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Problem

The most recent data from the U.S. Department of Educational Statistics estimate that part-time faculty now comprises almost half of the faculty labor force; many believe this statistic has been gravely underestimated. Powerful unions like the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU) believe that universities are relying too heavily on part-time faculty members and that this over-reliance threatens the quality of higher education today. The debate surrounding the use of part-time faculty seems to focus on issues of instructor confidence, loyalty, and student satisfaction. Many question whether a part-time faculty member can deliver quality instruction and contribute to the community of
learners as well as their full-time tenured counterparts. This dissertation explores whether peer mentoring is an effective means to increase confidence, loyalty to the organization, and student satisfaction scores among part-time faculty members.

Method

An ex post facto research design was used to explore the quality of a previous peer-mentoring experience and its relationship to several dependent variables. The sample was comprised of the eligible 600 part-time faculty who taught in the School of Business at a large, private, Christian, mid-western university. Data were collected using an online survey instrument, comprised of four subscales. After the data were collected, descriptive statistics were generated and a Pearson $r$ was calculated and correlational matrixes generated to initially determine what, if any, significant relationships existed between the independent and dependent variables. Linear regression models were generated to answer the research hypotheses.

Results

One of the study’s major findings was the significant relationship that exists between mentoring and instructor confidence. Independent variables, such as age and gender, did not significantly affect these results. However, part-time faculty who taught for other universities tended to score higher in the measure of instructor confidence than those with experience teaching only for the University.

While the fidelity or the quality of the mentoring program was not significantly related to instructor confidence, it was significantly related to institutional loyalty. This finding was independent of the type of mentor and the other demographic variables,
including teaching at other universities. This was a surprising find, particularly in light of the way teaching at multiple institutions is portrayed negatively in the literature.

Finally, the research asked whether part-time faculty members who received mentoring have students with higher means on end-of-course survey forms, which are used to measure student satisfaction. The data analysis revealed that no significant relationship exists between mentoring and student satisfaction scores. The research design and response rate (25%) limit the ability to generalize from these findings.

Conclusions

The research re-affirmed that mentoring is an effective management strategy. Part-time faculty members who receive mentoring tended to score significantly higher on measures of instructor confidence. The quality of the peer-mentoring experience did not appear to be as important as the fact that mentoring, in some form or another, occurred. In addition, teaching at other universities did not negatively influence the significant relationship between mentoring, instructor confidence, and institutional loyalty.

Secondly, the quality or fidelity of the mentoring program seems to be important as it relates to institutional loyalty. While any type of mentoring could result in increased confidence, if the goal of the University is to develop a sense of institutional loyalty, then developing a quality mentoring program and fostering quality mentoring relationships would seem to be important.

This study found no significant relationship between a faculty member’s self-reported perception of a peer-mentoring experience and the level of student satisfaction. That no relationship was found in the course of this study does not mean that a
relationship does not exist. It could be that the instrument used to measure student satisfaction was not valid or that the “halo effect” influenced the student ratings.

Finally, I developed subscales created to measure instructor confidence and the fidelity of the mentoring program, which have the potential to aid further research and administrators in the development of both professional development activities and organizational mentoring programs. Further research can use alternative strategies for improving the estimates of reliability and validity of these two instruments.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Harvard College, founded in 1636, is the oldest institution of higher learning in America (Presidents and Fellows of Harvard College, 2007). Sixteen years after the Pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock, young Harvard tutors, not faculty, stood before individuals and small groups of students. These young men taught and instructed the next generation of clergy in order “to advance Learning and perpetuate it to Posterity; dreading to leave an illiterate Ministry to the Churches” (Presidents and Fellows of Harvard College, 2007, para. 4). For centuries, the Harvard model of education stood resolute, and faculty members in colleges and universities continued to be merely tutors, young men who had recently completed baccalaureate studies.

However, in the 19th century it became increasingly common to hire faculty to teach in one particular area of expertise or specialization (Carrell, as cited in Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). This specialization meant more “formal preparation” and a “graduate education” (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006, p. 23). This advanced preparation marked a shift in the transitory or temporary nature of the college tutor to a lifelong career commitment to teaching (McCaughey, 1974).

Students also became empowered; educators like Charles Elliot, President of Harvard College, advocated for an elective system of higher education. He proposed that each student be allowed to select the course of study he or she would pursue (Schuster &
Finkelstein, 2006). For a hundred years, full-time, professional faculty, who were more specialized, taught students who were more empowered, until the economic, demographic, and technological shifts of a post-World War II era interrupted this seamless fabric of academic life (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006).

In 1944, Congress enacted the G.I. Bill. This legislation resulted in the infusion of large numbers of returning veterans into an unprepared university system (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). This influx of students, coupled with a decrease in the availability of full-time, qualified faculty, resulted in universities and colleges turning to the use of part-time faculty members in the 1960s (Bowen & Schuster, 1986). According to Bowen and Schuster (1986), in 1960, 35% of all faculty appointments were for part-time faculty members. By 2006, this 35% had grown to 46%; if you include other forms of contingent faculty (graduate student instructors, post-doctoral fellows, and full-time non-tenure-track faculty) the percentage of contingent faculty rose to 65% (AAUP, 2006). The means that fully “two-thirds of all faculty employed in 2003” (AAUP, 2006, p. 6) were part-time and contingent faculty. Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) call this a “seismic shift” (p. 222).

The most recent data from the U.S. Department of Educational Statistics confirm this and estimate that part-time faculty alone now comprises almost half of the faculty labor force (Snyder & Dillow, 2012). In fact, many believe that this fact has been “gravely underestimated” (R. Wilson, 1999, p. A15). Because of the variance in how researchers define part-time faculty, some believe they are underreported (Lerber, 2006). Graduate assistants, guest lecturers, visiting professors, and fellowships are just some of the labels used (Ivey, Weng, & Vahadji, 2005; Reichard, 1998). Researchers seem to
agree that the use of part-time faculty is grossly underestimated, which raises the question, “Are universities and colleges relying too heavily on part-time faculty?”

The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) believes so. “Over-reliance on part-time and other ‘contingent’ instructional staff diminishes faculty involvement in student learning” (Benjamin, 2002, p. 4). In addition, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) concurs. In 2006, the AAUP issued the following statement: “As the faculty collectively grows more contingent, the quality of higher education itself is threatened” (AAUP, 2006, p. 12).

More and more voices seem to be suggesting that the use of part-time faculty members jeopardizes the academic integrity of the instructional process (Benjamin, 2002; Elman, 2002). One author went so far as to say that the use of part-time faculty is the “major scandal of higher education today” (Arden, 1989, p. A48). Most of those who deplore the use of part-time faculty members’ isolation from the larger, educational community (Beem, 2002; Benjamin, 2002; Bradley, 2004). Balch (1999) expands on these concerns and lists several other factors such as teaching quality, commitment to the college or university, and the time available for part-time faculty members to spend with students outside of class. Do these “invisible people of higher education,” as Arden (1989, p. A48) calls them, contribute to the culture of excellence that American universities and colleges strive for?

The AAUP believes they do not. And the union believes this continued growth trend is a “problem” (AAUP, 2006, p. 6). This powerful union is careful to note that the problems are not related to the individuals who are, for the most part, “able teachers and scholars” (AAUP, 2006, p. 6). Rather the problem lies in the nature of the part-time
faculty member’s employment conditions, the lack of support provided to part-time faculty, and the lack of academic freedom (AAUP, 2006).

Others have questioned whether this choir of voices has not missed an important side of the debate. While citing some concerns regarding the uses of part-timers, Balch (1999) also concluded that part-time faculty members are qualified, highly committed, and fulfill their duties and responsibilities conscientiously. For others, the use of adjuncts represents an essential link between the theoretical strongholds of ivory tower universities and the front lines of the pragmatic professional. The President of Indiana University concluded that “part-time instructors are necessary to teach specific courses or to bring specific professional experience to the classroom” (Brand, 2002, p. 21). Arden (1989) agrees, “Adjuncts are a source of expertise that greatly enriches the educational experience of students” (p. 17).

It is difficult to know who to believe as the controversy swirls. If the use of part-time faculty poses such a danger and a threat to the academic integrity of colleges and universities, why does the trend continue? One needs a clearer understanding of the issues related to the use of part-time faculty to more fully comprehend the problem and how best to address it.

**Background of the Problem**

The numbers do not lie. By conservative estimates, university and college administrators are giving almost half of post-secondary faculty teaching assignments to part-time faculty. For better or worse, part-time faculty members are here to stay (Benjamin, 2002; Snyder & Dillow, 2012). The U.S. Department of Labor predicts that post-secondary teaching positions will grow faster than the national average and that a
significant number of these positions will be for part-time professors (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2004).

Today, the U.S. Department of Education confirms this continuing trend (Snyder & Dillow, 2012). But tenured faculty, administrators, and accrediting bodies are wrestling with questions and concerns related to the use of part-time faculty (AAUP, 2006, 2009; Schuster & Finkenstein, 2006). Can a part-time faculty member deliver quality instruction and contribute to the community of learners as well as their full-time, tenured counterparts? The debate surrounding the use of full-time versus part-time faculty members seems to focus on the following three concerns: quality of instruction, isolation and loyalty, and student interaction.

Some maintain that adjunct faculty members are at a disadvantage. They are afforded few opportunities for professional growth, and the opportunities that are offered to them seem to be scheduled during times when work commitments keep adjuncts from attending (Phillips, 2002). Benjamin (2002) notes that part-time faculty members lack “professional evaluation . . . supports and, often-collegial involvement enjoyed by the full-time, tenure-track faculty” (p. 7). When university administrators do not give part-time faculty the same level of support as full-time, tenured track faculty, it is no wonder that questions of confidence and quality emerge. According the AAUP (2006), this “clearly represents a substantial limitation on their functioning as faculty” (p. 9).

This lack of support is evident when, after an adjunct faculty member is assigned his or her first teaching assignment, the part-timer is set adrift to either sink or swim. These “add-on” faculty members seldom interact with the full-time faculty and rarely receive “constructive feedback on the effectiveness of their teaching” (Beem, 2002, p. 2).
In addition to the question of quality instruction, some note that part-timers tend to be isolated from the larger educational community (AAUP, 2006; Balch, 1999; Beem, 2002; Benjamin, 2002; Bradley, 2004). Balch (1999) notes that a part-time member’s “commitment to the college or university” is a concern (p. 33). Some adjuncts themselves note there is a “strong sense of second class citizenship” (Foster & Foster, 1998, p. 11). Whereas full-time, tenured track faculty members have a “stake in the institution,” “temporarily employed faculty . . . feel less connected to the institution and less empowered” (Bradley, 2004, p. 30). Cohen (1999) describes the issue like this:

Part-timers are . . . symbolic of a new class of migrant workers. While they are not picking grapes, these laborers are wandering around the fields of academia, scraping together teaching assignments from different institutions while the fruits of full-time professorship—security, remuneration, stature, and academic freedom—remain out of reach. (para. 3)

These twin concerns of the quality of instruction provided by part-time faculty members and the feelings of isolation they experience are major issues that raise the question, “What impact might this have on a student’s perception and satisfaction with his or her educational experiences?” Do full-time faculty members truly provide a better educational experience than part-time instructors do? Elman (2002) believes they do and notes that the use of part-time faculty seriously hinders the quality of the student’s educational experience.

Benjamin (2002) also believes that the use of part-time faculty has a negative impact on student learning. The transitory nature of part-time faculty appointments and the fact that they rarely have a campus office could lead one to conclude that full-time faculty members devote more time and energy to their students than part-time faculty (Benjamin, 2002; Bowen & Schuster, 1986). If this is true, it seems logical to conclude
that students would be more satisfied with the instruction they receive from full-time faculty. AAUP (2006) notes that part-time faculty are not in a position to develop relationships with their students, they lack the support to provide students with a quality education experience, and, without the protection that academic freedom provides, part-time faculty are less likely to challenge students and hold them to high academic standards. But evidence that these negative results actually exist is virtually non-existent. The reality is that research concerning the effectiveness of adjuncts is “scant” (Klein, Weisman, & Smith, 1996, para. 12).

There is a plethora of literature that records recommendations on how to govern the use of adjunct faculty. The specific recommendations vary, but common themes are to provide support, training, and professional development opportunities and to include adjunct faculty in the greater, scholarly community (AAUP, 2006; Arden, 1989; Balch, 1999; Beem, 2002; Rice, 2004). Many of the concerns and recommendations fall into the categories of increasing instructor confidence (AAUP, 2003; Meacham, 2002), loyalty to the organization (AAUP, 2006; Beem, 2002; Bradley, 2004; Cohen, 1999), and student satisfaction (AAUP, 2006; Balch, 1999; Benjamin, 2002; Elman, 2002).

Part-time faculty members themselves have identified a key strategy to deal with these issues: mentoring by more experienced faculty. Feldman and Turnley (2001) concluded that part-time faculty members believe that with “more mentoring from senior colleagues and greater integration into their larger work groups” instructional quality could be improved (p. 14). Since a mentor is a guide, someone who has gone before and can now show the way (Clutterbuck & Megginson, 1999; Cunningham, 1999; Tobin, 1998), it seems logical to assume that an experienced, part-time faculty member may be
uniquely qualified to mentor other part-time faculty members. In an effort to provide insight into issue, this dissertation explores the relationship between instructors’ peer-to-peer mentoring experiences and their confidence as instructors, their loyalty to the institution, and the satisfaction of students with their teaching.

Statement of the Problem

Since adjuncts themselves have identified mentoring as a means to improve instruction and minimize the feelings of isolation often associated with a part-time faculty appointment, this study picks up this line of thought. I found no studies that specifically explored the ability of peer mentoring to assist in increasing the competence and confidence of part-time faculty or to decrease the sense of isolation that surrounds them. As noted earlier, these dual issues of instructor confidence and instructor isolation from the rest of the faculty give rise to questions about how students perceive the quality of the instruction they receive. Since universities routinely measure student satisfaction through end-of-course evaluations this is a factor that can easily be explored.

With almost 50% of all undergraduate courses in the United States being taught by adjunct faculty (Snyder & Dillow, 2012), it is essential that university leaders address how best to provide support and inclusion for these isolated members if universities and colleges are to continue to provide quality education. The focus of this study is the relationship between part-time faculty members’ peer-mentoring experiences and their confidence as instructors, their loyalty to the hiring institution, and their students’ satisfaction with their teaching.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate what relationship, if any, exists between a part-time faculty member’s self-reported perceptions of the quality of a peer-mentoring relationship with instructor confidence, institutional loyalty, and student satisfaction. Part-time instructors at a large, mid-western, Christian university served as the participants for this study. The University has developed and implemented an institutional mentoring program whereby part-time faculty members are mentored by other part-time faculty. As such, this institution was uniquely situated to provide insight into these previously stated relationships. More specifically, this study helped to answer the following question: “Is peer-to-peer mentoring an effective means to support part-time faculty, bolster confidence, increase institutional loyalty and consequently, produce students who are satisfied that they received the best education and preparation?”

Assumptions

During the course of designing this investigation, I made several assumptions regarding mentoring and its benefits as well as the effectiveness of peer-to-peer mentoring over other forms of mentoring. Literature and studies suggest that mentoring is a positive intervention that results in both personal and professional growth and satisfaction among first-year teachers at the elementary and secondary levels (Darling-Hammond, 2003; Edwards, 2000). This study assumes that the mentoring of part-time faculty members at the post-secondary level will have similar results.

My review did not find any research that investigated the relationship between peer mentoring among part-time faculty members. Consequently, this study assumes that
mentoring has not been widely practiced as a means of including part-time faculty members in the teaching and learning community of post-secondary institutions.

Another key assumption made by this study is the belief that part-time instructors are keenly interested in personal and professional development. They desire increased opportunities to be included and to improve their teaching effectiveness. Part-time faculty members are willing to invest the necessary time and energy to be actively involved in a mentoring relationship, which could possibly lead to increased instructor confidence, institutional loyalty, and student satisfaction.

**Research Questions**

This study sought to determine what relationship exists between a part-time faculty member’s self-reported perceptions of the quality of a peer-mentoring experience and several dependent variables: instructor confidence, institutional loyalty, and student satisfaction. The primary research question was, “What relationship does peer-to-peer mentoring have to instructor confidence, institutional loyalty, and student satisfaction among part-time instructors in the University’s School of Business?” From this overarching question, the following three research questions were identified.

**Research Question 1**

Is a part-time faculty member’s self-reported perception of the quality of a peer-mentoring experience related to his or her degree of instructor confidence?

**Research Question 2**

Is a part-time faculty member’s self-reported perception of the quality of a peer-mentoring experience related to his or her degree of institutional loyalty?
Research Question 3

Is a part-time faculty member’s self-reported perception of the quality of a peer-mentoring experience related to his or her students’ satisfaction with the quality of the learning experience as measured by a student evaluation of teaching/end-of-course form?

Theoretical Framework

Albert Bandura’s social cognitive theory served as the main theoretical framework for this dissertation. The foundation of social cognitive theory rests on the premise that an individual’s thoughts, actions, and emotions influence his or her behavior and that these three constructs are impacted and changed through reciprocal, social relationships (Bandura, 1989). Mentoring, a primary focus of this study, occurs in the context of personal relationships and within the social environment. This approach to personal and professional growth and development makes social learning theory an appropriate theoretical framework for this dissertation. According to social cognitive theorists, learning is a “social process” (Zins, Boodworth, Weissberg, & Walberg, 2004, p. 3).

Bandura’s (1989) social cognitive theory postulates that human beings have a superior ability to learn vicariously, that is to say, we have the ability to learn from the successes and mistakes of others. This aspect of social learning theory is critical. Bandura believes that if we learned only from our own personal experiences, “the process of cognitive and social development would be greatly retarded, not to mention exceedingly tedious and hazardous” (p. 21). By observing others, we are able to extend our own skills and conceptual knowledge. Bandura believes that we draw upon personal experiences as well as the experiences of others who are “well-informed on the matters of concern” in
order to develop our own competency (p. 13). In fact, social learning theory emphatically states that the most valuable knowledge is imparted socially. Typically, this vicarious learning generates “new instances of behavior that go beyond what they have seen or heard” (p. 25).

In fact, the attainment of these goals and increasing mastery of a particular skill set results in what social learning theorists call self-efficacy (Bandura & Schunk, 1981). According to Bandura (1989), “When people aim for and master valued levels of performance, they experience a sense of satisfaction” (p. 48). Social learning theory supports mentoring as an important means to convey knowledge and skill to another person. Bandura claims that “knowledge and reasoning skills are best gleaned from those who are highly knowledgeable and skilled” (p. 13).

Typically, an individual who is successful within an institution believes that the work he or she does is important and valuable (Murray, 1991). According to Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, and McKee (1978), a mentor is someone who takes a special interest in helping to ensure that an individual develops into a successful professional. Mentoring is a trusting, social relationship, which exists between a mentor, who is experienced and successful, and a protégé, who is less skilled and experienced. The purpose of a mentoring relationship is to develop confidence and competency. Mentors can be helpful as they act as a counselor and guide in order to provide direction on how to become a leader in their chosen vocation (Tobin, 1998).

This dissertation seeks to determine what relationship peer mentoring has with the mentee’s confidence as an instructor, his or her institutional loyalty, and finally student satisfaction scores. Bandura (1989) clearly believes that an influential social relationship,
such as mentoring, can result in increased confidence and personal satisfaction. This study suggests that in addition to these outcomes, a socially influential relationship, such as mentoring, will also result in increased commitment and loyalty to the organization. Moreover, this study also examines if the increased confidence and loyalty of faculty members are also notable in higher levels of satisfaction recorded by students with their learning experience.

Bandura’s (1989) social learning theory supports the conclusion that an influential relationship, like mentoring, results in greater confidence and loyalty. But Bandura’s theory addresses only how one learns. It does not address what ramifications such learning will have on the organization, its leadership, employees, or consumers. We have already seen, through the literature, that a social learning strategy, like mentoring, would likely result in higher levels of confidence and organizational loyalty among employees. Because part-time instructors work in the organizational context of a university or college, Bandura’s theory needs to be extended to address the results those twin outcomes would have on the students of these employees or the organization’s “consumer.” This is what System 4 Management Theory (Likert, 1961, 1967) does. The System 4 management strategy, which Likert calls participative group, will generally result in high levels of trust, which in turn leads to higher levels of confidence and loyalty among employees. This confidence and commitment to group and organizational goals results in a high performing organization. It seems logical to assume that when organizational goals are met, not only will the employees experience satisfaction but the recipients of the organization’s services (i.e., students) will as well.
As the name implies, Likert hypothesized that there are four systems of management. High functioning and high performing organizations have leaders who operate using the fourth system, which Likert (1967) refers to as Participative Group. System 1, which Likert (1961) labeled as exploitive, is characterized by a complete lack of trust and the use of coercion and fear to achieve goals. The opposite set of behaviors and skills is where we find System 4 or the participative-group function. Likert (1967) maintains that high trust levels, mutual respect, high levels of participation, and a commitment to individual, group, and organizational goals are characteristics of this fourth system. Table 1 illustrates this continuum.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert’s System 4 Management Theory</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System 1: Exploitive/Authoritative</td>
<td>Distrust</td>
<td>Fear/Punishment</td>
<td>Little interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System 2: Benevolent/Authoritative</td>
<td>Cautious Trust</td>
<td>Reward/Punishment</td>
<td>Little interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System 3: Consultative</td>
<td>Incomplete Trust</td>
<td>Reward/Punishment and Involvement</td>
<td>Moderate interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System 4: Participative-Group</td>
<td>Complete Trust</td>
<td>Participation and Improvements</td>
<td>Extensive interaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The most effective managers and organizations operate using this fourth system. This fourth generation of management theory emphasizes supportive behavior on the part
of managers and team members. The function of supportive behavior is to increase and maintain each individual’s sense of worth and value to the organization. Likert (1967) states that when the organization engages in supportive behavior, “the group is eager to help each member develop to his full potential” (p. 167). One result of this supportive culture is a high level of peer loyalty, success in achieving organizational goals, and effort on the part of team members to coach, train, encourage, and motivate each other (Likert, 1967).

This dissertation actually modifies Likert’s theory by postulating that when social learning occurs in the form of peer mentoring, members of the organization experience increased trust levels and increased opportunities for participation and interaction. This results in confident and loyal employees. These confident and loyal employees have a positive impact on the organization’s customers, the students, which, in turn, results in higher levels of students satisfied with the instruction they have received.

This dissertation tested whether peer mentoring was an effective supportive behavior strategy and tool that managers could utilize to facilitate the achievement of System 4 outcomes such as high employee confidence, institutional loyalty, and high levels of customer (i.e., student) satisfaction. I assumed that a high performing organization, by default, would have customers who are satisfied with the product and services they received. Figure 1 illustrates this process and outcome.

**Significance of the Study**

As one of five regional coordinators of faculty services for Spring Arbor University, I have spent the past 12 years in the trenches, beside the most gifted and committed part-time faculty members. Adjuncts desire to grow and develop in their roles
Figure 1. Peer mentoring process and outcomes.

as faculty members; they are willing and able to join the larger, scholarly community. They only lack the avenue to do so. This study is important because it will assist those in similar leadership roles to lead this army of part-time laborers more effectively.

This study is important because the results could be used to inform the University’s leaders, and those of similar schools, how best to support the large number of adjuncts who teach in their programs. This University relies heavily on part-time faculty members to fill teaching appointments. As the research suggests, this was an intentional decision based on two elements—cost effectiveness and the belief that practitioner professors were uniquely qualified to teach adult learners.

To those who work in the field of higher education, the significance of this study is apparent. As reliance on part-time faculty appointments increases, so do the questions. The problems are real, the debate rages; yet I was not able to locate any research designed to investigate the relationship between peer-to-peer mentoring and instructor confidence, institutional loyalty, and student satisfaction. It is evident that part-time
faculty appointments are not going away. Evidence is to the contrary; part-time faculty members are here to stay and our reliance on them is increasing. Consequently, it is essential that universities and administrators wrestle with the issues in order to answer the question, “Can a part-time faculty member deliver quality instruction and contribute to the community of learners as well as their full-time, tenured counterparts?” Moreover, “is peer-to-peer mentoring an effective means to achieve that outcome?”

**General Research Methodology**

Since this study sought to collect data “after the fact,” an ex post facto research design was used to gather data from the part-time faculty members in the University’s College of Adult and Professional Studies. The group surveyed was a convenient sample representative of part-time faculty members teaching at this University at the present and in the future. The survey collected demographic information and data to measure instructor confidence and institutional loyalty. Moreover, one section of the survey was designed to elicit the participants’ perceptions of the fidelity or quality of their peer-mentoring experience. I also reviewed historical data from the University’s End of Course Survey forms in order to determine the measure for student satisfaction. Once the survey responses were collected, general linear regression models were generated in order to test the research questions and to determine whether the findings were significant.

**Limitations**

Several factors limit the ability to infer and generalize from the study’s findings. Since an ex post facto research design was used, random manipulation of the independent
and predictor variables was not possible. Therefore, it is impossible to conclude, with any certainty, the predictor variable was the cause of the significant relationships rather than some other spurious variable. Adequate safeguards do not exist to infer causation (Ary, Jacobs, & Sorenson, 2010). Broadly generalizing causation from this study’s findings would be inappropriate.

The response rate (25%) also affects the ability to generalize from the study’s findings. For example, some responses were not included in the analysis because the participant had not received mentoring or failed to answer all the questions on a particular subscale. Of the 147 who responded, only 63 (or 43%) had received mentoring. In addition, some of the hypotheses stated that those with a part-time mentor would do just as well or better than those mentored by a full-time administrator counterpart. Cases available to test the hypotheses related to type of mentor were further reduced. For example, of the 63 who had received mentoring, only 31 (or 49.2%) were mentored by another part-time faculty member. When you consider those mentored by a full-time faculty member (n = 23 or 36.5%) or an administrator (n = 8; 12.7%) the cases available for analysis are even less. While the findings will provide helpful information to the University’s leadership, broadly generalizing or inferring causation from the results would be inappropriate.

Finally, while the instrument used to collect data on instructor confidence and the fidelity of the mentoring program variables was developed using multiple strategies to increase the estimates of its validity and reliability, the fact remains that these two subscales lacked extensive testing and re-testing to increase validity and reliability. The initial estimates of reliability, the ability of the instrument to be consistent, were adequate
(α_c = .937 for the Instructor Confidence subscale and α_c = .817 for Fidelity of Mentoring Experience Subscale). And while key strategies, such as field testing, expert judges, logical and concrete validity were used to increase the estimated validity of these two subscales, more testing and analysis are needed.

**Delimitations**

I elected to limit the scope of this study to part-time instructors who teach in the School of Business at a large, private, mid-western, Christian university. (The School of Business comprises almost 80% of the student enrollment and represents the largest sector of part-time faculty.) I selected this University because it is a large, Christian university that offers adult degree programs, uses part-time faculty members almost exclusively to staff classroom-teaching assignments, and has an institutional peer-mentoring program. In addition, this University utilizes end-of-course survey forms as a means of assessing student satisfaction.

This study explored the relationship of peer-to-peer mentoring and an individual part-time faculty member’s confidence level, institutional loyalty, and degree of students’ satisfaction with the instructor’s competence. I did not attempt to measure or evaluate the overall quality of instruction that part-time instructors provide. Conclusions regarding the institution’s effectiveness as a teaching community were beyond the scope or interest of this study.

**Definition of Terms**

I have provided the following definition of terms in order to ensure consistency and clarity of communication concerning the key constructs involved in the study. The
independent and dependent variables are operationally defined, and definitions are provided for other important and frequently used terms.

*Andragogy:* Refers to the teaching philosophy, first espoused by Malcolm Knowles, which delineated the differences between traditional students and adult learners. Different from pedagogy (which is teacher driven), andragogy is student driven and recognizes that adult learners bring the following characteristics into the classroom: motivation, discipline, life experience, and a desire for practical application that links theory to practice (Knowles & Associates, 1984).

*College of Adult and Professional Studies (CAPS):* Refers to the University’s department that develops and implements programs designed specifically for the working adult. Such programs are typically based on principles of andragogy and have the following common characteristics: lock-step cohort design, modules offered in 5- or 6-week increments, weekly classes meet for 4 hours, accelerated curriculum design and course learning measured by higher order thinking skills, and the students’ ability to apply learning to work and personal settings (Bash, 2005).

*Fidelity Measure:* Refers to the extent to which the peer-mentoring program adhered to the prescribed protocol (Mowbray, Holter, Teague, & Bybee, 2003). Considering the fidelity of any intervention or treatment variable is important to ensure that experiences similar and that any significant differences are documented. In the case of this study, the prescribed protocol refers to the recommended elements of quality mentoring programs as delineated in the scholarly literature and not the mentoring program requirements as outlined by the University.
Institutional Loyalty: A self-reported measure in which a part-time instructor indicates his or her degree of positive regard toward the organization (Ashforth, Spencer, & Corley, 2008) as well as how much the part-time instructor believes the University values his or her contribution and well-being (LaMastro, 2000). Frequently one finds the term organizational commitment used almost synonymously with institutional loyalty. Consequently, I use these terms interchangeably. Institutional loyalty was measured using a previously validated organizational commitment scale (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1988).

Instructor Confidence: A self-reported measure in which a part-time instructor indicates his or her level of confidence with the course content (Donaldson, 1988; Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2005), adult learning methodology (Bash, 2005; Fleming & Garner, 2009; Galbraith, 2004; Merriam, 2001), and institutional policies and procedures (Wilson & Elman, 1990). A researcher-developed questionnaire was used to measure this variable.

Part-time Instructor: The instructional faculty who are not contracted full-time with the University. Typically, a part-time instructor’s teaching load is less than 50% of the load carried by full-time, contracted faculty. Contracts for part-time instructors are issued on an individual teaching assignment basis. Part-time instructors do not have dedicated office space or benefits such as health insurance, retirement, sick days, etc. (AAUP, 2006; Barnetson, 2001; Fulton, 2000; Magner, 1999).

Peer-to-Peer Mentoring: Experiences of adjunct faculty who have been mentored, coached, and guided by other, part-time instructors (Kram & Isabella, 1985; Routman,
The researcher-developed fidelity subscale was used to gather data on this self-reported measure.

*Student Satisfaction:* The student self-reported perception of the instructor’s effectiveness in terms of overall course quality, teaching skill, and availability (Appleton-Knapp & Krentler, 2006; Kelly, Ponton, & Rovai, 2007; Sproule, 2002). An aggregate of the University’s end-of-course survey forms was used to measure this variable.

**Organization of the Study**

This chapter provided the reader with the history and background of the problem. I offered social learning theory and Likert’s System 4 Management Theory as appropriate theoretical frameworks for the study. The research problem and general research questions were given along with operational definitions of key terms and variables.

Chapter 2 begins with a review and analysis of relevant literature. Literature relevant to the phenomenon of rise in use of part-time instructors is noted. The concerns and benefits regarding the use of a large number of part-time instructors are investigated. The literature review also examines the roots of mentoring and its use by post-secondary institutions to train and orientate new faculty members. The concept of peer-to-peer mentoring is investigated; this includes a review of studies and other relevant literature that examine the benefits of using peer mentors as opposed to non-peer mentors.

As universities continue to turn to the use of part-time faculty, the issues of availability and loyalty arise. New phrases such as “Roads Scholars” and “Freeway Faculty” have entered the post-secondary institutions’ vocabulary. I examined this trend and its relationship to institutional loyalty. Elements that contribute to instructor
confidence and its role in teaching effectiveness are shared. Also, student satisfaction as a measure of instructor effectiveness was investigated.

Chapter 3 provides the reader with detailed information regarding the research design. This includes information on the sample and selection criteria. This chapter also outlines the data collection plan and includes information on the survey instruments and other tools used to gather data related to the study. Chapter 4 describes the setting of the research and the peer-mentoring program, which comprises the “intervention” used in the collection and analysis of the data. The data analysis plan will be explained. Chapter 5 provides the results of the study, and Chapter 6 discusses the conclusions and recommendations, including thoughts for further research.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU), and others have expressed concern that universities are too dependent on part-time faculty members, and this dependency threatens the academic integrity of the American academy (AAUP, 2006; Benjamin, 2002). This chapter reviews literature as it relates to the previously mentioned issues.

