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The majority of faculty in higher education, including secular and biblical institutions, are adjunct faculty. The literature suggests that adjunct faculty are less effective and satisfied, and have weaker organizational sense of belonging (OSB) and affective organizational commitment (AOC). Denominational affiliation (DA) and religious commitment (RC) might mitigate the adjunct faculty’s feelings regarding OSB and AOC, but no research has pursued this set of questions. The main purpose of this study was to investigate the impact of denominational affiliation and religious commitment on organizational sense of belonging and affective organizational commitment among the sample population, adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the Association for Biblical Higher Education.

A web-based survey comprised of previously vetted instruments, Survey of Workplace Relations (OSB and AOC Subscales) and Religious Commitment Inventory-10 (RCI-10), was distributed. Descriptive and inferential statistics were utilized to answer the research questions: 1) What is the distribution of religious commitment, denominational affiliation, typology, teaching modality, academic division, race, years at institution and gender? 2) What is the level of religious commitment, organizational sense of belonging and affective organizational commitment? 3) To what extent do RC, DA, and other commonly studied characteristics...
influence OSB and AOC? 4) What combination of variables best predicts OSB and AOC? 5) To what extent do OSB and AOC vary by institution?

Results indicate that adjunct faculty at Bible colleges and universities are a complex heterogeneous group of employees, yet they have a homogenously high level of religious commitment. They come to the profession with a variety of characteristics and they teach for varying reasons. Results suggest that their organizational sense of belonging and affective organizational commitment are strong and their individual denominational affiliation influences and predicts their organizational sense of belonging. Additionally, the findings suggest that OSB influences and predicts AOC. Teaching modality and reasons for being an adjunct instructor did not influence either OSB or AOC for this population. Adjunct faculty are as varied as the institutions that employ them, but for Bible colleges, denominational alignment may help adjunct faculty feel valued and valuable.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Most of the research in higher education on adjunct faculty has been conducted at secular institutions, leaving a void in the empirical evidence related to faith-based institutions. These institutions include a subgroup of Bible colleges accredited by the Association for Biblical Higher Education (ABHE) which is the focus population of this research. According to the U.S. Department of Education, of the approximately 4,000 degree-granting institutions of higher education in the United States, approximately 900 define themselves as religiously affiliated (Council for Christian Colleges and Universities, 2015). Moreover, many of these institutions are experiencing challenges such as financial constraints resulting in a higher proportion of adjunct faculty. Current statistics show that more than half of the instructors at religiously-affiliated colleges and universities are adjunct faculty (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015). Bible colleges and universities are a vital segment of higher education and a preferred option for students and families who value a Bible-centered education. The purpose of this study is to investigate whether denominational affiliation (DA) and religious commitment (RC) influence organizational sense of belonging (OSB) and affective organizational commitment (AOC) among adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the Association for Biblical Higher Education.

In 2015, 132 colleges and universities affiliated with the Association for Biblical Higher Education served a total of 37,326 students in the United States plus additional students at institutions in Canada. The average headcount of ABHE institutions in 2015 was 397 students
including both undergraduate and graduate levels. Institutions progress through three levels of affiliation which are applicant, candidate, and affiliated institutions; as of 2016, 24 were applicant institutions, 14 were candidate institutions, and 94 were accredited institutions. According to the 2015 ABHE Annual Statistical Report, ABHE institutions were located in 37 of the 50 states. The two largest institutions accredited by the ABHE are Ohio Christian University with 4290 students and Moody Bible Institute with 3907 students. The two smallest institutions accredited by the ABHE are Horizon University with 29 students and Family of Faith College with 18 students. The mean number of full-time faculty was 18 and the mean number of part-time faculty was 43 at all ABHE institutions. All faculty must make a profession of faith, and they must teach courses from a biblical worldview (Association for Biblical Higher Education, 2015). These colleges and universities appeal to students and families who do not desire the large secular community college or university setting for a variety of reasons, including their relatively small size, faculty who are Christians, the ability to double major in Bible and another major program, and emphasis on programs in the areas of service and ministry.

