of faculty governments or anything of that. I think that's all pretty much smoke and mirrors.

In the observation of the teacher education department, several governance issues arose, including reports by various committees within the department and the hiatus of several projects.

Workload

Two of the full-time faculty and one of the adjunct faculty members described their workload or other related job experience that had an impact on their participation. Compensation was the focus of Alex's statement below:

> I have had adjunct positions where about two-thirds of the way through the quarter, I think, "Man, I've done way more than the amount they're paying me." And it is not that you back off, but there is a little bit of – it is not resentment but what would be a mild form. Just – you feel like you have already earned your pay and you have another three or four weeks of work to do.

The difficulty of the tenure process was expressed by full-time faculty member Dominique:

> You had to show [for tenure] that you were you had a scholarly agenda, and the old adage: *publish or perish*, and the service commitment and the community and working in the partnership schools and stuff like that. They say they do not look…solely at teaching evaluations, but you try to get high teaching evaluations.

The extra duties beyond teaching weighed heavily on full-time faculty member Addison: "I feel like there are many demands here on my time beyond what is needed for teaching because of all of my service commitments. To the detriment, it's too much."

Budget Restrictions

A member of both the full-time and the adjunct faculty cited budget cuts at the state level as losing new opportunities for increased participation in the department. The loss of staff was mentioned by full-time faculty member Kelly:

> I think that the state has cut budgets, and so we have had to figure out where we can cut budgets…with these incentives…they are giving money for people to leave…but still – they figure they will not fill everything that is vacant.

Adjunct faculty member Cameron cited state budget cuts as a reason why she has not had more opportunities to participate:

> In the beginning, I taught two classes. And now, I am down to one class. It has just been a – kind of a budget thing for them to consolidate…and there was a definitely a no hiring freeze. So – because I know – I asked about a position. And – and they said, "Oh, I don't think it's going to go through."

Furthermore, at the teacher education department meeting, potential staff layoffs were announced as well as the chance to hire new adjunct faculty in the fall of the next school year.

Time

One of the adjunct faculty members indicated he had no time to participate further in the work of the department. Drew indicated that he would like to update a syllabus he shared with me but stated that he had no time to do so because of his schedule.

Other Commitments

All of the adjunct faculty members explained that other commitments influenced their participation. Family relationships were the main reason Alex and Drew chose to limit their participation. Alex explained:

> And my husband is retired now too, so the additional flexibility is really good for us. I also put my courses here not completely online, but a pretty heavy online hybrid so I do about 70 percent online and 30 percent face-to-face [which offers her more time at home].

Drew elaborated, “That's what I prefer. I have a wife and three kids, and…this is a small part of my life.” Cameron had other part-time work commitments, which limited how much she participated in the department.

Findings on Participation and Instruction

The research subquestion pertaining to adjunct and full-time faculty perceiving that their participation influences their instruction led to a discovery that adjunct and full-time faculty members have completely different views of how their participation affects

their instruction. All of the full-time faculty believed their participation in the teacher education department did affect instruction, whereas all of the adjunct faculty members did not.

Participation Did Affect Instruction for Full-Time Faculty

All full-time faculty members believed some aspect of their participation influenced their instruction. Kelly cited accountability as impacting instruction:

> I would have to say *yes* because I think the collegiality, the working together as a faculty, the professional development opportunities we do, it encourages you to reflect on your practice… we've got to do assessments that let us know whether we're doing what we say we're doing. And so all of that does, I think, help to improve [teacher education] candidates as well as their PK-12 students.

Jordan believed her relationships with other colleagues aided her work with students:

> Certain students have different things they want to discuss, and they might be a little too nervous to go to another faculty member that they need to have the discussion with…And so I will go and talk to that instructor, have that instructor come down and talk to the class as a whole…And that kind of opens it up, if anybody wants to ask questions, or wants to get involved.

Participating in meetings allowed Dominique to make connections:

> I mean, I would hope that in the departmental activities it helps you see the big picture of why you do what you do…When I sit in the department, I learn more about what my colleagues are doing in classes and other programs.

Addison concurred:

> I learn from my colleagues and from the meetings that I attend. When I learn new information, then I am able to share that with my students and make any needed program changes.

At the observed meetings, many of the participants' views above were substantiated by the work that was conducted in the meetings. The meetings were characterized by a collegial atmosphere in which several aspects of the work were tackled.

Participation Did Not Affect Instruction for Adjunct Faculty

All of the adjunct faculty members felt differently about how their participation or lack of participation impacted instruction. Alex taught classes that did not require participation, due to the courses' nature:

> I do not think so. But part of why I teach the [undisclosed class] and the [undisclosed class] is that they are reasonably static. They do not change real dramatically from year to year. So I do not have to be tied in as dramatically as I would be if I were teaching, say, reading or special education where things change more quickly.

Drew believed that his deliberate nonparticipation in the department was important for instruction:

> My lack of being an insider here, I think – one thing I get in my evaluations from my students is they really like that I'm in the [PK-12] classroom…They appreciate that, and so it's a breath of fresh air to them.

This statement also supports how Drew worked within the boundary of two communities of practice. Cameron believes that her work with her classes is more impacting than her participation in the teacher education department.

Faculty Work

Though not a specific research question, the varied aspects of faculty scholarship as portrayed by Boyer (1990) did emerge in the data. Boyer described four types of scholarship that faculty members carry out throughout their careers: discovery/research, application/service, integration/collaboration, and teaching, which were evident in the participants' experiences. In exploring the types of scholarship faculty participated in, I asked how they would improve aspects of their work. The findings presented in this section will illuminate the work conducted by the faculty of this department by analyzing the results according to Boyer's four types of scholarship.

Discovery/Research

Half of the full-time faculty members have conducted research or were actively researching. Kelly talked about writing a series of research articles, "So we have the one article that's being published, but we haven't had a chance to proceed with article number two and article number three." Kelly shared a university publication she coauthored with another full-time faculty member. Dominique was working on a research project at the university, "I like being able to do research things that interest me…you can have the time to do what you need to do." Jordan was researching for other stakeholders.

Teaching

All faculty members indicated they spent some portion of their time teaching students. The range of hours dedicated to teaching varied from 10 to almost 40, depending on the faculty member. Alex was pleased with the time she could spend on teaching:

> Yeah, you pretty much just come in and you do the teaching…whereas when you are full-time you have teaching, the service, the scholarship, – all those aspects that you need to juggle. And that is part of what I like about being an adjunct is I really can focus on the teaching. And I put way more into my teaching here than I did when I was full-time because I had all those other responsibilities. One of the things I have the luxury to do as an adjunct is I really do improve my course from quarter to quarter, because I have time to do that. I am ultra prepared whereas sometimes when I was teaching full-time, you know I might be just barely prepared.

Adjunct faculty member Cameron provided an artifact of a poem to show how creativity can be lost when students are taught in only one way. This was embodied in her words below:

> If I were to have my personal wishes fulfilled, I would really like to have a class designed that would be an elective that would be just about developing your own creativity. And how that – if you become, either through journaling or through visual arts or any of the arts, you become a richer teacher. And that I think that you become really more aware of what you can do to bring to your classroom.