First, I review the historical perspective, which includes statistics related to the rising use of part-time faculty members as well as some of the reasons for this continuing trend. I discuss critical issues surrounding the debate in the rise in use of part-time faculty members. As outlined in Chapter 1, instructor confidence, institutional loyalty, and student satisfaction are important issues related to this dependence on part-time faculty members and will be discussed in section two. Finally, the practice of mentoring, which includes information related to peer mentoring, will be examined in general with a closer look at the peer mentoring. This literature review will assist in building a framework to help answer the research question, “What is the relationship between peer-to-peer mentoring and a part-time faculty member’s instructor confidence, institutional loyalty, and student satisfaction scores?”
**Part-time Faculty**

The Rise in Use of Part-time Faculty

The use of part-time faculty is not the sole purview of the modern post-secondary institution. As far back as the middle ages through the post-Civil War era, part-time faculty were used in order to provide expertise that was lacking among full-time faculty (Jacobs, 1998). Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) believe that “faculty is central to the well-being of the academy” (p. 3). The powerful union, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), could not agree more. The AAUP asserts, “The integrity of higher education rests on the integrity of the faculty profession” (AAUP, 2003, p. 69). Bowen and Schuster (1986) state the matter plainly; there can be no question, “The main duty of every institution of higher education is to place a competent faculty” (p. 3).

This is the central debate over the use of part-time faculty members reduced to its most fundamental elements. The use of part-time faculty has come a long way since priests and scholars roamed the European countryside, visiting monasteries and universities to study and offer expertise (Toutkoushian & Bellas, 2003). These authors assert that a century of progress has been reversed because the American academy has come to over-rely on part-time faculty members (Bowen & Schuster, 1986).

Consider that in 1960, according to Bowen and Shuster (1986), 35% of faculty appointments were for part-time faculty members. Benjamin (2002) asserts that use of part-time appointments over full-time ones rose 103% between the years of 1975 and 1995. In 1998, the AAUP claimed that the 25 years from 1973 to 1998 saw a substantial increase in the number of universities relying on part-time appointments.
In 1998, university administrators gave 43% of all faculty appointments to part-timers. In 2004, this trend and reliance on part-time faculty has remained consistent, increasing by several percentage points, from 43 to 49.3% (Snyder & Dillow, 2012). Leatherman (2000a), in an article entitled, “Part-timers Continue to Replace Full-timers on College Faculties,” observed that adjuncts comprise nearly 50% of the professoriate. This is consistent with more recent figures from the AAUP that estimates that 48% of faculty in U.S. institutions are part-time, non-tenure-track faculty (AAUP, 2009). Many believe these numbers are “gravely underestimated” (Wilson, 1999, p. 15).

In an interview conducted by Rice (2004), Finkelstein and Schuster agreed that the American professoriate is “to a considerable degree, a part-time profession. . . . Faculty members in the U.S. are currently split close to 50-50 between part and full-time” (p. 28). Some universities, particularly the University of Phoenix, use exclusively part-time faculty members (Feldman & Turnley, 2001).

This reliance grew, not only in 4-year colleges, but in community colleges and private institutions as well. Between 1972 and 1977, both private and public universities experienced a sharp decline in their financial support (Ivey et al., 2005). As a result, since the 1980s, the majority of new hires were part-timers and not tenure-track faculty. In 2003, the AAUP (2006) stated that full-time, tenure-track faculty positions comprised only 24% of the faculty labor force. Ivey et al. (2005) compared this to 1969 when 96.7% of new hires were for full-time, tenure-track positions.

When one reviews the literature, which seems replete with dire warnings regarding the consequences associated with using part-time faculty, one has to wonder, “Why does the trend continue?” There are four key reasons why universities continue to
depend on part-time faculty: the G.I. Bill, money, flexibility in scheduling, and supply and demand.

The G.I. Bill

At the end of World War II, almost 30 million American military personnel employed by the war efforts were thrust back into American life. This number comprised almost one-quarter of the entire American workforce. Recruiting and drafting efforts took millions of young people out of school and sent them to war (Mosch, 1975). The resulting influx of millions, coupled with an educational deficit, set the stage for an unprecedented domestic crisis (Mosch, 1975).

As a result, the G.I. Bill, signed by Franklin D. Roosevelt, provided educational benefits, among other provisions, to World War II veterans (Toby, 2010). By the time the bill’s initial provisions ended in 1956, over 7.8 million of the 16 million World War II veterans took advantage of these resources; in 1947, almost half of U.S. college students were veterans (U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, n.d.). Universities worried about the educational consequences of admitting large numbers of veterans; they could not expand facilities or faculty fast enough to accommodate this influx of students (Toby, 2010).

In 1952 and again in 1966, this bill was extended to offer education, grants, and job-training skills to more veterans (Mosch, 1975). Twenty years later, baby boomers (who were coming of age) flocked to universities in ever-increasing numbers, which resulted in another boon and even more increased enrollments (Bowen & Schuster, 1986). This increase in enrollment, along with an increase in the number of qualified, full-time faculty who were retiring, resulted in an unprepared university system turning to part-time faculty members (R. Smith, 1980).
The Money Factor

Like any business, educational administrators have had to look for ways to increase revenues and decrease costs. So it comes as no surprise that, without exception, most agree that this rise in use of part-time faculty over the past 40 years is primarily due to Cherchez L’Argent, or the money motive (Noble, 2000). In 1980, federal and state governments subsidized 46% of the cost of higher education; by 2003, the percentage had decreased to 35% (Lerber, 2006). In addition, federal financial aid polices became more restrictive (German, 1996). Because of this decline in government spending, colleges and universities had to cut costs to make ends meet (Ochoa, 2011). By not hiring full-time, tenure-track faculty, universities were able to realize a cost savings. Once a full-time position was cut, the faculty dollars saved were rarely seen again. Instead, universities began spending whatever surplus funds were realized on the school’s physical infrastructure and technology (Ochoa, 2011).

Consequently, the use of part-timers mushroomed into a source of cheap labor (Magner, 1999). In fact, Noble (2000) estimates that the use of adjunct faculty results in an almost 42% net gain for the bottom line of universities. Noble (2000) states, “Lower faculty status is associated with the production of a larger net gain” (p. 94).

Generally, universities pay part-time faculty members less than full-time faculty and these institutions rarely provide benefits or job advancement opportunities (Barnetson, 2001; Fulton, 2000; Magner, 1999; Ochoa, 2011). Marcus (1997) observed, “Because they are so cheap, institutions really come to depend on them” (p. 10). Terry-Sharp (2001) surveyed 421 anthropology departments on their utilization of part-time faculty and learned that 60% of the part-time instructors employed in these departments
earned less than $3,000 a course. Terry-Sharp (2001) observes that “this salary is comparable to salaries received by fast-food workers, baggage porters, or theatre lobby attendants” (p. 20).

In addition, part-time faculty members are less likely to have access to health benefits, retirement plans, or life insurance (Fulton, 2000; Marcus, 1997; Ochoa, 2011; Rhoades, 1996; Terry-Sharp, 2001). In fact, more than 60% of the institutions that responded to the Terry-Sharp (2001) survey offered part-time faculty no benefits at all. The compensation paid to adjunct faculty becomes an issue of quality. Shakeshaft (2002) remarked that it is unrealistic to expect additional time and commitment from a professional who is “being paid peanuts” (p. 29).

Toutkoushian and Bellas (2003) analyzed the data from the 1993 National Survey of Post-secondary Faculty (NSOPF) and found that contrary to Terry-Sharp, part-time faculty are satisfied with their salaries and jobs overall. While part-time faculty may be paid lower for teaching classes, when all sources of income are combined, part-time faculty salaries compare quite favorably with their full-time counterparts. Mello (2007) disagrees with those who claim adjuncts are dissatisfied. According to Mello, adjuncts are not teaching for the money. “Many part-time faculty have careers outside of academia and teach part-time primarily for the intrinsic rewards of teaching” (Toutkoushian & Bellas, 2003, p. 191). According to Noble (2000), “adjunct faculty are often more willing to accept symbolic instead of hard currency rewards for their contributions” (p. 90).

**Flexibility in Scheduling**

In addition, the face of the college student has changed (Ochoa, 2011). According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2002), 73% of all undergraduate students
can be classified as non-traditional. This means that universities must look for new and creative delivery methods to accommodate these working adults. Teaching evening and weekend classes typically does not appeal to full-time, tenured faculty (Leatherman, 1997).

Some believe that administrators welcomed this increase in the use of part-timers not only because it saved money but also because it provided for flexibility in scheduling (Barnetson, 2001; Bradley, 2004; Fulton, 2000; German, 1996; Ivey et al., 2005; Marcus, 1997). This flexibility is important as it allows administrators to cope with the fluctuating enrollment trends (Leatherman, 2000b). Adjuncts are much more likely to accept evening and weekend teaching assignments than their full-time counterparts (Leatherman, 1997).

**Supply and Demand**

The age-old, free-market concept of supply and demand is another leading cause in the rise of part-time faculty appointments. There is simply an abundance of qualified individuals; it makes sense that administrators would take “sensible advantage” of this increase in supply (German, 1996, p. 236). Others echo this sentiment. Bowen and Schuster (1986) noted that in the 70s and 80s, part-time faculty appointments increased because the large numbers of individuals with advanced degrees who did not seek or could not find full-time employment. Not enough jobs to go around meant that job seekers were “forced to piece together a living from a patchwork of part-time positions” (Bradley, 2004, p. 29; Fulton, 2000). This phenomenon led to the coining of such phrases as Roads Scholars (Tillyer, 2005), Add-Ons (Beem, 2002), Freeway Flyers (Will, 1997), and Gypsy Faculty (Bowen & Schuster, 1986). The transitory nature of part-time faculty
appointments has contributed to the debate regarding the over-reliance on part-time faculty members. The following section will discuss this debate.

**The Debate Related to the Use of Part-time Faculty**

Bowen and Schuster (1986) firmly assert that the excellence of higher education is a function of the type of faculty each university is able to recruit and retain. Smith (1980) could not agree more; he claims that the use of part-time faculty actually undermines academic excellence. So, it should come as no surprise that the debate regarding the use and over-reliance on part-time faculty continues. The review of the literature suggests that concerns over the use of adjuncts center on the quality of instruction they provide, the lack of academic freedom afforded to part-timers, and job security coupled with other financial considerations. This section concludes with a brief look at the benefits that using part-time faculty members can bring to the post-secondary classroom.

**Quality of Instruction**

Much of the literature regarding the use of part-time faculty members centers on the quality of instruction (AAUP, 2003, 2006). The literature assumes that full-time faculty members provide better instruction and hold students to a higher academic standard. Ochoa (2011) asserts that the overabundant use of continent or part-time faculty could potentially threaten the quality of undergraduate education in America. Ochoa cites the Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in Higher Education (1984) who concluded that “strong faculty identification with the institution and intense faculty involvement with students requires a primary commitment” (Study Group, 1984, p. 36)
and are necessary to facilitate excellence in undergraduate educational programs. This primary commitment is jeopardized by the very nature of part-time faculty appointments (Ochoa, 2011).

Another fact that could contribute to the debate regarding the quality of instruction is the fact that universities recruit and select full-time faculty with more care than they do for part-timers (Shakeshaft, 2002). One author noted that the recruiting of part-timers is haphazard, last minute, and accomplished without consulting full-time faculty (Balch, 1999). It seems evident that a direct correlation exists between the excellence in higher education and the quality of the instructional staff (Bowen & Schuster, 1986).

Some authors believe that questions of the quality of instruction provided by part-time faculty are raised by unions (like the AAUP) and accrediting agencies who are run by and for the benefit of tenured faculty (Selingo, 2008). In fact, Smith (1980) found that full-time professors do not welcome the use of part-timers and see the use of adjuncts as a very serious problem. This is a somewhat ironic observation as Barnetson (2001) suggests that “full-time, permanent faculty has (intentionally or inadvertently) facilitated the growing use of part-time and limited-term faculty” (p. 97) by refusing to accept the less desirous teaching assignments scheduled during the evening and on weekends. The only way for full-timers to protect their stake in the institution is to declare non-tenured faculty as incompetent (Selingo, 2008).

Full-time faculty members believe their institutions hire too many part-timers and that the instruction provided by these adjuncts is marginal (Bowen & Schuster, 1986). Balch (1999) states that 80% of full-time faculty expressed concern about the large
number of part-time faculty who teach courses in their colleges and universities. The controversies are related to the quality of instruction, availability of part-timers to meet with students outside of class, and the lack of continuity in academic planning (AAUP, 2006; Balch, 1999; Ochoa, 2011).

Klein et al. (1996) confirm this conclusion in their study of social work programs. They found that while part-timers were enthusiastic and exposed students to the reality of the social work profession, they lacked integration with the full-time faculty, were isolated from curriculum and research discussions, and lacked quality in their teaching when compared to full-timers (Klein et al., 1996). Klein and his associates do admit that research regarding the effectiveness of part-timers is “scant” (Klein et al., 1996, p. 2).

The Role of Academic Freedom

The conclusion that full-timers provide better quality instruction is largely due to the academic freedom afforded full-time faculty (Ochoa, 2011). Benjamin (2002) concluded that the institutional practice regarding the excessive use of part-time faculty members erodes academic freedom. Bradley (2004) contends that tenure is the best protector of academic freedom and, by extension, instructional excellence. The AAUP (2003, 2006) agrees that tenure is the only secure protection for academic freedom. Chait, a professor of higher education at Harvard University, studied the faculty handbooks of 250 colleges and found that only 10 had policies related to academic freedom that explicitly mentioned adjuncts (Schneider, 1999). Without this protection, it becomes all too easy to drop part-timers at the stroke of a pen (Schneider, 1999; Sonner, 2000).

Adjuncts feel less confident and, as a result, less empowered to voice opinions (AAUP, 2006; Bradley, 2004). As a result, part-time instructors tend to “fly under the
“radar” and go to great lengths not to “rock the boat” (Tillyer, 2005, para. 26). Adjuncts are reluctant to complain or to bring concerns to the administration because of the lack of job security (Ochoa, 2011; Thompson, 2003). Thus, the part-time faculty member is required to be circumspect in order to keep the right people satisfied.

This would be in direct contrast to full-time, tenured faculty members who, because of job security, have the freedom to address issues and concerns without fear of reprisals. Bradley (2004) observed that contingent faculty have every incentive to avoid taking risks and/or tackling controversial topics. Part-time faculty are vulnerable to student complaints and, as a result, may not teach as rigorously or give low grades to students who earned them (Bradley, 2004). Part-time faculty are “beholden to individual administrators for their jobs,” so these contingent faculty members “avoid any actions that might offend either administrators or students” (AAUP, 2006, pp. 9-10). In essence, “open mouths lead to closed doors” and this results in a lack of confidence on the part of adjunct faculty members to confront issues of academic quality as they relate to student performance (Schneider, 1999, para. 5).

**Job Security and Other Financial Considerations**

As outlined in the previous section, the lack of job security is a major factor that contributes to the belief that the use of part-time faculty members negatively affects quality instruction and student learning (Ochoa, 2011). Cost-savings is one major factor indicated in the literature as to why the use of part-time instructors has peaked and remains high (Magner, 1999; Noble, 2000). The savings in terms of salary is evident. However, other savings occur, as institutions are reluctant to invest in the professional development of adjunct faculty members.
A study of 421 anthropology departments, conducted by Terry-Sharp (2001), found that only 23.6% of part-time faculty members receive support to attend workshops. Terry-Sharp (2001) contends that universities provide insufficient support to provide necessary faculty development opportunities to part-time instructors. The failure to invest in faculty development directly influences the institution’s ability to improve instruction. Institutions refuse to make long-term commitment to the academic careers of part-timers (Lerber, 2006). Tillyer (2005) observed that administrators see no benefit to allocating faculty development funds for use by part-timers. One common theme recommended throughout the literature to improve instructional quality is professional development (AAUP, 2006; Balch, 1999; Crannell, 1998; Feldman & Turnley, 2001; Howell & Tweedell, 2007; Irvin, 2003; Klein et al., 1996; Selingo, 2008; Shakeshaft, 2002; Terry-Sharp, 2001).

Contributions of Part-time Faculty

Certainly, the literature reports that the rising use of adjunct faculty reflects, at least in part, a need to cut costs and increase flexibility in scheduling. Although there is much rhetoric surrounding the lack of quality, there are many voices raised to negate these conclusions. Many authors note the real-world experience and expertise in the field that adjuncts bring to the classroom (Shakeshaft, 2002; Sonner, 2000). This infusion of faculty, who have not been protected by the ivory tower of academia allows for a fresh perspective and a chance to cover new topics in the curriculum (Mello, 2007). Balch (1999) believes that part-time faculty members are highly committed, conscientious, and provide strong links to the community. In addition, they offer “a wide range of variety in experience” (Balch, 1999, p. 33). Irvin (2003) studied the use of part-timers in graduate,
non-profit programs and concluded, “Part-time faculty ensure a more diverse teaching force with stronger representation from the people in direct practitioner roles” (p. 181).

Regardless of which side one takes in this debate, the conclusion that Adams (1995b) drew from her study of part-time nursing faculty makes the most sense. “Since quality education is the ultimate goal of the institution, the faculty member who can provide the student with the best guidance is the faculty who should be hired, evaluated and retained” (Adams, 1995b, p. 296). It is important now, as the debate continues, that administrators and professors decide how to define the term “best.” It is evident that part-timers are overworked, underpaid, underappreciated, and have little input into decisions (Adams, 1995b). Fulton (2000) agrees that at the heart of the debate is the belief that part-time faculty members are overused and abused. Still, we cannot forget that “adjuncts are a source of expertise that greatly enriches the educational experience of students” (Arden, 1989, p. A48).

It is for these reasons that this dissertation seeks to explore the nature of this dependence on part-time faculty and the critical issues identified in the literature of instructor confidence, institutional loyalty, and the quality of instruction that adjuncts provide as measured by student satisfaction scores.

**Issues Related to Part-time Faculty**

**Instructor Confidence**

Bowen and Schuster (1986) define faculty as the professional person with substantial learning employed by higher educational institutions to teach, to conduct research, and to serve. After reviewing the literature regarding the use of part-time faculty members, it was evident that some scholars see a “perceptual divide” and that
part-time faculty members are viewed as outcast members of the scholarly community (Benjamin, 2002; Rice, 2004). Foster and Foster (1998) refer to part-time faculty as “second-class citizens” (p. 30). It seems only logical that the uncertain nature of part-time faculty teaching assignments and the lack of professional development and support would result in faculty who are uncertain and lack confidence to fulfill their roles as easily as full-time faculty do.

Considering Bowen and Schuster’s (1986) lofty definition of the professoriate, it is no wonder that some have asked whether corporate America would continue to prosper and provide quality services and products if 65% of its workforce were part-time (Balch, 1999). Marcus (1997) echoes these thoughts: “It is hard to think of any industry that uses so many part-time professionals as a regular part of their staff” (p. 9). Giamartino, the dean for the business school at the University of Detroit Mercy, asked, “How can you build an entire curriculum and academic program around part-time faculty” (Leatherman, 1998, p. A14)?

According to Arden (1989), higher education’s use of part-time faculty members is the major scandal in American higher education. Arden (1989) continues further and refers to part-time or adjunct faculty members as “the invisible people of higher education” (p. A48). One author went so far as to state that the increased use of part-time faculty members constitutes “a sneak attack on academic values and on the stability of the faculty as a whole” (Bradley, 2004, p. 28). These phrases hardly conjure up images of a highly trained, confident, and effective labor force. But what do we mean by instructor confidence?
Instructor Confidence Defined

A popular online dictionary defines an instructor as one who teaches (*The Essential American Heritage Dictionary*, 2011). The editors particularly note that the individual teaches college and is a rank below that of assistant professor. Confidence is defined as the state of being certain (*The Essential American Heritage Dictionary*, 2011). So, instructor confidence is the degree to which a faculty member is certain about the skills and knowledge related to the act of instructing or teaching.

While there appears to be no consensus on what constitutes effective instruction at the post-secondary level (Kelly et al., 2007; Smith & Welicker-Pollack, 2008), some common themes do emerge from the literature. Reviewing books and articles related to effective instruction, particularly with regard to non-traditional students, it appears that understanding the course content and the ability to apply it to practical situations is a key component (Beder & Darkenwald, 1982; Brookfield, 1986; James & Maher, 2004; Pearson, 2005). In addition, understanding and accommodating the unique needs of students through lesson planning and learning methodologies is also important (Bash, 2005; Cross, 1981; Fleming & Garner, 2009; Knowles & Associates, 1984; Knowles et al., 2005; Merriam, 2001). Finally, it would seem that effective instructors, who operate within an organizational setting, should have an understanding of the organization in which they teach, which includes its mission, purpose, organizational policies, as well as the ability to enforce them appropriately (ASHE-ERIC, 1995; Boyle & Boice, 1998; Kram & Isabella, 1985; Mullen, 2000; Simmons, 1998).

So, for the purposes of this study, instructor confidence can be understood to be the degree of certitude that a part-time faculty has with regard to his or her ability to
understand course content, to apply that content pragmatically, to understand student
needs, to provide developmentally appropriate lessons and methodology, and to
understand, interpret, and apply key organizational polices.

**Role of Inclusion in Instructor Confidence**

Santovec (2004) observes that building a collaborative and inclusionary teaching
culture is a way to prevent feelings of isolation and second-class citizenship. Feldman
and Turnley (2001) studied 105 non-tenured-track faculty members concerning job
satisfaction and professional commitment. One participant noted, “I have not had any
contact with any other members of the department, nor have I ever been invited to take
part in faculty meetings” (p. 14). Five years earlier, German (1996) studied the part-time
faculty trend and noted that little time is placed on the development of part-time faculty
and no institutional commitment is made to them. He concludes by saying, they “have
become invisible in our midst” (German, 1996, p. 237). The reality is that the
professional development of part-time faculty members has been ignored (AAUP, 2003).

Rhoades (1996) examined the contracts of 183 institutions and found that while
part-timers deliver instruction, there are few offers for professional growth and
development. He specifically noted that this practice was in direct contrast to the
literature, which stated that to improve instruction, part-timers need inclusion. Rhoades
(1996) found that out of the 183 contracts, only 10 provided some sort of professional
development and none included part-timers in the academic decision-making process. To
improve quality instruction we need to enable part-time faculty members to contribute to
the quality of the educational program and integrate them into the lives of departments in
which they teach (Rhoades, 1996). The AAUP (2006) notes that part-time faculty have limited interaction with colleagues, they teach in isolation, do not understand how the courses they teach fit into the overall instructional design, and are excluded from the “broader departmental or institutional governance” (p. 9). This results in a “substantial limitation” as part-timers fulfill their roles as teachers (p. 9). The literature could not be clearer; yet, it is evident that our practice continues to lag behind our knowledge.

Many authorities believe that instructional quality is associated with adjuncts belonging to the larger community, providing them with support and professional development opportunities, and including them in curriculum development and other key decision-making discussions (Ochoa, 2011; Thompson, 2003). Arden (1989) noted that there are “important educational advantages for making adjunct members a part of the team” (p. A48). The University uses part-time faculty almost exclusively in their degree-completion programs. They contend that properly leading and managing the adjunct faculty pool can “maximize student learning, ensure consistency in outcomes, and build a culture of excellence” (Howell & Tweedell, 2007, para. 1). As a result, the University has found that this training and support results in part-time faculty members who are confident and “enthusiastically support” the mission of the University (Howell & Tweedell, 2007, para. 2).

The conclusion is obvious: Providing training and professional development opportunities to part-time faculty has the potential to increase confidence and quality of instruction (Ochoa, 2011). Adams (1995b) in her study on part-time nursing faculty noted that an adjunct’s overall job satisfaction increased when administrators expressed appreciation regarding their contributions and when the adjunct was included in
orientation and other professional development activities. There is the belief that “quality instructors will want to teach for institutions that demonstrate a commitment to quality and to its employees’ professional and personal development and overall satisfaction” (Santovec, 2004, p. 5). In addition to building confidence and competence, these inclusionary overtures have the potential to result in an adjunct’s sense of belonging to the institution.

Institutional Loyalty

If it is true, as some of the literature claims, that adjuncts bring richness to the educational experience of students, how do we include these “invisible people” (Arden, 1989, p. A48) into the larger scholarly community? The matter becomes even more complex when we consider that many adjuncts teach at more than one institution (AAUP, 2006; Reichard, 1998; Tillyer, 2005) and that 66% of them report being employed full-time elsewhere (Fulton, 2000). Since a large number of part-timers are employed elsewhere and the literature has identified that inclusion into the larger community is essential to improving instruction, increasing an adjunct’s sense of loyalty to the university in which he or she teaches is of paramount importance.

Transitory Nature of Part-time Appointments

As early as 1986, the literature began recognizing the transitory nature of part-time appointments by coining such phrases as Gypsy Faculty (Bowen & Schuster, 1986), Freeway Flyers (Will, 1997), and Roads Scholars (Tillyer, 2005). These terms hardly conjure up a vision of professionals who are loyal and committed to an organization. The
sense is that, like migrant farm workers, part-time faculty move with the seasons and follow the crops to the next paid teaching assignment.

This pattern contributes only to the sense of isolation that many researchers note as a concern. This isolation means that those who are teaching the most classes are least familiar with campus culture (Leatherman, 1997). Balch (1999) noted that most post-secondary institutions are remiss in integrating part-time faculty into campus life; we “need to work to ensure their integration and participation in each institution’s faculty community” (pp. 33-34). Jones (2000) agrees that we do not have a systematic plan for supporting and including part-time faculty.

**Institutional Loyalty Defined**

Ashforth et al. (2008) observe that “commitment represents a positive attitude toward the organization” (p. 333). Meyer and Allen (1988) found in their work on organizational commitment that employees who are favorably disposed to an institution will remain and work to contribute to its success. They claim that increasing commitment is the first step to reducing turnover. In fact, Mello (2007) claims that if a part-time faculty member develops a “deep connection to one school, they’re unlikely to be tempted away by better salaries” (p. 44).

While it is true that the organization plays an important role in employee commitment, the type of work an employee does is also essential. The work that employees do must be satisfying and meet basic needs (Meyer & Allen, 1988). According to Edmonson, Fisher, Brown, Irby, and Lunenburg (2002), these basic needs include control, meaning in situations, and positive support. When organizations and
leadership meet these basic human needs, commitment and loyalty are increased (Angle & Perry, 1986).

The nature of the attachment that forms between individuals and their organizations is the essence of institutional loyalty (Ketchland & Strawser, 2001). The fact is that individuals do form opinions and beliefs regarding the degree to which an organization values their contributions and their well-being (LaMastro, 2000). The stronger the individual’s positive regard in those areas, the stronger his or her identification and involvement with a particular organization. The result is more loyalty to the institution and more energy put forth to remain connected (Hafer & Martin, 2006; Ketchland & Strawser, 2001). Angle and Perry (1986) refer to the dynamics of this relationship as the “norm of reciprocity” (p. 128).

Simply put, when people are on the receiving end of kind regard and good works, they are strongly prone to reciprocate in kind (Angle & Perry, 1986). Angle and Perry describe this as a “psychological contract” (p. 128); when members of the organization offer their commitment in exchange for the organization’s support and acknowledgment of contributions, this contract is fulfilled. When organizational leaders ensure that the employees’ needs are met, their loyalty and commitment increase. Angle and Perry studied bus operators from 24 mass transit systems in the United States ($n = 1099$). They discovered that the most significant predictor of organizational commitment was the institution’s treatment of the employee. Essentially, they observed that “organizational commitment is largely a matter of reciprocation between individual and organization. . . . Our data suggest that the principal antecedents of commitment may be well within management’s capacity to influence” (Angle & Perry, 1986, p. 144).
Organizational commitment is the phraseology adopted by Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) to refer to this idea of being loyal to an institution. Mowday et al. define this concept as “(a) strong belief in and acceptance of organizational goals and values, (b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and (c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization” (p. 27). Ashforth et al. (2008) agree that through “close intimate personal cooperation” (p. 326) the interests of the employee and company become identical; the outcome of this mutuality is a willingness on the part of the individual to increase his or her efforts on behalf of the organization. This idea of reciprocation with regard to institutional loyalty is an important one. The AAUP (2006) articulates the paradox that exists when institutions ask teachers to commit to “them, their mission, and their students” (p. 16) yet withhold institutional commitment to the faculty employee in terms of inclusion, support, and professional development opportunities.

Types of Institutional Loyalty

Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) are quick to note that not all forms of organizational commitment are equal. In their research, they have conceptualized the following three components to this construct: affective, continuance, and normative. Affective commitment is an emotional attachment and occurs when the employee identifies with the organization and exhibits a willingness to help achieve the institution’s goals.

Continuance commitment develops gradually, over time, as the employee accumulates investments (such as promotion, salary increases, seniority). The greater and larger the investments, the greater the threat of loss and the less willing the employee is
to risk losing them (Meyer et al., 1993). Continuance commitment typically grows out of economic factors (Meyer & Allen, 1984). When the employee develops feelings of moral obligation and responsibility, they remain with the organization because they have a normative commitment (Meyer et al., 1993). LaMastro (2000) summarized the definitions of these three concepts by noting that affective commitment means the employee stays because he or she wants to. If the individual stays because he or she needs to, that is continuance commitment. Finally, employees who exhibit normative commitment stay because they ought to.

According to Meyer et al. (1993) all three forms of commitment are negatively correlated with turnover. Affective and, to a lesser degree, normative commitment should be positively related to job performance. This means that an employee’s commitment to an organization should result in improved quality in his or her job performance and a willingness to remain connected. Ketchland and Strawser (2001) support these conclusions; they note a significant relationship exists between affective commitment and organizational commitment. Employees with high levels of affective commitment are less likely to consider other job offers or explore alternative job opportunities. This is one key reason why increasing the loyalty of part-time adjuncts to their universities is important.

LaMastro (2000) supports this conclusion in her study of full-time, K-12 teachers in the state of New Jersey. She found a correlation between perceived level of organizational support and affective commitment. She also found a positive correlation between perceived organizational support and daily mood, suggesting that feelings of support and feelings of being valued can lead to greater excitement and enthusiasm for teaching. She concludes her study by saying, “Administrators who take steps to support
employees will reap the benefit of strongly committed teachers willing to ‘go the extra mile’ for their students and their schools” (LaMastro, 2000, p.9).

While LaMastro (2000) studied elementary and secondary school teachers, Edmonson et al. (2002) report similar results as they describe the collaborative culture of Sam Houston State University’s Department of Educational Leadership. They observed that higher morale, an enhanced commitment to teaching, and a desire to continue in the profession are all outcomes of an increased collaborative culture. They describe a collaborative culture as one with mutual trust and respect. The environment must present a safe venue for honest and open communication. In addition, leaders need to recognize the contributions of their members. These authors stress that you cannot leave such a culture to “chance” (Edmonson et al., 2002, p. 11). Tyrrel and Stine (1997) support these conclusions:

Leadership practices that emphasize cooperative relationships and a shared vision can create schools that aim for excellence. . . . The emphasis on cooperative relationships can help bring about a work climate in which self-esteem, commitment, and task accomplishment are so significant that they raise people to a higher level. (p. 34)

The benefits of strategically and systematical seeking ways to include part-time faculty members in the larger, educational community are numerous. In addition to those noted above, Ashforth et al. (2008) note that the increasing organizational commitment can result in the following outcomes: “cooperation, effort, participation and organizationally beneficial decision-making, low turnover, higher retention, job satisfaction, work adjustment, increased social support and helping behaviors, customer orientation, positive evaluation of organization, and defense of the organization” (p. 337).

When we consider the large number of positive outcomes associated with high levels of institutional loyalty, it is no wonder that the insight gleaned from the literature
regarding part-time faculty and organizational commitment underline the importance of seeking ways to increase adjuncts’ inclusion in the larger scholarly community. It is likely that issues of quality instruction and isolation may be ameliorated simply by increasing the part-timers’ perceived level of organizational support. Administrators who treat part-timers well as “critical assets will find their adjunct professors are loyal, productive, and insightful members of the faculty team” (Mello, 2007, p. 44). It seems obvious that organizations will thrive only when “the individuals within the organization flourish” (Krajewski, as cited by Edmonson et al., 2002). It seems reasonable, then, to assume that part-time faculty members who are flourishing in their roles as educators, who exhibit high levels of self-esteem, and who are loyal to their institutions would have students who express a high degree of satisfaction with their learning experiences.