It is vitally important to study adjunct faculty who teach at Bible colleges and universities. Although adjunct faculty are a complex group, patterns of similarity and indications of variation are observable. Adjunct faculty are the majority group of instructors at ABHE institutions; they assumedly have some level of religious commitment since employment at ABHE institutions is contingent on a profession of faith and agreement with the institution’s doctrinal statement, unless an exception is approved. Adjunct faculty at Bible colleges are likely experiencing challenges similar to their counterparts at secular institutions, but empirical evidence is not yet available to support this assumption. In addition, strong organizational sense
of belonging and affective organizational commitment are linked to positive work behaviors such as loyalty, longevity, low absenteeism, adherence, and job performance which are all important characteristics for adjunct faculty (Merriman, 2010; Mowday, et al., 1982).

**Adjunct Faculty**

Half of all faculty in the United States higher education system are part-time employees, often called adjunct faculty, who work for low wages, limited contracts, and no benefits (Kezar, 2013). Adjunct faculty must meet minimum credential requirements for accreditation, yet their salaries are not commensurate with their qualifications (American Association of University Professors, 2015; Eckert & Williams, 1972; Rodgers, 2010). Furthermore, research shows that adjunct faculty at community colleges and research universities often lack organizational sense of belonging (OSB) and affective organizational commitment (AOC) which can affect their job performance as well as their job satisfaction (Nichols, 2012; Quinn, 2005; Smith, 2010).

Gappa and Leslie (1993) conducted a formative study and discovered that institutions began relying on adjunct faculty as a temporary solution to variations in student enrollment, but came to rely on the employment of adjunct faculty as a more permanent practice to save money on instructional costs and to provide for more flexible scheduling. Not only has the tendency toward the use of adjunct faculty not reversed, it has intensified. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2015), the percentage of adjunct faculty at all types of colleges and universities increased from 40 percent in 1993 to 49 percent in 2013; the number of part-time faculty increased by 104 percent while the number of full-time faculty only increased by 45 percent in that time period. As of 2013, the proportion of part-time faculty exceeded that of full-time faculty 51 percent to 49 percent. These dramatic statistics indicate a need to focus on what
is now the majority, adjunct faculty in higher education. This trend towards a majority adjunct faculty is consistent across secular institutions and religiously-affiliated institutions.

For decades, researchers have focused on different aspects of adjunct faculty in higher education including job performance (Jacoby; 2006; Jaeger & Eagan, 2011; Johnson, Pitts, & Kamery, 2006; Kirk & Spector, 2009; Smith, 2010), job satisfaction (Ambrose, 2005; Antony & Valdez, 2002; Herbst, 1994; Hudson, 2013; Leslie & Gappa, 2002; Maynard & Joseph, 2008), organizational sense of belonging (Hudson, 2013; Merriman, 2010; Quinn, 2005), and organizational commitment (Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002; Merriman, 2010; Schroder, 2008; Taylor, 2005). The results are mixed, but mostly negative, suggesting that adjunct faculty are less effective (Jacoby; 2006; Jaeger & Eagan, 2011; Johnson, Pitts, & Kamery, 2006; Kirk & Spector, 2009; Smith, 2010) and less satisfied (Ambrose, Huston & Norman, 2005; Hudson, 2013; Maynard & Joseph, 2008) than their full-time counterparts. In addition, adjunct faculty generally have weaker organizational sense of belonging (Hudson, 2013; Merriman, 2010; Quinn, 2005) and weaker organizational commitment (Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002; Merriman, 2010; Schroder, 2008; Taylor, 2005).

Influences on Adjunct Faculty

Variables of interest in studies concerning faculty, both part-time and full-time, have historically included typology, teaching modality, academic division, race, years at institution and gender. A typology developed by Leslie and Gappa (1993) was used for classification of adjunct faculty into categories based on the circumstances surrounding their employment as adjunct faculty (Hudson, 2013; Merriman, 2010). The four categories are Career-enders, Specialists or Experts, Aspiring Academics, and Freelancers; each has its own unique
characteristics depending on the credentials and career aspirations of the adjunct faculty which influences their attitudes (Gappa & Leslie, 2003; Leslie & Gappa, 1993).