Application/Service

Two of the three adjunct faculty and all four of the full-time faculty members committed to some type of service component of their work. One adjunct member conducted a workshop for fellow faculty members (Alex) while another participated in a study for a textbook adoption (Cameron). One full-time faculty member participated in professional organizations and committees (Kelly) and another supervised students (Jordan). Dominique explained her work with students:

> And then I also work with, like today I was out in the field with students who are taking their first field level experiences at the first phase...I enjoy going out in the field and talking with teachers and seeing what's going on out there.

Beyond supervising students at various sites, Addison was required to attend other meetings:

> Service and working within schools is expected. I have been assigned and work closely with one particular school. Due to this commitment, I am expected to attend school and district level meetings regularly.

In the program meeting, faculty members discussed students who were struggling and potential interventions for each.

Integration/Collaboration

The only data that illustrated integration, one of Boyer's (1990) types of scholarship, was that of a meeting topic witnessed in one of the observations around the planning of a mathematics and science seminar. Faculty members from the science and mathematics colleges collaborated with teacher education department faculty in the

construction of this seminar at one of the observed meetings. Meeting participants collaborated on the student audience, the appropriate time to take the course, who would teach it, and what content would be taught.

Recommendations for Improvement of Work Situation

All faculty members offered suggestions for improvement of their work situation for the purpose of improving instruction. Alex offered suggestions for more deliberate departmental integration of adjuncts into the faculty:

> It would probably be helpful to have an orientation...If they just had people come in at the beginning of the quarter and you give them coffee and a cookie and walk them around, introduce them to people, and just do the kind of logistical things….And that way when you see people in the hallway you at least have some recognition.

Addison agreed:

> The department and the faculty could do a better job with mentoring adjunct faculty and providing them with handbook type information. We could also be more attentive to making them feel like part of the department or a program team. We should do more to support adjunct instructors since we need them currently and will need them more in the future.

Full-time faculty member Dominique needed more administrative assistance for tasks such as emails and phone calls. Kelly would make improvements to her workload:

> And also, I need to be able to say *no* sometimes. I really find that I say *yes* because I think I am flattered to be asked. So when I am asked to serve on this

> and that, it is like, "Okay, I'll do that." So I probably do need to prioritize more, learn to say no and delegate more. I definitely need to delegate more, so I have to work on that.

Jordan wished for better communication with staff:

> Well, I think that amongst much of the staff, I think there needs to be a little more communication. I think there can be communication breakdowns sometimes…So there needs to be some communication so that everybody's working on the same level, so that the students are not getting confused. And that makes them put the professors against each other, which is no fault of their own. If you are getting mixed information, what can you expect?

Another topic mentioned by Alex was the desire to have course meetings:

> It could be relatively informal, you know kind of what did you do this quarter, what worked, what didn't work, what [teaching methods]…should I steal from you, which things do you not want anybody to even know about outside this room? You know, to have a really frank discussion of the course would be great... because the adjuncts do not care so much about the program as they do about their particular course. And they need to know where in the program their course is, but that is probably it.

While the faculty members above were more focused on relational issues, adjunct faculty members Drew and Cameron mentioned specific needs regarding materials and time. Drew mentioned improvements he could make to his own work, "There's a lot if I

had the time.…This course, I'd rewrite. I put everything electronically into PowerPoint. I would – I use overheads." Cameron needed more space for her supplies.

Types of Faculty Members

Adjunct and full-time faculty members perceived each other in different ways, as revealed by interview and observation data. Though not a research question, for the most part, adjuncts had a negative view of full-time faculty. Most full-time faculty, including those at observed meetings who were not interviewed, expressed respect for the work that adjuncts offer.

Perceptions of Full-Time Faculty

Two of the three adjunct faculty members and one of the four full-time faculty members described full-time faculty members as being disconnected from the PK-12 world. Drew contrasted students' views of his experience with those of full-time faculty work, "I'm not a full-time professor. I am in the classroom. I'm in the trenches, and they're tired of hearing theory." Jordan concurred, "There's a lot of professors…maybe they've been in teaching for 10, 15 years, and have no idea what's going on in the classrooms now." Dominique took offense at her perception of how some adjunct faculty view full-time faculty and wished for a better working atmosphere for both adjuncts and full-time faculty:

> I have also heard through the grapevine, adjuncts saying stuff like, "Oh, those professors. They haven't set foot in a school in years." Which is totally untrue. I was just in a school today. I was just out working with children…That is an old, old adage. That is no longer even close to being true. Almost like they need to put

> the other one down and I do not like that because I think we need to work together as partners in a teacher education program.

Perceptions of Adjunct Faculty

One of the adjunct and full-time faculty members had history as both types of faculty, which gave that individual a varied perspective. Alex explained:

> Now, as a former person who hired adjuncts, I would say that the thing with adjuncts is they are more variable. I would say our best teachers were adjuncts and our worst teachers were adjuncts. But you just have them at both ends because at the very best you have people who are not only knowledgeable, but they have wonderful current experience, which sometimes you lack with the full-time faculty. You know they might be very knowledgeable, but I think you get out of touch real quickly with reality if you do not do a lot of work in the schools. But then, I do think you have the adjuncts who do not really have the theoretical knowledge that they need, and they may not even be that good in PK-12, but they want to teach and they are available and they get hired.

Addison had a different position:

> I do not know if as a full-time faculty member that we think a lot about the adjuncts unless we know them or we had a tie, like we brought them in to teach this class…I know I've walked by the adjunct room and I see people in there, but if I do not know them, I typically do not stop. They may perceive me as not caring because of that. When I was an adjunct, I guess I perceived the people who I knew as friendly and nice and supportive, and others as just busy, or did not want

> to take the time…I could do a lot better job of checking in with them. And sometimes, we do view them as like saving us, though too. When we are trying to plan out the schedules and we do not have someone and to find someone who we can trust is a big deal. It is like, "yay, we got somebody!"

Adjunct faculty member Cameron had no idea how full-time faculty perceived adjuncts. Drew believed full-time faculty had an esteemed view of adjuncts:

> I think they appreciate — they appreciate us. We provide a service of – to be able to teach the courses so they can do research; they can travel, sabbatical – whatever they need to do. I think they value us, and I think that is great, and there is a respect our way toward them also.

Kelly held an esteemed view of adjuncts:

> I think that – I mean we could not do it without adjuncts. There is just too much to do for the full-time faculty to be able to do it all, and a lot of the adjuncts are people who are teachers or principals or whatever, who can bring some of that current knowledge and experience into the classroom…Yeah, I think that they realize that they are essential to what we do…I mean I think they see them as partners in doing what we do.

Dominique agreed, "With adjuncts being closer to the workplace, they have a lot to offer." In the teacher education department meeting, a few full-time faculty members were disappointed that they would lose viable adjunct faculty because new program standards required only full-time faculty to teach methods courses. Another meeting observed saw full-time faculty teachers debating whether the content seminar previously

mentioned should be taught by adjunct or full-time faculty with the discussion concluding that adjuncts are closer to the classroom setting.