Student Satisfaction

As mentioned previously, it seems only logical that when members of an organization feel supported and are flourishing, the results will be highly satisfied customers (Likert, 1967). In the post-secondary setting, this means students, who are the consumers of the educational product we provide, are highly content with the quality of their educational experience. This is particularly true because student evaluation of instructor teaching effectiveness is the tool most frequently used when the decision to assign additional classes to part-time faculty members is made (Kelly et al., 2007; Sproule, 2002). For this reason, measures of student satisfaction are an important factor to consider when discussing issues related to part-time faculty members.
Student Satisfaction Defined

What do we mean by satisfaction? Oliver (1999) defines satisfaction as the perception that the fulfillment of a service or product has resulted in feelings of pleasure. Appleton-Knapp and Krentler (2006) build on this concept when they explain that a good predictor of student satisfaction is the extent to which an instructor meets the student’s expectation. Typically, one gauges satisfaction with a product or service after the fact (Appleton-Knapp & Krentler, 2006). In the university or college setting, this means that when students are successful, they are learning and they are satisfied with their educational experiences (Kariotis, 2000). Student perceptions of their educational experiences are most frequently collected using student evaluation of teaching (SET) forms.

Students complete SETs using standardized forms at the conclusion of a course. University representatives provide the forms or surveys to students in a well-defined and controlled process (Otto, Sanford, & Ross, 2008). This controlled process usually has students completing the form in class and a paid staff member processing the results (Arden, 1989; Sproule, 2002). Because students may have radically different perceptions of similar experiences and they may not recall the past correctly, some question whether such a tool is a viable means for evaluating instruction (Appleton-Knapp & Krentler, 2006).

Sproule (2002) believes that SETs are widely used because they are inexpensive to administer. Questions arise as to the validity of these measures, particularly in light of the fact that administrators and leaders base important personnel decisions, such as promotion, tenure, and additional teaching assignments, on the findings (Kelly et al.,
2007; Sproule, 2002). Otto, Sanford, and Ross (2008) agree that the SET has become an ever-present measure of teacher effectiveness and will continue to be the major consideration for promotion, tenure, and merit pay. Sproule (2002) believes SETs, while riddled with errors and hopelessly flawed, “will continue to be a cornerstone of teaching assignments” (Sproule, 2002, p. 292).

**Validity of Using Student Satisfaction Surveys**

Part of the reason that SETs are so controversial is that a lack of clarity exists regarding what the standards are that comprise excellence in post-secondary teaching (Kelly et al., 2007; Smith & Welicker-Pollack, 2008). Others cite the lack of validity of SETs as a measure of instructional effectiveness because such tools are essentially popularity contests and that crowd-pleasing instructors get high evaluation marks regardless of whether or not students learned (Clayson & Sheffet, 2006). Felder (1995) disagrees and states that the idea that SET constitutes a popularity contest is a myth. In addition, Boice (1992) observes that measures of “personality and popularity correlate low, usually at insignificant levels, with SETs” (p. 2).

Some researchers have conducted studies in an effort to answer these questions and others. The findings provide no clear direction. Clayson and Sheffet (2006) surveyed the SETs of 727 students at their university. They collected data on measures of teacher effectiveness at week 0, 10, and 16, which was the end of the term. They compared measures of personality (agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, extroversion, and imagination) with SETs. These researchers found that all the personality dimensions were significant predictors of a positive final SET except
extroversion. Clayson and Sheffet (2006) concluded, “Students universally associate personality with instructional effectiveness” (p. 156). In addition, they found that combining the expected grade, a halo effect, and personality/likability resulted in 73% of variance in the final SET. The halo effect occurs when individuals mistakenly conclude that an unrelated factor contributed to or resulted in the desired outcome (Clayson & Sheffet, 2006; Feeley, 2002; Otto et al., 2008). For example, physically attractive individuals tend to be perceived by others as being happier and more successful. In reality, the happiness and success are more likely related to factors other than one’s physical appearance. In the above mentioned study, the halo affect likely occurred when student-raters failed to discriminate between relevant and irrelevant teaching behaviors (Feeley, 2002; Otto et al., 2008). Clayson and Sheffet (2006) concluded that SET follows a seriously flawed paradigm, and those who utilize the results of SETs as indicators of teacher quality should closely monitor their use.

Clayson and Sheffet (2006) concluded that while a teacher’s likability is an important piece of information, using only this piece of information reduces the “evaluation process” down to a “beauty pageant” and students are the “ultimate losers” (p. 159). They state, “It may be that some teachers never receive consistently high evaluations in certain environments, irrespective of anything they do or possibly could do” (p. 158). Machina (1987) came to similar conclusions almost 20 years earlier. “Some teachers will not receive the high marks they deserve despite brilliantly conceived lectures” (p. 22).
Students and SETs

Centra (1980) believes that student evaluation of teacher effectiveness and instructional quality is inexplicitly linked to the quality of interactions between the student and teacher as well as the interpersonal rapport students experience. These have been historically prominent variables in many studies. Regardless of how we view the SET system, students regard their relationship with faculty as one of the most critical aspects of the teaching-learning experience; student perception affects both learning and motivation (Aguinis, Nelser, Quigley, Lee, & Tedeschi, 1996).

These findings seem to support the idea that SETs are highly correlated to personality traits, that students form an opinion early on about an instructor, and that there is little evidence to suggest that changes occur over the duration of the course (Clayson & Sheffet, 2006). Decision-makers would be wise to remember that teachers may score high on evaluations “not because they teach well, but simply because they get along with students” (Foote, Harmon, & Mayo, 2003, p. 17).

Instructors and SETs

It is evident that no clear path emerges from the literature as to how instructors feel about SETs. Do they perceive them as a valuable source of information they can use to improve teaching? A Smith and Welicker-Pollack (2008) study found that professors were generally favorable to student feedback and felt that students were capable of assessing quality instruction, were honest in their responses, and that students have the right to provide feedback on the learning experiences in the classroom.

The professors in Smith and Welicker-Pollack’s (2008) study indicated that they wanted student feedback on their teaching, that they took the feedback seriously, and that
they desired to improve. Despite this finding, few teachers sought out counsel on how to improve their teaching based on the feedback from SET (Smith & Welicker-Pollack, 2008). In addition, most university administrators fail to provide a useful platform for real reflection and feedback—an element that is essential if the individual teacher and institution as a whole is to achieve instructional improvement. They conclude by noting that in order to minimize the danger that formalized feedback remains solely a managerial instrument for the purposes of accountability, teacher education institutions need to develop a comprehensive follow-up support system, which enable educators to engage in supportive dialogues with colleagues—a factor which has been found to be of major importance in professional development processes for practitioners. (Smith & Welicker-Pollack, 2008, p. 212)

A decade earlier, Baer (1999) came to a similar conclusion; he noted that a faculty member’s acceptance of the feedback provided by student evaluations depends on the administration not using the results of these surveys for reward or punishment. Baer suggests that student feedback be a part of the overall instructor evaluation process. This process should include the following elements: course syllabi, course materials, active learning techniques, clarity of course requirements and expectations, the instructor’s contributions and service, as well as other duties.

**SETs as Measure of Instructor Effectiveness**

Based on the literature, a legitimate question arises as to the appropriateness of this, or any study, utilizing student satisfaction to measure instructor effectiveness. There is sufficient support on each side of the argument. Despite the controversy, it is evident that the use of SETs is on the rise (Cochran-Smith, 2004). Grenzke (1998) estimates that students in some form or fashion evaluate 89% of all part-time faculty members. The
highly competitive marketplace of higher education has resulted in teachers and administrators at all levels finding themselves in an era of accountability (Cochran-Smith, 2004).

If we seek feedback from our student-consumers, administrators and teachers need to take such feedback seriously. Failing to do so could have serious repercussions (Baer, 1999). SETs are built on the premise that a student who learns is satisfied. Studies suggest that students give low satisfaction scores to instructors they do not learn from and high scores to those they do (Kelly et al., 2007). Because of this, researchers, administrators, and teachers consider SETs to be the single most valid source of data on teaching effectiveness.

**Summary of Issues Related to Part-time Faculty**

The historical trend of relying on part-time faculty members, beginning with the passage of the G.I. Bill in 1944, has resulted in an ongoing debate among various factions within the post-secondary academy. The temporary nature of part-time faculty teaching assignments leaves them vulnerable. Part-time faculty members who desire continued teaching appointments find themselves aligned with institutions and administrations that largely ignore their contribution and fail to provide support. They are often left to sink or swim with little or no orientation or opportunities for professional development. They are isolated from the full-time faculty and have little or no input into curriculum design and academic policies. Continued teaching contracts are often predicated upon positive student evaluations.

Part-time faculty members, many who teach at multiple institutions, find themselves in a precarious situation. Or more accurately, they find themselves caught
between university leaders, who need them to boost the bottom line and staff less popular class times declined by full-time counterparts, and students, who must be satisfied with the teaching experience before further teaching contracts would be offered.

This literature is clear. Conservatively, at least 50% of college classes are taught by part-time faculty. Yet, they are largely ignored, given little or no opportunities to increase in competence, no feedback is provided on their teaching performance, and when faced with questions about academic quality, must wrestle with the competing interest of pleasing students or future teaching contracts. How can any industry not professionally invest and support 50% of its workforce and yet expect to deliver a quality product to its customers? Businesses have learned that mentoring is an effective means for supporting new employees, for bolstering self-confidence, and for building positive regard and commitment to the organization that results in decreased turnover.

**Mentoring**

In order to set the framework, this portion of the literature review relates to mentoring and will focus on defining the term mentoring. I will discuss the concepts of natural and spontaneous mentoring relationships, as opposed to the more structured form known as systematic mentoring. The principles involved in developing systematic mentoring programs will be explored along with some empirical studies, which examine the effectiveness of such programs. The advantages of peer-to-peer mentoring, over other kinds of relationships, will be included as well. Finally, the benefits of participating in a mentoring program will be discussed from the perspectives of the mentor, the mentee, and the institution.
Mentoring: A Definition

Young and Wright (2001) define mentoring as the creation of a practical relationship that focuses on providing the individual with opportunities for personal and professional growth through the advice, coaching, and nurturing by a more experienced individual. They identify mentors as individuals who are “skilled, knowledgeable, visionary, dynamic and committed” to the process of investing in the development and improvement of others (Young & Wright, 2001, p. 202). At its heart, mentoring is a relationship (ASHE-ERIC, 1995; Biehl, 1996; Kaye, 2000; Phi Delta Kappa, 2002; Price, Graham, & Hobbs, 1997; Young & Wright, 2001).

Mentoring is an honorable and necessary means by which the “wisdom of the past” connects to the creative future (Loeffler, 2004, p. 23). Routman (2000) in her book entitled Conversations states that “mentoring encompasses coaching, supporting, hand holding, actively listening, gently suggesting, sharing materials, dialoguing with empathy and understanding, and much more” (p. 3). The activities typically engaged in by a mentor (coaching, nurturing, guiding, and modeling) are purposeful, with the result being the advancement of the mentor or protégé (Davis, 2001; Hansman, 2001; Washburn & LaLopa, 2003; Young & Wright, 2001). Young and Wright (2001) define mentoring as a nurturing process in which a more skilled or more experienced person, serving as a role model, teaches, sponsors, encourages, counsels, and befriends a less skilled or less experienced person for the purpose of promoting the latter’s professional and/or personal development. (p. 202)

There exists some agreement among scholars that the traditional mentoring relationship involves some form of hierarchy in that those with more experience help those with less (Cunningham, 1999; Grant-Vallone & Ensher, 2000; Price et al., 1997; Semeniuk & Worall, 2000; Street, 2004). In the classical sense, the mentor is older,
wiser, and more mature (Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, & McKee, 1978). In fact, Davis (2001) insists that mentors are always more experienced and knowledgeable than the mentee. Ellison and Scribner (2001) describe a mentor as someone who has already been where you are going. When you walk down the path, you do not have to fall into the potholes and wait for someone to pull you out of the mire. You can see the way ahead through the eyes of those who have traveled that way, and you can avoid their mistakes. (p. 27)

Mullen (2000) expands on this idea by noting that traditional mentors guide, facilitate, and help to transfer knowledge. Pierce (1998) extends this definition and describes mentors as essentially acting in a parental role; mentors are role models with demonstrated competence in teaching. Kram, in a 1985 landmark study (Kram & Isabella, 1985), noted that previous research on mentoring tended to focus on this hierarchical relationship and noted that “mentors tended to be older and several organizational levels higher and that the mentoring relationship was characterized as a one-way helping relationship” (p. 115).

Typically, the mentoring relationship is a dyad. One common theme found throughout the literature is that of relationship, and it would appear that a recipe for success carved in stone does not exist (Young & Wright, 2001). As a result, the matching of the mentor and the mentee is of critical importance. Many mentees self-select their mentors in what is known as a natural or spontaneous mentoring relationship. The matching of mentor and mentee is a much more complex decision when the mentoring program is systematic or developed, sanctioned, and implemented by the institution. The following section discusses these two types of mentoring programs.
Types of Mentoring Programs

There are two camps when it comes to mentoring programs—informal or natural and formal or systematic (Hansman, 2001). Informal mentoring occurs spontaneously, whereas formal mentoring programs are sanctioned and planned by the organization. The nature of how mentors and mentees elect to begin a mentoring relationship determines the nature of the relationship and whether it would be classified as a formal or informal one. This particular section will explore the similarities and differences between these types of mentoring programs. In addition, I share the stages of mentoring program development and what areas an organization should include as they create and implement a systematic mentoring program.

Since mentoring has its basis in relationships, the stronger the relationship, the more effective the mentoring experience. Some concur that the end result of the mentoring relationship is key, regardless of how it is formed. Mentoring is an influential relationship that results in an individual’s growth and change. Wang (2001) notes the promise of change is inherent in the mentoring process and lies in the nature of the mentor-mentee relationship. This growth can occur in both structured and unstructured relationships and in planned or unplanned ones (ASHE-ERIC, 1995).

Spontaneous Mentoring

There are those who firmly assert that a natural mentor is best (Phi Delta Kappa, 2002). Biehl (1996) believes that mentoring relationships require a “positive, natural chemistry” (p. 18) and cannot be guaranteed; he continues by saying that attempts to artificially match mentor to mentee can produce a deep frustration. One of IBM’s six principles of mentoring states that the employee must be the driving force behind the
mentoring relationship (Price et al., 1997). Semeniuk and Worall (2000) agree and believe that planned and systematic mentoring programs have many drawbacks. They believe that relationships which arise spontaneously and gradually allow teachers to enter more deeply into considering what it means to be teachers, to teach better and to engage more fruitfully with students. Because the associations are more personally created, their likelihood of success maybe greater. (Semeniuk & Worall, 2000, p. 425)

Croake (1996) worked to develop a systematic mentoring program in her community college and learned that new faculty already considered themselves to be experienced teachers; they questioned the need for a formal mentoring program. These new faculty members suggested that the mentoring program be less formal, provided to all faculty (not just the new ones), and be more individualized. Wang, Strong, and Odell (2004), in their comparison study of the mentoring relationships between Chinese and U.S. teachers, found that any kind of contrived collegiality, where partnerships are imposed by administrators, poses challenges to the creation and development of continued collaboration among faculty.

While many who engage in the debate do so in a diplomatic manner, Davis (2001) speaks plainly. In order for an authentic mentoring relationship to develop, it must be “a voluntary and ultimately personal relationship between two individuals. No one can mandate and monitor such a relationship” (p. 2). For Davis, the idea of personal choice is so essential to the mentoring relationship that if this element is mandated and devoid of personal choice, it is “not mentorship” (p. 3). Davis criticizes administrators and organizations that seek to artificially create these relationships; he concludes by saying that this contrived effort will “yield empty results” (p. 3).
Vincent and Seymour (1995) concur, “Mentoring should never be forced but only encouraged in organizations” (p. 9). It would seem that the participants of Goodwin, Stevens, and Belamy’s (1998) study agree. Their exploratory and descriptive study of full-time faculty members in 13 public and private universities found that faculty members valued voluntary and informal mentoring relationships over those that were formal and mandated (Goodwin et al., 1998).

**Systematic Mentoring**

While some believe that the spontaneous nature of the mentoring relationship works best; one author noted that, for better or worse, organizational leaders routinely institutionalize mentoring programs (Kaye, 2000). Many note that in the business world formalized mentoring programs exist and have worked quite adequately (Gaskill, 1993). While Gaskill acknowledges that disagreements exist on “the value of mandatory programs,” the reality is that “formalized mentoring programs are successful” (p. 148). Because these programs are well designed and not left to chance, they offer the greatest opportunity for personal and organizational benefit. Gaskill defines a formal mentoring program as one that “involves setting explicit goals and practices for linking less experienced and more experienced managers, encouraging mentoring by arranging relationships that serve developmental purposes for both individuals” (p. 147).

Boyle and Boice (1998) are two authors who believe that the traditional view of spontaneous mentoring is, at best, a myth. They found that spontaneous mentoring tends to be irregular and short-lived. In addition, oftentimes those who desire mentoring go un-mentored. In fact, they state that those who benefit the most from “spontaneous
mentoring tend to be white males” (p. 159). Women and minorities are least likely to find a mentor.

Boyle and Boice (1998) are not quick to praise these systematic mentoring models; they note that oftentimes these programs are seen as remedial and a hindrance rather than an opportunity to enhance professional growth. In addition, participants fear that administrators will use the mentoring relationship for evaluation purposes; this is particularly true if the mentor and mentee are from the same department. Their pilot study sought to evaluate the effectiveness of a university’s systematic mentoring program.

Boyle and Boice’s (1998) study focused on pairing mentors and recording their interactions. Mentoring pairs agreed to meet for one academic year, to meet weekly, and to attend monthly meetings. The researchers collected weekly phone logs and journals, submitted by the participants, in order to rate the frequency, content, and compatibility of the mentoring interactions. The study also utilized a score of 65 or higher on a mentoring index to indicate an acceptable level of mentoring.

The results showed that individuals with mentors across departmental lines reported a higher mentoring index when compared to mentors from the same department. Mentees rated administrative mentors more highly than they did regular faculty members (Boyle & Boice, 1998). Not surprisingly, mentoring pairs that met weekly, attended the group meetings, and enthusiastically worked to build compatibility and reciprocity were the most successful. Mentoring pairs agreed that the impetus for change came from the monthly group meetings.
Boyle and Boice’s (1998) pilot study also compared mentoring pairs who participated in the systematic mentoring program with a group of faculty members who self-reported having experienced a spontaneous mentoring relationship. The authors found that systematic mentoring works better than spontaneous, natural mentoring. Boyce and Boice concluded, “Even the best-treated of natural mentees fared less well than most of the counterparts in the formal program” (p. 169).

Gaia, Corts, Tatum, and Allen (2001) reported the results of their study on a graduate teaching assistant mentoring program. This systematic mentoring program recognized that few programs exist that prepare graduate students for the professoriate. This particular program combined regular meetings of small teams (one outstanding, experienced faculty member working with 5-7 teaching assistants) with large group meetings. The purpose of the program was to provide an open forum for discussing issues related to research and effective teaching. Program organizers hoped that because of increased professional support, the GTAs (graduate teaching assistant) would experience greater self-confidence about classroom teaching (Gaia et al., 2001). These authors conclude the study by noting that creating systematic mentoring programs that provide opportunities for junior- and senior-level faculty members to interact across disciplines have the potential to greatly contribute to the quality of undergraduate education (Gaia et al., 2001).

Cunningham (1999) notes that the intentional and effective mentoring among colleagues can enhance professional growth and development. The literature concerning systematic mentoring is encouraging and seems to indicate that it can be as effective as a natural and spontaneous mentor pairing. The above studies regarding both natural and
systematic mentoring have focused on the relationship between a more experienced individual with one who is less experienced or confident. The following section will explore the idea of peer mentoring.

**Peer Mentoring**

Typically, research regarding mentoring investigates a one-way helping relationship (Kram & Isabella, 1985). Peer relationships may offer “unique developmental opportunities” that should not be overlooked (p. 120). Previous studies have hinted at the potential of peer relationships. Due to current organizational structure trends, individuals are much more likely to have more peers than supervisors or bosses. In addition, those who have looked at peer mentoring conclude that the absence of a hierarchical relationship means that communication, mutual support, and collaboration will result.

Because of the potential benefit of peer mentoring, Kram and Isabella (1985) conducted an exploratory study to investigate peer mentoring. The study focused on identifying the purpose of a peer mentor, to explore the varying kinds of peer mentors, and to understand the function of peer relationships at different career stages. This grounded-theory study sought patterns and themes from the participants’ responses. The researchers interviewed 15 individuals in three different age groups. During the first interviews, the voluntary participants were asked to name “two relationships with colleagues that you feel supported your personal and professional growth” (p. 114). Participants then gave permission for the researchers to contact these individuals for another guided interview.
The results showed that peer relationships are an important alternative to the traditional mentoring dyad. These peer relationships provided a range of support that spanned different career stages. The psychosocial support, information sharing, and technical support resulted in a sense of competence and confidence (Kram & Isabella, 1985). In addition, these peer-mentoring relationships tended to be more intimate and have a higher degree of self-disclosure and trust.

Peer relationships offer a degree of mutuality and enable both individuals to experience being a giver as well as the receiver of these functions. In contrast to a mentoring relationship, where one individual specializes in the role of guide or sponsor, in a peer relationship both assume both kinds of roles. (p. 118)

While traditional and peer mentoring have several common attributes, peer relationships have a longevity that exceeds most traditional mentoring relationships. While a conventional mentor may be most useful at the beginning stage of a career, Kram and Isabella (1985) conclude that peer relationships are important at all stages.

Mullen (2000) agrees with this assessment and notes that the traditional model of mentorship falls short of satisfying the deeper and multiple demands required of a professional partnership. Peer mentoring, or co-mentoring as Mullen calls it, is empowering, proactively supportive, and synergistic. The lack of a hierarchical relationship encourages professional learning among equals.

Despite the potential for peer mentoring, little is known about this kind of mentoring experience and few studies have examined how formally assigned peer mentors support their mentees and what affect this has on important outcomes (Grant-Vallone & Ensher, 2000). As a result, Grant-Vallone and Ensher examined 29 peer mentors. Both mentors and mentees volunteered and were required to attend an orientation session, a large-group function at the beginning of each semester, and meet at
least two times during the semester. The researcher-developed instrument collected data relative to support functions, perceived stress, and the degree of satisfaction with the program. The researchers hypothesized that increased high-contact relationships would report more support and less stress. Support was identified as psychosocial (interpersonal) and instrumental (task-related support).

The findings revealed that high-contact peers (HCP) reported significantly higher levels of psychosocial support and instrumental support than did the low-contact peers (LCP). The HCP pairs also reported a greater degree of overall satisfaction with the program than did the LCP (Grant-Vallone & Ensher, 2000). Grant-Vallone and Ensher (2000) also learned that peer mentors provided more psychosocial support than instrumental support.

Because of their study, Grant-Vallone and Ensher (2000) recommend that peer mentors receive intensive training, that a more extensive pairing strategy be designed or allow peers to choose their mentors, and that an orientation be provided so that mentees can understand the expectations. In addition, the authors recommend rewarding peer mentors for their efforts. Because contact was high at the beginning of the program and tapered off at the end, Grant-Vallone and Ensher recommend organizing formal events, which ensure that the mentoring pairs have regular contact.

Whether one engages a traditional or peer mentor, most agree that organizations that desire to establish this collaborative relationship are best served by designing and implementing a systematic mentoring program. The literature is replete with examples of institutional mentoring programs and best practices with regard to how these programs should be developed. The following section will explore this literature.
Developing Systematic Mentoring Programs

In 1993, Gaskill studied 90 executive development directors across the United States who employed 10 or more executives, in order to propose a conceptual framework for the development of systematic mentoring programs. Only 51 of the 90 executives responded to his initial inquiry and of those, only nine had formal mentoring programs. Not surprising, Gaskill (1993) learned that systematic mentoring begins with development and moves toward the implementation phase. Finally, the organization needs to evaluate the program’s effectiveness in order to determine if each mentor and mentee pair achieved the stated outcomes of the program.

All the executive development directors noted the importance of obtaining the support and buy-in from those at the highest leadership levels in the organization. Without this support, important resources may not be available. Pierce (1998) supports the importance of administrative and institutional support and notes that without this buy-in “a viable program is not possible” (p. 36). In addition, he notes that this support needs to demonstrate “concretely” by committing human, physical, and psychological resources, which includes, but is not limited to, meeting space and time (p. 37).

After gaining institutional support, other critical elements of the development phase include the selection of mentors. While the mentees’ participation can be either voluntary or mandated, this should not be the case with the mentors. “Mentor candidates . . . need to be carefully reviewed for their qualifications, willingness, and desire to participate” (Gaskill, 1993, p. 155). Gaskill advises those who are developing mentor programs to select mentors wisely.

Mentor selection process should begin with the identification of a pool of potential candidates obtained either on a voluntary basis or by targeting key individuals in the
Once potential mentors are identified, candidates should then be evaluated using pre-determined selection criteria. (p. 155)

Gaskill (1993) also recommends that organizers provide training to both the mentor and mentee prior to entering into the mentoring relationship. The purpose of the training is to orientate participants to the program’s purposes and objectives. Training also serves to minimize any ambiguity in roles, duties, and responsibilities. Developing essential mentoring skills, such as active listening and problem-solving techniques, is also an important aspect of this pre-service training.

Perhaps the most important element to consider in this planning phase is how one will actually pair each mentor and mentee. Gaskill (1993) refers to this process as “linkage” (p. 155). He suggests that linkage be based on commonalities like shared interest and geographic proximity. It is essential that once the mentoring link has been made that the program’s facilitator monitors the match to “determine if the individuals are compatible and functioning adequately” (p. 156).

Once the pre-implementation steps have been accomplished and mentees have been linked to a compatible mentor, the mentoring program moves into the implementation phase (Gaskill, 1993). The participants of this study recommended that the details related to the specifics of each mentoring pair’s contact be “left to the discretion of the parties involved” (p. 156). This contact should include elements of career function and enhancement and such psychosocial support as building confidence and self-worth.

Finally, the systematic mentoring program needs to be evaluated for its effectiveness and to determine whether the objectives were achieved. This evaluation should include feedback from both the mentor and the mentee; thus, using pre-developed
questionnaires or non-structured interviews are two methods he recommends. Gaskill (1993) recommends that data be collected on the participants’ impressions of the overall effectiveness of the program and the mentoring relationship, personal benefits achieved, and suggestions for improvement. Gaskill concludes his study by observing that “formalized mentoring programs build confidence and competence, provide emotional support, and, in general, help to develop productive, fast-tracking executives with improved levels of career commitment” (p. 159).

Boyle and Boice (1998) noted that effective systematic mentoring programs need planning, structure, and intentional assessment. Boyle and Boice also recommend that you recruit mentors and mentees (early), carefully pair the mentoring assignments (cross-department pairings worked best), and communicate clearly the mentoring program’s goals to participants. They also note that the monthly meetings were critical to the program’s success. The researchers regularly followed up and provided incentives for pairs to meet. In conclusion, Boyle and Boice note that “effective mentoring, as far as we can tell, begins with institution-wide programs that coach departments in ways to systematically immerse newcomers in support programs and provide them with a sense of connectiveness” (p. 177).

Recognizing that mentoring programs are an effective way to integrate employees into the workplace, Price et al. (1997) offer a comprehensive model for developing a systematic mentoring program. The model includes program design and encompasses the establishment of goals and objectives, selection criteria for mentors, as well as developing and training the mentors to be successful in their roles. These authors also suggest that both the mentor and mentee receive training that includes an understanding
of their different roles. For the mentor, this means how to use meetings to build relationship and to create trust with the mentee, how to write objectives as part of a growth plan, and how to observe and evaluate the mentee. The mentee also needs to be orientated to his or her roles and responsibilities. These can include how to accept advice, the importance of commitment, and following through on suggestions for improving.

Price et al. (1997) also note that assessing the mentoring program is of critical importance. This should be formative as well as summative. The assessment plan should include a means whereby the mentee can evaluate the mentor. Participants should evaluate all components of the program, as this feedback is essential for the implementation of a continuous improvement plan. These steps are essential. The benefit is well worth the effort. “An employee who experiences an intensive mentoring program under the tutelage of a competent mentor will become an asset to the organization and will ideally become a role model for future employees” (para. 24).

In conclusion, research seems to suggest that systematic mentoring is as effective as and, in some cases, more effective than mentoring relationships, which evolve from a more natural and spontaneous pairing. The literature also seems to agree that effective mentoring programs need to be intentional and the result of careful planning that includes a pre-implementation phase where goals and objectives are established. Strong administrative support is critical (Pierce, 1998). The qualifications of the mentor must be carefully considered as well as how the mentor and mentee pair will be linked (ASHE-ERIC, 1995; Grant-Vallone & Ensher, 2000; Price et al., 1997).

Contrary to conventional wisdom, the literature supports the idea that interdisciplinary pairings are more effective than assigning mentors and mentees from the
same department. Organizers should also provide some form of training and orientation for both mentors and mentees (Phi Delta Kappa, 2002; Price et al., 1997; Wang, 2001). In addition, during the actual mentoring phase it is important to provide regular monitoring to ensure that the linkage is effective and that the mentoring dyad is meeting on a regular basis. Mentor pairs left alone were ineffective (Boice, 1992).

Finally, the creators and authors of the program must plan for and provide a means whereby ongoing and summative assessment occurs (Gray, 1989). Feedback, from all levels and all participants, will ensure that the program is continually revised and improved so that the stated goals and objectives continue to be met. When all these components are effectively put into place, a successful program will result, which empowers the institution’s human capital and supports the institution’s vision and mission (ASHE-ERIC, 1995). In addition to these two important outcomes, the literature suggests there are many more benefits to mentoring.

Benefits of Mentoring

It should come as no surprise that engaging in a mentoring relationship, whether natural and spontaneous or systematic and formalized, will benefit the mentee. However, the literature is also replete with data that suggest that mentors and institutions benefit as well. The development and maintenance of these personal and professional relationships provide a forum for discussing what we mean by quality teaching. The dialogue alone should raise our awareness and spur us on to excellence.

For mentees, the benefits are numerous and as individualized as each person. Gaia et al. (2001) noted in their study that mentees benefited from the GTA mentoring program as they built relationships with professors and other graduate assistants across
disciplines. This increased sense of community resulted in a positive and supportive culture, which encouraged risk-taking that might not otherwise have occurred. The one-on-one meetings with the mentor, as well as the group meetings, fostered professionalism and a venue to think and talk about teaching as a profession (Gaia et al., 2001). As a result of this community discussion on excellence in teaching, the mentors “reengaged in issues of everyday teaching” (p. 64).

On a practical level, Simmons (1998) reported that university professors who engage in a mentoring relationship are better prepared for the tasks of teaching. These include, but are not limited to, the following: creating course syllabi, meeting promotion and tenure requirements, preparing for annual performance reviews, setting class expectations, holding students to high academic standards, securing class materials, and understanding the institutional lore. New faculty members do not have the time to pore over faculty manuals and handbooks. Mentors who support, advise, and affirm their mentees will find that the protégé has gained the confidence necessary to be comfortable and successful.

In addition to the task-related support outlined above, the personal or psychosocial support a mentee receives can be invaluable. Wickman and Sjodin (1997) suggest that mentoring opens doors for the protégé, reduces frustration by saving time, increases success and productivity, and improves career satisfaction. The result of this personal support and encouragement is a teacher with higher levels of institutional commitment and loyalty.

Goodwin et al. (1998) echo this conclusion. They note that the major outcomes of mentoring are gained confidence. A close relationship with a mentor will help the protégé
successfully navigate the institution’s tenure process and assist the protégé in engaging in scholarly activities, such as research and service. Finally, an increased commitment to the program is also common.