Teaching modality refers to whether faculty teach predominantly online, face to face, or in both modalities (Betts, 2009; Dolan, 2011). With the rise of online education, teaching modality has been a focus of recent research since it has been found to influence adjunct faculty. For example, both Betts (2009) and Dolan (2011) found that online programs have a large proportion of adjunct faculty, and those who teach predominantly online feel even more isolated than adjunct faculty who teach predominantly on campus. Teaching modality influences adjunct faculty because of their interaction, or lack of interaction, with administration, colleagues and students.

An academic division is a community of colleagues who are connected by an academic discipline or similar disciplines, and are and influential unit within the academy. Their common discipline-specific interests lead to greater collegiality (Alleman, 2012; Taylor, 2005). Gender is commonly used as an independent variable when researching faculty because it has been found to be predictive of specific dependent variables regarding teaching, mentoring, and advising (Hudson, 2013; Quinn, 2005; Taylor, 2005). Longevity or number of years at the institution is found to be directly related to institutional commitment (Taylor, 2005; Quinn, 2005; Merriman, 2010; Hudson, 2013).

Religious commitment (RC) and denominational affiliation (DA) are seldom used as independent variables in research on adjunct faculty, but are of particular interest in this research since many Bible colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE are affiliated with specific churches or denominations. Religious commitment is defined by Worthington (1988) as “the
importance of religion to a religious person” (p. 68) and by Worthington, et al. (2003) as “the degree to which a person adheres to his or her religious values, beliefs, and practices and uses them in daily living” (p. 85). According to Worthington (2003) religious commitment, which was used as an independent variable for this research, is comprised of several key components including the way religious beliefs affect one’s approach to life, time commitments, decisions, activities, affiliations, and financial contributions. Denominational affiliation refers to when faculty attend a church in the same denomination as the college’s religious affiliation (Alleman, 2012). In other words, the faculty member shares the same theological perspectives as the group of churches with which the college is connected.

**Organizational Sense of Belonging and Organizational Commitment of Adjunct Faculty**

One way to look at adjunct faculty is through the lenses of organizational sense of belonging and organizational commitment. Organizational sense of belonging and affective organizational commitment are constructs that have been operationalized in various contexts including healthcare (Hammell, 2014; Mohamed, Newton & McKenna, 2014), industry (Chovwen, 2012), business (Gatling, Kim, & Milliman, 2010; Sheng, 2014), and church congregations (Dougherty & Whitehead, 2011; Ghorpade, Lackritz, & Moore, 2011; Lim & Putnam, 2010; Porter & Emerson, 2013; Putnam & Campbell, 2010; Stroope, 2011; Stroope & Baker, 2014). In addition, part-time and full-time faculty have been studied in educational contexts including a liberal arts college (Quinn, 2006), a Christian college (Taylor, 2005), a Christian university (Schroder, 2008) and public research universities (Hudson, 2013; Merriman, 2010).
Several authors’ definitions were considered before deciding on the most relevant and appropriate definitions of organizational belongingness and affective organizational commitment for the purposes of this research. Merriman (2010) describes organizational belongingness as “the extent to which individual members of the organization are included in (or consider themselves to be included in) opportunities available to all members of the organization” (p. 32-33) which was similar to the definitions used by Baumeister and Leary (1995) and Quinn (2005) in their research on belongingness. Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) generally define organizational commitment as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (p. 226) but this definition was insufficient because it did not capture the psychological well-being that is important for employees in the workplace. Later, Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, and Topolnytsky (2002) specifically defined affective organizational commitment as “denoting an emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization” (p. 21) which is the definition that was used for the purposes of this research because of the emotional element that is also part of one’s sense of belonging. The need to belong, although an emotional need, is almost as powerful as the need for food and shelter, and is critical to healthy human development (Baumeister and Leary, 1995; Maslow, 1962).