Summary

The findings presented detail a rich and complicated experience of adjunct and full-time faculty members in a teacher education department. Similarities, differences, and contradictions surfaced that are typical of any participants in a social system. Each member offered a unique position and path but shared many elements from those of his or her colleagues. These findings, as well as implications for social change and future research, will be further examined in the next chapter.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Introduction

This chapter will synthesize the findings of this research study so that the research questions may be answered. In particular, the findings will be linked to the conceptual framework and literature review. Recommendations for further action, implications for social change, future research possibilities, and reflections on the study process will connect this study to the larger field of higher education. It is hoped this study will contribute to the research on university faculty and their experience in a teacher education department.

Overview

Higher education institutions prior to the late twentieth century were more focused on educational inputs than outputs (Anderson, 2007; Zumeta, 2005). Once key reports such as *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) and *Measuring Up* (National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, 2006) were published, the focus shifted to the outputs of student outcomes. Accrediting organizations, such as NCATE, helped teacher education departments in higher education institutions remodel their accountability systems to measure student outcomes. Still important are the inputs of teacher education, such as faculty and their instruction, that lead to successful student outcomes. Thus, the purpose of this study was to understand how both adjunct and full-time faculty members were situated in a teacher education department, how they experienced participation, and if their participation affected the

instruction of students. Citing a gap in the literature, I designed this study to understand this phenomenon.

Guiding this study were the research question—How do adjunct and full-time faculty members experience participation in a university teacher education department?—and the following subquestions:

1. What aspects of a community of practice, as perceived by the faculty members of a teacher education department and evidenced in artifacts and observations, are experienced by adjunct and full-time faculty members?
2. What influences the participation of faculty members in a community of practice?
3. Do adjunct and full-time faculty members perceive that their participation within the department affects their instruction? If so, to what extent and in what way does their participation affect their instruction?

Data from interviews, artifacts, and observations were gathered to address the research questions for this interpretive, phenomenological case study of three adjunct and four full-time faculty members. They were chosen using a stratified purposeful sampling method to ensure both types of faculty were selected as well as those who represented the proportion of minority faculty. All agreed to provide artifacts that epitomized their participation in the teacher education department. Both a program and department level meeting were observed. Data collection, organization, and analysis strategies ensured that standards for qualitative validity and reliability, as well as guidelines for interpreting phenomenologies, were met.

The table below organizes the findings by research subquestion:

Table 2

Summary of Research Findings

Research Subquestion	Findings
1. What aspects of a community of practice, as perceived by the faculty members of a teacher education department and evidenced in artifacts and observations, are experienced by adjunct and full-time faculty members?	• All seven participants experienced the aspects of meaning, identity, and community. • Five of the seven participants had experienced the aspect of practice. • No adjunct faculty members attended any of the observed meetings.
2. What influences the participation of faculty members in a community of practice?	• All of the seven participants cited accountability, workload, budget restrictions, time, or other commitments as influences on their participation in the teacher education department.
3. Do adjunct and full-time faculty members perceive that their participation within the department affects their instruction? If so, in their perception, to what extent, and in what way does their participation affect their instruction?	• All of the full-time but none of the adjunct faculty believed their participation in the teacher education department affected their instruction. • Those faculty members who did believe their participation affected their instruction attributed it to their collaboration with other colleagues.

Interpretation of Findings

The main research question of this study, How do adjunct and full-time faculty members experience participation in a university teacher education department?, synthesizes elements of faculty work, communities of practice, teacher education as a discipline, and adjunct versus full-time issues. In the output-based system of higher education, student learning is what ultimately matters, but faculty experiences support this goal. Addressing how adjunct and full-time faculty members experience participation requires an integrated response that was answered by the findings presented in chapter four. Participation and reification, faculty trajectories, influences on participation, participation influences on instruction, and teacher education will be explored in this chapter.

Participation and Reification

Legitimate peripheral participation is the concept conceived by Lave and Wenger (1991) that embodies how individuals become members of a community of practice. "Learners inevitably participate in communities of practitioners and…the mastery of knowledge and skill requires newcomers to move toward full participation in the sociocultural practices of a community" (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 29). An individual experiences legitimate peripheral participation when the learning gained is related to the community's practice, the learning is empowering due to the individual's ability to move to the center of the community, and participation is full. Learning is not only the knowledge and skills of the community but is social because of the formation of an identity within the community (Wenger, 1998). Consequently, if an individual is to be a

master of a community of practice, they need to participate fully in the department collaboratively to gain new social and discipline-based learning.

Of the seven faculty members, only the full-time members had participated regularly in the sociocultural practices of the department through meetings and other collaborations. Some adjuncts had been involved in projects (Cameron) or professional development (Alex) that extended beyond the department's expectations, but those had been voluntary and random occurrences. One adjunct (Drew) did not wish to participate beyond teaching. Most collaborations in which adjuncts were involved occurred with a mentor (in some cases, the chair of the department or another faculty member) and there was no attendance at any of the meetings observed, which is consonant with Bathmaker and Avis' (2005) study regarding the induction of new faculty members into a community of practice. Bathmaker and Avis found that new faculty members had difficulties co-constructing their community due to political or management issues. The adjunct faculty's lack of participation at departmental meetings indicates no co-construction of the community of practice.

In addition, the learning in the department varied between the types of faculty members. All faculty members created some type of reified product or process, but not all cocreated these products and processes. Full-time faculty, as evidenced by one of the observations, utilized a peer review process to analyze their syllabi. Adjuncts and full-time faculty both modeled their syllabi after previous course syllabi and supplemented them with their own education and experience. Full-time faculty had access to social learning to (a) gain better discipline knowledge and skills and (b) gain social learning

because of the access to sociocultural practices. As in Anderson's (2007) study on how adjunct faculty continue to learn despite marginalized conditions, adjunct faculty in the teacher education department still learned but had to rely more heavily on themselves to improve their knowledge of their discipline. Contradicting Anderson's position that adjuncts lack access to faculty development resources, Alex was able to access these resources on her own accord, which she perceived improved her work. Nevertheless, it was her own initiative that led to this improvement and not that of the department.

Clearly, not all of the adjuncts had experienced legitimate peripheral participation in this teacher education department. It may be probable that they will never experience this phenomenon, increase their social learning, or become masters of the community under the current sociocultural configuration of the teacher education department. Though each adjunct faculty member had access to many of the materials and resources of the full-time faculty and had a relationship with at least one master of the community, their opportunity to legitimately participate was not present. Lave and Wenger's (1991) condition that an individual's identity is formed in the community of practice as he or she becomes a master practitioner does not apply in this case. The adjunct faculty members in this study had other identities when they joined the department, in line with Fuller's et al. (2005) study that newcomers do not join communities of practice as blank slates.

Faculty perceptions may be intricately linked with the lack of participation. Wenger (1998) explained that if there is not enough balance between participation and reification of products and processes, problems may arise. Not enough participation by its members can increase suspicion in the community of practice. Most of the adjunct faculty

and even one of the full-time faculty members explained that full-time faculty members are too focused on theory and have difficulty sharing current practice with the students in their classrooms. It may be possible that the lack of participation by the adjuncts will lead to this perception of full-time faculty. It also may simply be that adjuncts use this perception to promote an aspect of adjunct work that was legitimized by other faculty. For instance, several of the full-time faculty members, both interviewed and observed at meetings, complimented adjunct faculty members on their close connection to the PK-12 world and wished that more collaboration were possible. These results are the opposite of what Smith and Shoho (2007) discovered in their study looking at faculty trust. They found that the level of trust in other faculty members decreased with increase in rank but in this study trust increased for the most part.