While the benefits to the mentee or protégé can be easily understood, the reality is that the “mentors themselves become more professional, less anxious and better engaged and positive about their work—there is a greater sense of responsibility and security” (Semeniuk & Worall, 2000). Wickman and Sjodin (1997) further explain this outcome as they note that those who serve as mentors benefit as they pass their legacy on to others. Serving as a role model and guide to another forces the mentor to set an example, which can often result in more creativity and effectiveness concerning the mentor’s own teaching style. The reality is that as you impart your values to others, you “get by giving” (p. 89).

While both mentee and mentor benefit and grow from an effective mentoring relationship, this positive outcome is not lost on the institution (Cunningham, 1999). The institution realizes an enhanced teaching effectiveness on the part of the professoriate. This results in a vibrant and productive faculty who are keenly satisfied in their positions and who are loyal and remain committed to the institution’s purpose and mission. There can be no doubt that mentoring strengthens the organization and supports its vision (ASHE-ERIC, 1995).

**Conclusion**

This chapter explored the rising dependence on part-time faculty in America’s post-secondary institutions. While the Bureau of Educational Statistics indicates that the trend has remained a steady 44% of the professoriate over the past decade, some
researchers believe this number is misleading due to the varied categories and ranks that colleges and universities use to define these faculty members.

Despite the steady use of part-time faculty members over the past 50 years, the debate continues to rage across college campus classrooms and faculty meetings. Some believe this over-reliance on part-time faculty members threatens the very fabric of academic quality and excellence. Others believe that the part-time faculty bring a much-needed link between theoretical ivory towers and the application of these theories in a pragmatic manner within the fields of professional practice. No clear conclusion emerges and the debate continues.

While the discussion continues, the literature appears to agree on several key factors. Part-time faculty members are isolated from the larger academic community and are not provided the same level of support and professional development opportunities as their full-time counterparts. This isolation and feelings of belonging to a second-class citizenry have resulted in a lack of confidence and loyalty to the institution. Tenured faculty and professional organizations like the AAUP believe that part-time faculty provide a less than stellar educational experience and that students ultimately suffer from this lack of quality.

The literature review clearly supports the evidence that part-time faculty members are here to stay and that university administrators and leaders need to begin to address how best to meet the professional development and inclusion needs of these vital members of the faculty. Mentoring has proved effective in the business arena and at all levels of the educational spectrum. There is no evidence to suggest that such an
intervention would not be effective or that participants who receive mentoring would do worse than those who do not.

Of the many studies examined, only two specifically addressed the use of peer mentors. Consequently, it seems logical that a study designed to explore the impact of peer mentoring on a part-time faculty member’s confidence, organizational loyalty, and student satisfaction scores is needed to help address the existing gap in the literature. Chapter 3 presents the research design and methodology, including the data collection and analysis plans.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to examine what relationship self-reported perceptions on the quality of a peer-to-peer mentoring experience would have on a part-time faculty member’s instructor confidence, institutional loyalty, and student satisfaction at a very large mid-west university. This chapter informs the reader about the research protocol used to both collect and analyze the data. Specifically, I have organized this chapter into the following sections: (a) description of participants, (b) data collection procedures, (c) design of the study, (d) statement of hypotheses, (e) the variable list, (f) the instrumentation, (g) data analysis plan, and (h) summary of methodology.

Description of Participants

Part-time faculty members who teach in the School of Business in the College of Adult and Professional Studies (CAPS) programs from the University served as the sample for this ex post facto study. It is important to note that I did not use random sampling techniques in this study. Because the independent variable cannot be manipulated or controlled, the variation was achieved by selecting participants in which the variable, in this case, a peer-mentoring experience, is “present, absent, strong, or weak” (Ary et al., 2010, p. 334). For this reason, the following list details the criteria for determining who was eligible to participate in the study:
1. Eligible participants must be part-time faculty members and teach in the School of Business in the University’s CAPS program.

2. Eligible participants must have taught at least three courses so that the mean from end-of-course surveys can be calculated.

3. Eligible participants may not hold a full-time teaching or administrative position with the University.

To identify eligible faculty, I coordinated with the Associate Vice-president for Academic Administration and Operations to identify the sample who meets the above criteria. Because the University changed the end-of-course survey form and the manner in which they collect and analyze this information, participants must have taught at least three courses between June 1, 2009, and December 31, 2010.

In order to maintain the confidentiality and anonymity of the participants and their individual end-of-course survey results, the University handled the dissemination of the survey. The statistics department matched survey responses with the corresponding end-of-course survey means. Each participant was given a unique identifier before disseminating survey and end-of-course results to the researcher. Since the identifier contained no personal information, no one was able to match survey responses and end-of-course data to a particular respondent.

Babbie (2007) notes that there is an important distinction between confidentiality and anonymity, and researchers must be clear with participants as to how individual identity will be handled. Since I am not a member of the University’s academic community, this additional step was deemed prudent to further protect the confidentiality of the study’s participants.
Data Collection Procedures

The CAPS Assistant Director for Research and Program Development was responsible for putting the survey into the University’s Internet survey site, launching the survey, and compiling the results. The Associate Vice-president for Academic Administration and Operations and the Associate Dean for the School of Business sent email communications to the School of Business Faculty informing them of the research, stressing to them the importance and value of the research, and encouraging them to complete the survey in a timely manner. All parties believed this introduction would increase both the response rate and timeliness of completion. The survey remained open for 2 weeks; after 1 week, a reminder was sent to encourage those who had not yet responded to access the survey’s URL and to complete the survey. Once the data from the survey were complete, the responses were compiled and the unique identifier was created and attached to the end-of-course survey means. The results were then emailed to me. The data were analyzed using the statistical software package PASW 18.0 (formerly SPSS).

Design of the Study

Kerlinger and Lee (2000) note that the cardinal rule of planning any research study is that the research questions should dictate the research design. Since this study sought to explore the quality of a previous peer-mentoring experience and its relationship to several dependent variables, it was determined that an ex post facto study was the most appropriate research design to use in order to answer the research questions and to test the hypotheses. Ex post facto research, by its very design, investigates “the world as it
naturally occurs” and explores phenomena that have already occurred (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 257).

According to Newman et al. (2006), there are three types of ex post facto research. The first design uses no hypothesis and generally considered the weakest of the three. Other ex post facto designs included the testing of hypotheses and have a bit more scientific value. The third type of ex post facto research design includes the test of hypotheses along with test for alternative hypotheses are “considerably more powerful in terms of internal validity” (Newman, et al., 2006, p. 101).

Ary et al. (2010) note that an ex post facto research design is useful when one wants to investigate the relationship between the dependent and independent variables when randomization or manipulation of the independent variable is not possible. While both an experimental and ex post facto design test relationships between variables and test hypotheses, the ex post facto design does not provide adequate safeguards; consequently, less evidence exists to infer a causal relationship (Ary et al., 2010). Despite these limitations, ex post facto research contributes valuable information to the field of education and other social sciences.

**Internal Validity**

At the beginning of any research, it is important to note the threats to both the internal and external validity. Internal validity, a term coined by Campbell and Stanley (1963), concludes that the relationship between two variables is causal. Campbell and Stanley indicate that threats to the internal validity of any study occur when researchers draw inaccurate conclusions from the research results; this happens whenever anything other than the independent variable affects the dependent variables. So, for a study to
have internal validity it must control for all other possible explanations for the relationship (Johnson & Christensen, 2008).

Since ex post facto research does not manipulate the independent variable, researchers must be particularly cautious when making inferences from the study’s findings (Ary et al., 2010; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). Regardless of these restrictions, researchers can take steps in the implementation and data analysis phases to minimize the effects of these limitations. For the purposes of this study, several factors may influence the conclusions drawn from the study’s findings.

Perhaps the most significant threat to the internal validity of an ex post facto study is the post hoc fallacy, which occurs when the investigator incorrectly concludes that causation exists simply because evidence of a relationship is found (Ary et al., 2010). In order to conclude that a causation relationship exists, researchers must be able to meet the following three standards for a non-spurious relationship: (a) a statistical relationship between X and Y has been established, (b) X preceded Y in time, and (c) other factors did not determine Y (Ary et al., 2010, p. 333).

It is with this last condition that ex post facto studies have the most difficulty (Johnson & Christensen, 2008). Because the independent variable is not controlled, a causation conclusion would be a mistake. The relationship could exist due to the presence of an undetermined third variable. One way to combat this is to control for extraneous variables, which could provide for an alternate conclusion, into the research design.

For this reason, age, gender, ethnicity, educational level, primary teaching area, and teaching experience were included as independent variables in statements of alternate hypotheses. Kerlinger and Lee (2000) note that the credibility of ex post facto research
can be improved when designing the study that a number of hypotheses be considered. This is because the greater number of alternative hypotheses investigators can eliminate, the greater likelihood the study can approximate internal validity (Newman, Newman, Brown, & McNeely, 2006). Newman et al. support this conclusion when they state, “Ex post facto research with hypotheses and tests for alternative hypotheses is considerably more powerful in terms of internal validity” (p. 101).

In addition, the primary means of data analysis will be a general linear regression model, which can be used to statistically control for some extraneous variables. This technique, according to Johnson and Christensen (2008), can be used to remove some of the influence of the extraneous variables. Kerlinger and Lee (2000) note that controlling for extraneous variables in a research design makes it possible to extract additional research information on the possible relationship the extraneous variables may have with the dependent variables.

Another threat to internal validity is maturation, which refers to changes that can occur in individuals over time. Babbie (2007) states that it is possible that a participant is not completely truthful in answering the survey questions or may respond by choosing what he or she perceives to be the preferred or ideal answer as opposed to choosing a response that accurately reflects the current situation. Since this study asked instructors to recall a previous past mentoring experience, their memory may be faulty. The changes in instructor confidence and loyalty may increase over time, regardless of the mentoring experience. It is for this reason that the general linear model controls for length of teaching experience.
External Validity

While internal validity refers to the ability of researchers to infer causation, external validity relates to the ability for one to generalize based on the research findings (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). Several factors significantly affect the ability to generalize the findings of this research to the broader population. The sample population limits the ability of the research findings to be generalized. The sample consists of part-time faculty from one private, mid-western Christian university. It would be inappropriate to draw conclusions about part-time faculty members in the public and private sectors across the United States. At best, the study’s results can be used to make generalizations about the relationship between peer-to-peer mentoring on part-time instructors in the University’s College of Adult and Professional Studies. While care must be taken to limit recommendations for practice to the University, certainly recommendations for future research can include implications for the broader part-time faculty community.

Statement of Hypotheses

Hypothesis statements are frequently used when the investigator wishes to compare groups with regard to the relationship among the different variables (Creswell, 2003). The reader will note that the hypothesis statements are directional; it is assumed that those who perceive a higher degree of quality within the peer-mentoring experience will score higher on the dependent variable measures than those who perceive a lesser quality experience. The literature on mentoring seems to strongly support the supposition that recipients of mentoring have increased confidence and greater loyalty (Boyle & Boice, 1998). At least the literature is clear that those who receive mentoring will not do worse than those who have not received mentoring. The primary and secondary
directional hypotheses or prediction statements that form the basis for this study are
detailed in the sections that follow.

Hypothesis Statements Related to Instructor Confidence

Hypothesis Statements Related to Mentoring
and Instructor Confidence

Hypothesis 1a: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of
instructor confidence than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 1b: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of
instructor confidence, independent of age, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 1c: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of
instructor confidence, independent of gender, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 1d: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of
instructor confidence, independent of ethnicity, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 1e: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of
instructor confidence, independent of length of service, than those who receive no
mentoring.

Hypothesis 1f: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of
instructor confidence, independent of modules taught, than those who receive no
mentoring.

Hypothesis 1g: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of
instructor confidence, independent of educational level, than those who receive no
mentoring.
Hypothesis 1h: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of primary teaching level, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 1i: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of whether or not the faculty member teaches at other universities, than those who receive no mentoring.

**Hypothesis Statements Related to Mentoring, Fidelity, and Instructor Confidence**

Hypothesis 1j: Subjects who perceive a higher quality mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 1k: Subjects who perceive a higher quality mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of age, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 1l: Subjects who perceive a higher quality mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of gender, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 1m: Subjects who perceive a higher quality mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of ethnicity, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 1n: Subjects who perceive a higher quality mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of length of service, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.
Hypothesis 1o: Subjects who perceive a higher quality mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of number of modules taught, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 1p: Subjects who perceive a higher quality mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of educational level, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 1q: Subjects who perceive a higher quality mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of primary teaching level, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 1r: Subjects who perceive a higher quality mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of whether or not the faculty member teaches at other universities, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

**Hypothesis Statements Related to Mentoring, Type of Mentor, and Instructor Confidence**

Hypothesis 1s: Subjects who receive peer mentoring will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence than those with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.

Hypothesis 1t: Subjects who receive peer mentoring will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of age, than those with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.
Hypothesis 1u: Subjects who receive peer mentoring will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of gender, than those with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.

Hypothesis 1v: Subjects who receive peer mentoring will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of ethnicity, than those with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.

Hypothesis 1w: Subjects who receive peer mentoring will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of length of service, than those with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.

Hypothesis 1x: Subjects who receive peer mentoring will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of number of modules taught, than those with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.

Hypothesis 1y: Subjects who receive peer mentoring will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of educational level, than those with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.

Hypothesis 1z: Subjects who receive peer mentoring will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of primary teaching level, than those with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.

Hypothesis 1aa: Subjects who receive peer mentoring will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of whether or not the faculty member teaches at other universities, than those with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.
Hypotheses Related to Mentoring and Institutional Loyalty

Hypothesis 2a: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 2b: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of age, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 2c: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of gender, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 2d: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of ethnicity, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 2e: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of length of service, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 2f: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of modules taught, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 2g: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of educational level, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 2h: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of primary teaching level, than those who receive no mentoring.
Hypothesis 2i: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of whether or not the faculty member teaches at other universities, than those who receive no mentoring.

**Hypotheses Related to Fidelity and Institutional Loyalty**

Hypothesis 2j: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2k: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of age, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2l: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of gender, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2m: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of ethnicity, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2n: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of length of service, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2o: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of number of modules taught, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.
Hypothesis 2p: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of educational level, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2q: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of primary teaching level, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2r: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of whether or not the faculty member teaches at other universities, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

**Hypothesis Statements Related to Type of Mentor and Institutional Loyalty**

Hypothesis 2s: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2t: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of age, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2u: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of gender, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.
Hypothesis 2v: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of ethnicity, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2w: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of length of service, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2x: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of number of modules taught, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2y: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of educational level, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2z: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of primary teaching level, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2aa: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of whether or not the faculty member teaches at other universities, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.
Hypotheses Related to Mentoring and Student Satisfaction

Hypothesis 3a: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 3b: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of age, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 3c: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of gender, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 3d: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of ethnicity, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 3e: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of length of service, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 3f: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of modules taught, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 3g: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of educational level, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 3h: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of primary teaching level, than those who receive no mentoring.
Hypothesis 3i: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of whether or not the faculty member teaches at other universities, than those who receive no mentoring.

**Hypotheses Related to Fidelity and Student Satisfaction**

Hypothesis 3j: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 3k: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of age, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 3l: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of gender, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 3m: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of ethnicity, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 3n: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of length of service, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 3o: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of number of modules taught, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.
Hypothesis 3p: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of educational level, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 3q: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of primary teaching level, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 3r: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of whether or not the faculty member teaches at other universities, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

**Hypothesis Statements Related to Type of Mentor and Student Satisfaction**

Hypothesis 3s: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction than those with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.

Hypothesis 3t: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of age, than those with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.

Hypothesis 3u: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of gender, than those with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.
Hypothesis 3v: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of ethnicity, than those with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.

Hypothesis 3w: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of length of service, than those with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.

Hypothesis 3x: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of number of modules taught, than those with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.

Hypothesis 3y: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of educational level, than those with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.

Hypothesis 3z: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of primary teaching level, than those who with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.

Hypothesis 3aa: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of whether or not the faculty member teaches at other universities, than those with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.

The Variable List

Below is a list of the operational definitions for the independent (IV) and dependent variables (DV), which was used in this study. Table 42 (Appendix A) provides
the reader with information regarding the conceptual, instrumental, and operational definition of each variable.

1. **Peer-to-Peer Mentoring (IV):** Refers to the perceived quality of the peer-mentoring experience. Peer-to-peer refers to the relationship between the mentor and mentee and denotes that one part-time faculty member mentors another part-time faculty member. This variable was measured using the 25 questions in Part V of the survey instrument, “Tell us about your mentoring experience.” Questions 1-9 are answered using a “yes” or “no” response (yes = 1; no = 0). Questions 10-24 are forced-choice using a Likert scale of *Strongly Agree* (SA = 3), *Agree* (A = 2), *Disagree* (D = 1), and *Strongly Disagree* (SD = 0).

2. **Instructor Confidence (DV):** Refers to a self-reported measure in which a part-time instructor indicates his or her level of confidence with the course content, adult learning methodology, and institutional policies and procedures. This variable was measured using the 39 questions in Part IV of the survey instrument, “Tell us what you know.” All questions use a forced-choice Likert scale of *Strongly Agree* (SA = 3), *Agree* (A = 2), *Disagree* (D = 1), and *Strongly Disagree* (SD = 0).

3. **Institutional Loyalty (DV):** Refers to a self-reported measure in which a part-time instructor indicates his or her preference for accepting a teaching assignment at the institution in which they were mentored over teaching opportunities at other universities. (Frequently one finds the term *organizational commitment* used almost synonymously with institutional loyalty. Consequently, these terms are used interchangeably.) This variable was measured using the 25 questions in Part III of the survey instrument, “Tell us how you feel about the University.” These items were based on the Allen and Meyer
(1990) previously validated organizational commitment scale. Questions for this section were used with permission. All questions use a forced-choice Likert scale of Strongly Agree (SA = 3), Agree (A = 2), Disagree (D = 1), and Strongly Disagree (SD = 0).

4. **Student Satisfaction (DV):** Refers to the self-reported perception by students of the instructor’s effectiveness in terms of overall course quality, teaching skill, and availability. Nine items listed under the INSTRUCTOR section of the University’s end-of-course survey forms were used to measure this variable. (The complete list of statements can be found in the Instrumentation section of this chapter.) Please note that the mean for each statement for the three most current end-of-course survey forms is calculated. The aggregate of 27 mean scores was used to measure this variable. The assumption has been made that all items are equally important.

5. **Age (IV):** Refers to the chronological age of each participant and was measured in years.

6. **Gender (IV):** Refers to the sex of the participant and was measured as follows: 1 = male, 0 = all others; 1 = female, 0 = all others.

7. **Ethnicity (IV):** Refers to the ethnic group in which the participant belongs and was measured as follows: 1 = African-American, 0 = all others; 1 = Asian, 0 = all others; 1 = Caucasian, 0 = all others; 1 = Hispanic, 0 = all others; 1 = Middle Eastern, 0 = all others; 1 = Mixed, 0 = all others; 1 = all others.

8. **Educational Level (IV):** Refers to the highest educational level achieved by each participant and was measured as follows: 1 = Bachelor’s Degree; 2 = Master’s Degree; 3 = Post-Masters; 4 = Specialist degree and, 5 = Terminal Degree (Ph.D., D.Min., J.D., Ed.D., or other).
9. *Primary Area of Teaching Responsibility* (IV): Refers to level where the faculty member does the majority of his or her teaching. Primary Area of Teaching was measured as follows: 1 = undergraduate, 2 = graduate, 3 = online.

10. *Teaching Experience* (IV): Refers to the number of module/courses that each participant has taught and was measured by reviewing the answer to question 4, which is found in Part I of the survey, “How many courses/modules have you taught?” This variable is operationally defined in increments of five (0-5 modules = 0; 6-10 modules = 1; and more than 10 modules = 2).

11. *Teach at Other Universities* (IV): Refers to whether or not the participant teaches at universities other than The University, which is the setting for this research. This is found in Part I of the survey, “Do you teach (either face to face or online) for other universities?” Respondents indicate Yes (= 0) or No (= 1). If they answered yes, the participant is prompted to enter the number of other universities.

**The Instrumentation**

An online survey instrument was used to gather information that aided in answering both the research questions and whether to accept or reject the hypotheses. I developed the survey after an extensive review of the literature. One portion of the survey utilized the organizational commitment research conducted by Meyers and Allen (1984, 1988). This instrument was deployed to participants using the University’s online survey site.
Online Survey Instrument

The online survey was developed to address the relationship between the independent variable, peer-to-peer mentoring, and the twin dependent variables of institutional loyalty and instructor confidence. The survey was organized into five parts. Following is a description of each section.

Part I—Informed Consent

This section was the informed consent. Participants were introduced to the purpose of the study and invited to complete the survey. The benefits and risks were included; the participant was also informed that the institution would be accessing his or her most recent end-of-course survey forms. Respondents were told they would remain anonymous. Respondents had to agree to the conditions detailed in the informed consent. Those who disagreed were immediately taken to a fade-out page that thanked them for participating.

Part II—Tell Us about You

A series of drop-down boxes was utilized to collect information with regard to the participants’ age, gender, ethnicity, educational level, primary instructional area, and teaching experience.

Part III—Tell Us How You Feel About the University

This section consisted of 25 questions, developed by Meyer and Allen (1988, 1990), which gathered information related to each instructor’s commitment to the University. Research suggests that this commitment scale is positively correlated to
institutional loyalty and improved job performance. The institutional loyalty subscale has been studied and its validity estimate was based on previous research conducted by Meyer and Allen (1997) and others (Ketchland & Strawser, 2001; LaMastro, 2000; Meyer et al., 1993). The 22 questions, which were used with permission, are listed below. Note that due to the University’s desire to remain anonymous, the actual name of the university, which was included in the survey, has been changed to the University to protect the identity of the research setting.

1. I do not feel like a part of a family at the University.

2. I am not concerned about what might happen if I left the University without having another part-time teaching position lined up.

3. I feel emotionally attached to the University.

4. Working at the University has a great deal of personal meaning for me.

5. I feel a strong sense of belonging to the University.

6. I cannot financially afford to leave the University right now.

7. The University does not deserve my loyalty.

8. I would feel guilty if I left the University now.

9. I am proud to tell others I work for the University.

10. I attend faculty meetings and other professional development opportunities on a regular basis.

11. I would be happy to continue teaching at the University.

12. Right now, staying at the University is a matter of necessity as much as desire.

13. It would be very hard for me to leave the University right now; even if I wanted to.
14. I really feel that the problems faced by the University are also my problems.

15. I do not feel any obligation to remain at the University.

16. I serve on a curriculum development team.

17. The University deserves my loyalty.

18. It would be wrong to leave the University right now because of my obligation to the people in it.

19. One reason I continue to work for the University is that leaving would require considerable sacrifice—another organization may not match the overall benefits I have there.

20. Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave the University right now.

21. I enjoy discussing the University with people outside of it.

22. I would be willing to serve as a mentor to another part-time faculty member.

23. One of the few serious consequences of leaving the University would be the scarcity of available alternatives.

24. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave the University right now.

25. I owe a great deal to the University.

**Part IV—Tell Us What You Know**

A series of 39 questions was designed to gather data about each respondent’s confidence level concerning his or her knowledge of course content, adult learning methodology, and the University’s policies and procedures. Administrators and others who work closely with full-time and part-time faculty in a supervisory role were
consulted as these questions were constructed. Questions were also taken from measurement tools used to evaluate instructor performance, such as the student evaluation and instructor observation forms.

I assumed that an increase in the instructor's knowledge and understanding of the needs and characteristics of adult learners and in the understanding and implementation of each school's policies would result in a corresponding increase in confidence. The literature supports this conclusion. Cross (1981), Merriam (2001), Galbraith (2004), Bash (2005), and Fleming and Garner (2009) include chapters on understanding adult learners and adult learning theory in their books, which were written for teachers of adult learners with the expressed intent of increasing instructor effectiveness. The questions were as follows:

Twenty-five of the 39 items on this subscale relate to effective instructional behaviors as identified in the literature. In some statements, the opposite wording is given. For example, the statement on lecture as a primary instructional strategy when teaching adults is contrary to effective strategies noted in the literature. These statements, along with corresponding citations, are noted below:

1. When teaching adults, it is important to share practical work/life experiences (Beder & Darkenwald, 1982; Brookfield, 1986; Pearson, 2005).

2. Adult learners are more disciplined and need less direction from the instructor (Knowles & Associates, 1984; Knowles et al., 2005).

3. I can verbally explain my philosophy of education and teaching to anyone who asked me (Heimlich & Norlund, 1994).
4. Adult learners are uniquely different from traditional age college students (Knowles & Associates, 1984; Knowles et al., 2005).

5. I use the time that students are in small groups to review my notes and lesson plans (Cross, 1981; Galbraith, 2004).

6. When teaching adults, it is important to spend a lot of time lecturing (Cross, 1981; Galbraith, 2004).

7. Overall, adult learners are motivated to learn (Bash, 2005; Cross, 1981; Fleming & Garner, 2009).

8. I am comfortable facilitating a large group discussion (Brookfield, 1986).

9. I have thought about my philosophy of education and teaching and could write it down if asked to (Heimlich & Norlund, 1994).

10. I clearly explain course requirements (Brookfield, 1986; James & Maher, 2004; Pearson, 2005).

11. The criteria I use to evaluate student work are clearly defined for the student (Brookfield, 1986; James & Maher, 2004; Pearson, 2005).

12. The expected learning outcomes for my course(s) are clearly defined (Brookfield, 1986; James & Maher, 2004; Pearson, 2005).

13. I return assignments and/or exams in a timely manner (James & Maher, 2004; Pearson, 2005).


15. I provide students with contact information so they may reach me during the week when questions and problems arise (James & Maher, 2004; Pearson, 2005).
16. I am careful to relate course content and material to practical situations (Beder & Darkenwald, 1982; Brookfield, 1986; Pearson, 2005).

17. I am respectful and open to students’ differing perspectives (Brookfield, 1986; Donaldson, 1988; Pearson, 2005).

18. I make clear and understandable presentations (Donaldson, 1988; Pearson, 2005).

19. I am knowledgeable about the course content that I teach (Donaldson, 1988; Knowles et al., 2005).


21. I am helpful and responsive to students (James & Maher, 2004; Pearson, 2005).

22. I am prepared for each class period (Donaldson, 1988; James & Maher, 2004; Pearson, 2005).


25. I return graded papers and final grades to students within 2 weeks (James & Maher, 2004; Pearson, 2005).

The remaining 14 items were designed to measure how well each participant understood the University’s institutional policies and procedures. The Assistant Dean for Teaching Learning, who was responsible for orientating new faculty members and
implementing the peer-mentoring program, was consulted. She agreed that the following
items represented important expectations regarding the administrative duties of faculty
members. No citations are provided for these questions since they reflect the internal
priorities of the University.

1. I know what to do when a student does not turn the final paper in on time.

2. I am fair and accurate when evaluating a student’s written work and
consistently assign the appropriate grade.

3. I know APA style and consistently insist my students use it when writing
papers.

4. I am familiar with the University’s attendance policy and know how to handle
student absences.

5. I am aware of the faculty handbook.

6. I can recognize student plagiarism and know the correct procedure to follow for
addressing the situation.

7. I can create appropriate makeup assignments for any student who is absent in
my class.

8. I use a grading rubric for major written assignments.

9. I am confident in my ability to handle a student who challenges me in a
classroom setting.

10. I know what to do in an emergency and how to report them.

11. I am confident that if another instructor graded my students’ work, he or she
would assign a similar grade.

12. I am a role model for the Christian life.
13. I provide my classes with a written information sheet.

14. I am very familiar with the University’s policies and procedures.

Part V—Tell Us About Your Mentoring Experience

This subscale was designed to gather information on each participant’s perception on the quality of a previous peer-mentoring relationship. A fade-out function was used to exclude participants who indicated they had not been mentored. Based on a review of the mentoring literature, the following 24 questions were developed (the corresponding citations are also provided). Questions 1-9 require a yes or no response, except for question 2, which asks if the mentor was an administrator or full- or part-time faculty member; and question 3, which asks the length of the mentoring relationship. Questions 10-24 used the following Likert scale: SA = *Strongly Agree*, A = *Agree*, D = *Disagree* and SD = *Strongly Disagree*.

1. I have received mentoring (Grant-Vallone & Ensher, 2000; Kram & Isabella, 1985; Mullen, 2000). Yes or No [If respondent selects “no”; he or she was automatically faded from the survey].

2. My mentor was
   a) A full-time faculty member
   b) A part-time faculty member
   c) An administrator

3. Please indicate how many weeks your mentoring relationship lasted.

4. I observed my mentor teaching, either face-to-face or online (Boyle & Boice, 1998; Le Maistre, Boudreau, & Paré, 2006; Wang, 2001). Yes or No
5. My mentor observed me teaching (Le Maistre et al., 2006; Young & Wright, 2001). Yes or No

6. My mentor shared written notes about my teaching with me (Davis, 2001; Hansman, 2001; Le Maistre et al., 2006; Washburn & LaLopa, 2003). Yes or No

7. My mentor's feedback helped me improve my teaching (Wang, 2001; Young & Wright, 2001). Yes or No

8. My mentor explained my university's polices to me (Washburn & LaLopa, 2003). Yes or No

9. My mentor helped me understand what was expected of me (Washburn & LaLopa, 2003) Yes or No

Questions 10-24 used the following Likert scale: SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; D = Disagree; and SD = Strongly Disagree.

1. I was motivated to grow and improve through my mentoring relationship (Semeniuk & Worall, 2000; Wickman & Sjodin, 1997; J. Wilson & Elman, 1990).

2. I was satisfied with the number of times that my mentor and I met or communicated (either face-to-face, phone or via email, or other technologies) (Cohen, 1995; Hawkey, 1997; Phi Delta Kappa, 2002).

3. I was satisfied that my mentor was knowledgeable and skilled. He or she was someone who could help me grow (Goodwin et al., 1998; Young & Wright, 2001).

4. I believe my mentor cared about me as a person and as a teacher (Cohen, 1995; Hawkey, 1997; Routman, 2000).

5. My mentor was motivated and wanted me to succeed (Pierce, 1998).
6. I was satisfied that my mentoring partner and I spent time getting to know each other (Cohen, 1995; Hawkey, 1997; Routman, 2000).

7. Our mentoring partnership set professional and personal development goals for the mentoring experience (Young & Wright, 2001).

8. The mentoring goals were written down (Levinson et al., 1978).

9. The mentoring goals were achieved (Levinson et al., 1978).

10. My mentor helped me understand the University’s polices.

11. I was satisfied with how my mentor responded to my questions and concerns (Goodwin et al., 1998).

12. My mentoring experience has helped me become more confident in my teaching (Simmons, 1998; Wickman & Sjodin, 1997).

13. I was more confident about my teaching ability after participating in the mentoring experience (Hawkey, 1997; Simmons, 1998).

14. My mentoring experience helped me feel more loyalty to the University (Semeniuk & Worall, 2000; Simmons, 1998; Young & Wright, 2001).

15. I would recommend my mentor to another new instructor.

**Part VI—Conclusion**

The survey concluded with a brief statement thanking the instructor for participating.

This section described in detail the development and content of the online survey tool, which was used to collect data related to peer mentoring (IV) and the twin dependent variables of institutional loyalty and instructor confidence. Historical data
from the University end-of-course survey forms were used to measure the third dependent variable, Student Satisfaction.

End-of-Course Surveys

To measure the student satisfaction variable, I utilized the University’s School of Business end-of-course survey forms. This form asks students to provide feedback related to course learning outcomes and instructor effectiveness. For the purposes of this study, only the nine questions directly related to instructor performance were used. The questions are as follows:

1. The instructor was very knowledgeable about the subject.
2. The instructor’s Christian faith was clear.
3. The instructor was well prepared for this course.
4. The instructor motivated me to learn about the subject.
5. The instructor was available to help when I needed it.
6. The instructor provided timely feedback on my work.
7. The instructor graded my work fairly.
8. The instructor treated me like an adult professional.
9. Overall, I think the instructor did a good job.

The University provided me with each student’s anonymous ranking on each of these items. The mean was calculated based on the three most current end-of-course surveys received.
Estimates of Validity and Reliability

Estimates of Validity

Researchers agree that it is not possible to calculate the precise reliability or validity of any instrument (Newman et al., 2006; Trochim, 2006). However, statistical processes and procedures can be utilized to estimate the validity of a research tool. When considering the validity and reliability of an instrument, validity must be considered the most important characteristic (Newman et al., 2006). This is because validity attempts to determine the degree to which any instrument accurately measures the construct it was designed to measure.