**Biblical Higher Education**

Institutions accredited by the Association for Biblical Higher Education are characterized by a shared commitment to a biblical education, the requirement of 30 credits of Bible and Theology in addition to another major, compliance with rigorous standards and essential elements, belief in the ABHE Tenets of Faith, resolve to teaching Christian worldview, and
adherence to the core values of the ABHE which include spiritual engagement and uncompromising integrity. Furthermore, Standard 9 specifically relates to the credentials and welfare of faculty, requiring evidence of a spiritually mature faculty. More than 200 institutions in the United States and Canada are either accredited by or affiliated with the ABHE and all have a mission related to biblical values and Christian worldview (ABHE, 2015). Because of these institutional qualities and values based on shared tenets of faith, one would expect adjunct faculty who teach at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE to have a high level of organizational sense of belonging and organizational commitment as a result of their religious commitment which might be stronger when they are further connected by their denominational affiliation. Variables such as religious commitment and denominational affiliation might mitigate the negative effects of adjunct faculty status. One would expect adjunct faculty at faith-based institutions to experience weaker organizational sense of belonging and organizational commitment than full-time faculty, similar to their adjunct counterparts at secular institutions.

The research on adjunct faculty at religiously-affiliated colleges and universities is very limited, and has focused on a sense of calling to their occupation and institution (Livingston, 2011) rather than on OSB and AOC. This study extended the research into the areas of RC, DA, OSB and AOC.

**RC, DA, OSB, and AOC of Members in Church Congregations**

The importance of one’s sense of belonging and affective commitment not only applies to workplaces such as colleges and universities, but also to church congregations. Empirical evidence suggests that sense of belonging and organizational commitment are important to individual members and to congregations as a whole. In fact, research suggests that the social
aspect of church has a greater effect on one’s well-being than the religious aspect; having relationships and friends at church is linked to greater sense of belonging in and commitment to the congregation (Lim & Putnam, 2010; Porter & Emerson, 2013; Putnam & Campbell, 2010). Moreover, theological unity or denominational affiliation positively affects sense of belonging (Dougherty & Whitehead, 2011; Stroope, 2011; Stroope & Baker, 2014) and commitment (Ghorpade, Lackritz & Moore, 2011; Vandenberghe, 2011).

**Significance of this Research**

I hypothesize that the shared faith, as measured by religious commitment, of adjunct faculty with the institution and the other faculty would result in a greater organizational sense of belonging and affective organizational commitment at schools accredited by the ABHE. Research has not been conducted to determine whether religious commitment or denominational affiliation influences organizational sense of belonging and commitment in Bible colleges and universities where adjunct faculty have a shared faith with their colleagues. Because of the relatively large number of religiously-affiliated institutions, the percentage of adjunct faculty employed, and the number of students attending, studying this segment of higher education is valuable and has the potential to inform the broader field of higher education with deeper understanding of adjunct faculty.

Given the pivotal role of faculty in higher education and the fact that full-time faculty are now in the minority in both secular and faith-based higher education, it is of critical importance to understand adjunct faculty. Considering the already strong empirical evidence that suggests employees who have a stronger sense of belonging and organizational commitment have greater job satisfaction and better job performance, the results of this study have the potential to inform
the decisions and actions of administrators in higher education who provide leadership for adjunct faculty. Greater understanding of the psycho-social constructs of organizational sense of belonging and affective organizational commitment is beneficial, particularly the extent to which these are influenced by religious commitment, denominational affiliation and other characteristics. Research on adjunct faculty at Bible colleges and universities is nonexistent in the literature, yet of critical importance for the health of the institutions as well as for the health of the individuals who teach there.

Conceptual Framework Explanation

Multiple variables influence whether adjunct faculty have a strong or weak organizational sense of belonging or affective organizational commitment. Variables including typology, teaching modality, academic division, race, years at institution, and gender are commonly part of the demographics considered when studying adjunct faculty. The primary focus of this study was on the two independent variables, religious commitment and denominational affiliation, which have not yet been considered as they relate to or predict OSB and AOC. The conceptual model guiding this study is illustrated in Figure 1.