When I asked participants to recommend a meeting to attend in the department, I followed the suggestion of several adjunct and full-time faculty members and attended the teacher education department meeting. One full-time faculty member perceived that many of the items on the meeting agenda could be bulleted items sent out in an email or newsletter. At the meeting, several committees reported their progress on their work, one program coordinator read a report that was submitted to a university committee, and statistics were shared about the current and incoming student body. Laksov et al. (2008) recommended through their study on the inclusion and consequences of including scholarly topics on meeting agendas that departmental meetings be focused on products and processes that increase participation and reification by members. Many of the items from the departmental meeting could have been shared via another format due to their

informational nature but what would have been missed was the dialogue that did occur between faculty members seeking clarification and connecting departmental functions and programs. Briggs (2007) and Warhurst (2006) noted that faculty members experienced increased participation and reification as well when the organizer of the meetings distanced herself from the participants, ensured engaging items were included on the agenda, and meeting participants were able to cofacilitate the meetings. The chair organized the departmental meeting but was not an overwhelming presence, which allowed the participants to more fully engage with their colleagues.

It may be possible that if adjuncts (with some full-time faculty members) mutually engaged on the teaching function alone in meetings or other types of collaborations, the adjunct faculty might be able to experience legitimate peripheral participation, albeit in only one function of the department. If adjuncts collaborated with other adjuncts, supportive cohorts could develop to improve teaching, similar to Warhurst's (2006) study of apprentice lecturers who relied on each other. The difficulty of scheduling how a meeting is to take place as well as who can attend may also be considered due to the fact that adjuncts may not have availability outside of their teaching hours. An adjunct electronic forum or something comparable might allow adjuncts to collaborate on teaching but within the confines of their other professional obligations.

The practice of the community in terms of mutual engagement, joint enterprise, and shared repertoire was experienced partially by most of the faculty members. Most of the full-time faculty and part of the adjunct faculty indicated that they mutually engaged with other faculty on joint enterprises such as syllabi development, pedagogical

strategies, and departmental forms. For the adjunct faculty members, this mutual engagement was relegated to a brief collaboration with few other individuals in the department. According to Wenger (1998), mutual engagement involves agreements and disagreements about how the work of the community progresses. The full-time faculty members were constantly mutually engaging on projects with most of their full-time peers through departmental meetings; adjunct faculty was not. No explicit questions were asked of the participants regarding their shared repertoire.

Faculty Trajectories

Despite the lack of legitimate peripheral participation for adjuncts or the heavily involved workload of full-time faculty, the desired trajectory of each member is what most members perceived as important. Though legitimate peripheral participation had not been achieved, the adjunct faculty members indicated they were content with this situation due to their trajectories. Full-time faculty members were immersed in the department on an insider trajectory and were striving for a system (Kuhn, 1975) that reified its products and processes for the sake of improvement.

Maynard and Joseph's (2008) study both supported and contradicted findings of this study, finding greater satisfaction among voluntary adjuncts than involuntary adjuncts who wished to be full-time faculty members. In this study, though some of the adjuncts (Alex and Cameron) wished to have more involvement in the department as full-time members, they were also content with their current situation as adjuncts.

In concordance with these trajectories, the participation of each of the members in the teacher education department was different and in some cases, had consequences for

their identities and learning in the department. One adjunct member's (Alex) current perception of her peripheral participation was determined by an incident with a nonsupportive full-time faculty member who did not think adjuncts should collaborate on syllabus design despite the adjunct faculty member's prior experience and credentials. Warhurst (2006) described a similar experience of one of his study's participants who was qualified to engage in a project but was left out by other faculty members. Though this adjunct was willing to volunteer for more functions than just teaching, this incident solidified the decision to move to the periphery. One full-time faculty member (Dominique) was so quickly immersed in the department's work as an insider that there was little time for induction. Poyas and Smith's (2007) research spoke of how PK-12 educators struggle to form new identities when they begin working as teacher educators. One full-time faculty member spoke of the induction into the teacher education department as an insider: "Well, it's been exciting. I will say this is quite different from teaching children." This experience was difficult at first as she tried to navigate a new community and teach a different age group, but she eventually established a sense of direction.

Influences on Participation

Issues such as time, compensation, and other commitments may also influence this participation. All of the adjuncts had commitments, whether familial and/or professional, that they honored, so participation was already limited. Compensation was mentioned by one of the adjuncts (Alex) as an explanation for why adjuncts limited their participation as well. If their pay is low, which Alex perceived, then volunteering for

anything beyond teaching was highly unlikely. Drew wishes he had more time to improve his courses, but with a full-time teaching job outside of the teacher education department, this was difficult.

The full-time faculty members met for the purpose of enhancing their teaching, discovery/research, application/service, and integration functions, and both of the meetings observed found several of these functions addressed. Issues such as accountability and tenure were mostly perceived to influence participation for full-time faculty members. Heavily evident at the observed meetings and throughout the interviews was the need to complete reports for processes such as NCATE and state compliance. Senge's (1990) form of adaptive learning, which is the type of learning that occurs when the survival of resources, ideas, or people is at stake, came to mind when observing and listening to the participants talk about accountability. Tenure weighed heavily on one of the full-time faculty members (Dominique) due to the personal drive to achieve this status for increased recognition in the department while maintaining her other duties. The number of students needing supervision and relevant meetings to attend to support the students was something another full-time faculty member (Addison) felt took a lot of time in the week.

Participation Influences Instruction

In this study, when asked if participation in the teacher education department influenced their instruction, the faculty members were split by type. Adjuncts felt that their participation did not affect their instruction whereas full-time faculty members did. The adjuncts did not participate fully, so there may be little to no connection between

participation and instruction. One adjunct (Alex) believed that the course she taught was relatively established, so collaboration with other faculty members would not yield new instructional insights; another (Drew) believed his own PK-12 experience impacted instruction. On the other hand, full-time faculty members cited meetings and interactions in the department where they gained new information, networked with other teachers, and created products that they felt would eventually aid students. The delineation between faculty types regarding this issue also speaks to the type of learning gained by both types of faculty. It is evident that the full-time faculty cited both learning that was interactional as well as discipline-based as impacting instruction, whereas adjuncts only discuss discipline-based learning, acquired alone.

This finding of the influence of participation on student instruction solely for full time faculty may be problematic for the teacher education department. Darling-Hammond (2006) discussed how both department leaders and full-time faculty are concerned about the distance between adjunct members and the discussions around teacher preparation. If adjunct members claim they are not participating in departmental functions, and none of them did during the observed meetings I attended, then how can they be aware of the most current information about teacher preparation? For instance, in the program meeting, discussions were held about the construction and review of new syllabi to accommodate the move from quarters to semesters as well as whether a new course should require students to attend an internship in the field. Adjunct faculty members could have provided critical feedback on both of these topics, which would have directly influenced the instruction of students through methods and content. On the

other hand, faculty governance topics that were explored in the teacher education department could have been good for adjuncts to be knowledgeable about but were more appropriate for full-time faculty and staff.