The online survey, which I developed, used to gather data related to the research questions and alternative hypotheses, was divided into the following subscales: Instructor Confidence, Institutional Loyalty, and Fidelity of the Mentoring Experience. The Institutional Loyalty subscale was based on previous research and an instrument tool that has already had its validity estimated; this is a form of construct validity (Newman et al., 2006). Space is not dedicated in this study to report the results of these tests; the reader can refer to such studies as Meyer et al. (1993), Meyer and Allen (1997), LaMastro (2000), and Ketchland and Strawser (2001) for a full discussion.

The other two subscales, Instructor Confidence and Fidelity of Mentoring, used a form of face validity known as expert judges. After the scale was developed, selected experts were asked for their feedback. The qualifications of these judges can be found in Appendix C. In addition to expert judges, the Instructor Confidence and Fidelity of Mentoring subscales were developed based on content or logical validity. The survey items for the Instructor Confidence and Fidelity of Mentoring subscales were constructed
based on previous research and review of the scholarly literature; consequently, they have the assumption of a sound estimate of content validity. Each scale was described in detail earlier in this chapter.

Field Testing

After the initial development of the survey, I consulted several expert judges. Newman et al. (2006) suggest that expert judges is a type of face validity that is “a little more sophisticated” than simple face validity (p. 48). I invited the three Regional Coordinators of Faculty Services from Spring Arbor and the directors of the various programs to give feedback on the survey’s readability and content validity. The coordinators and directors supervise and monitor the performance of the adjunct faculty. Because of this supervisory relationship, the coordinators and directors are uniquely qualified to provide insight into the reliability of the instrument. In order to ensure the confidence scale accurately reflected the University practices and policies, the Associate Vice-president and Associate Dean for Teaching and Learning were also consulted.

In an email, these judges were provided information on the purpose of the survey as well as the operational definitions of the dependent variables, specifically instructor confidence and fidelity of mentoring experience. Copies of the subscales were attached and these expert judges were asked to evaluate how closely, in their opinion, each survey item approximated the construct being tested. Reviewers were asked to pay particular attention to the subscale, which was designed to measure Instructor Confidence and was labeled Part IV—Tell Us What You Know and the Fidelity of Mentoring subscale (Part V).
All five judges (100%) agreed that the Instructor Confidence subscale appeared to be an appropriate measurement of the instructor confidence variable. One of the five judges suggested rewording all statements contained in the Instructor Confidence subscale so respondents could answer using the *Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree* scale. In addition, two questions were added to the Instructor Confidence subscale based on the recommendation of three of the five judges (60%). They were as follows: “I am comfortable integrating my faith into the classroom experience” and “I make full use of the allotted instructional time in each of the courses I teach (i.e. I teach for four hours if the class is designed to run from 6-10 pm).”

These questions were an important addition; the former question goes to the heart of the Christian university’s commitment to Jesus Christ. The latter question relates to a core behavioral expectation of all faculty members who teach in an accelerated adult-degree completion program like the University’s. In addition, some minor typographical and formatting errors were corrected.

All (100%) of the expert judges felt that the Fidelity of Mentoring subscale was an appropriate measure for assessing the perceptions of a previous peer-mentoring experience. This portion of the survey took less than 5 minutes to complete. All the judges noted the unclear wording of question 3, "How long did your mentoring relationship last?" As a result, the question was re-phased to ask how many weeks the mentoring relationship lasted. Question 7, which asked if the mentor had reviewed the mentee’s syllabus, was also deleted, based on feedback from the University. Part-time faculty members are not required to submit a syllabus. Also, both questions 8 and 19 asked if respondents understood the University’s policies, so question 19 was deleted.
The directions for completing the survey were also revised based on feedback from one of the judges.

Estimates of Reliability

After the revisions were completed, approximately 150 part-time faculty members from Spring Arbor University were invited to field test the Instructor Confidence and Fidelity of Mentoring subscales using an Internet survey site. This field test was used to estimate the initial reliability of the survey instrument. The field test also allowed me to determine how long, on average, it took participants to complete the survey. In order to encourage maximum participation, the goal was for the survey to take no more than 20 minutes to complete.

Newman et al. (2006) note that reliability estimates can be increased by using the following procedures: reviewing the instrument for clarity, by standardizing the administration, increasing the number of items, and eliminating items that are unclear. All of these strategies were utilized in the development and pre-testing phase. The survey was field tested for clarity. Since all participants received the same written survey questions and the same written instructions, administration of the online survey was standardized and each subscale had a large number of items (22, 39, and 24, respectively).

The Cronbach’s Alpha was calculated to evaluate whether survey items had psychometric properties (Trochim, 2006). The Cronbach’s Alpha ($\alpha_c$) for the Loyalty Scale was $0.777$ (25 items) and the Confidence Scale was $\alpha_c = 0.937$ with 39 items.

Finally, the Fidelity of Mentoring subscale was field-tested using the East Region Faculty and the Cronbach’s Alpha was calculated ($\alpha_c = 0.813$ with 24 items). Using
established procedures to increase reliability resulted in a Cronbach’s Alpha scores of over .75 on all subscales, and I estimated that each of the subscales was sufficiently reliable.

**Fidelity Measures**

All participants responded to the four main sections of the survey and were asked if they had received mentoring from an administrator, or full-time or other (peer) part-time faculty member (non-full-time faculty person). Boyle and Boice (1998) suggest that faculty members believe mentoring received from administrators was more effective than mentoring received from a peer. For this reason, all participants who participated in a mentoring experience were asked to complete a fifth section entitled, “Tell Us About Your Mentoring Experience.” Results from this section were used to arrive at a fidelity estimate with regard to a common understanding of what is meant by a “quality mentoring experience.”

Essentially, fidelity measures are used to ascertain how well implementation of an intervention matched its prescribed protocol (Blase, 2005). Fidelity measures speak not only to how well one conformed to the “prescribed elements” of a particular intervention but also the “absence of non-prescribed elements” (Freeman, 2001, para. 2). Blase (2005) indicates that fidelity measures typically are used to increase confidence in the outcomes achieved by the proposed intervention. Typically, fidelity measures do not occur in real-time but tend to be retrospective in nature (Trabin & Minden, 2006).

The fifth section of the survey was comprised of 24 questions; only 21 items were used to estimate the fidelity. Question 1 asked whether or not the respondent had received mentoring and question 2 asked if the mentor was full-time faculty, part-time faculty, or
Questions 4-9 required a yes or no response; questions 10-24 used a Likert scale from 0 (Strongly Disagree) to 3 (Strongly Agree).

Following the completion of the survey, the estimated fidelity was calculated. Respondents answered the first nine questions. For questions 4-9, yes responses were coded as 1; no responses were coded 0. For the remaining 15 forced-choice statements, the responses indicating Strongly Agree were coded as 3 and represents responses at the top of the scale. Responses for Strongly Disagree were coded as 0. The remaining two forced-choice responses were coded as 2 (Agree) and 1 (Disagree). The total raw score was arrived at by summing the individual’s responses for each question. The highest possible individual raw score for questions 4-9 was 6, and the highest possible individual raw score for questions 10-24 was 45 (15 * 3). Consequently, the highest possible individual raw score on Part V of the survey was 51. In order to estimate the fidelity of each participant’s mentoring experience, the individual raw score was summed. Raw scores that ranged from 90–100% (46 to 51) were considered as having a high level of fidelity; scores that ranged from 75-89% (38.25-45.9) were considered as having a satisfactory level of fidelity. Scores that fell below 38.249 were categorized as having an unsatisfactory fidelity measure. This perceived quality mentoring score was used to test the research hypotheses.

This estimate of the fidelity of the peer-mentoring relationship will assist in interpreting the outcomes of the study. Since participants are recalling past mentoring experience, estimating the fidelity helps determine how effectively the peer-mentoring experiences were implemented. If the estimate of fidelity is low, this could imply there is
a need to provide mentors and mentees with more effective training and follow-up. If the estimate of fidelity is high, I can be somewhat assured that the actual peer-mentoring relationship mirrors the effectiveness noted in the literature. Whether the fidelity estimate is high or low, the outcomes inform and help interpret the data.

**Data Analysis Plan**

Both descriptive and inferential statistics were utilized to analyze the data collected to answer the research questions. Demographic data were collected in order to best describe the sample population. The hypotheses related to the participants’ age, gender, ethnicity, educational level, and one of the following primary instructional areas: graduate or undergraduate and on-site or online. Participants self-reported this information on the survey.

The length of each participant’s teaching experience was gathered using the survey and was reported in terms of modules/courses taught and the years the participant had been affiliated with the University. Many part-time instructors teach one or two courses each year; therefore, reporting only years of service rather than modules taught could be misleading and could make it appear the part-time instructor had more teaching experience than he or she actually had.

In order to clearly and completely report the description of the sample and for the split cases (mentored and non-mentored), frequency distribution tables were generated that recorded descriptive statistics for each of the six demographic categories listed above. Both of the percentages for each of the nominal variables (gender, ethnicity, educational level, and primary instructional area) were calculated. For the age and
teaching experience variables, a table was generated that provided the following descriptive statistics: mean, minimum, maximum, and the standard deviation.

In order to determine whether to accept or reject the research hypotheses, and to determine the significance of the independent variable (perceived quality of the peer-mentoring experience) in predicting the dependent variables (institutional loyalty, instructor confidence, and student satisfaction) multiple linear regression was used to analyze the survey responses. This form of statistical analysis is appropriate when there is a single criterion variable (Y) and multiple predictor variables (X) (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003). In the case of this study, the hypotheses stated that the quality of peer mentoring would predict higher scores for instructor confidence, institutional loyalty, and student satisfaction. In addition, other independent variables, such as age, gender, educational level, and experience, are hypothesized not to be significantly related to the predictor variable.

PASW 18 for Windows® (SPSS, Inc., 2009) was used to analyze the data and to generate the full and restricted multiple regression models. An alpha level of .05 was chosen as the criteria for determining whether to accept or reject the directional hypotheses. The full and restricted models illustrated below were generated in order to address the research hypotheses. Newman et al. (2006) note that when utilizing linear regression models, any number of questions can be asked. In addition, regression models can be generated that will specifically address the research questions. Consequently, the researcher is not limited in the number of research questions that he or she can ask. “This is the most compelling reasons for using the general linear model” (McNeil, Newman, & Kelly, 1996, p. 2).
Since the possible variation of models that can be generated is infinite, the full and restricted models that follow are not meant to be exhaustive. The full and restricted multiple regression models for the first dependent variable, instructor confidence, are presented. The same model was used for analyzing the remaining two dependent variables, institutional loyalty and student satisfaction. Essentially, the full model, shown below, asks whether or not all the variables together can significantly predict instructor confidence.

Model One (M1): Full Model

\[ Y_{con} = a_0 U + a_1 X_{men} + a_2 X_{gender} + a_3 X_{age} + a_4 X_{AA} + a_5 X_{ASN} + a_6 X_{CAU} + a_7 X_{HIS} + a_8 X_{ME} + a_9 X_{oth} + a_{10} X_{BA} + a_{11} X_{MA} + a_{12} X_{post} + a_{13} X_{spec} + a_{14} X_{PhD} + a_{15} X_{under} + a_{16} X_{grad} + a_{17} X_{online} + a_{18} X_{TeEX} + E_1 \]

The first restricted model is written below and was tested against the full model. All of the variables are removed and the question is asked, “Do all of the variables identified in the full model account for a significant amount of variance in predicting confidence, beyond what one would expect by chance alone?” Remember that \( Y = \) the dependent variable confidence, \( a_0 U = \) the constant, and \( E_2 = \) the errors. The restricted model is written as follows:

Model Two (M2): Restricted Model 2

\[ Y_{con} = a_0 U + E_2 \]

The final restricted model (M3) removes the independent variable, peer-to-peer mentoring, and asks whether or not peer mentoring, when it is controlled for everything else, is a significant predictor of instructor confidence, institutional loyalty, and student satisfaction. You will note that this model is similar to the full model illustrated above;
only the $a_1X_{men}$ has been removed. Model three was tested against Model one and asks whether or not mentoring is a significant predictor of confidence when all the variables in the restricted model are controlled.

Model (M3): Restricted Model 3

$$Y_{con} = a_0 U + a_2X_{gender} + a_3X_{age} + a_4X_{AA} + a_5X_{ASN} + a_6X_{CAU} + a_7X_{HIS} + a_8X_{ME} + a_9X_{oth} + a_{10}X_{BA} + a_{11}X_{MA} + a_{12}X_{post} + a_{13}X_{spec} + a_{14}X_{PhD} + a_{15}X_{under} + a_{16}X_{grad} + a_{17}X_{online} + a_{18}X_{TeEX} + E_3$$

An alpha level of .05 ($\alpha = .05$) was chosen for this particular study. An alpha level of .05 means that if a relationship is found between peer mentoring and the three dependent variables, the likelihood of such a relationship occurring by chance is 5 times out of 100 (Newman et al., 2006). As previously mentioned, all the hypotheses in this study are directional, since I predict higher scores on the dependent variables from those participants who indicate a high fidelity measure of the mentoring relationship. As discussed in the literature review, there is significant support in the literature to predict that those who receive mentoring will do better than those who do not; at least it seems reasonable to assume that those who receive mentoring will not do significantly worse. The Bonferroni test was used to maintain for Type I inflation errors.

**Summary of Methodology**

This chapter presented the reader with details regarding the study’s methodology and research design. This ex post facto study primarily used a researcher-constructed questionnaire to collect data with regard to the respondents’ perception of the quality of a peer-mentoring relationship as well as instructor confidence and institutional loyalty. Items from the University’s end-of-course survey forms were used to measure the
dependent variable of student satisfaction. Both full and restricted linear regression models were used to test the 81 research hypotheses and to determine whether the relationship between the perceived quality of a peer-mentoring experience is related to increased instructor confidence, institutional loyalty, and student satisfaction. Chapter 4 provides the reader with a description of the research setting as well as a detailed explanation of the University’s institutional mentoring program.
CHAPTER FOUR

SETTING OF THE RESEARCH

This dissertation sought to ascertain whether a relationship exists between mentoring and a part-time instructor’s level of instructor confidence, institutional loyalty, and student satisfaction scores, as measured by end-of-course survey forms. Previous chapters have outlined the perceived over-reliance on part-time faculty and the issues this dependence raises for universities and colleges. This chapter provides the reader with a description of the University where the research was conducted. In addition, the University’s mentoring model is described in detail. The program’s philosophy, purpose, and outcomes are delineated. The qualifications of faculty mentors are described as well as the expectations of the faculty mentee.

The University

The University, which is the subject of this research, is a large, private evangelical Christian university located in the mid-west. The University began offering courses in the fall of 1920. Several years prior to this, a group of local citizens worked to raise the funds needed to endow the school. Between the years of 1920 and 1988, the University operated as a liberal arts school and continually worked to develop a variety of both Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degrees. In the mid-80s, the University started
offering classes in the evenings and on the weekends in order to attract working adults who desired to complete their bachelor’s degrees.

Currently, the traditional undergraduate, on-campus programs have an enrollment of over 3,200 students; the off-campus programs have been hugely successful, having educated thousands of students. The campus is situated in an urban setting and was ranked in the top quartile in *US News and World Report’s* 2012 Best Colleges in the Mid-West (*US News*, 2012).

Founded on Christian principles, the school’s website identifies it as a “Christ-centered academic community” (the University website). The school’s commitment to excellence and creative programming has resulted in a number of honors and awards including receipt of the Foundation of Excellence Award, granted in recognition of the school’s quality programs directed at first-year college students. In 2008, the University was selected as one of the top three Best Christian Workplaces in America; two faculty members have received Fulbright Scholarships (the University website). The University is also an active member in the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU).

The huge success of the University programs designed to reach working adults resulted in the University offering courses at a number of off-site campuses across several states in the mid-west. The growth of these programs resulted in the University turning to a large pool of part-time faculty members to staff the thousands of courses offered each semester. The program was developed and implemented in 2005 and revised in 2008 (C. Fleming, personal communication, July 9, 2010). The following section discusses the mentoring program and its protocols.
The University Mentoring Program

The administration of the University recognized the need to provide orientation and mentoring support for its teaching faculty. The growing number of part-time faculty used to staff courses, as well as the growing number of external sites (both in-state and out-of-state), contributed to a growing need to implement strategies to connect the growing number of part-time faculty members to the University and to ensure that quality instruction was being consistently delivered. This section discusses the University’s mentoring program’s philosophy, as well as the outcomes of the mentoring experience. The mentoring model or process is described, and the qualifications of mentors and mentees are provided. The information provided in these sections was learned through a series of emails and conversations with the developer of the mentoring program and from internal University documents provided to me. These documents can be found in Appendix B.

The Philosophy of the Mentoring Program

Much of the philosophy of the program was based upon research completed by Veenman in 1984. Veenman (1984) reviewed over 100 empirical studies and found that most beginning teachers, who had taught less than 3 years, experienced the following common problems: (a) classroom discipline/management, (b) motivating students, (c) assessing student work, (d) effective use of appropriate teaching strategies, (e) organization and planning of course work, and (f) knowledge of university policies and procedures.

The philosophy of the University’s mentoring program is based on the belief that the faculty want to be skilled and it is the University’s responsibility to provide them with
a comprehensive plan for development. The University strongly believes that the faculty are “one faculty” and work hard to minimize any distinctions and felt differences between full- and part-time faculty members. A continuous improvement model is the basis for developing excellence in the “delivery of instruction for adult learners” (see Appendix B, Induction Program Overview). In order to achieve this both full and affiliate (part-time) faculty are utilized to provide support and mentoring to new faculty. The goal is for the program to be ongoing and to utilize a variety of formats, which include on-site and online training, classroom observations, and individual coaching sessions.

The Mentoring Program Outcomes

It is hoped that upon completion of the mentoring experience, the entire faculty (full-time and part-time) will function as one faculty in order to provide quality educational experiences for all the University’s adult learners, regardless of delivery system (face-to-face, online, on campus, offsite). The purposes of the mentoring program are found in the “Adult and Professional Studies Mentoring Program” handout in Appendix B and are outlined as follows:

1. Provide all faculty members with the proper materials, training, and support to enable them to succeed.

2. Provide all new faculty members with a mentor, who will discuss strengths and weaknesses with them, as well as assist them with teaching strategies, preparation of course syllabi, and development of lesson plans.

3. Provide new faculty members with mentors from the same discipline, recognizing that a full-time faculty mentor or experienced adjunct from another area could still provide mentoring.
4. Provide orientation sessions that must be attended by all new faculty members.
5. Provide new faculty members with an introduction to andragogy and pedagogy.
6. Provide new faculty with the basic concepts of evaluating student work.
7. Provide a thorough understanding of the University’s grading criteria.

Qualifications of the Mentor

Before detailing the specific procedures that mentors and mentees follow, it is important to note how the University selects mentors. The literature provides a plethora of qualities the effective mentors must possess. Prospective mentors are required to complete and submit an application (see Appendix B). The University has identified the following qualifications.

The faculty mentor must either be a full-time faculty member or be a selected part-time faculty member. The mentor, regardless of employment status, must receive consistently positive evaluations on his or her teaching observations and on the University’s end-of-course survey form. Faculty members are observed by University administration and are evaluated on a number of elements. In addition, students assess instructor effectiveness using a standardized student satisfaction form. This qualification addresses a key trait that the literature suggests mentors must have; that is, the ability to lead by example (Phi Delta Kappa, 2002). The University expects that mentors are good role models and have the respect of others at the University.

The prospective mentor must also meet the University guidelines for attendance at annual faculty development events. This highlights another characteristic found in the literature. Mentors must possess the ability to help others assess their development and to help them create opportunities for growth (La Maistre et al., 2006). Mentors must show a
willingness to share their knowledge, show the ability to motivate and encourage others, and possess the knowledge to be an influential mentor.

Mentors must also exhibit a willingness to fulfill the duties and responsibilities of a mentor. It seems quite elementary to state the obvious. However, the literature is clear in this regard. Successful mentors possess a desire to give back to others (Biehl, 1996; Pierce, 1998). Gaskill (1993) also notes that when using a systematic mentoring program it is essential that mentor qualifications be reviewed and that the mentors exhibit a willingness and desire to participate as mentors.

Finally, all mentors must successfully complete the mentoring training. During this training, mentors receive information on how to create a trusting relationship and how to provide constructive feedback. In addition, the mentors receive training on what is expected of them. Gaskill (1993) recommends that mentor training include an orientation to the program’s purposes and objectives. The mentor training should also serve as time to minimize any ambiguity regarding the roles, duties, and responsibilities of the mentor.

During training, the University provides the following information regarding the expectations of the mentoring role and is outlined in the “Mentoring Program for New Adjunct Faculty” in Appendix B.

1. Mentors are to establish contact with the new faculty member.
2. Mentors are to welcome the new faculty to their classroom.
3. Mentors are to review the new faculty member’s syllabus/faculty information sheet.
4. Mentors are to utilize a variety of teaching strategies during the adjunct faculty member’s visit.
5. Mentors are to designate, after discussion with the new faculty member, a segment of the class session to be taught by new adjunct (devotion, prayer, mini-lecture, small-group activity, class discussion).

6. Mentors are to observe the new adjunct faculty member during his or her teaching segment.

7. Mentors are to complete the observation form.

8. Mentors are to spend time as needed to discuss the observation form with the new adjunct faculty member, highlighting strengths and making suggestions.

9. Mentors are to submit the observation to the Faculty Development Assistant.

10. Mentors are to maintain contact with the new adjunct as needed to assist during the new adjunct’s first teaching assignment.

The Mentoring Program Model

The procedure or model the University uses is outlined in the “Induction Program Overview,” and this document can be found in Appendix B as well. The forms noted below can also be found in this appendix. Because the mentoring program was developed by University administration and it is expected that all new faculty complete the program prior to their first teaching assignment, the model qualifies as a systematic mentoring program. Systematic mentoring programs are found primarily in the business sector and occur when organizational leaders institutionalize the mentoring program (Kaye, 2000). These programs are characterized by written goals, specific practices are outlined, and strategies for linking mentor and mentee are identified (Gaskill, 1993).

The University has also recognized the value of having part-time faculty members serve in the role of mentor. Due to the size of the University’s programs and the large
number of part-time faculty used to staff courses, there are insufficient numbers of full-
time faculty or administrators to meet the mentoring demand (Kram & Isabella, 1985).
Research suggests that peer mentoring has the potential to provide a wide range of
support that results in increased competence and confidence (Kram & Isabella, 1985).

The mentoring experience of new faculty begins after the new faculty member has
attended the two orientation sessions and completed the “New Adjunct Faculty
Mentoring Assignment.” The form asks for the new faculty’s name and contact
information, the desired location and nights for the mentoring experience, and the courses
he or she expects to teach. The form reminds new faculty that they must complete the
mentoring program before an initial teaching assignment was given.

Upon completion of the form, the administration matches the mentee with a
suitable mentor. The mentor is selected from a list of qualified and available mentors that
is kept by the University’s administration. When the mentor accepts the mentoring
assignment, he or she is provided with the mentee’s contact information. A “Mentoring
Assignment Checklist” is then begun; this form records the new faculty member’s
information and the mentor assigned to him or her. This form is also used to track the
mentoring activity and to ensure that the classroom observations occur and the necessary
forms are completed. The secretary then mails the forms that the mentor must complete
as part of the mentoring experience to the mentor at this time.

At this point, the mentor and mentee make contact in order to make arrangements
to meet. At this initial meeting, the mentor and mentee meet and collaborate on goals and
a time for the mentee to visit and observe the mentor’s classroom. At this juncture, the
mentee also completes a self-assessment form to aid in the formulation of goals for the
mentoring relationship. The mentee is also provided information on how to develop his or her course syllabi and lesson plan. In addition, the mentor will discuss with the mentee which segment of the observed class time he or she would like to facilitate (devotion, prayer, mini-lecture, small-group activity, class discussion, etc.).

The next activity involves the mentee’s actual visit to the mentor’s classroom. During this time, the mentor is expected to utilize a variety of teaching strategies and this allows the mentee to facilitate the previously agreed-upon activity. The mentor completes the “Mentee Observation Form” during the time the mentee facilitates. Upon completing the classroom visit, the mentee and mentor complete page 2 of this form together. Page 2 asks the mentee to record his or her observations and insights from observing the mentor’s teaching. Specifically, the mentee is asked to identify behaviors and strategies that were observed that he or she will incorporate his or her teaching and to list any questions he or she has about the classroom experience.

On the same form, the mentor is asked to critique the strengths he or she observed while the mentee was conducting his or her portion of the evening’s lesson. The mentor also reviews the mentee’s proposed syllabus and lesson plan. A copy of this completed form is sent to the Faculty Development Assistant who sees that the mentee is given a copy, and that one copy is kept in the mentee’s permanent employment file. The submission of this completed form begins the payroll process and the compensation is then paid to the mentor. However, mentors are expected to remain available to the mentee throughout the first teaching assignment to provide support and to answer any questions. Sometimes, through mutual agreement, the mentor and mentee elect to continue the relationship.
Conclusion

Chapter 4 provided the reader with a description of the setting of the research. This University was chosen because it has a strong program designed for the adult learner. A large number of part-time faculty members are employed to staff classrooms in over 80 off-site locations. In addition, the University has developed an organizational mentor program that utilizes part-time faculty members to mentor other part-time faculty members. This chapter outlined the philosophy of the mentoring program and the qualifications of the mentors, and described in detail the mentor program protocols. Chapter 5 presents the results of the study.
CHAPTER FIVE

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine what relationship, if any, exists between the self-reported perceptions on the quality of a mentoring experience on a part-time faculty member’s instructor confidence, institutional loyalty, and student satisfaction scores at a large, private Christian University in the mid-west. The study also sought to determine if a peer mentor significantly related the relationship to the three dependent variables mentioned previously. This chapter presents the findings of the study.

First, the response rate is given as well as the number of cases used in the analysis of the data. Following this, descriptive statistics are provided on a number of variables. The sample is described in its entirety and then descriptive statistics are presented according to whether or not the participant received mentoring or not. Correlational matrixes were generated to determine if any significant relationships existed between the independent and dependent variables. Linear regression models were then generated in order to test the hypotheses.

Response Rate

Six hundred part-time faculty members who teach in the School of Business in the College of Adult and Professional Studies (CAPS) programs from a large, private midwest University met the eligibility requirements outlined in the research protocol.
described in chapter 3. To be eligible, participants must have taught at least three courses between June 1, 2009, and December 31, 2010.

The Associate Vice-president sent an invitation email to the 600 eligible participants on May 13, 2011. The survey was deployed through the school’s Office of Research and Program Development. A reminder email was sent prior to the survey being closed on July 18, 2011 (A copy of the emails and the survey can be found in Appendices C and D). Of the 600 participants, 150 completed the survey for a response rate of 25%. Of the 150 who responded, 3 did not agree to the conditions outlined in the informed consent, which left 147 usable cases. See Table 2.

Table 2

*Descriptive Statistics for Response Rate*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have read and agree to the conditions.</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have read and do not agree with the conditions.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Descriptive Statistics**

Of the 150 respondents, 147 usable cases were identified. This section provides the reader with descriptive statistics relative to the sample. In addition, descriptive statistics are further analyzed based on whether the respondent received mentoring or not.
Of the 147 respondents, 63 or 42.9% indicated they had received mentoring, and 57.1% had not received mentoring. With regard to what type of mentor they had (full-time faculty, part-time faculty, or administrator), 31 (49.2%) of faculty report they were mentored by a peer (another part-time faculty member). More than 36% were mentored by a full-time faculty person, and 8 or 12.7% received mentoring from an administrator. Tables 3 and 4 illustrate these findings.

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics for Mentoring Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentoring Status</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentored</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-mentored</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Descriptive Statistics for Type of Mentoring Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Mentor</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Faculty</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the total number (147) of respondents, 109 (74.1%) were male; 37 (25.2%) were female. One person elected not to respond to that item (7%). As mentioned earlier, the cases were split into two groups: those who had received mentoring and those who had not. In the mentoring subgroup, 69.8% or 44 were male while 18 (28.6%) were female (n = 63). One case (1.6%) did not respond to the gender question. From the non-mentored subgroup, 65 or 77.4% were male; 22.6% (n = 19) were female (n = 84). See Table 5, which summarizes these results.

The ethnic distribution of the sample and its subgroups can be found in Table 6, Descriptive Statistics for Ethnicity. In terms of ethnic background, 11.6% (n = 17) were African-American; 122 (83%) were Caucasian, and 1 (7%) each for the following ethnicities: Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, Middle Eastern, Alaskan Native, Greek, and Mixed Race. There was one missing case (7%). Reviewing the frequency distribution for ethnicity by group, the mentoring group (n = 63) noted 10 (15.9%) were African American, 52 Caucasian (83.5%), and 1 Hispanic (1.6%). From the non-mentored subgroup, the large majority were Caucasian (n = 70; 83.3%), African-Americans had the second highest percentage with 8.3% (n = 7). This group also reported 1 (1.2%) for each of the following: Asian/Pacific Islander, Middle Eastern, Greek, and Alaskan Native. In addition 2 (2.4%) indicated a mixed ethnic heritage.

It was determined that using single cases of the other categories (Asian/Pacific, Middle Eastern, Greek, Hispanic, Alaskan, etc.) for ethnicity in the testing of the hypotheses could create outlier data that could skew the results. Consequently, I decided to use only the African-American and Caucasian variables in the analysis. These results for ethnicity are summarized in Table 6.
Table 5

**Descriptive Statistics for Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entire Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentored Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-mentored Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

*Descriptive Statistics for Ethnicity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entire Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Race</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>147</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentored Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-mentored Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American (AA)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Race</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents also were asked to indicate the highest level of education they had completed (master’s, post-masters, Ph.D., or other terminal degree). Over half (55.8%) of the sample had a master’s degree \((n = 82)\); 16.3% had post-master’s education \((n = 24)\), and 41 (27.9%) had some kind of terminal degree (Ph.D., D.Min., Ed.D., J.D., or other). Master’s degrees were held by 25 or 39.7% of those in the mentored subgroup, 14 (22.2%) had completed some level of post-master’s degree coursework, and 24 or 38.1% had terminal degrees. In the non-mentored subgroup, 57 (67.9%) held master’s degrees, 10 (11.98%) had work at the post-master’s level, and 17 (20.2%) had terminal degrees. These results are summarized in Table 7.

The mean age for the entire sample was 52.87 \((SD = 9.935)\) with a range of 31 to 79 years. For the mentored subgroup, the mean age was 50.9 \((SD = 10.922)\) with a range between 31 and 79; for the non-mentored subgroup, the mean age was 54.36 \((SD = 8.896)\) and the range was between 33 and 77. Table 8 illustrates these results.

Based on the results for the entire sample, the mean length of time that a part-time faculty has taught for the University was 6.83 years \((SD = 3.928)\) with a range between 2 to 25 years. The mentored subgroup had a mean length of service of 5.52 years \((SD = 2.911)\) with a range of 2 to 16 years. The non-mentored subgroup had a range between 2 and 25 years of service \((M = 7.81; SD = 4.312)\). Table 9 summarizes these results.

Due to the nature of part-time teaching assignments, years of service can provide an inflated sense of seniority. As a result, respondents were also asked to indicate how many courses/modules they had taught at the University. For the entire sample, 16 or 10.9% taught 5 or less modules; 18.4% \((n = 27)\) have taught between 6 and 10 modules, and over 70% \((70.7%; n = 104)\) have taught more than 10 modules. In the mentored
subgroup, 4 (6.3%) taught between 0–5 modules, 17.5% \( (n = 11) \) taught between 6 and 10 courses, and 48 (76.2%) had taught more than 10 modules. From the non-mentored subgroup, 12 (14.3%) taught five or fewer modules, 16 (19%) taught between 6 and 10 courses, and 56 (66.7%) taught over 10 classes. Table 10 provides a summary of this result.