The proposed relationships are depicted in the model by the directionality and boldness of the arrows. I expected that the effects of demographic variables would be consistent with previous findings from the literature on part-time and full-time faculty, as described in Chapter 2.

The two variables of particular interest in this study were RC and DA. I expected to find that RC and DA would influence the outcome variables, OSB and AOC. Furthermore, I expected to find that a specific combination of characteristics and independent variables would best predict the dependent variables.
Figure 1 Conceptual Framework
Purpose Statement and Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to investigate whether denominational affiliation (DA) and religious commitment (RC) influence organizational sense of belonging (OSB) and affective organizational commitment (AOC) among adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the Association for Biblical Higher Education (ABHE). The research questions and hypotheses for this study are as follows:

1. What is the distribution of denominational affiliation, typology, teaching modality, academic division, race, years at institution, and gender among adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE?

2. What is the level of RC, OSB, and AOC among adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE?

3. To what extent do RC, DA, and other commonly studied characteristics of adjunct faculty influence OSB of adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE?

   H₁ RC influences OSB and AOC.
   H₂ DA influences OSB and AOC.
   H₃ Typology influences OSB and AOC.
   H₄ Teaching modality influences OSB and AOC.
   H₅ Academic division influences OSB and AOC.
   H₆ Number of years at the institution influences OSB and AOC.
   H₇ Gender influences OSB and AOC.
   H₈ OSB influences AOC.
4. What combination of characteristics and independent variables best predicts OSB of adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE?

   H₁ RC predicts OSB.
   H₂ DA predicts OSB.
   H₃ Teaching modality predicts OSB.
   H₄ RC, DA, typology, teaching modality and academic division best predict OSB.
   H₅ OSB predicts AOC.

5. To what extent do OSB and AOC vary by institution?

   Methods Overview

   This study used a quantitative survey method, since all of the salient constructs being examined have been operationalized in validated surveys (OSB and AOC Subtests of Survey of Workplace Relationships by Merriman, 2010, and Religious Commitment Inventory-10 by Worthington, et al. 2003, and Typology by Gappa and Leslie, 1993) to determine an OSB Score, AOC Score, RC Score, and Typology. Data were collected by implementing an online survey administered through the Provost or other gatekeepers at selected ABHE institutions. These scores were used to evaluate differences in OSB and AOC of adjunct faculty, to determine what relationships, if any, exist between variables, and to develop a predictive model. The dependent variables considered in this study included OSB and AOC and the independent variables included typology, teaching modality, academic division, race, years at the institution and gender with the key independent variables being religious commitment and denominational affiliation.
Summary

Previous research shows that the new majority of faculty in secular and faith-based institutions is adjunct faculty who may have poor job performance and low job satisfaction while lacking organizational sense of belonging and affective organizational commitment. Denominational affiliation and religious commitment might mitigate these effects, but no research has pursued this set of questions until now. This quantitative research used validated instruments capturing RC, OSB, and AOC to explore the impact of denominational affiliation and religious commitment on organizational sense of belonging and affective organizational commitment among adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the Association for Biblical Higher Education.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

In colleges and universities, faculty are of utmost importance. However, over time, the number of full-time faculty has decreased while the number of adjunct faculty has increased in higher education (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015). Reasons for the shift toward using adjunct faculty, including scheduling flexibility, fluctuating enrollment, and budget constraints, have been cited as rationale for making these hiring decisions. Extensive research has been conducted on adjunct faculty job performance (Jacoby; 2006; Jaeger & Eagan, 2011; Johnson, Pitts, & Kamery, 2006; Kirk & Spector, 2009; Smith, 2010;), job satisfaction (Antony and Valdez, 2002; Ambrose, 2005; Herbst, 1994; Hudson, 2013; Leslie & Gappa, 2002; Maynard & Joseph, 2008), organizational sense of belonging (Hudson, 2013; Merriman, 2010; Quinn, 2005), and organizational commitment (Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002; Merriman, 2010; Schroder, 2008; Taylor, 2005). Most of this research has been conducted at community colleges and research universities. Because of the number of religiously-affiliated institutions in the United States and the increasing number of adjunct faculty at these institutions, it is important to consider the organizational sense of belonging and affective organizational commitment of adjunct faculty at ABHE accredited colleges and universities.