Teacher Education

In regard to research, an element corroborating Labaree's (2004) work was uncovered through the interviews and observed meetings. Labaree contrasts how education research is soft due to multiple variables that can influence results and applied because it is practical, versus other sciences that exemplify hard research that can isolate variables and are pure because they produce theory. In one of the observations, the faculty discussed capstone student research studies that were to be given at a symposium. Professors from other colleges in the university were questioning the research topics of the teacher education students, which put the teacher education staff on the defensive about their research standards. In addition, Dominique elaborated in her interview on this conundrum that the department's teacher educators faced:

> They do not think the type of research we do is valuable because we do qualitative. They do not value qualitative research. They think we could put kids in these little test tubes and isolate all these variables, and that is not just the nature of the beast.

Another way that Labaree's (2004) observations are supported in the work of this faculty is through the lack of content in teacher education courses. At an observed meeting, faculty members from the teacher and mathematics education departments were discussing which program would be most qualified to teach a mathematics education

seminar. The seminar could be taught by middle childhood or adolescent young adult education faculty, as those would be the kind of students participating in the seminar. It was determined that the middle childhood program would be most appropriate because of its focus on teaching methods rather than the content-rich adolescent program. Labaree's contention that less content is taught in teacher education departments was recognized at this meeting.

Summary

Participation was experienced by full-time and adjunct faculty in the teacher education department in an intricate web of approaches and intersections. Each faculty member engaged with the rest of the teacher education community in either involved or limited ways. Participation was influenced by various factors that required faculty either to collaborate or to distance themselves from one another. Full-time faculty felt their increased involvement in the department affected instruction, whereas adjunct faculty perceived the opposite.

Implications for Social Change

Communities of practice exist in several human endeavors, including which higher education. This study might inform various communities of practice about the dynamics of peripheral, insider, and marginal members and their participation in the community. Products and processes that are reified either individually or collaboratively and the need to have access to experts and resources was evident in the teacher education department and may have implications for other communities. The findings from this study might be generalized to several types of social communities.

By reworking the functions of the department based upon the revelation of faculty needs, the purpose and growth within the department may become apparent. Faculty members, their work, and their collaboration with other faculty may also be impacted. The sharing of responsibility for the creation and revision of departmental products and processes as well as improved quality interactions with each other was evident in this study, whether one was a full-time faculty member who was able to participate in this work or an adjunct who longed to participate in this work. These changes in leadership and faculty may ultimately lead to increased student achievement. These students will have the power to impact several generations of young students for years to come.

Recommendations for Action

The individuals who may benefit from the results of this study include faculty members (both adjunct and full-time), program coordinators, department chairs, college deans, and provosts. Other individuals who work within communities of practice (and not necessarily in higher education) may also gain knowledge from the results of this study. The following are suggestions for recommended actions based upon the findings of this study:

1. Chairs and deans need to determine the desired career trajectories, as well as strengths and weaknesses, of full-time and adjunct faculty in a community of practice and maximize opportunities as best they can for each member. Budget restrictions and other factors might influence the ability to promote or tenure faculty, but all efforts should be made to capitalize on the department's current sources of professional skills and knowledge in their faculty.

2. Occasional walkthroughs of classes might be scheduled to assess the progress of both adjunct and full-time faculty members. This information may also assist the chair and dean in understanding the needs of their faculty.
3. Departmental products and processes should be available to both adjunct and full-time faculty to create and revise. Even though some faculty may not be able to meet in person, e-discussions or other electronic means to produce and revise departmental artifacts may be an alternative that could ease the burden of full-time faculty who produce a significant amount of these items and tap the expertise of adjuncts. On the other hand, this may increase the adjunct time investment without financial compensation.
4. Full-time faculty members who are responsible for programs within the department should schedule course meetings with all faculty members who teach those courses. This way, adjunct and full-time faculty can collaborate to ensure that standards and assessments are aligned and that students in each section of the course will have an equitable learning experience.
5. Meetings which both adjunct and/or full-time faculty members can attend should be scheduled to increase participation and thereby enhance instruction. Substitute faculty members should be considered so all can attend.
6. Meeting agendas and minutes should be made available to all faculty members at least a few days before the meeting so both types of faculty can make informed decisions regarding attendance.

7. Meeting agenda topics need to be reviewed by the meeting facilitator for the appropriate dissemination method. Topics that require the expertise of the faculty in the meeting should be programmed.
8. Increased coteaching opportunities might be a means to enhance the work of the teacher education department community as well as develop the relationships between adjunct and full-time faculty.
9. Orientations, handbooks, and other induction events or products should be created for both adjunct and full-time faculty.
10. Faculty mentors, materials, and resources should be available to both full-time and adjunct faculty.

Recommendations for Further Study

In regards to the research methodology, there are changes that, if implemented, might lead to different outcomes. For instance, a different department at the university of the study could be the focus to determine if those adjunct and full-time faculty members experience participation similarly or differently. A teacher education department at another university or across multiple universities could be explored. The observations could include meetings where adjuncts are the target audience (such as the course meetings that Alex mentions). A protocol for observing adjunct and full-time faculty members who teach the same course could be designed and utilized. Part of an interview schedule might include specific questions about the artifacts that the participants provide regarding topics such as how was the artifact developed, with whom, and how the participant believes the artifact contributes to the department. Focus groups could be

formed of full-time and adjunct faculty to discuss their participation in the teacher education department. To increase the validity of the data, interviews with the participants could be done over the course of an academic year.

There are some research questions that could be further explored. How do chairs and deans perceive how faculty members participate in the department? How are the NCATE outcomes influenced, if at all, by faculty participation in the teacher education department? Do students perform better in certain areas of their licensing exams depending on the type of faculty who provided instruction in those areas? Walden University recently began using the title of *contributing faculty* for their adjunct (previously called part-time) faculty members and *core faculty* for their full-time faculty members. Does a shift in language such as this one result in a shift in perceptions about others and oneself in a faculty community of practice? Another research question could pertain to how a university's mission aligns to faculty recognition and rewards.

Linking this research topic to other issues could lead to some interesting studies. One study could include analyzing longitudinally the grades and/or graduation outcomes of students taught by adjunct or full-time faculty. With all variables equal, do students earn better grades in one type of faculty member's class over another? A syllabi review of adjunct and full-time faculty classes could be conducted to uncover what differences, if any, exist between the curriculum and assessment of each. Another study could pair an adjunct and full-time faculty member together in a coteaching situation and determine student outcomes of such an undertaking. Similarly, the collaboration of adjunct and full-time faculty in a research study could also be studied. A time study might be conducted

that measures how much time full and adjunct faculty spend on discovery/research, application/service, integration, teaching, governance, and other tasks over a period of time.

Researcher Reflection

At the time I joined Walden University, I was teaching as an adjunct faculty member and was experiencing difficulties with another full-time faculty member. This full-time faculty member, who was also the program coordinator of the course, had expectations for what skills and knowledge students needed to possess before entering their courses and was dismayed at the perceived performance of these students, not just from my sections, but all sections, of the prerequisite courses. After several attempts to collaborate, a meeting was arranged with the full-time faculty member to discuss what these expectations were and integrate them into the course curriculum before the course began again. During the meeting, the full-time faculty member proceeded to critique my assessment choices and scoring practices rather than focus on the curriculum, which was the main complaint. My stance was that if the curriculum is not accurate then the assessments could not be accurate either, so there was no usefulness in reviewing the assessments. There was no resolution to the problem.