Table 7

*Descriptive Statistics for Educational Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Entire Sample</th>
<th>Mentored Group</th>
<th>Non-mentored Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entire Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Master’s</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Degree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentored Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Master’s</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Degree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-mentored Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Master’s</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Degree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire Sample</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>52.87</td>
<td>9.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentored Group</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>10.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-mentored Group</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>54.36</td>
<td>8.896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics for Years of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire Sample</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>3.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentored Group</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>2.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-mentored Group</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>4.312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked if they taught at other universities, 36.1% ($n = 53$) of the entire sample indicated yes, while 94 (63.9%) said no. From the mentored group, 46% responded yes to this question ($n = 29$) and 54% or 34 said no. Twenty-four respondents in the non-mentored subgroup (28.6%) indicated they did teach for other universities, while over 71.4% ($n = 60$) said no. Table 11 illustrates these results. In addition, those who indicated they taught at other universities were asked to indicate how many. Those results are found in Table 12.

Respondents also were asked to indicate whether they taught undergraduate classes, graduate classes, or online courses. Because respondents were not forced to
indicate only one preference, the total number of responses \( n = 199 \) is greater than the number of participants in the sample \( n = 147 \). Table 13 provides a summary of the findings.

Table 10

*Descriptive Statistics for Number of Modules Taught*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Modules Taught</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entire Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentored Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-mentored Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

Descriptive Statistics for Taught at Other Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taught at Other Universities</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entire Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentored Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-mentored Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fidelity Measure

In order to test the hypotheses related to the fidelity measure, only those participants who responded to all of the questions in the Instructor Confidence, Institutional Loyalty, and Fidelity subscales were used in the testing of the hypotheses related to the quality of the mentoring experience. Of the 63 who indicated they had received mentoring, only 50 answered all the questions in the Fidelity subscale, and of those 50, only 46 answered all the questions in all the subscales and were included in the testing of the hypotheses related to the fidelity measure.
Table 12

*Descriptive Statistics for How Many Other Universities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Other Universities</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entire Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentored Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-mentored Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

*Descriptive Statistics for Teaching Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entire Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Classes</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Classes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Classes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentored Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Classes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Classes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Classes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-mentored Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Classes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Classes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Classes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the research protocol, the fidelity score was assigned based on the total raw score obtained from the Fidelity subscale; the highest possible raw score was 72. A raw score which fell in the 90–100% range (65-72) was coded as 3, represented the highest fidelity score possible, and was considered excellent. Raw scores that ranged from 54-64 (75-89%) were coded as a 2 and were considered to have a satisfactory level of quality. Any raw score that fell below 53 (or less than 74%) was coded as a 1 and was
considered to have a poor level of fidelity. Of the 50 respondents who answered all the questions in the Fidelity subscale, 26 (56.5%) scored a 3; 19 (41.3%) scored a 2, and 1 (2.20%) scored a 1. In generating the regression models, only the raw score on each scale was used (see Table 14).

Table 14

Fidelity Score Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Fidelity Rank</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation Matrix

The Pearson R correlation coefficient was initially run in order to determine if any significant relationship existed between the independent variables (mentoring, fidelity of the mentoring experience, and type of mentor) and the three dependent variables (instructor confidence, institutional loyalty, and student satisfaction). The results show a significant relationship exists between mentoring and instructor confidence and between institutional loyalty and confidence. These relationships were significant at the .01 level. Table 15 provides the correlational matrix for these variables.

A second correlational matrix was generated in order to test what relationships may exist between the second cluster of hypotheses and variables. Namely, does a
significant relationship exist among these variables when one considers the quality or fidelity of the mentoring experience? The results show a strong, positive correlation \((r = .517; p = .000)\) exists between the fidelity of the mentoring program and institutional loyalty. Table 16 provides the correlational matrix for these variables.

Table 15

*Correlation Matrix for Confidence, Loyalty, Student Satisfaction, and Received Mentoring*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentored</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
<th>Loyalty</th>
<th>Student Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>.273**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.342**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level; mentored coded as received mentoring = 1; all others = 0.

Table 16

*Correlation Matrix for Confidence, Loyalty, Student Satisfaction, and Fidelity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fidelity</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
<th>Loyalty</th>
<th>Student Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>.517**</td>
<td>.342**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level; fidelity coded as unsatisfactory = 1; satisfactory = 2; excellent = 3.
Finally, a third correlational matrix was generated to determine whether or not the type of mentor a faculty member had (full-time faculty, part-time faculty, or an administrator) was significantly related to the three dependent variables. The hypothesis statements postulated that mentees who were mentored by a peer would do as well or better than those mentored by either a full-time faculty member or administrator. The results show no significant relationship exists between the type of mentor and the instructor’s confidence, loyalty, or student satisfaction scores. Table 17 provides the correlational matrix for this cluster of variables.

**Multiple Regression Analysis**

According to the data analysis plan outlined in chapter 3, linear regression models were generated in order to test a number of hypotheses. The hypothesis statements were organized in clusters by the dependent variables, predictor variable, and a number of independent variables. This section highlights the results of the linear regression models that were generated. It is important to note that the research hypotheses predict that mentoring will result in increased confidence, loyalty, and student satisfaction. Additional hypotheses were generated that stated the higher the fidelity score of the mentoring experience, the higher the measures on the dependent variables and that those with a peer mentor would do better than those without a peer mentor.

**Instructor Confidence Variables**

The first linear regression model tested the ability of mentoring (PV) to predict a part-time faculty member’s instructor confidence (DV). Participants were grouped into those who had received mentoring and those who had not. Additional hypothesis
statements were generated that asked whether or not the significant relationship between mentoring and instructor confidence was independent of age, gender, ethnicity, length of service, number of courses taught, educational level, primary teaching level (undergraduate, graduate, and online), and whether faculty taught at other universities or not. A second model was generated, similar to the first, but used the fidelity score of the mentoring program, rather than the receipt of mentoring, as the predictor variable. Finally, a third model was generated that used the type of mentor as the predictor variable.

Table 17

Correlation Matrix for Confidence, Loyalty, Student Satisfaction, and Type of Mentor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Confidence</th>
<th>Loyalty</th>
<th>Student Satisfaction</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td>.342**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.223**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-.124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Type of Mentor coded as follows: FT = 1; all others = 0; PT = 1; all others = 0; Admin = 1; all others = 0.
**Correlation is significant at the .01 level.

In order to report the results, the hypothesis statements for each cluster of predictor variables (mentoring, fidelity, and type of mentor) are given followed by the results of the regression model.
Hypotheses Related to Mentoring and Instructor Confidence

Hypothesis 1a: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 1b: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of age, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 1c: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of gender, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 1d: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of ethnicity, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 1e: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of length of service, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 1f: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of modules taught, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 1g: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of educational level, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 1h: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of primary teaching level, than those who receive no mentoring.
Hypothesis 1i: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of whether or not the faculty member teaches at other universities, than those who receive no mentoring.

**Results Related to Mentoring and Instructor Confidence**

In order to test the hypotheses related to mentoring and instructor confidence, the respondents were categorized into two groups: those who received mentoring and those who did not receive mentoring. Of the 147 respondents, 63 or 42.9% received mentoring and 57.1% (n = 84) had not received mentoring. The generation of the regression model related to instructor confidence revealed that a significant relationship exists between mentoring and the level of instructor confidence ($R^2 = .074$; Adj $R^2 = .066$; $df = 1$; $F_{\text{Change}} = 9.473$; $p = .003$). Those who received mentoring scored significantly higher on the Instructor Confidence subscale than those who did not. The ability of a mentoring experience to predict instructor confidence is significant and is likely not due to random error.

In addition, models were generated for a number of additional independent variables in order to ascertain whether or not factors such as age and gender affected the relationship between the predictor variable and instructor confidence. The findings suggest that the ability of the independent variable (mentoring) to predict instructor confidence is independent of the respondent’s age, gender, ethnicity, length of service, number of modules taught, educational level, and primary teaching level. Those who indicated they taught at other universities (yes = 0; no = 1), on average, scored
significantly higher on the Instructor Confidence subscale than those who taught only at the University ($\beta = -7.101$). Tables 18–25 summarizes these findings.

Table 18

*Regression Models for Hypothesis Statements: Mentoring, Instructor Confidence, and Age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Hypotheses</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$F$ Change</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b: Age</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.709</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.709</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>$S**$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Coded in chronological years.

**Significant at .05 level and when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni test.

Table 19

*Regression Models for Hypothesis Statements: Mentoring, Instructor Confidence, and Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Hypotheses</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$F$ Change</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1c: Gender</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.094</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.094</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>$S**$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .05 level and when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni test.
Table 20

Regression Models for Hypothesis Statements: Mentoring, Instructor Confidence, and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Hypotheses</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F$ Change</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1d: African American</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.491</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.491</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.491</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>$*$**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Coded African-American = 1; all others = 0; Caucasian = 1; all others = 0; All other ethnicity cases were single cases and excluded from this analysis.

**Significant at .05 level and when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni test.

Table 21

Regression Models for Hypothesis Statements: Mentoring, Instructor Confidence, and Length of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Hypotheses</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F$ Change</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1e: Length of Service</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.666</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.666</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>$*$**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Coded in chronological years.

**Significant at .05 level and when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni test.

Table 22

Regression Models for Hypothesis Statements: Mentoring, Instructor Confidence, and Number of Courses Taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Hypotheses</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F$ Change</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1f: # of Courses taught</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.284</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.491</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>$*$**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Coded 1 = 0-5; 2 = 6-10; 3 = more than 10.

**Significant at .05 level and when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni test.
Table 23

Regression Models for Hypothesis Statements: Mentoring, Instructor Confidence, and Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Hypotheses</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F_{\text{Change}}$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1g: Educational Level</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.716</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.716</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>S**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coded 1 = bachelor’s, 2 = master’s, 3 = post-master’s, and 4 = terminal degree.
**Significant at .05 level and when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni test.

Table 24

Regression Models for Hypothesis Statements: Mentoring, Instructor Confidence, and Teaching Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Hypotheses</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F_{\text{Change}}$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1h: Undergraduate</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.216</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.216</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.216</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.216</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>S**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Coded undergraduate = 1; all others = 0; graduate = 1; all others = 0; online = 1; all others = 0.
**Significant at .05 level but not when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni test.

Table 25

Regression Models for Hypothesis Statements: Mentoring, Instructor Confidence, and Teaches at Other Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Hypotheses</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F_{\text{Change}}$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1i: Other Universities</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.667</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>S**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.667</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>S*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Coded 0 = yes; 1 = no.
*Significant at the .05 level. **Significant at .05 level and when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni test.
Hypotheses Related to Fidelity and Instructor Confidence

Hypothesis 1j: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 1k: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of age, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 1l: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of gender, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 1m: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of ethnicity, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 1n: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of length of service, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 1o: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of number of modules taught, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 1p: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of educational level, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.
Hypothesis 1q: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of primary teaching level, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 1r: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of whether or not the faculty member teaches at other universities, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Results Related to Fidelity and Instructor Confidence

In order to test the hypotheses related to the fidelity measure and instructor confidence, only those participants who responded to all of the questions on both the Instructor Confidence and Fidelity subscales were used in the testing of these hypotheses. Of the 63 who indicated they had received mentoring, only 46 answered all the questions and were included in the analysis of these hypotheses.

The generation of the regression model related to the ability of the quality of the mentoring experience (fidelity measure) to predict instructor confidence revealed that no significant relationship exists between these two variables ($R^2 = .005$; Adj $R^2 = -.018$; $df = 1$; $F_{\text{Change}} = .213$; $p = .647$). Because no significant relationship was found between these variables, the additional models related to the other independent variables were not generated.
Hypothesis Statements Related to Type of Mentor and Instructor Confidence

Hypothesis 1s: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 1t: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of age, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 1u: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of gender, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 1v: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of ethnicity, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 1w: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of length of service, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 1x: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of number of modules taught, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 1y: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of educational level, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.
Hypothesis 1z: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of primary teaching level, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 1aa: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of instructor confidence, independent of whether or not the faculty member teaches at other universities, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

**Results Related to Type of Mentor and Instructor Confidence**

In order to test the hypotheses related to the type of mentor and instructor confidence, the respondents were categorized into three groups: those who received mentoring from a full-time faculty member, those who received mentoring from a part-time faculty member, and those who received mentoring from an administrator. Of the 63 respondents, 49.2% received mentoring from a part-time faculty member (n = 31); 36.5% (n = 23) received mentoring from a full-time faculty member; 8 (12.7%) received mentoring from an administrator. Note that one case did not indicate type of mentor and so 62 cases were used in this analysis.

The generation of the regression model related to instructor confidence revealed that a significant relationship exists between the type of mentor and the level of instructor confidence ($R^2 = .082; \text{Adj } R^2 = .058; df = 3; F\text{Change} = 3.459; p = .019$). Those who received mentoring from an administrator tended to have the highest mean score ($\beta = 10.643; p = .022$). Those who received mentoring from a full-time faculty member had the second highest mean score ($\beta = 7.395; p = .016$). It would appear that those who were
mentored by full-time faculty member scored significantly higher on the Instructor Confidence subscale than those who received peer mentoring. It is noteworthy that while those with an administrator mentor did not score significantly higher at the .05 alpha level, these eight cases came very close ($p = .022$) and may indicate some practical significance. No significant difference was noted when the mentor was a peer ($\beta = 4.067; p = .114$).

In addition, models were generated for a number of additional independent variables in order to ascertain whether or not factors such as age and gender affected the relationship between the predictor variable and instructor confidence. The findings suggest that the ability of the independent variable (type of mentor) to predict instructor confidence is independent of the respondent’s age, gender, ethnicity, length of service, number of modules taught, educational level, and primary teaching level. However, when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni test, whether a respondent taught at other universities was significant ($p = .003$). See Tables 26–33.

Table 26

Regression Models for Hypothesis Statements: Type of Mentor, Instructor Confidence, and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Hypotheses</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$F_{\text{Change}}$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1t: Age</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.572</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.572</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>$S^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.572</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.572</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>$S^{*}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Coded in chronological years.*

*Significant at the .05 level but *not* when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni test.*
**Bonferroni Test.** **Significant at .05 level and when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni test.**

Table 27

*Regression Models for Hypothesis Statements: Type of Mentor, Instructor Confidence, and Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Hypotheses</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>FChange</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1u: Gender</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.934</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.934</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>S*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.934</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.934</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>S*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level but not when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni Test.

Table 28

*Regression Models for Hypothesis Statements: Type of Mentor, Instructor Confidence, and Ethnicity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Hypotheses</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>FChange</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1v: African American</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.300</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.300</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.300</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>S*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.300</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.300</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>S*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Coded African-American = 1; all others = 0; Caucasian = 1; all others = 0.*

**Significant at .05 level but not when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni test.**
### Table 29

*Regression Models for Hypothesis Statements: Type of Mentor, Instructor Confidence, and Length of Service*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Hypotheses</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>FChange</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1w: Length of Service</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.580</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.580</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>$S^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.580</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.580</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>$S^*$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Coded in chronological years.  
*Significant at the .05 level but not when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni Test.

### Table 30

*Regression Models for Hypothesis Statements: Type of Mentor, Instructor Confidence, and Number of Courses Taught*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Hypotheses</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>FChange</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1x: # of Courses taught</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>$S^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>$S^*$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Coded 1 = 0-5; 2 = 6-10; 3 = more than 10.  
**Significant at .05 level but not when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni test.
### Table 31

*Regression Models for Hypothesis Statements: Type of Mentor, Instructor Confidence, and Educational Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Hypotheses</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F_{\text{Change}}$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1y: Education Level</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.590</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.590</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>$*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.590</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.590</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>$*$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Coded 1 = bachelor’s, 2 = master’s, 3 = post-master’s, and 4 = terminal degree. **Significant at .05 level but not when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni test.

### Table 32

*Regression Models for Hypothesis Statements: Type of Mentor, Instructor Confidence, and Teaching Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Hypotheses</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F_{\text{Change}}$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1z: Undergraduate</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.192</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.192</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.192</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.192</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.192</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.192</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Coded undergraduate = 1; all others = 0; graduate = 1; all others = 0; online = 1; all others = 0.
Table 33

Regression Models for Hypothesis Statements: Type of Mentor, Instructor Confidence, and Teaches at Other Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Hypotheses</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>FChange</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1aa: Other Universities</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.132</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>S**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.132</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.132</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.132</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Coded 0 = yes; 1 = no.
**Significant at .05 level and when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni test.

Institutional Loyalty Variables

Linear regression models were generated to test the ability of mentoring to predict institutional loyalty. Additional hypothesis statements were generated that asked whether or not the relationship (if one existed) between mentoring and institutional loyalty was independent of age, gender, ethnicity, length of service, number of courses taught, educational level, primary teaching level (undergraduate, graduate and online), and whether or not the respondent teaches at other universities. A second model was generated, similar to first, but used the fidelity score of the mentoring program rather than the receipt of mentoring as the predictor variable. The third linear regression model used the type of mentor as the predictor variable. The statements for each cluster of hypotheses, as well as the results, follow.
Hypotheses Related to Mentoring and Institutional Loyalty

Hypothesis 2a: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 2b: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of age, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 2c: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of gender, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 2d: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of ethnicity, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 2e: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of length of service, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 2f: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of modules taught, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 2g: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of educational level, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 2h: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of primary teaching level, than those who receive no mentoring.
Hypothesis 2i: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of whether or not the faculty member teaches at other universities, than those who receive no mentoring.

Results Related to Mentoring and Institutional Loyalty

In order to test the hypotheses related to mentoring and institutional loyalty, the respondents were categorized into two groups: those who received mentoring and those who did not receive mentoring. Of the 147 respondents, 63 or 42.9% received mentoring and 57.1% (n = 84) had not received mentoring. The generation of the regression model related to institutional loyalty revealed that no significant relationship exists between mentoring and the level of institutional loyalty the respondents reported ($R^2 = .005; \text{Adj} R^2 = -.002; df = 1; F\text{Change} = .689; p = .408$). Because no significant relationship was found between these variables, the additional models related to the other independent variables were not generated.

Hypotheses Related to Fidelity and Institutional Loyalty

Hypothesis 2j: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2k: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of age, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.
Hypothesis 2l: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of gender, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2m: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of ethnicity, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2n: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of length of service, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2o: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of number of modules taught, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2p: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of educational level, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2q: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of primary teaching level, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2r: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of whether or not the faculty member teaches at other universities, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.
Results Related to Fidelity and Institutional Loyalty

In order to test the hypotheses related to the fidelity measure and institutional loyalty, only those participants who responded to *all* of the questions on both the Institutional Loyalty and Fidelity subscales were used in the testing of these hypotheses. Of the 63 who indicated they had received mentoring, only 46 answered all the questions and were included in the analysis of these hypotheses.

The generation of the regression model related to the ability of the quality of the mentoring experience (fidelity measure) to predict institutional loyalty revealed that a significant relationship does exist between these two variables ($R^2 = .268$; $\text{Adj } R^2 = .251$; $df = 1$; $F_{\text{Change}} = 16.088$; $p = .000$). Those who reported a higher fidelity score with their mentoring experience scored significantly higher on the Institutional Loyalty subscale than those who did not.

In addition, models were generated for a number of additional independent variables in order to ascertain whether or not factors such as age and gender affected the relationship between the predictor variable and institutional loyalty. The findings suggest that the ability of the independent variable (fidelity) to predict institutional loyalty is independent of the respondent’s age, gender, ethnicity, length of service, number of modules taught, educational level, primary teaching level, and whether or not the respondent teaches at other universities. The results are still significant even when Type I errors were controlled using the Bonferroni test (see Tables 34–41).
Table 34

Regression Models for Hypothesis Statements: Fidelity, Institutional Loyalty, and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Hypotheses</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F_{Change}$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2k: Age</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.372</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.372</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>$S^{**}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Age coded in chronological years.

**Significant at .05 level and when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni test.

Table 35

Regression Models for Hypothesis Statements: Fidelity, Institutional Loyalty, and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Hypotheses</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F_{Change}$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2l: Gender</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.833</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.833</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>$S^{**}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level and when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni Test.

Table 36

Regression Models for Hypothesis Statements: Fidelity, Institutional Loyalty, and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Hypotheses</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F_{Change}$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2m: African American</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.556</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.556</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.556</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>$S^{*}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Ethnicity coded African-American = 1; all others = 0; Caucasian = 1; all others = 0.

**Significant at .05 level and when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni test.
### Table 37

**Regression Models for Hypothesis Statements: Fidelity, Institutional Loyalty, and Length of Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Hypotheses</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$F_{\text{Change}}$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2n: Length of Service</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.628</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.628</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>S**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Length of service coded in chronological years.

**Significant at the .05 level and when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni Test.

### Table 38

**Regression Models for Hypothesis Statements: Fidelity, Institutional Loyalty, and Number of Courses Taught**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Hypotheses</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$F_{\text{Change}}$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2o: # of Courses taught</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.516</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.516</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>S**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Number of courses taught coded 1 = 0-5; 2 = 6-10; 3 = more than 10.

**Significant at .05 level and when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni test.

### Table 39

**Regression Models for Hypothesis Statements: Fidelity, Institutional Loyalty, and Educational Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Hypotheses</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$F_{\text{Change}}$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2p: Education Level</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.931</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.931</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>S**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Educational Level coded 1 = bachelor’s, 2 = master’s, 3 = post-master’s, and 4 = terminal degree.

**Significant at .05 level and when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni test.
Table 40

Regression Models for Hypothesis Statements: Fidelity, Institutional Loyalty, and Teaching Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Hypotheses</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F_{\text{Change}}$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2q: Undergraduate</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.341</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.341</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.341</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.341</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td><strong>S</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Teaching Level coded undergraduate = 1; all others = 0; graduate = 1; all others = 0; online = 1; all others = 0. **Significant at .05 level and when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni test.

Table 41

Regression Models for Hypothesis Statements: Fidelity, Institutional Loyalty, and Teaches at Other Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Hypotheses</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F_{\text{Change}}$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2r: Other Universities</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.972</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.972</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td><strong>S</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Teaching at other universities coded 0 = yes; 1 = no. **Significant at .05 level and when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni test.

Hypothesis Statements Related to Type of Mentor and Institutional Loyalty

Hypothesis 2s: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.
Hypothesis 2t: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of age, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2u: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of gender, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2v: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of ethnicity, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2w: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of length of service, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2x: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of number of modules taught, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2y: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of educational level, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2z: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of primary teaching level, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 2aa: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of institutional loyalty, independent of whether or not the faculty
member teaches at other universities, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

**Results Related to Type of Mentor and Institutional Loyalty**

In order to test the hypotheses related to the type of mentor and institutional loyalty, the respondents were categorized into three groups: those who received mentoring from a full-time faculty member, those who received mentoring from a part-time faculty member, and those who received mentoring from an administrator. Of the 62 respondents who indicated a type of mentor, 49.2% received mentoring from a part-time faculty member (n = 31), 36.5% (n = 23) received mentoring from a full-time faculty member, and 8 (12.7%) received mentoring from an administrator.

The generation of the regression model related to institutional loyalty and type of mentor revealed that no significant relationship exists ($R^2 = .024$; Adj$R^2 = .002$; $df = 3$; $F_{\text{Change}} = 7.070$; $p = .364$). Since no significant difference was noted between type of mentor and institutional loyalty, additional regression models to test the relationship between the demographic independent variables were not generated.

**Student Satisfaction Variables**

The following linear regression models tested the ability of mentoring to predict student satisfaction scores as measured by the aggregate score from the University’s end-of-course survey forms. Specifically, questions 2.1–2.9, which dealt with instructor behaviors, were used. Additional hypothesis statements were generated that asked whether or not the relationship (if one existed) between mentoring and student satisfaction was independent of age, gender, ethnicity, length of service, number of
courses taught, educational level, primary teaching level (undergraduate, graduate, and online), and whether or not the participant taught at other universities. A second model was generated, similar to the first, but used the fidelity score of the mentoring program rather than the receipt of mentoring as the predictor variable. The final model was generated using the type of mentor. Following is a list of the hypothesis statements for student satisfaction.

**Hypotheses Related to Mentoring and Student Satisfaction**

Hypothesis 3a: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 3b: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of age, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 3c: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of gender, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 3d: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of ethnicity, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 3e: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of length of service, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 3f: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of modules taught, than those who receive no mentoring.
Hypothesis 3g: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of educational level, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 3h: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of primary teaching level, than those who receive no mentoring.

Hypothesis 3i: Subjects who receive mentoring will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of whether or not the faculty member teaches at other universities, than those who receive no mentoring.

Results Related to Mentoring and Student Satisfaction

In order to test the hypotheses related to mentoring and student satisfaction, the respondents were categorized into two groups: received mentoring and did not receive mentoring. Of the 147 respondents, 63 (42.9%) received mentoring and 57.1% (n = 84) had not received mentoring.

The Student Satisfaction subscale was comprised of nine questions taken from the University’s end-of-course survey forms. These questions related directly to instructor behavior and effectiveness. To be eligible to participate in the study, faculty members must have taught at least three courses between June 1, 2009, and December 31, 2010. Many subjects had more than three end-of-course survey results. Each item was summed and the mean calculated. The mean for each of the nine items was summed and this aggregate total was used in generating the linear regression model.
The generation of the regression model related to student satisfaction revealed that no significant relationship exists between mentoring and the level of satisfaction students reported on the end-of-course survey forms ($R^2 = .003$; Adj $R^2 = -.004$; $df = 1$; $F_{\text{Change}} = .476; p = .491$). Whether a faculty member received mentoring was not a significant predictor of student satisfaction. Since no significant relationship was found between these variables, the additional models related to the other independent variables were not generated.

**Hypotheses Related to Fidelity and Student Satisfaction**

Hypothesis 3j: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 3k: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of age, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 3l: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of gender, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 3m: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of ethnicity, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.
Hypothesis 3n: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of length of service, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 3o: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of number of modules taught, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 3p: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of educational level, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 3q: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of primary teaching level, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Hypothesis 3r: Subjects who perceive a higher quality of peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of whether or not the faculty member teaches at other universities, than those who report a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Results Related to Fidelity and Student Satisfaction

In order to test the hypotheses related to the fidelity measure and student satisfaction, only those participants who responded to all of the questions in the mentoring subscale were used in the testing of these hypotheses. Of the 63 who indicated they had received mentoring, only 49 cases were calculated in the analysis of these hypotheses. The generation of the regression model related to the ability of the quality of
the mentoring experience (fidelity measure) to predict student satisfaction revealed that
no significant relationship exists between these two variables ($R^2 = .000; \text{Adj } R^2 = -.021;
df = 1; F_{\text{Change}} = .000; p = .986$). Because no significant relationship was found
between these variables, the additional models related to the other independent variables
were not generated.

**Hypothesis Statements Related to Type of Mentor and Student Satisfaction**

Hypothesis 3s: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score
higher on indicators of student satisfaction than those with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.

Hypothesis 3t: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score
higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of age, than those with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.

Hypothesis 3u: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score
higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of gender, than those with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.

Hypothesis 3v: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score
higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of ethnicity, than those with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.

Hypothesis 3w: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score
higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of length of service, than those with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.
Hypothesis 3x: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of number of modules taught, than those with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.

Hypothesis 3y: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of educational level, than those with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.

Hypothesis 3z: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of primary teaching level, than those who with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.

Hypothesis 3aa: Subjects who receive a peer-mentoring experience will score higher on indicators of student satisfaction, independent of whether or not the faculty member teaches at other universities, than those with an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.

**Results Related to Type of Mentor and Student Satisfaction**

In order to test the hypotheses related to the type of mentor and student satisfaction, respondents were coded into three groups: those who had received mentoring from a full-time faculty member, from a part-time faculty member, and from an administrator. Of the 62 respondents who indicated type of mentor, 49.2% received mentoring from a part-time faculty member \((n = 31)\); 36.5% \((n = 23)\) received mentoring from a full-time faculty member; and 8 (12.7%) received mentoring from an administrator.
The generation of the regression model related to the ability of the type of mentor to predict student satisfaction revealed that no significant relationship exists between these two variables \((R^2 = .005; \text{Adj } R^2 = -.016; df = 3; F_{\text{Change}} = .247; p = .864)\). Because no significant relationship was found between these variables, the additional models related to the other independent variables were not generated.

**Conclusion**

This chapter presented the results of the study in order to answer the overarching research hypotheses. Namely, does a mentoring experience, the quality or fidelity of the mentoring experience, or the type of mentor significantly predict a part-time faculty member’s instructor confidence, institutional loyalty, and student satisfaction scores on end-of-course surveys. The analysis of the data reveals mentoring is a significant predictor of instructor confidence \((p = .003)\) and that the fidelity measure (or quality of that mentoring experience) is a significant predictor of institutional loyalty \((p = .000)\). The type of mentor (full-time faculty member, part-time faculty member, or an administrator) was not a significant predictor of institutional loyalty or student satisfaction. However, the type of mentor was a significant predictor for instructor confidence. Most notably, those who received mentoring from a full-time faculty member \((p = .016)\) scored significantly higher on the Instructor Confidence subscale than those mentored by an administrator \((p = .022)\) or a peer \((p = .114)\). Chapter 6 discusses these results and makes recommendations for practice and future research.
CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study investigated what relationship, if any, exists between mentoring and a part-time faculty member’s level of confidence, loyalty to his or her institution, and the level of his or her students’ satisfaction. Previous chapters have outlined in detail the problem, research questions, methodology, and the study’s findings. This chapter summarizes the problem and purpose of the research as well as reviews the research hypotheses and the data collection and analysis protocol. Conclusions drawn from the results of the study are discussed and recommendations for practice and additional research are given.

Summary

According to the most recent data from the U.S. Department of Education Statistics, almost half the faculty labor force is comprised of part-time faculty (Snyder & Dillow, 2012). Many believe that this figure has been “gravely underestimated” (R. Wilson, 1999, p. A15) and the use of part-time faculty is underreported (Lerber, 2006). The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) believe that post-secondary institutions rely too heavily on the use of part-time faculty (AAUP, 2006; Benjamin, 2002).
The widespread use of part-time faculty presents some evident challenges to university leadership. A conservative estimate is that at least half of all instructors are part-time, yet they lack support and professional development that would increase their confidence in the classroom. They experience feelings of isolation; many teach at multiple universities. Therefore, questions of institutional loyalty arise. Third, if full-time faculty members deliver better instruction, then half of the U.S. college student population is receiving an inferior education. One can only assume that students are less satisfied with the learning experience they receive from part-time faculty members. How can university leadership ensure that part-time faculty members deliver quality instruction and contribute to the community of learners as well as their full-time, tenured counterparts?

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate what relationships exist between part-time faculty members’ self-reported perceptions of the quality of a peer-mentoring relationship with instructor confidence, institutional loyalty, and student satisfaction. More specifically, this study helped to answer the question: “Is peer-to-peer mentoring an effective means to support part-time faculty, bolster confidence, increase institutional loyalty, and consequently produce students who are satisfied that they received the best education and preparation?”

Statement of Hypotheses

In order to answer the overarching research questions, 81 directional hypotheses were developed. The hypotheses were clustered into three categories which encompassed the three dependent variables: (a) instructor confidence, (b) institutional loyalty; and
(c) student satisfaction. Each cluster of 27 statements hypothesized that participants who received mentoring would score higher on measures of instructor confidence, institutional loyalty, and student satisfaction. In addition, it was hypothesized that the higher the self-reported quality of the mentoring program (fidelity score) the higher the scores on the three dependent variables. Also, those who received peer mentoring would score higher than those who did not. Finally, it was hypothesized that the results would be independent of age, gender, ethnicity, and educational level, length of service, number of modules taught, primary instructional level, and whether or not the instructor taught at other universities.

Research Methodology

An ex post facto research design was deemed most appropriate since this study explored the quality of a previous peer-mentoring experience and its relationship to several dependent variables (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 257). The sample comprised the eligible 600 part-time faculty who taught in a large, private, mid-western University. Participants were eligible if they taught at least three courses between June 1, 2009, and December 31, 2010.

Data were collected using an online survey instrument that was comprised of four subscales. The survey was developed after an extensive review of the literature. I wrote the Confidence and Fidelity subscales, which were based on a review of the literature. Expert judges were asked to give feedback on the two scales and improvements were made, based on their input. One portion of the survey utilized the organizational commitment research conducted by Meyers and Allen (1984, 1988). Nine questions from the University’s end-of-course survey forms comprised the final subscale entitled
“Student Satisfaction.” The survey was administered between May 13 and July 18, 2011, to participants using the University’s online survey site.