Historical Influences

Christian and Bible Institutions in the Context of American Higher Education

To place Christian institutions within the landscape of higher education in the United States, it is important to note that Bible schools emerged over 130 years ago as a movement separate from the denominationally affiliated colleges of the colonial period. The Bible Institute
Movement began in North America in response to the desire to train and educate evangelical missionaries. The Missionary Training Institute, later known as Nyack College, began in New York City in 1882 and Moody Bible Institute began in Chicago, Illinois in 1886. The Bible institute movement later became known as the Bible college movement.

According to the U.S. Department of Education (2015), there are over 4,000 degree-granting institutions of higher education in the United States. As of 2015, there are approximately 1000 Bible schools and colleges throughout Canada and the United States, but only 152 institutions are accredited by, or are in the process of seeking accreditation from, the ABHE, serving a total of 54,894 students (Association for Biblical Higher Education, 2015). Bible colleges and universities continue to be a vital segment of higher education and a preferred option for students and families who value a Bible-centered education. Biblical higher education has changed since the early years of the Bible college movement. While the early Bible institutes and colleges specifically trained laymen for missionary and vocational ministry, today’s Bible institutions offer a variety of specialized programs to prepare students for a variety of careers in both church and society.

The Association for Biblical Higher Education is recognized by the United States Department of Education as a “gatekeeper” accrediting agency. An increasing number of the ABHE members are dually accredited by a regional accredited association as well, further supporting the credibility of biblical institutions in the greater landscape of higher education. Institutions accredited by the Association for Biblical Higher Education are characterized by a shared commitment to a biblical postsecondary education. In order for institutions to qualify, they must document and demonstrate compliance with 22 Conditions of Eligibility, 11
Standards, and a total of 158 Essential Elements. To be accredited by or affiliated with the ABHE requires a commitment to a core of biblical and theological studies as well as general education requirements. Member institutions must also be committed to the ABHE Tenets of Faith, six beliefs based on truths found in the Bible (Association for Biblical Higher Education, 2015). ABHE institutions are required to provide documentation about the spiritual maturity, mentoring relationships, ministry involvement, community service, professional development, and scholarship of their faculty, including full time and adjunct faculty, for accreditation site visits. All faculty, including adjunct faculty, must teach course material from a biblical worldview. Adjunct faculty from Bible colleges and universities are expected to have some level of religious commitment since employment at ABHE institutions requires a profession of faith and most institutions require agreement with the institution’s doctrinal statement (ABHE, 2015). Exploring how these unique characteristics of adjunct faculty at biblical institutions provided valuable insights.

**History of Adjunct Faculty**

The role and importance of part-time faculty has deep roots in the history of American higher education. Throughout the history of higher education in the United States of America, those who have taught in colleges and universities have been referred to by a variety of titles. In Colonial times, they were called tutors and professors (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). Today, terms such as contingent faculty, part-time faculty, and adjuncts are most common, all indicating the tenuous nature of their employment relationship with institutions.

Cohen (2010) writes about how legislation has impacted the rise of adjunct faculty. The Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944, also called the GI Bill of Rights, changed the landscape
of higher education in America with regards to faculty. Greenberg (2004) describes the extent to which higher education continues to be affected more recently by identifying links between grants, scholarships and loans that increase access to higher education and the GI Bill of Rights. This increase in accessibility, affordability, and enrollment had an impact on the number of faculty needed to teach the crowded classes after the GI Bill was passed, thus the further perpetuation of the practice of employing adjunct faculty. The trend towards part-time faculty, which began early in American history, continues today.