This incident created my need to belong in the community of faculty practitioners and work with them proactively and productively. I then began studying the history of higher education, adult learning, collaboration, faculty, and governance during my tenure at Walden to understand these dynamics. Eventually, my dissertation topic was formed based upon this previous experience and work.

The selection of the topic was motivated by a desire to understand if other adjunct faculty members had felt the same need. That is the extent of any possible personal bias that may have entered the research study. From the creation of the research questions that were open-ended to the research design of an interpretive phenomenology (which could have easily included personal knowledge interpretations but were deliberately left out), there has been an improbable chance of this preconceived notion influencing the findings of the study. My body language as well as the utterances between participant responses were carefully self-monitored to ensure adjunct faculty were not receiving extra encouragement or support of their plight more than full-time faculty.

By conducting this study, I realized that each faculty member, full-time or adjunct, has a trajectory that is unique and complicated. Not all adjunct faculty members desire to be as involved as I wished to be. The voluminous work and responsibilities of full-time faculty inspired awe and appreciation. The full-time faculty member that I conflicted with may have had little to no time to collaborate or dedicate to a curricular overhaul of the course. This study helped me positively reframe my previous perceptions of adjunct and full-time faculty relationships.

Summary

Understanding how faculty members engage with their professional community can help university teacher education departments as they piece together all of the elements that account for increased student achievement. The elements that this study informed included the teacher education department as a community of practice, topics specific to adjunct and full-time faculty members, their identity in the community of

practice, the meaning derived from their work, and the perceived impact of their participation on student instruction.

Findings from the study include a variety of concepts that span from the individual to all participants. Most notably, full-time and adjunct faculty members perceive their participation in the teacher education department does and does not influence their instruction, respectively. In addition, faculty members are on different trajectories for how fully they want to participate in the department. What is evident is that departmental and other college leaders should consider taking time to understand each of the individuals in their communities and differentiate their leadership to meet the needs of each person. From that point, creating collaborative opportunities and other types of connections for all faculty members, both adjunct and full-time, can promote a self-sustaining and inclusive departmental system that is learning generatively, for the sake of learning itself (Senge, 1990). This would further enhance the university classroom environment, which would benefit teacher candidates and ultimately their future students.

References

Ajjawi, R., & Higgs, J. (2007). Using hermeneutic phenomenology to investigate how experienced practitioners learn to communicate clinical reasoning. *The Qualitative Report, 12*(4), 612-638.

Anderson, E. L. (2002). *The new professoriate: Characteristics, contributions, and compensation*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Anderson, L. W. (2007). *Congress and the classroom: From the Cold War to "No Child Left Behind."* University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Anderson, V. (2007). Contingent and marginalized? Academic development and part-time teachers. *International Journal for Academic Development, 12*(2), 111-121.

Anis, M., Armstrong, S. J., & Zhu, Z. (2004). The influence of learning styles on knowledge acquisition in public sector management. *Educational Psychology, 24*(4), 549-571.

Banathy, B. H. (1973). *Developing a systems view of education: The systems-model approach*. Belmont, CA: Siegler/Fearon.

Barriga, A. Q., Cooper, E. K., Gawelek, M. A., Butela, K., & Johnson, E. (2008). Dialogue and exchange of information about grade inflation can counteract its effects. *College Teaching, 56*(4), 201-209.

Bathmaker, A., & Avis, J. (2005). Becoming a lecturer in further education in England: The construction of professional identity and the role of communities of practice. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 31*(1), 47-62.

Bontekoe, R. (1996). *Dimensions of the hermeneutic circle*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Carnegie Foundation.

Briggs, C. L. (2007). Curriculum collaboration: A key to continuous program renewal. *Journal of Higher Education, 78*(6), 676-711.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Constructing 21st-century teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*(3), 300-314.

Edwards, C., & Titchen, A. (2003). Research into patients' perspectives: Relevance and usefulness of phenomenological sociology. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 44*(5), 450-460.

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

Fuller, A., Hodkinson, H., Hodkinson, P., & Unwin, L. (2005). Learning as peripheral participation in communities of practice: A reassessment of key concepts in workplace learning. *British Educational Research Journal, 31*(1), 49-68.

Gadamer, H. G. (2004). *Truth and method* (Rev. ed.). London, England: Continuum.

Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1993). *The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Grene, M. (Ed.) (1969). *Knowing and being: Essays by Michael Polanyi*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Jaschik, S. (2009). Adjunct breakthrough (II). *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2009/12/02/adjunct

Jawitz, J. (2007). New academics negotiating communities of practice: Learning to swim with the big fish. *Teaching in Higher Education, 12*(2), 185-197.

Kahveci, A., Southerland, S. A., & Gilmer, P. J. (2008). From marginality to legitimate peripherality: Understanding the essential functions of a women's program. *Science Education, 92*(1), 33-64.

Kuhn, A. (1975). *Unified social science: A system-based introduction*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.

Labaree, D. F. (2004). *The trouble with ed schools*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Laksov, K. B., Mann, S., & Dahlgren, L. O. (2008). Developing a community of practice around teaching: A case study. *Higher Education Research & Development, 27*(2), 121-132.

Landrum, R. E., & Lisenbe, N. R. (2008). Use of alumni perceptions to evaluate instructional and departmental quality. *College Student Journal, 42*(2), 408-415.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Lei, S. A. (2008). Assessment techniques of instructors in two community colleges in a state-wide system. *Education, 128*(3), 392-411.

Lopez, K. A., & Willis, D. G. (2004). Descriptive versus interpretive phenomenology: Their contributions to nursing knowledge. *Qualitative Health Research, 14*(5), 726-735.

Lucas, A. F. (2000). A teamwork approach to change in the academic department. In A. F. Lucas and Associates, *Leading academic change: Essential roles for department chairs.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Madison, G. B. (1988). *The hermeneutics of postmodernity: Figures and themes.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative researching* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Maynard, D. C., & Joseph, T. A. (2008). Are all part-time faculty underemployed? The influence of faculty status preference on satisfaction and commitment. *Higher Education, 55*(2), 139-154.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B., Courtenay, B., & Baumgartner, L. (2003). On becoming a witch: Learning in a marginalized community of practice. *Adult Education Quarterly, 53*(3), 170-188.

National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education (NCPPHE). (2006). *Measuring up: The national report card on higher education*. Retrieved November 29, 2008 from http://measuringup.highereducation.org/

National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE). (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform* [Electronic version]. Retrieved November 29, 2008 from http://www.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/index.html

National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). (2007). *NCATE at 50.* Retrieved March 22, 2009 from http://www.ncate.org/documents/15YearsofGrowth.pdf

Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization Science, 5*(1), 14-37.

Odman, P. J., & Kerdeman, D. (1997). Hermeneutics. In Keeves, J. P. (Ed.), *Educational research, methodology, and measurement: An international handbook* (pp. 185-192). Tarrytown, NY: Elsevier Science.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Leech, N. L. (2007). A call for qualitative power analyses. *Quality & Quantity, 41*(1), 105-121.