After the data were collected, descriptive statistics were generated based on the sample as a whole and two sub-groups (mentored and non-mentored). A Pearson r was calculated and correlational matrixes created to initially determine what, if any, significant relationships existed between the independent and dependent variables. Finally, linear regression models were produced to answer the research hypotheses and to determine if any of the independent variables significantly predicted a participant’s confidence level, institutional loyalty, and student satisfaction scores.

Limitations

The limitations of this study are largely related to the ex post facto research design, since such a design does not allow random manipulation of the independent variables and it does not provide adequate safeguards; consequently, less evidence exists to infer a causal relationship (Ary et al., 2010). Therefore, one must exercise caution when attempting to generalize that the predictor variable caused any difference found in the confidence, loyalty, or student satisfaction variables.

The response rate is another limitation to the study. Of the 600 participants invited to participate, only 150 (25%) responded and only 147 agreed to the Informed Consent. Since the study investigated a mentoring experience, some cases, which were used to test the hypotheses related to the fidelity of the mentoring program and the relationship between a peer mentor and the dependent variables, had to be discarded because the participant either was not mentored or did not answer all the questions on the Fidelity subscale. For example, only 42.9% (n = 63) received mentoring. Of those 63, only 46
were included in the analysis of the fidelity measure. In addition, only 31 of the 63 participants who received mentoring were mentored by another part-time faculty member or a peer. Eight were mentored by an administrator and 23 were mentored by a full-time faculty. It is possible that a larger sample size with regard to type of mentor would yield different results.

In addition, the researcher assumed that all part-time faculty members were equally qualified. While the results of this research will provide valuable insight to the University, it would be inappropriate for others to broadly generalize from the conclusions of this research.

This is the first study to utilize the researcher-developed subscales related to instructor confidence and the fidelity of the mentoring program. While the development of the subscales, as well as the field testing, used sound validity and reliability strategies, further research is needed to further test and estimate the validity and reliability of these two measurements.

**Conclusions**

The study examined the ability of several independent variables to predict a part-time instructor’s confidence, institutional loyalty, and student satisfaction. It was hypothesized that those who had been mentored would score significantly better on the three scales than those who had not been mentored. In addition, the quality or fidelity of the mentoring experience was deemed to be important as well. The higher the perceived quality of the mentoring experience, the higher a participant would score on the Confidence, Loyalty, and Student Satisfaction subscales. Finally, this study predicted that those who received mentoring from a peer would do as well or better that those who
receive no mentoring or those who were mentored by a full-time faculty member or administrator. This section will answer each of the three research questions outlined in chapter 1 and state the conclusions based on the analysis of the data.

Conclusions for Research Question 1

The first research question asked, “Is a part-time faculty member’s self-reported perception of the quality of a peer-mentoring experience, as measured by the fidelity score, related to his or her degree of instructor confidence?” In order to effectively answer this question, the data were first analyzed in order to determine whether mentoring, regardless of quality or type of mentor, was a significant predictor of instructor confidence. The results revealed that those who had received mentoring scored significantly higher on the indicator of instructor confidence that those who receive no mentoring. This finding was significant at both the .05 level and when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni Test ($p = .003$). Analysis revealed that the following demographic variables: (a) age, (b) gender, (c) ethnicity, (d) educational level, (e) years of service, (f) number of modules taught, and (g) level taught were independent of the results (significant at both the .05 level and when controlling for Type I errors using the Bonferroni test). However, those who taught at other universities scored significantly higher on the Confidence subscale than faculty who taught only for the University ($p = .001$).

The second step in the analysis was to ask what relationship, if any, exists when the fidelity or quality of the mentoring experience is considered. The linear regression model showed that fidelity is not significantly related to instructor confidence ($p = .647$). Those who reported a higher level of fidelity did not score significantly better on
measures of instructor confidence than part-time faculty who perceived a lesser quality mentoring experience.

Finally, this first research question asked whether those who received peer mentoring scored as well or better on the Instructor Confidence subscale than those who were mentored by either a full-time faculty person or administrator. The linear regression model showed that the type of mentor was significantly related to instructor confidence at the .05 level ($p = .019$). Those who received mentoring from a full-time faculty member had a significantly higher mean ($p = .016$) on the Confidence subscale than those who were mentored by a peer ($p = .114$).

Therefore, the answer to the first research question is no. A part-time faculty member’s perceived quality of a peer-mentoring relationship is not related to his or her level of instructor confidence. However, mentoring, regardless of quality, is related to instructor confidence. Those who received mentoring scored higher than those who did not. There was a significant difference when the type of mentor was considered. Those who reported having an administrator or full-time faculty mentor scored higher than those with a peer mentor. In addition, part-time faculty members who taught at other schools scored higher on the confidence measure than those with only experience at the University.

Conclusions for Research Question 2

The second research question asked, “Is a part-time faculty member’s self-reported perception of the quality of a peer-mentoring experience, as measured by the fidelity score, related to his or her degree of institutional loyalty?” A similar process was used to answer this question as was used in the analysis of question 1. First, I looked at
whether mentoring, regardless of the fidelity or type of mentor, was significantly related to institutional loyalty and discovered that it is not \((p = .408)\). There was no significant difference between the score on the Institutional Loyalty subscale between those who had received mentoring and those who had not.

However, a significant relationship was noted when I looked at the relationship between the perceived quality of the mentoring experience (fidelity) and institutional loyalty. Those who perceived a higher quality mentoring experience did significantly better on indicators of institutional loyalty than those who perceived a lesser quality experience \((p = .000)\). This finding was independent of the participant’s age, gender, ethnicity, length of service, number of courses taught, educational level, teaching level, and whether they taught at other universities. In addition, the type of mentor was not significantly related to the results \((p = .364)\).

So, a part-time faculty member’s self-reported perception of the quality of a peer-mentoring experience is related to his or her degree of institutional loyalty. The higher the participant’s perceived quality of the mentoring experience, the higher the subject’s mean score on the Institutional Loyalty subscale. In addition, the type of mentor did not appear to influence the results. Those with a peer mentor did just as well as those who had an administrator or full-time faculty mentor.

Conclusions for Research Question 3

The final research question asked, “Is a part-time faculty member’s self-reported perception of the quality of a peer-mentoring experience, as measured by the fidelity score, related to his or her students’ satisfaction with the quality of the learning experience as measured by the end-of-course survey form?” Again, this question was
answered by first asking if a mentoring experience predicted student satisfaction. The linear regression model showed no significant relationship between mentoring and student satisfaction (\( p = .491 \)), Furthermore, the fidelity or quality of the mentoring experience was not a significant predictor of student satisfaction either (\( p = .986 \)). Also, the ability of type of mentor to predict student satisfaction was not significant (\( p = .864 \)).

Therefore, a part-time faculty member’s self-reported perception of peer-mentoring experience is not related to a student’s level of satisfaction as measured by the aggregate means from the University’s end-of-course survey forms.

**Discussion**

This study sought to address how best to support part-time faculty so that their confidence is increased as is their loyalty to the universities in which they teach. The U.S. Department of Education Statistics estimates that at least half of all classes at the post-secondary level are taught by part-time or adjunct faculty (Snyder & Dillow, 2012). Some believe this number has been grossly underestimated (Lerber, 2006). Two powerful forces, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU), believe that universities depend too much on a part-time labor force and as a result the “quality and stability of higher education today” is threatened (AAUP, 2003, p. 17).

It seems obvious that no industry that relies on a workforce that is comprised primarily of part-timers can expect to flourish and deliver a quality product. This is the heart of the debate surrounding the use of part-time instructors. For the most part, the literature agrees that adjunct faculty do not have the support that is provided to their tenured, full-time counterparts and they are essentially left to sink or swim (Beem, 2002;
The findings from this study indicate what business models have indicated for some time: Mentoring is an effective means to help new and inexperienced newcomers succeed in the educational arena (Madison & Huston, 1996). While this has been a widely accepted practice to assist the acculturation and orientation of newly hired and inexperienced full-time faculty, little research has supported its use among part-time counterparts. This section discusses the key research findings and their implications for the understanding on the use of part-time faculty and how best to support their professional teaching endeavors.

**Instructor Confidence**

This study confirmed that mentoring, independent of its fidelity, results in part-time faculty who score significantly higher on measures of instructor confidence than those without mentoring. This certainly is not new. Bandura’s (1989) social learning theory, part of the theoretical framework for this dissertation, postulates that learning is a social process, and competency is developed as we reflect and draw upon our own personal experiences and the experiences of others. Social learning indicates that the most important and valuable knowledge is imparted socially and that this social learning inevitably leads to “new instances of behavior that go beyond what [has been] seen or heard” previously (Bandura, 1989, p. 25).

The mentoring relationship certainly is a form of social learning as it takes place within the context of a social relationship. One of the benefits of this social learning experience is increased confidence on the part of adjunct faculty. Bandura (1989) observes that if we could not learn from our observations and social exchanges with others, our development would be “greatly retarded . . . tedious and hazardous” (p. 21).
Thankfully, due to our relationships with others, we do not have to approach each new endeavor as a blank slate. While no clear recipe appears in the literature about what constitutes effective teaching (Kelly et al., 2007; Smith & Welicker-Pollack, 2008), books and articles on the subject explore the notion that competency in the three aforementioned areas is important for effective instruction (Bash, 2005; Cross, 1981; Fleming & Garner, 2009; Galbraith, 2004; Merriam, 2001).

It is clear that mentoring as a means for conveying knowledge about the characteristics of adult learners, the principles of adult learning theory, and knowledge of the institution’s policy and practices is an effective and supportive management practice. Social learning theory, however, is not sufficient to explain all the effects of mentoring on an organization. Likert (1967) observed that the result of managers engaging in supportive behavior, what he termed Participative-Group, was that the individual’s sense of worth and value to the organization is increased and others in the organization are quick to help coworkers develop to their “full potential” (p. 167). The end result is an organizational culture that is supportive and that has engaged employees who encourage and motivate each other.

It is interesting that this study learned that the quality of this supportive behavior (mentoring) was not a significant predictor of this confidence. This would lead one to logically assume that the value of gaining knowledge and confidence (and hopefully competence) rests in the power of the social learning exchange rather than in the preparation and implementation of the social experience. This means that university leaders who develop and implement any type of mentoring program for their adjuncts
could experience similar results, even if the sanctioned mentoring program is not implemented precisely along recommended guidelines.

This study modified Likert’s System 4 management strategy somewhat to postulate that peer mentoring (not mentoring provided by a full-time employee of the organization) could result in similar outcomes. For the confidence variable, this proved to be inaccurate. In fact, it was mentoring provided by full-time teaching faculty that is significantly related to this finding. As a result, the modified theory, offered in chapter 1, may have to be revised to note that mentoring by full-time associates of the organization (as opposed to part-time) provides for support through social learning, training, coaching, encouragement, and motivation, which results in increased confidence in adult learning theory, effective teaching methods, content knowledge, and understanding of university policies and procedures.

Institutional Loyalty

Likert’s System 4 states that loyalty to the organization and members of the organization is one key outcome when a culture of support is high (Likert, 1967). The findings of this study support that claim. It was curious that those who received mentoring did not score significantly different from their counterparts who did not receive mentoring on the measure of institutional loyalty. This would seem to negate Likert’s and Bandura’s claim that supportive relationships result in a sense of community and loyalty. However, when this idea of organizational commitment is visited in light of the fidelity or quality of the mentoring experience, a clearer picture begins to emerge.

This study found that those who perceived a higher quality mentoring experience scored significantly higher on measures of institutional loyalty. In addition, this outcome
was independent of the respondent’s age, gender, ethnicity, and length of service, number of courses taught, educational level, or teaching level. In addition, part-time faculty who taught at multiple universities scored no differently than those who taught only for the University. In addition, the type of mentor did not appear to affect the outcome. Those who were mentored by full-timers, adjuncts, or administrators scored no differently.

In my opinion, this is a significant finding. While the study suggests that confidence can be increased through any social mentoring experience, loyalty requires the quality of that relationship to be high. Increasing one’s confidence can be accomplished by maintaining some emotional and physical distance. Loyalty, however, requires an investment of our emotions and affective domain. In order for loyalty to grow, our emotions must be engaged. Typically, this will not occur if we feel threatened, unsupported, or unsafe. One organizational researcher noted that loyalty is a “deep connection to the school” (Mello, 2007, p. 44). It is the nature of the attachment the individual forms for the organization that is at the heart of institutional loyalty (Ketchland & Strawser, 2001). Ashforth et al. (2008) conclude that institutional loyalty develops through “close intimate personal cooperation” (p. 326). In light of this, the claim that quality mentoring programs have the ability to build loyalty seems logical and not at all surprising.

Time and time again the literature touts concerns regarding the isolation experienced by part-time faculty and their lack of inclusion into the larger scholarly community. Teaching at multiple universities is presented in a negative light in most of the literature. Part-time faculty members are “migrant workers” hobbling together an existence (Cohen, 1999, para. 3). Terms like Roads Scholars, Freeway Flyers, and Gypsy
Faculty are frequently used to describe these part-time faculty members. Even adjuncts perceive that they are “second-class citizens” (Foster & Foster, 1998, p. 11).

However, this study suggests that a quality mentoring relationship has the potential to increase one’s sense of value (an ingredient Likert says is essential for those who wish to utilize participative-group management strategies) regardless of whether you are mentored by an administrator, full-time faculty member, or a peer. In addition, it is possible to teach at multiple universities and still maintain a high sense of loyalty and connectedness to one institution.

In this regard, researchers, and those who work as part-time faculty, need to re-visit the thinking that teaching at multiple universities is the great concern others have noted. Perhaps institutional loyalty can be better defined when we remove the caveat that teaching at multiple schools impedes the development of loyalty to one institution.

Again, this finding seems to support the theory offered in chapter 1 with the modification that quality mentoring experiences may be necessary for the development of institutional loyalty. This study seems to confirm that mentoring results in increased confidence, while fidelity results in increased loyalty.

Student Satisfaction

Grenzke (1998) suggests that close to 90% of all university faculty are evaluated using some form of student evaluation of teaching (SET). I can think of no other industry where the opinions of the “consumer” have such potential to affect hiring decisions. While SETs are controversial (Kelly et al., 2007), the reality is that administrators base important personnel decisions on the results (AAUP, 2006; Sproule, 2002). This takes the adage, “The customer is always right,” to a whole new level. These are the main reasons
the University end-of-course survey forms where elected as the third dependent variable in this study. No study of part-time faculty would be complete without considering this widely used form of feedback.

The results of this study found that student satisfaction levels were not significantly related to instructor confidence or institutional loyalty. Type of mentor (peer or otherwise) was not significantly related either. That no relationship was found in the course of this study does not mean that a relationship does not exist. It could be that the current research design was simply not robust enough to discern it.

Another, more likely explanation could be attributed to the “halo effect” (Clayson & Sheffet, 2006; Feeley, 2002; Otto et al., 2008). The halo effect is best understood when some cognitive bias influences another trait. For example, individuals who possess what society deems as physical beauty are often perceived to be happier and more successful. Physical beauty, happiness, and success are not necessarily correlated, but we interpret them that way. In using SETs it could be that an instructor’s physical appearance, personality, humor, or other similar quality places a halo around them and students evaluate teaching behaviors clouded by the glare of this halo.

When looking at some of the data from the end-of-course survey (EOC) forms, this is a likely explanation for the failure to discern a relationship (if one exists). The highest possible score for the EOC was 40. The mean was 34.72 (SD = 2.69) with a minimum of 17.03 and a maximum of 39.4. Overall, students are extremely satisfied with the educational experiences they are receiving at the University. At this point in time it is impossible to discern whether this is related to the quality of teaching or some other
spurious relationship. Consequently, insufficient data exist to accept or refute whether mentoring results in increased student satisfaction.

Theoretical Framework

This study began by using Bandura’s (1989) social learning theory as the basis for the theoretical framework of this study. Bandura postulates that the most important learning occurs within the context of social exchanges and social relationships. Because mentoring occurs within the context of personal relationships, social learning theory is an appropriate theoretical framework for this study. Mentoring is a means by which knowledge and skill are conveyed from one person to another. Bandura’s theory was not sufficient to explain all the dynamics predicted by the hypotheses. The study sought to determine whether mentoring by part-time instructors resulted in similar learning and mastery and whether this social exchange would increase employee loyalty and result in satisfied customers (or students).

Likert’s (1961, 1967) System 4 Management theory was also used to help explain this process. Likert theorized that a supportive and participatory organizational culture would result in high levels of trust, confidence, and loyalty among employees. The combinations of these two theories were extended to postulate that confident and committed employees working diligently to meet organizational goals would result in a high performing organization. Finally, it seemed logical to conclude that recipients of the services provided by this high performing organization would experience a corresponding sense of satisfaction.

The findings of this study only partially substantiated these theories. With regard to instructor confidence, full-time employees appeared to be best situated to help part-
time instructors build confidence. In addition, the quality of the social exchange was not significantly related to this increase in instructor confidence. So, it would seem that any mentoring experience has the potential to increase confidence. According to this study’s findings, mentoring—a form of social learning—resulted in more loyalty among employees when the quality of the mentoring experience is considered. Finally, no evidence emerged that confidence and loyal employees who operate within a high performing organization resulted in significantly higher levels of customer (or student) satisfaction.

So, based on the study findings, the revised theory, as outlined and illustrated in Chapter 1, would be changed to the following (see Figure 2):

Figure 2. Mentoring process and outcomes revised.
Recommendations for Practice

The findings of this research study can begin to provide University administrators and faculty a place to begin to remedy the disparity that exists in the use and support of part-time faculty members. Many universities are decreasing the number of full-time, tenured faculty in favor of the more flexible and cost-effective part-timer (AAUP, 2006; Bradley, 2004; Ivy et al., 2005; Noble, 2000). If we agree that “the main duty of every institution of higher education is to place a competent faculty” (Bowen & Schuster, 1986, p. 3), then it is imperative that university leaders and administrators begin to invest in the development of their part-time faculty. To continue to debate whether to use or not use part-time faculty is no longer productive. The reality is, we are using them and according to every sign, we will continue to do so. It is time to turn our attention to how best to support, encourage, and equip them. The following recommendations are offered in an effort to begin a dialogue on this topic.

1. Consider using the Instructor Confidence subscale to diagnose and identify areas of individual and community professional growth opportunities. The Instructor Confidence subscale was developed by me to measure a part-time instructor’s knowledge of course content, adult learning methodology, and university policy and procedures. The literature suggests that competency in each of these areas is essential if a faculty member is to be deemed competent and offered continued employment (Bash, 2005; Cross, 1981; Fleming & Garner, 2009; Galbraith, 2004; Merriam, 2001).

While it is not possible to precisely estimate the validity or reliability of any instrument (Newman et al., 2006), the developer can take important steps to enhance the validity of an instrument and increase its reliability. This subscale had a good estimate of
reliability with a Cronbach’s Alpha of .937. I used the procedures outlined by Newman et al. (2006) to increase this subscale’s reliability. Namely, I used a large number of items (39), standardized the administration, and sought feedback from expert judges in order to increase clarity and eliminate unclear items. In addition to the use of expert judges, content and logical validity strategies were used as the items on the subscale were based on a review of the literature. Finally, the instrument was field-tested using the part-time faculty in Spring Arbor’s School of Graduate and Professional Studies. This yielded an initial estimate of reliability (.913) and revisions were made based on the feedback from the participants.

This subscale appears to have a good estimate of validity and reliability. As a result, administrators and mentors could find the information provided by the subscale useful for identifying areas for individualizing professional development goals and plans as well as for determining continuing educational needs of the current faculty. Surveying the faculty anonymously could provide valuable information for planning professional development activities. Items on the scale that are consistently scored at a 3 or lower could indicate areas where faculty need support and further information.

Mentors could also use this subscale as a means of self-evaluation for the mentee in order to identify areas or goals for the mentoring relationship. These areas could be stated as measureable goals and be reviewed at the end of the mentoring relationship to determine if the outcome has been met or if further training, coaching, or feedback is needed.

2. Develop a quality, institutional mentoring program. Consistent with the literature, this study supports the idea that mentoring is an effective strategy to support
faculty. One of the significant findings of this study is that not all mentoring programs are created equal. The findings of this study suggest that any type of mentoring has the potential to increase instructor confidence, but loyalty to one’s university is best achieved through a quality mentoring experience.

Boyle and Boice (1998) believe that mentoring is crucial to developing a competent and effective faculty. Many articles and studies have looked at this only in relation to full-time faculty. This study begins to increase our understanding that mentoring can have the same results for part-time faculty members. Because of this, the leadership and administrators in post-secondary institutions should give serious consideration to the development and implementation of a systematic, institutional-wide mentoring program. The literature is divided between the effectiveness of informal mentoring relationships (those that develop spontaneously and are driven by the mentee’s desire to grow) and formal mentoring relationships that are organized, planned, and sanctioned by the institution (Boyle & Boice, 1998; Semeniuk & Worall, 2000). This study suggests that formal mentoring relationships have the potential to result in positive outcomes for both the part-time faculty member and the organization. Developing an institutional-wide mentoring program with a high degree of fidelity, that is based on the literature and implemented among part-time faculty, will likely result in both more confidence for the adjunct and greater loyalty to the institution.

3. **Consider using the Fidelity subscale to evaluate current or newly developed mentoring programs in order to identify areas for improvement.** The Fidelity subscale was developed and tested using the same procedures as the Instructor Confidence subscale, outlined above. Since all mentoring programs are not equal, in an effort to
derive the greatest benefit, university leaders and administrators should consult literature and other sources when developing a systematic or institutional mentoring program. Boyle and Boice (1998) note these programs need planning, structure, and intentional assessment. The Fidelity subscale can be used to guide the planning of the mentoring program and its assessment. The items on the scale were developed based on the literature and give insight to the characteristics of effective mentoring programs. Obviously, more research and testing are needed.

4. Consider the outcomes of the mentoring program in order to determine what type of mentor would be most effective. This study hypothesized that those mentored by a peer would score on the dependent variables than those who had other types of mentors, namely administrators and full-time faculty. The findings of the study resulted in the partial acceptance of this hypothesis. The type of mentor was not significant with regard to institutional loyalty; however, it was significant when considering confidence levels. Those who were mentored by a full-time faculty member scored significantly higher on the confidence subscale than those mentored by a peer. It is also important to note that while those with administrative mentors did not score significantly higher at the .05 alpha level on measures of instructor confidence, they did very well. It is likely that a larger sample size that has been mentored by an administrator would have resulted in a significant finding. Remember, only 8 of the 63 cases received mentoring from an administrator and the significance level of $p = .022$ is very close to the Bonferroni of $p = .016$. This is of practical significance and appears to support the results found by Boyle and Boice (1998) when mentees scored administrator mentors more highly than faculty.
Thus, if the outcome is to build confidence, then the results of this and other studies would seem to suggest that mentoring programs should seek to pair part-time faculty mentees with either an administrator (preferable) or a full-time faculty mentor. If the outcome is to increase loyalty, then consider using all three types of mentors. This research showed no significant difference between the type of mentor and loyalty when the mentoring program evidences a high level of fidelity ($p = .364$).

5. Begin to re-consider whether it is advantageous for part-time faculty to teach at only one institution. Perhaps the most surprising finding of this study related to the number of universities a part-time faculty taught at and its relationship to the instructor’s confidence and institutional loyalty. The literature suggests that faculty who teach at multiple universities is a negative thing. Part-time faculty members have been labeled as Roads Scholars (Tillyer, 2005) and Freeway Flyers (Will, 1997). They have been likened to migrant workers hobbling together a career by teaching at other universities (Cohen, 1999). None of these phrases conjure up a confident, competent, and loyal faculty.

However, the results of this study suggest that teaching at other universities actually increases a part-time instructor’s confidence ($p = .001$). This seems logical. The more experience a teacher has, the greater his or her sense of competence and confidence. Teaching at other universities was the only independent demographic variable that was significant when paired with a mentoring experience. The other variables, such as age, gender, and ethnicity, did not appear to significantly influence how a part-time faculty member scored on the Confidence subscale. In addition, teaching at other universities was not significantly related to institutional loyalty ($p = .690$) when paired with the fidelity of the mentoring program. These findings suggest that teaching for other schools
increases confidence and does not negatively impact loyalty. Consequently, teaching at multiple schools may not be the pariah currently portrayed in the literature.

6. **Universities should consider adding mentoring to the job responsibilities of administrators.** This study, along with the 1998 study by Boyle and Boice, suggests that administrators are uniquely qualified to serve as effective mentors and guides for new and inexperienced faculty, regardless of their employment status. Universally, it is accepted that a mentor is more experienced and mature and that those who receive some mentoring experience enhanced productivity and success (Wickman & Sjodin, 1997). Typically, a mentor and mentee are matched because the mentor has more experience in the area the mentee needs to grow in (Semeniuk & Worall, 2000). This logic would assume that another faculty member would be the most effective mentor. This study and Boyle and Boice’s may bring the veracity of this comment into question.

The key to the effectiveness of administrators as mentors may lie in Wilson and Elman’s (1990) observation that mentoring “is simply the best method to pass along norms, values, assumptions, and myths that are central to an organization’s successful survival” (p. 93). As an administrator, I have a perspective of my organization and its functioning that is broader and deeper than a faculty member’s. For most faculty members, the four walls of the classroom and their students are essential. They enter into dialogue about university policy and functioning only when it interferes with classroom planning and teaching. A faculty member seeks to master his or her content and how it is communicated or taught to students effectively. As an administrator, I am required to be a jack of all trades yet master of none. I often tell individuals that I know just enough about most topics to be dangerous. But the reality is that my universal perspective puts me in a
unique situation to help less experienced faculty navigate not only the intricacies of classroom teaching and management but the institution’s culture as well.

For example, as an administrator, part of my role is to be fully informed regarding all university policies (attendance, academic, financial aid, HR polices, etc.) that affect all levels of employees. I know the policy and the history behind the policy. When a new faculty member questions why some things are done the way they are, I am able to provide a historical perspective and a rationale that a full-time faculty member may not have. When a faculty member has a student who misses classes, a faculty mentor will likely advise the faculty member to consult his or her administrator (me). I am able to provide the faculty with concrete steps for dealing with the situation. In other words, as an administrator, I am able to help them resolve most problems on the spot. This is an advantage administrators have that the faculty do not.

Consequently, universities may find a significant return on their investment by revising administrators’ job descriptions to include mentoring. Leaders can retool administrative duties and functions so that clerical and other non-essential tasks are performed by assistants and secretaries, thereby leaving administrators ample time to build mentoring relationships. Administrators, who hire the part-time faculty to begin with, can become an essential bridge from the institution to the part-timer. This has the potential to minimize isolation, increase support and feedback, and connect the part-time faculty member to the larger academic community.

7. *Universities should consider revising the holy trinity of professorship from teaching, service, and research to one that includes the mentoring and development of part-time faculty as a part of a full-time professor’s duties.* At first glance, this
recommendation may appear to negate the one discussed in item 6 above. However, while those with administrative mentors scored higher on the confidence subscale (p = .022), those with full-time faculty mentors scored significantly higher as well (p = .016). This was significant even when controlling for Type I errors using Bonferroni test.

It is commonly agreed, among post-secondary institutions, that full-time faculty are engaged in the following three activities: (a) teaching, (b) research, and (c) service (AAUP, 2006; Bowen & Schuster, 1986). This triad of professoriate responsibilities has informed the role of full-time faculty in the American academy for decades, if not a century or more. To this day, faculty members are hired for their ability to teach, to research and publish, and to serve. It is not enough to be an effective teacher; you must demonstrate the ability to publish (or perish) and to serve. It is time for full-time faculty to enter the 21st century.

Beem (2002) notes that full-time faculty members rarely interact with their part-time counterparts. This may be due to the fact that part-time faculty continue to replace full-time tenure-track faculty when hiring decisions are being made (Leatherman, 2000a). Full-time faculties do not welcome use of part-timers (R. Smith, 1980) and consider them to be inferior instructors with less commitment to the organization and to the students (Bowen & Schuster, 1986). Overwhelmingly, full-timers express concern about the over-reliance on part-time faculty (Balch, 1999). Some speculate that the only way full-time faculty members have to protect their stake in the university is to declare part-time faculty incompetent (Selingo, 2008).
I believe it is time for the debate about the use of part-time faculty to cease and for our energies to move toward conversations and actions that allow for the best support of our part-time colleagues. We are all members of the scholarly community, and are only as strong as our weakest link. Are there part-time faculty members less effective than their full-time counterparts? Certainly. Are there full-time faculty members who are less effective instructors than their part-time colleagues? Absolutely. Adams (1995b) has stated the bottom line most effectively, “Since quality education is the ultimate goal of the institution, the faculty member who can provide the student with the best guidance is the faculty who should be hired, evaluated and retained” (p. 296).

Full-time faculty need to begin embracing their part-time colleagues and provide them with similar collegial support they give to other full-time partners. This means engaging alongside administrators in the mentoring and the professional development of part-time teachers. In addition to guiding part-timers through the maze of institutional culture and effective teaching methods, full-timers may find their expertise called upon to assist with the writing and development of curriculum, syllabi, and other tools, which support effective classroom instruction.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

While the use of part-time faculty has remained fairly constant for the past decade or so, the reality remains that at least 50% of undergraduate classes (some estimate it is as high as 70%) are taught by part-timers (Ivey et al., 2005; Leatherman, 2000a; Rice, 2004). Despite this, research on the use and effectiveness of adjunct faculty members has been scant (Klein et al., 1996). While the findings of this study add to this “scant” body of knowledge, more research is needed.
1. **Re-test to improve the reliability and validity of the Confidence and Fidelity subscales.** The initial use of these subscales yielded a good estimate of their reliability. I believe the subscales have potential to help diagnose and inform areas for individual and community development. In addition, the Fidelity subscale could be an effective tool to help universities assess the quality of their mentoring programs. This study used an internal consistency measure (Cronbach’s Alpha) to determine reliability. Further studies could use other reliability measure strategies like test-retest and equivalent forms to confirm and improve on the reliability. (Since the Institutional Loyalty subscale was used with permission, it is not included in this recommendation.)

2. **Improve the study’s design and replicate to verify conclusions.** A major limitation of this study was its research design and sample size. An ex post facto study does not use an experimental design and participants are not randomly assigned to experimental or control groups. The ability to generalize from this study is very limited. In addition, of the 147 respondents to the survey, only 46 answered all the questions on all the subscales and were included in the analysis of some of the hypotheses. In addition, only 8 received mentoring from an administrator. In order to increase the generalizability of the study, I would suggest an experimental design with a sample of part-time faculty members randomly assigned to a quality mentoring program (experimental group) and to a control group (who do not receive mentoring). The survey instrument, which had a good estimate of reliability and was created using a combination of validity strategies, could be used to gather the data. Studying the fidelity of the mentoring program provided some valuable insight. As a result, any future studies should include the measurement and analysis of this variable.
3. Investigate administrators as mentors. This study confirmed at least one earlier study that faculty tend to rate administrative mentors more effectively than other types of mentors. Why? What characteristics and knowledge base do administrators have that teaching faculty do not? How can these qualities be identified and taught so that full-time and part-time faculty can gain in effectiveness as mentors? A qualitative method using structured interviews may be effective in garnering this information. Patterns and common threads can be gleaned and then tested using quantitative methods. In addition, these recommendations are suggested on the basis of a very small sample size (n = 8). Further research needs to employ sampling methods that would significantly increase the sample size and use random sampling techniques, thereby increasing the ability to generalize from the findings.

4. Teaching at other schools and institutional loyalty. This study was conducted using the part-time faculty of a large, Christian university. The finding of this study suggests, contrary to most of the literature, that teaching at additional schools may not be a negative thing. In this study, those who taught at other universities scored significantly higher on measures of instructor confidence than those with only experience teaching for the University. In addition, those who taught for multiple schools scored no differently in measures of loyalty than those who taught only for the University. Further research is needed to determine if this finding is an anomaly.