Polkinghorne, D. (1983). *Methodology for the human sciences.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Polyani, M. (1969). *Knowing and being.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Poyas, Y., & Smith, K. (2007). Becoming a community of practice – the blurred identity of clinical faculty teacher educators. *Teacher Development, 11*(3), 313-334.

Price, M. (2005). Assessment standards: The role of communities of practice and the scholarship of assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 30*(3), 215-230.

Reeves, D. B. (2002). *The leader's guide to standards: A blueprint for educational equity and excellence*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ricoeur, P. (1976). *Interpretation theory: Discourse and the surplus of meaning*. Fort Worth, TX: Texas Christian University Press.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline.* New York, NY: Currency.

Smith, P. A., & Shoho, A. R. (2007). Higher education trust, rank, and race: A conceptual and empirical analysis. *Innovative Higher Education, 32*(3), 125-138.

Sonner, B. S. (2000). A is for 'adjunct': Examining grade inflation in higher education. *Journal of Education for Business, 76*(1), 5-9.

St. Germain, L., & Quinn, D. M. (2005). Investigation of tacit knowledge in principal leadership. *The Educational Forum, 70*(1), 75-90.

Sundin, K., Jansson, L., & Norberg, A. (2002). Understanding between care providers and patients with stroke and aphasia: A phenomenological hermeneutic inquiry. *Nursing Inquiry, 9*(2), 93-103.

Warhurst, R. P. (2006). "We really felt part of something": Participatory learning among peers within a university teaching-development community of practice. *International Journal for Academic Development, 11*(2), 111-122.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Zlotkowski, E. (1998). A service learning approach to faculty development. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 73*, 81-89.

Zumeta, W.M. (2005). Accountability and the private sector: State and federal perspectives. In J. C. Burke (Ed.), *Achieving accountability in higher education: Balancing public, academic, and market demands* (pp. 25-54). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

.

Appendix A: Letter of Cooperation

Crystal Aker
[redacted]

June 12, 2009

Dear Ms. Aker,

Based on my review of your research proposal. I give preliminary permission for you to conduct the study entitled The Experience of Adjunct and Full-Time Faculty Participation in a University Teacher Education Department: An Interpretive Phenomenological Inquiry within [redacted] As part of this study, I authorize you to contact, survey, and interview adjunct and full-time faculty members affiliated with the [redacted] Individuals' participation will be voluntary and at their own discretion. We reserve the right to withdraw from the study at any time if our circumstances change. Personal information and contact information for faculty, other than campus contact information may not be provided.

I confirm that I am authorized to initiate the approval process for research in this setting contingent upon a favorable review from [redacted] IRB. It is your responsibility to initiate and secure this approval from the [redacted] IRB.

I understand that the data collected will remain entirely confidential and may not be provided to anyone outside of your dissertation research team without permission from the Walden University IRB.

Appendix B: Letter of Participation

Good morning,

My name is Crystal Aker and I am a doctoral student at Walden University as well as a former adjunct instructor of [undisclosed].

I am currently conducting my dissertation study, which aims to understand how faculty members perceive participation in a teacher education department.

Would you be interested in participating in the study? Your expertise would greatly enhance my research. The study would consist of an interview and sharing of departmental artifacts (syllabi, course curriculum, etc.).

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me by my email at crystal.aker@waldenu.edu. I work full-time but have several times when I could meet you, whatever is best for your schedule.

Thank you so much for consideration of my request and I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,
Crystal Aker

Appendix C: Interview Questions

A. Greeting, identification of interviewer, and description of study

1. How did you first come to work as an adjunct/full-time faculty member?
    a. When did you first begin working at [undisclosed]?
    b. Is this a long- or short-term appointment?
    c. Have/do you teach both graduate and undergraduate courses?
2. Can you tell me about your experience as an adjunct/full-time faculty member at [undisclosed]?
    a. Can you describe your experience as it relates to your involvement in the teacher education department?
    b. How many hours per week do you dedicate to teaching?
    c. How many hours per week do you dedicate to other functions?
3. What departmental resources, information, and skills do you have access to that are useful in your work?
4. Are there any departmental functions are you invited to participate in? Which functions?
    a. To what extent do you wish to be involved in departmental functions in which you are not already participating?
    b. How has your participation in departmental functions developed over time? Do you attend functions consistently when offered the opportunity? Why are these important to you to attend?
5. Are there any departmental processes or products you have assisted in cocreating?

a. Can you tell me about them?

b. What was the process like?

c. How did you get involved?

d. Has there been any followup?

6. Do you believe your level of participation in the teacher education department has affected your instruction and student learning? If so, how and to what extent?

7. How do you believe adjunct and full-time faculty members perceive the other in the teacher education department?

8. Is there anything you would do to improve any aspects of your work? If so, how?

9. Are there differences in the work/planning of graduate or undergraduate courses? If so, what are they?

10. Is there a departmental function you would suggest I ask to attend?

11. Is there anything that I have not asked that you would like to share or something that has surprised you or stood out about our discussion?

B. Possibility of scheduling a followup interview, contact for member checking and clarification, and salutation

Appendix D: Interview and Research Question Alignment

Interview Question	Research Subquestion
1. How did you first come to work as an adjunct/full-time faculty member?	Not Applicable
a. When did you first begin working at [undisclosed]?	Not Applicable
b. Is this a long- or short-term appointment?	2
c. Have/do you teach both graduate and undergraduate courses?	1
2. Can you tell me about your experience as an adjunct/full-time faculty member at [undisclosed]?	1
a. Can you describe your experience as it relates to your involvement in the teacher education department?	1
b. How many hours per week do you dedicate to teaching?	1
c. How many hours per week do you dedicate to other functions?	1
3. What departmental resources, information, and skills do you have access to that are useful in your work?	1
4. Are there any departmental functions are you invited to participate in? Which?	1, 2
a. To what extent do you wish to be involved in departmental functions in which you are not already participating?	1, 2
b. How has your participation in departmental functions developed over time? Do you attend functions consistently when offered the opportunity? Why are these important to you to attend?	1, 2
5. Are there any departmental processes or products you have assisted in cocreating?	1, 2
a. Can you tell me about them?	1, 2
b. What was the process like?	1, 2
c. How did you get involved?	1, 2
d. Has there been any followup?	1, 2
6. Do you believe your level of participation in the teacher education department has affected your instruction and student learning? If so, how and to what extent?	3
7. How do you believe adjunct and full-time faculty members perceive the other in the teacher education department?	1, 2
8. Is there anything you would do to improve any aspects of your work? If so, how?	1, 2

9. Are there differences in the work/planning of graduate or undergraduate courses? If so, what are they?	1, 2
10. Is there a departmental function you would suggest I ask to attend?	Not Applicable
11. Is there anything that I have not asked that you would like to share or something that has surprised you or stood out about our discussion?	1, 2, 3

Appendix E: Sample Transcript Page

Interviewer: Yeah, maybe, yeah, that's – those are two very different concentrations there. So, okay. Now, working in the department – I mean, how would you say that is in terms of your involvement?