5. Instructor effectiveness and student satisfaction. This study hypothesized that part-time faculty who received mentoring would have students with significantly higher scores on measures of student satisfaction. This series of hypothesis statements was rejected since no significant relationship was found between the independent variables
and student satisfaction. The literature is quite divided on the veracity of using student satisfaction tools to measure instructor effectiveness and its use is quite controversial. Because this study found no relationship does not mean that one does not exists. The study’s design may not have been robust enough to discern the relationship among the variables. A more likely explanation is that the halo effect resulted in the end-of-course survey’s ineffectually discerning relevant teaching behaviors. While Kelly et al. (2007) claim that researchers, administrators, and teachers believe that SETs are the single most valid source of data on teaching effectiveness, others question whether this is a viable tool for evaluating instruction (Appleton-Knapp & Krentler, 2006). Additional research should be focused on supporting or refuting this claim and identifying alternative means of assessing the relationship between mentored faculty and student satisfaction.

Summary of the Study

The reliance on part-time faculty to teach in American colleges and universities will continue. This study explored the relationships that exist between a part-time faculty members’ perception of the quality of a peer-mentoring experience and instructor confidence, institutional loyalty, and student satisfaction scores. The study’s major findings include the not-surprising result that a significant relationship exists between any mentoring and instructor confidence. While such independent variables as age and gender did not significantly impact these results, teaching at other universities resulted in significantly higher scores on the Confidence subscale. Those who were mentored by either an administrator or full-time faculty member scored significantly higher on the Confidence subscale than part-time faculty who were mentored by a peer.
The fidelity or quality of the mentoring experience was significantly related to institutional loyalty. This finding was independent of the type of mentor and the other demographic variables, including teaching at other universities. This was a surprising find, particularly in light of the way teaching at multiple institutions is portrayed negatively in the literature.

Although the debate continues on the use of part-time faculty, this study contributes to the scholarly body of knowledge related to the use of part-time faculty members and how best to support them. Debating will not change the facts: Part-time faculty members are here to stay. It is time to move the dialogue to one that offers solutions and support.

The study began by asking the question, “Is peer-to-peer mentoring an effective means to support part-time faculty, bolster confidence, increase institutional loyalty and consequently produce students who are satisfied that they received the best education and preparation?” The question has been only partially answered. While the findings suggest that mentoring is an effective means to support part-timers, bolster confidence, and increase institutional loyalty, insufficient data exist to determine whether student satisfaction levels are related to mentoring.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Peer-to-peer mentoring (IV)</th>
<th>Conceptual Definition</th>
<th>Instrumental Definition</th>
<th>Operational Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What? Refers to experiences of adjunct faculty who have been mentored, coached and guided by other, part-time instructors. This is a self-reported measure. | | 1. Part V of the Survey, “Tell us about your mentoring experience”
- 24 questions
- Question 1 – 9 are yes/no
- Questions 10 - 24 use Likert scale (SA, A, D, SD) | Yes = 1/No = 0
SA = 3
A = 2
D = 1
SD = 0 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Instructor Confidence (DV)</th>
<th>Conceptual Definition</th>
<th>Instrumental Definition</th>
<th>Operational Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What? A self-reported measure in which a part-time instructor indicates his or her level of confidence with the course content, adult learning methodology and institutional policies and procedures. A researcher-developed questionnaire will be used to measure this variable. | | 1. Part IV of the Survey, “Tell us what you know”
- 39 questions
- Use Likert scale (SA, A, D, SD) | SA = 3
A = 2
D = 1
SD = 0 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>What?</strong></th>
<th><strong>What it means?</strong></th>
<th><strong>How it will be observed?</strong></th>
<th><strong>How it will be measured?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Institutional Loyalty (DV) | A self-reported measure in which a part-time instructor indicates his or her preference for accepting a teaching assignment at the institution in which they were mentored over teaching opportunities at other universities. Frequently one finds the term organizational commitment used almost synonymously with institutional loyalty. Consequently, these terms will be used interchangeably. Institutional loyalty will be measured using a previously validated organizational commitment scale. | 1. Part III of Survey, “Tell us how you feel about your University”  
• 25 questions  
• Use Likert scale (SA, A, D, and SD) | SA = 3  
A = 2  
D = 1  
SD = 0 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: (The name that I will utilize to identify the variable through all the study).</th>
<th>Conceptual Definition (The specific definition that I will utilize, accordingly to the literature, as a definition of the variable in the study).</th>
<th>Instrumental Definition: (The items, stimulus or indicators in the survey that I will utilize in order to observe the variable)</th>
<th>Operational Definition (The procedure to get one score or value for the variable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Measure (DV)</td>
<td>A self-reported measure in which the part-time instructor evaluates the quality of his or her mentoring experience. A researcher-developed questionnaire will be used to measure this variable.</td>
<td>1. Part V of Survey, “Tell us about your mentoring experience.”</td>
<td>How it will be measured?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 24 questions</td>
<td>SA = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Use Likert scale (SA, A, D, and SD)</td>
<td>A = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable: <strong>Student Satisfaction (DV)</strong></td>
<td>Conceptual Definition: Students self-reported perception by students of the instructor’s effectiveness in terms of overall course quality, teaching skill and availability. An aggregate of the University’s end of course survey forms will be used to measure this variable.</td>
<td>Instrumental Definition: The 9 items from SOB end of course survey forms: 1. Forms were collected by the university between June 1, 2009 and December 31, 2011 will be collected for each participant. Each participant will have minimum of 3 EOC surveys. 2. The sum and mean for each item will be calculated using the following scale: SA = 4 A = 3 N = 2 D = 1 SD = 0</td>
<td>Operational Definition: How it will be measured?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable:</td>
<td>Conceptual Definition</td>
<td>Instrumental Definition:</td>
<td>Operational Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The name that I will utilize to identify the variable through all the study).</td>
<td>(The specific definition that I will utilize, accordingly to the literature, as a definition of the variable in the study).</td>
<td>(The items, stimulus or indicators in the survey that I will utilize in order to observe the variable)</td>
<td>(The procedure to get one score or value for the variable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What?</th>
<th>What it means?</th>
<th>How it will be observed?</th>
<th>How it will be measured?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (IV)</td>
<td>Chronological Age</td>
<td>Question 1 of Part II of Survey, “How old are you?”</td>
<td>In years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (IV)</td>
<td>Refers to the sex of the participant</td>
<td>Question 2 of Part II of Survey, “Are you male or female?”</td>
<td>1 = male; 0 = all others; 1 = female; 0 = all others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (IV)</td>
<td>Refers to the ethnic group each participant belongs to</td>
<td>Question 5 of Part II of the Survey, “What is your ethnicity?”</td>
<td>1 = African-American, 0 = all others; 1 = Asian, 0 = all others; 1 = Caucasian, 0 = all others; 1 = Hispanic, 0 = all others; 1 = Middle Eastern, 0 = all others; 1 = Mixed, 0 = all others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level (IV)</td>
<td>Highest educational level achieved</td>
<td>6. Question 6 of Part II of the Survey, “What is the highest level of education you have?”</td>
<td>1 = Bachelor’s Degree; 2 = Master’s Degree; 3 = Post Masters; 4 = Terminal Degree, (PhD, D.Min, JD, Ed.D, or other).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable:</td>
<td>Conceptual Definition</td>
<td>Instrumental Definition:</td>
<td>Operational Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(The name that I will utilize to identify the variable through all the study).</td>
<td>(The specific definition that I will utilize, accordingly to the literature, as a definition of the variable in the study).</td>
<td>(The items, stimulus or indicators in the survey that I will utilize in order to observe the variable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What it means?</strong></td>
<td><strong>How it will be observed?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary area of teaching responsibility (IV)</td>
<td>The level where participant does the majority of his or her teaching</td>
<td>Questions 7, 8 and 9 of Part II of the survey:</td>
<td>1 = yes; 0 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do you teach mostly undergraduate courses?</td>
<td>1 = yes; 0 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do you teach mostly graduate courses?</td>
<td>1 = yes; 0 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do you teach mostly online courses?</td>
<td>1 = yes; 0 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience (IV)</td>
<td>The number of modules or courses that each participant has taught</td>
<td>Question 4 of Part II of the survey, How many modules/courses have you taught?</td>
<td>0 = 0-5 modules 1 = 6-10 modules 2 = more than ten modules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

UNIVERSITY MENTORING MODEL
Veenman (1984) studied the voices of beginning teachers, defined as those who had less than three years teaching experience. After analyzing more than 100 empirical studies, Veenman described the following as the most common problems experienced by new teachers:

- Classroom discipline/management
- Motivating students
- Dealing with individual differences
- Assessing student work
- Organization of course work
- Short and long-term planning
- Effective use of appropriate teaching strategies
- Knowledge of policies and procedures
- Subject-matter knowledge
- Dealing with unique student problems

How might mentors approach these issues in discussion with mentees?

College of Adult and Professional Studies
Mentoring program for new Adjunct faculty

Mentor Qualifications

1. Serve as full time, affiliate, or selected adjunct faculty member
2. Receive consistently positive teaching observation/evaluations
3. Meet annual requirements for faculty development attendance as required by [University] College of Adult and Professional Studies
4. Demonstrate willingness to fulfill mentor responsibilities
5. Achieve generally positive student end-of-course surveys
6. Attend mentor training

Mentor Expectations

1. Establish contact with the new adjunct faculty member
2. Welcome the new adjunct faculty member to his or her classroom
3. Review the new adjunct faculty member's syllabus/ faculty information sheet
4. Utilize a variety of teaching strategies during the new adjunct faculty member's visit
5. Designate, after discussion with the new adjunct faculty member, a segment of the workshop to be taught by the new adjunct faculty member (devotion, prayer, mini-lecture, small group activity, class discussion)
6. Observe the new adjunct faculty member during his or her teaching segment of the workshop
7. Complete the observation form
8. Spend time as needed to discuss the observation form with the new adjunct faculty member, highlighting strengths and making suggestions
9. Submit the observation form
10. Maintain contact with the new adjunct as needed to assist during the new adjunct's first teaching assignment

Qualities of a good mentor:

- considered a role model in his/her position or area
- committed to the mentoring process
- encourages and motivates others
- creates a continuous learning environment
- has the respect of others at the University
- commits time to be a mentor
- possesses the knowledge and influence needed to be a mentor
- willing to share knowledge
[The University]

Adult and Professional Studies
Mentoring Program

Adjunct Mentor Application

Applicant's Name:_________________________________________________________

Position with the University: _______________________________ ________________

List the classes that you feel comfortable in mentoring new faculty:__________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Agreement

1. I would share my syllabus with new faculty and provide them with ideas for composing their own syllabus. Yes___ No___

2. I would utilize a lesson plan and share same with the new faculty member. Yes___ No___

3. I would utilize a variety of teaching strategies, including visual instructional methods, when the new faculty member observes my class. Yes_____ No_____

4. I would allow the new faculty member to participate in a portion of the workshop (e.g., present a devotional, lead breakout sessions, deliver a mini-lecture, etc.). Yes___ No___

5. Spend the necessary time in discussion with the new faculty member, helping them to appreciate their strengths and to work with them to overcome any potential weaknesses. Yes___ No___

6. I will complete the Observation Narrative and discuss same with the new faculty member (during class breaks, after class, by phone, by e-mail, etc.). Yes___ No___

When all of the items on this list have been completed and the Observation Narrative turned in to the University, I understand that I will receive a S50.00 stipend.

Signed: _________________________________  Date: ______________________

White copy: Mentor  Green copy: Coordinator  Yellow copy: [University]
College of Adult and Professional Studies
Induction Program Overview

[The University] College of Adult and Professional Studies provides a comprehensive plan for development of a skilled force of adjunct faculty. Based on research and best practices for selecting and inducting new faculty, the program includes an extensive recruitment system, with multiple gateways for recruiting, screening, evaluating, and approving prospective faculty members.

A continuous improvement model serves as the basis for development of excellence in the delivery of instruction for adult learners, employing a cadre of full time and affiliate faculty to provide support for new adjuncts. Once adjunct faculty members have successfully passed these gateways and completed the approval process, they embark upon the orientation process. This process, required of all new adjuncts, involves attendance at two 4-hour training sessions: Orientation for New Faculty and Introduction to Adult Learning. Both formal and informal mentoring with experienced faculty members completes the initial induction process.

The on-going plan for faculty development provides both onsite and online training sessions, utilizing a variety of formats. Classroom observations, and individual coaching round out the opportunities for improvement of instructional practice in the Christ-centered academy.

Mentoring Program for New Adjunct Faculty

1. Upon completion of the orientation sessions, each new adjunct faculty member will be asked to complete a Mentee Information Form regarding availability to participate in the mentor observation. (Information will include name, desired location for observation, available days/nights of the week, degree program if known.) The form will be submitted to the orientation instructor, for submission to the coordinator of the mentor program.

2. Based upon the information provided on the form, the mentee will be matched with a suitable mentor from the list maintained by [UNIVERSITY] College of Adult and Professional Studies. Upon agreement to serve as a mentor, contact information will be provided to both mentor and mentee. The mentor will receive by mail the observation forms.

3. The mentor and mentee will establish contact, and will collaborate to arrive at an appropriate workshop for the observation to occur.

4. The mentor will welcome the new adjunct faculty member to his or her classroom, completing the requirements as outlined in the Mentor Expectations document:
   a. Review the new adjunct faculty member's syllabus/ faculty information sheet
   b. Utilize a variety of teaching strategies during the new adjunct faculty member's visit

Mentoring Program for New Adjunct Faculty
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c. Designate, after discussion with the new adjunct faculty member, a segment of the workshop to be taught by the new adjunct faculty member (devotion, prayer, mini-lecture, small group activity, class discussion)

5. The mentor will observe the new adjunct faculty member during his or her teaching segment of the workshop, and complete the observation form.

6. The mentor and mentee will spend time as needed to discuss the observation form, highlighting strengths and discussing suggestions.

7. The mentor will submit the observation form as indicated at the bottom of the form. Receipt of this form will begin the payroll process for reimbursement to the mentor. A copy of the form will be maintained in the mentee's file.

8. The mentor will maintain contact with the mentee as needed to assist during the mentee's first teaching assignment.
NAME: (please print) ________________________________________________

Contact information: Phone ____________________________________________

                Email ________________________________________

Desired location(s) for mentor assignment ________________________________

Desired night(s) for mentor assignment ________________________________

Courses that you will teach ____________________________________________

NOTE:

• You will not be eligible to receive a teaching assignment until your mentoring experience is complete.
• Every attempt will be made to honor your request for location and day of the week for this experience to take place.
• Your mentor will be a full time faculty member or designated affiliate or adjunct faculty member.

SIGNATURE: __________________________________________________________
Mentoring Assignment Checklist

Name of New Faculty ______________________________________________________

Date of Orientation ______________________________________________________

Mentor __________________________________________________________________

Course ____________________________________________________________________

Location ________________________________________________________________

Dates ________________________________________________________________

Contacted by Cheryl or Deb
(check one)
email
phone
(date) ____________________

Responded (date) __________________________________________________________________

Mentee info sent (email) ______________________________________________________

(Observation Form attached) ________________________________________________

Final forms submitted for reimbursement_______________________________________
Self-Assessment Questions for Mentees

1. How do I typically begin the class?
   • Review key points of previous class?
   • Use advance organizers?
   • Share current new events?
   • Relate common experiences to course concepts?

2. Where/how do I position myself in the classroom?
   • Move about the room?
   • Stand behind a lectern or desk?

3. How do I move in the classroom?
   • Back and forth in front of the class?
   • Towards students?
   • Promote active engagement?

4. Where are my eyes usually focused?
   • On my notes?
   • On the students?
   • On the rear wall of the classroom?

5. Do I facilitate students' visual processing of material?
   • Use of PPT, overhead, whiteboard?
   • Pacing appropriate for them to process?

6. Do I vary the tone, volume, speed of my voice?
   • Will students perceive the most important points?

7. How do I ask questions of the students?
   • Call on students by name?
   • Provide adequate wait time?
   • Answer the questions myself?
   • Ask for volunteers?

8. How often, and when, do I smile or laugh?
   • Do students smile or laugh with me?
9. How do I react to inattentive students?
   • Ignore them?
   • Encourage students to participate?
   • Call on them?

10. How do I react when students disagree or challenge what I say?
    • React as if threatened?
    • Acknowledge their viewpoint, using it as a springboard for discussion?

11. How do I incorporate Christian principles into my instruction?
    • Include scripture citations or references?
    • Tie in topics to Biblical references?

12. How do I end the class?
    • Material left uncovered?
    • Review of key points?
    • Discuss expectations/assignments for next class meeting?

This form should be used by the mentor to assess the mentee's performance during his/her teaching segment of the workshop visit. Please take time to review this information with the mentee.

New Faculty:_____________________________  Mentor: _______________________

Date:___________________________________  Location: ______________________

Course Title:____________________________  Time: _______________________

Number of students present:  _______________
(1=low, 5=high)

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Effectively introduced class/lesson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Created appropriate visual impact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Elicited student participation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Utilized a variety of teaching methods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Demonstrated expertise in subject matter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Demonstrated energy and enthusiasm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Used effective verbal communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Used effective nonverbal communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Utilized effective classroom management techniques</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Used appropriate support materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Presented a devotional and asked for prayer requests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Closed class session effectively</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Additional Notes from the Mentor:

1. Areas of strength exhibited by mentee:

2. Constructive suggestions for mentee:

Additional Notes from the Mentee:

1. Observations that will assist in first teaching assignment:

2. Questions about the classroom experience:

**Mentor— please send a copy of this completed form to:

[Name of person and Contact Information]


APPENDIX C

LIST OF EXPERT JUDGES
Kevin C. Chaney, MA
Spring Arbor University
Coordinator of Faculty Services (2003 – 2012)
School of Graduate and Professional Studies
Mr. Chaney is the CFS for the Mid-west region and is responsible for hiring, mentoring and supervising the over 100 part-time faculty in his region.
kchaney@arbor.edu

Martin A. Covey, PhD
Certified Family Life Educator
Associate Professor (1996 – Present)
Program Director for Family Studies and Christian Ministry Leadership (2008 – present)
School of Graduate and Professional Studies
Spring Arbor University
Dr. Covey is responsible for writing curriculum and supervising the students and faculty in the family life undergraduate and graduate programs.
mcovey@arbor.edu

Tamara Falk Dindoffer, PhD
Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies (2008 – present)
School of Graduate and Professional Studies
Spring Arbor University
Dr. Dindoffer has served as a regional director and interim dean for off-campus programs in addition to her current role as associate dean for undergraduate degree completion programs. Ultimately, she has the responsibility for program development, curriculum development and faculty recruitment, orientation, mentoring and professional development.
tammyd@arbor.edu

Geri Morris, MA, RHIA, CFD
Coordinator of Faculty Services (1997 – 2011)
School of Graduate and Professional Studies
Spring Arbor University
Mrs. Morris was the CFS for the north region and was responsible for hiring, mentoring and supervising the part-time faculty in her region.
gerisau@chartermi.net

Terry Lynne Pardee, PhD
Associate Professor, Psychology Department (2009 present)
Former Program Director for the Master’s in Counseling Program at SAU (2008 -2009)
Spring Arbor University
Dr. Pardee was the director of the MAC program for the School of Graduate and Professional Studies at the time she served as an expert judge. Dr. Pardee was responsible for writing curriculum and supervising the students and faculty in masters of counseling program.
,tpardee@arbor.edu
NOTE

The survey that follows is not an exact replication of the survey deployed through the University’s website. The look of the survey is different in order to protect the school’s desire to remain anonymous. In addition, any reference to the school’s actual name has been deleted and replaced with the phrase “the University.” It is important to note that the questions that follow are the exact questions that participants responded to on the web-based version of this instrument. In addition, the copy of the end-of-course survey forms that follows the web-based survey is not an exact duplication. Only the formatting of the page has been changed to remove any reference to the University. The questions have not been edited or changed; they are exactly as they appear on the school’s end-of-course survey forms distributed to students.
Part I: Informed Consent

I am aware that I have been invited to participate in a research project. The purpose of this research is to obtain information that will assist Christian universities with adult degree completion programs with information on the effectiveness of peer mentoring initiatives. In addition, I understand that data collected in this research will be used by the researcher in writing her doctoral dissertation.

I understand that I will be asked to complete an online survey. The survey will be open for me to respond from May 13 – July 18, 2011. I have been told that most individuals have been able to complete the survey in 15 – 20 minutes.

I have been informed that the benefit of participating in this study is to inform [the University] regarding the perceptions and attitudes of its part-time/adjunct faculty members and to assist [the University] in developing professional development opportunities for all adjunct faculty members. I have also been informed that the researcher will be reviewing my three most recent end-of-course survey forms in order to calculate the average. I understand that [the University] will provide this information **anonymously**. Results from this survey and the end of course surveys **will not be linked** to me personally in anyway. I have been told that my identity will remain anonymous and that I will not be identified in any published document.

I have been told that any questions or concerns related to this study can be addressed to Carolyn Watson at 800-968-1722 or via email at carolyns@arbor.edu. Concerns may also be addressed to Dr. Erich Baumgartner at (800) 471-6210 or via email at baumgart@andrews.edu. If I have concerns about the treatment of research participants, I can contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at [the University] Office of the Dean of the Graduate School, [address and phone number provided here]

☐ I have read and agree to conditions described in the above statement. I understand that completing this survey is a form of implied consent.

☐ I have read and do not agree to conditions described in the above statement. I elect not to participate in this study. (Checking this box will take the respondent to fade-out/thank you page)
Part II: Tell Us about You

1. How old are you?

2. Are you…
   o Male
   o Female

3. How many years have you taught for [the University]?

4. How many modules/course have you taught?
   o 0-5
   o 6-10
   o More than ten

5. What is your ethnicity?
   o African American
   o Asian/Pacific Islander
   o Caucasian
   o Hispanic
   o Middle Eastern
   o Other

7. What is the highest level of education you have?
   o Bachelors
   o Master’s
   o Post Master’s
   o Ph.D./D.MIN/Ed.D/JD or other terminal degree
   o Certification or specialist

8. Do you teach mostly undergraduate courses? Yes or No

9. Do you teach mostly graduate courses? Yes or No

10. Do you teach (either face-2-face or online) for any other universities? Yes or No

11. If “yes,” how many others do you teach for?
   o One
   o Two-three
   o Four to five
   o More than Five
Part III: Tell us how you feel about [the University]

Your candid answers to the following questions will help the administration to better serve you.

Directions: *Indicate whether you strongly disagree, disagree, agree, or strongly agree with each statement.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I do not feel like part of a family at [the University].
2. I am not concerned about what might happen if I left [the University] without having another part-time teaching position lined up.
3. I feel emotionally attached to [the University].
4. Working at [the University] has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
5. I feel a strong sense of belonging to [the University].
6. I cannot financially afford to leave [the University] right now.
7. [The University] does not deserve my loyalty.
8. I would feel guilty if I left [the University] now.
9. I am proud to tell others that I work at [the University].
10. I attend faculty meetings and other professional development opportunities on a regular basis.
11. I would be happy to continue teaching at [the University].
12. Right now, staying with [the University] is a matter of necessity as much as desire.
13. It would be very hard for me to leave [the University] right now; even if I wanted to.
14. I really feel that the problems faced by [the University] are also my problems.
15. I do not feel any obligation to remain at [the University].
16. I serve on a curriculum development team.

17. [The University] deserves my loyalty.

18. It would be wrong to leave [the University] right now because of my obligation to the people in it.

19. One reason I continue to work for [the University] is that leaving would require considerable sacrifice—another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.

20. Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave [the University] right now.

21. I enjoy discussing [the University] with people outside of it.

22. I would be willing to serve as a mentor to another part-time faculty member.

23. One of the few serious consequences of leaving [the University] would be the scarcity of available alternatives.

24. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave [the University] now.

25. I owe a great deal to [the University].

Part IV: Tell Us What You Know

Your candid answers to the following questions will assist the administration to design continuing professional development opportunities as well as provide better training and orientation to first time faculty members.

Directions: Indicate whether you strongly disagree, disagree, agree or strongly agree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I know what to do when a student does not turn the final paper in on time.

2. When teaching adults, it is important to share practical work/life experiences.

3. I am fair and accurate when evaluating students’ written work and assign the appropriate grade each time.
4. I know APA style and consistently insist my students use it when writing papers.

5. Adult learners are more disciplined and need less direction from the instructor.

6. I would be able to verbally explain my philosophy of education and teaching to anyone who asked me.

7. I am familiar with the [the University] attendance policy and know how to handle a student who is absent.

8. Adult learners are uniquely different from traditional age college students.

9. When teaching adults, it is important to spend a lot of time lecturing.

10. I am aware of the [the University] faculty handbook.

11. Overall, adult learners are motivated to learn.

12. I know what plagiarism is and am confident in my ability to address any student who I suspect has plagiarized.

13. I can create appropriate make-up assignments for any student who is absent in my class.

14. I use the time that students are in small groups to review my notes and lesson plans.

15. I am comfortable facilitating a large group discussion.

16. I use a grading rubric for major written assignments.

17. I have thought about my philosophy of education and teaching and could write it down if asked to.

18. I am confident in my ability to handle a student who challenges me in a classroom setting.

19. I know what to do in an emergency and how to report it to [the University].

20. I clearly explain course requirements.

21. I am confident that if another instructor graded my students’ written work, we would assign a similar grade.

22. The criteria I use to evaluate student work are clearly defined for the student.

23. The expected learning outcomes for my course(s) are clearly defined.
24. I return assignments and/or exams in a timely manner.
25. I provide helpful feedback on assignments.
26. I provide students with contact information so they may reach me during the week when questions and problems arise.
27. I am a role model for the Christian life.
28. I am careful to relate course content and material to practical situations.
29. I am respectful and open to student’s differing perspectives.
30. I make clear and understandable presentations.
31. I provide my classes with a written information sheet.
32. I am very familiar with [the University] policies and procedures.
33. I am knowledgeable about the course content that I teach.
34. I use a variety of learning approaches.
35. I am helpful and responsive to students.
36. I am prepared for each class period.
37. I use experiential and applied learning strategies to enhance student learning.
38. I integrate relevant theory and knowledge into real world situations.
39. I return graded papers and final grades to the students within two weeks.

Part V: Tell us about your mentoring experiences

The following section will ask you to recall your most recent mentoring experience. If you have mentored other faculty members, please think back to the last time you received mentoring.

1. I have received mentoring. Yes or No (If no, thank you for your time.)

2. My mentor was
   a. A full-time faculty member
   b. A part-time faculty member
   c. An administrator
3. How long did your mentoring relationship last? # of weeks/months

4. I observed my mentor teaching either in a face-to-face setting or online. Yes or No

5. My mentor observed me teaching. Yes or No

6. My mentor shared written notes about my teaching with me. Yes or No

7. My mentor's feedback helped me improve my teaching. Yes or No

8. My mentor explained my university's policies to me. Yes or No

9. My mentor helped me understand what was expected of me. Yes or No

Questions 10 - 24 will use the following scale:

For each of the statements below, indicate whether you strongly disagree, disagree, agree, or strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. I was motivated to grow and improve through my mentoring relationship.

11. I was satisfied with the number of times that my mentor and I met or communicated (either face-to-face, phone or via email or other technologies).

12. I was satisfied that my mentor was knowledgeable and skilled. He or she was someone who could help me grow.

13. I believe my mentor cared about me as person and as a teacher.

14. My mentor was motivated and wanted me to succeed.

15. I was satisfied that my mentoring partner and I spent time getting to know each other.

16. Our mentoring partnership set professional and personal development goals for the mentoring experience.

17. The mentoring goals were written down.

18. The mentoring goals were achieved.

19. My mentor helped me understand the University's policies.
20. I was satisfied with how my mentor responded to my questions and concerns.

21. My mentoring experience has helped me become more confident in my teaching.

22. I was more confident about my teaching ability after participating in the mentoring experience.

23. My mentoring experience helped me feel more loyalty to my university.

24. I would recommend my mentor to other new instructors.

**Part VI Conclusion**

Thank you for taking the time to respond to this survey.
### The University End-of-Course Survey Forms

1. **COURSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 The course increased my knowledge in the subject.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 The course material was clear.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 The textbook(s) enhanced the course.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 The assignments contributed to the Learning process.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 The workload was appropriately distributed Throughout the course.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 The course assisted in my spiritual growth.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 The course was relevant to my present or future career.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. INSTRUCTOR

2.1 The instructor was very knowledgeable about the subject. SD ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ SA

2.2 The instructor's Christian faith was clear. SD ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ SA

2.3 The instructor was well-prepared for this SD ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ SA

2.4 The instructor motivated me to learn about the subject. SD ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ SA

2.5 The instructor was available to help when I needed it. SD ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ SA

2.6 The instructor provided timely feedback on my work. SD ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ SA

2.7 The instructor graded my work fairly. SD ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ SA

2.8 The instructor treated me like an adult professional. SD ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ SA

2.9 Overall I think the instructor did a good job. SD ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ SA

3. COMMENTS

3.1 What suggestions do you have to improve the course curriculum?

3.2 What suggestions do you have for faculty improvement?

[Note: SD = Strongly Disagree; SA = Strongly Agree]
APPENDIX E

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD DOCUMENTS
NOTE
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January 25, 2011

Carolyn Watson
24915 New York St.
Dearborn, MI 48124
Tel: 313-598-5295
Email: Carolyn.Watson@arbor.edu

RE: APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS
IRB Protocol #: 11-008 Application Type: Original Dept.: Leadership
Review Category: Exempt Action Taken: Approved Advisor: Erich Baumgartner
Title: An Ex Post Facto Study of Relationship between self-reported peer-to-peer mentoring experiences on institutional loyalty, instructor confidence and Students Satisfaction among part-time instructors

This letter is to advise you that the Institutional Review Board (IRB) has reviewed and approved your proposal for research entitled: "An Ex Post Facto Study of Relationship between self-reported peer-to-peer mentoring experiences on institutional loyalty, instructor confidence and Students Satisfaction among part-time instructors" under Exempt category. The duration of this approval is up to January 25, 2012. If your research is not completed by the end of this period you must apply for an extension at least two weeks before the expiration date. We also ask that you inform IRB when you complete your research. Reference the protocol number in any future correspondences regarding this application.

Any future changes made to the study design and/or consent form require prior approval from the IRB before such changes can be implemented.

While there appears to be no risks with your study, should an incidence occur that results in a research-related adverse reaction and/or physical injury, this must be reported immediately in writing to the IRB. Any project-related physical injury must also be reported immediately to the University physician, Dr. Loren Hamel, by calling (269) 473-2222.

We wish you success in your research project as outlined in the approved protocol. Please feel free to contact our office if you have questions.

Sincerely,

[signed]

Administrative Assistant
Office of Research & Creative Scholarship, IRB
January 4, 2011

Carolyn Watson  
Coordinator of Faculty Services  
Spring Arbor University  
23400 Michigan Ave, Suite P-20  
Dearborn, MI 48124

Dear Carolyn,

On behalf of the College of Adult and Professional Studies (CAPS) at [University Name] [University Initials], I am pleased to acknowledge our support to your doctoral research, "An Ex Post Facto Study of the Relationship between Self-Reported Peer Mentoring Experiences on Institutional Loyalty, Instructor Satisfaction and Student Satisfaction among Part-time Instructors." Your study has been reviewed by our Institutional Review Board and was determined to be exempt. To ensure the fullest protection to our faculty, we pledge to assist by distributing your survey instrument and to code and compile the data results in such a manner that all the participants will remain anonymous to you. We look forward to collaborating with you and to reviewing your findings once your research is complete.

Please invite your dissertation chair to direct any questions or concerns directly to me at [Phone Number] or by email at [E-mail Address].

Sincerely,

[Signed]  
Associate Vice-President for Academic Administration and Operations
Notice of Exemption

An Ex Post Facto Study of Relationship Between Self-Reported Peer-to-Peer Mentoring Experiences on Institutional Loyalty, Instructor Confidence, and Student Satisfaction Among Part-Time Instructors

Title of Research Topic

Carolyn Watson (doctoral candidate, Andrews University)

I have reviewed your research proposal and have determined that:

Check One:

X 1. Your proposal is exempt from further review from the IRB. (please see notes below)

_ 2. Your proposal is not exempt and must be forwarded to the Chair of the University Institutional Review Board.

Exempt from further review with the understanding that:
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