Interviewee: I really try to be very self-sufficient. I try not to ask for anything or inquire about too much or be, like – I think my biggest interaction with the office is mostly just handouts and inquiry about new textbooks that might be coming out, that kind of thing. I do not really interact with them very much. There have been a couple of times where they have had – I think maybe – not even – maybe once, maybe twice where they have had adjunct meetings to hear our opinions on things. But I don't think they've done one at all this year. And so, you know, I feel like I don't really need it. But maybe it would be nice just as a, like, "hey, you're part of us kind of thing." Because I feel like I am still kind of on the fringes. I do not – I mean, I know the people in the office. But we don't interact with other full-time faculty much at all. ... So, like some of them will give me a nod or "hey, how's it going?" … Not, you know, which isn't very complimentary. But, you know –

Interviewer: Not as a fellow colleague essentially.

Interviewee: I mean, yeah, I don't feel like I'm getting a nod as I'm a student, not as I'm part of them. And in fact, one asked me, "Oh, you're still here." Because there were cutbacks. And they were, like, shocked that I was still here. But do you know something I don't know? So that was during that kind of scary period about – oh, I don't know, six months ago where they thought that everything was kind of going to be – it was like this big, black cloud that they kind of worked it out I guess. I think there was some – they had promised some tax rebates. And then they didn't give them back to the people so that they could keep higher education at the status that kind of was. Although they had already laid off quite a few people I think. That is probably something that you are probably going to have to look into. Because I do not know the details of that.

Appendix F: Sample Observation Notes

Teacher Education Department Meeting

Prediscussion
-articulation
-dual credit
-chair: acknowledge hard work of teachers

Committee
-standards revision and LPDC
-tech committee (new software)
-graduate studies committee

Senate
-conflicts = data from different sources
-reports recommendations
-questioning about intervention specialists
-report submitted was changed
-resolve conflicts
-difficulty of allowing nondegree students to take courses but student want to act like they are admitted
-faculty governance

Appendix G: Data Analysis Spreadsheet

Research Question	First Order Construct		Text	Reference	Faculty
	Time		Artifact Review - It's just because I'm not gonna put the time – I don't have the time to put into it to update it.	4 - 14	A
	Other Commitments		And my husband's retired now too, so the additional flexibility is really good for us. I also put my courses here not completely online, but a pretty heavy online hybrid so I do about 70 percent online and 30 percent face-to-face.	1	A
			That's what I prefer. I have a wife and three kids, and I've – this is a small part of my life.	4	A
Participation Affects Instruction					
	Perception	Yes	I would have to say yes because I think the collegiality, the working together as a faculty, the professional development kinda opportunities we do, it encourages you to reflect on your practice.	2	F
			So in preparation for that, we've gotta do assessments that let us know whether we're doing what we say we're doing. And so all of that does, I think, help to improve candidates as well as on their K-12 students. So that's what we're striving to do anyway, so I would say yes.teaching and learning and the impact on our	2	F
			Yes, I do believe so. I do believe so, and I will say I think that, again, I'm going to back to my personality and my style of instruction: that certain students have different things they want to discuss, and they might be a little too nervous to go to another faculty member that they need to have the discussion with. So, my – you can put on my back, where I have to take care of that, okay? And so I will go and talk to that instructor, have that instructor come down and talk to the class as a whole, because you never want to single anybody out. Just, "it seemed, there	3	F

Appendix H: Summary Sheet Sample

	Subtopic	Addison	Alex	Cameron	Dominique	Drew	Jordan	Kelly	Total	Percent
Research Subquestion 1 - Aspects of a Community of Practice										
Participation									**0**	**0%**
Reification		**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**7**	**100%**
Insider Participation		**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**		**1**	**1**	**6**	**86%**
Outsider Participation									**0**	**0%**
Peripheral Participation			**1**			**1**		**1**	**3**	**43%**
Marginal Participation			**1**	**1**					**2**	**29%**
Peripheral Trajectory		**1**	**1**	**1**		**1**			**4**	**57%**
Inbound Trajectory		**1**	**1**	**1**			**1**		**4**	**57%**
Insider Trajectory		**1**			**1**		**1**	**1**	**4**	**57%**
Boundary Trajectory									**0**	**0%**
Outward Trajectory							**1**		**1**	**14%**
Masters			**1**	**1**		**1**	**1**		**4**	**57%**
Resources		**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**7**	**100%**
Materials		**1**	**1**	**1**		**1**	**1**	**1**	**6**	**86%**
Mutual Engagement		**1**	**1**		**1**		**1**	**1**	**5**	**71%**
Joint Enterprise		**1**	**1**					**1**	**3**	**43%**
Shared Repertoire									**0**	**0%**
Research Subquestion 2 - Influences Participation										
NCATE		**1**	**1**		**1**			**1**		
Other					**1**				**1**	**14%**
Accountability					**1**			**1**	**2**	**29%**
Job Description		**1**					**1**	**1**	**3**	**43%**
Budget		**1**		**1**	**1**			**1**	**4**	**57%**
Time						**1**			**1**	**14%**
Other Commitments			1	1		1			**3**	**43%**
Research Subquestion 3 - Participation Affects Instruction										
Yes		1			1		1	1	**4**	**57%**
No			1	1		1			**3**	**43%**

Appendix I: Concepts and Codes

Research Subquestion 1 - Aspects of a Community of Practice

Meaning
Participation
Reification

Identity
Insider Participation
Outsider Participation
Peripheral Participation
Marginal Participation
Peripheral Trajectory
Inbound Trajectory
Insider Trajectory
Boundary Trajectory
Outward Trajectory

Community
Masters
Resources
Opportunities

Practice
Mutual Engagement
Joint Enterprise
Shared Repertoire

Research Subquestion 2 - Influences Participation

Accountability
Job Description
Budget
Time
Other Commitments

Research Subquestion 3 - Participation Affects Instruction

Yes
No

Other Experiences

Faculty Work
Discovery
Teaching
Application
Integration
Governance
Improvement

Types of Faculty
Full-Time
Adjunct

Appendix J: Sample Reflection Journal Page

Adjunct
Wants to be involved but with conditions
Feels excluded
Has had one raw experience
Syllabi – confirm contention and autonomy
Respects some full-time faculty – administration view

Does not want to be involved
Syllabus – adds to course year to year
Respects full-time faculty
Supplementary to full-time work

Wants to be more involved
Poem – embodies spirit of teaching
Feels she must not appear so needy
Mixed feelings toward full-time (prior experience as a student and "nose in books" paradigm)

Full-Time
Thinks highly of adjuncts
Is inundated with three types of work (discovery, application, and teaching)
Several projects
Publication – scholarship and collaboration

Agenda - involved in major department decisions despite short-term appointment
Not participated in reification
Difference in adjuncts due to structural causes (time teaching)
Forced outward trajectory

Inundated with administrative tasks
Lacks efficacy in decision making (top down) – plight of adjuncts?
Mixed feelings on adjuncts
Content with teaching, research, and application

Wants to get adjuncts more involved and increase their resources
Overcommitted to several projects and committees
Time spent between teaching and application
Past recent experience as an adjunct

Overall
Everyone has access to materials, resources, and at least one colleague