Researchers have been studying adjunct faculty—how they impact institutions and how institutions impact them—for decades. In fact, in 1972, Eckert and Williams found an increase in education as well as an increase in teaching experience among adjuncts, yet no increase in wages or job security for them. When discussing more effective use of part-time faculty, Jacobs (1988) suggested that budgetary issues are permanent rather than transient which leaders in higher education continue to witness today. Ellison (2002) made specific recommendations for following best practices and improving working conditions for adjunct faculty in community colleges such as providing orientation, offering professional development opportunities, and implementing performance evaluations. The financial constraints experienced by institutions of higher education began long ago and continue today, resulting in the current situation in which part-time faculty are in the majority at virtually all types of institutions.

Adjunct faculty face challenges that their full-time counterparts do not. Part-time faculty are still exposed to limited office space and minimal secretarial support (Schroeder, 2005). Adjuncts are expected to “function in a vacuum, outside the collegiality of their peers while they are often blamed for poor quality teaching and declining retention rates” (Wallace, 2011). In
addition to these poor working conditions, adjuncts do not have access to resources at the national level that serve faculty. For example, it is difficult to estimate the salaries for part-time faculty since the salary data reported by the AAUP excludes part-timers, despite the fact that they make up approximately one-half of all college and university instructors (Rogers, 2010). Gappa and Leslie (1993), Leslie and Gappa (2002), and Kezar (2013), along with their colleagues, have been researching and advocating for adjunct faculty for many years. Higher education has a long way to go toward equity for part-time faculty who have chosen to teach in higher education. With the limited and decreasing number of full-time faculty positions now available, a career as a professor in higher education is often merely a series of adjunct faculty contracts at multiple institutions.

**Current Research on Adjunct Faculty**

Research shows that adjunct faculty bring a diversity of expertise, flexible availability, and cost savings benefits to the institutions. However, this practice of hiring adjunct faculty also has limitations and challenges including low quality job performance and wavering job satisfaction. The practice of hiring a disproportionate number of adjunct faculty as a way of saving on instructional costs has spurred conversations among higher education leaders resulting in an abundance of empirical evidence regarding the impact of a predominantly part-time workforce on student success (Jacoby, 2006; Jaeger & Eagan, 2011; 2008; Johnson, Pitts, & Kamery, 2006; Kirk & Spector, 2009; Smith, 2010) and on faculty job satisfaction (Ambrose, Huston, & Norman, 2005; Antony & Valdez, 2002; Herbst, 1994; Hudson, 2013; Leslie & Gappa, 2002; Maynard & Joseph, 2008).

**Job Performance**
Job performance in higher education can be measured in a variety of ways by looking at student success. Student achievement, retention, and graduation rates are often used as indicators to measure job performance for adjunct faculty. The majority of the empirical research on adjunct faculty job performance is negative, suggesting that adjunct faculty offer sub-par quality education when compared to their full-time faculty peers. Although Jacoby (2006), Jaeger and Eagen (2011), Johnson, Pitts, and Kamery (2006), Kirk and Spector (2009), and Smith (2010) all found that adjunct faculty negatively impact job performance indicators such as student retention, student achievement, and graduation rates, Nichols (2012) found that the variable of part-time or full-time employment status, along with the variables such as perceptions of organizational support, professional development, and participation in department decisions, could not be used to predict student retention of freshmen returning for their sophomore year in the community college faculty who were surveyed.

A great deal of quantitative research has been conducted, but very little qualitative data is available to explore why increased exposure to part-time faculty has a negative impact on student retention. Jacoby (2006) conducted a quantitative study and found that part-time faculty have a highly significant and negative impact upon community college students’ graduation rates. Jaeger and Eagen (2011) conducted a quantitative study using logistic regression methods at six institutions within a public system to determine the impact of contingent faculty on student outcomes, controlling for other variables, and found that freshmen were 10%-30% less likely to persist until sophomore year when taking more classes with part-time faculty than with full-time faculty. Johnson, Pitts, and Kamery (2006) compared the achievement of students in English composition courses while Kirk and Spector (2009) compared the achievement of students in
business accounting courses. Each study found that students taking classes from part-time faculty were less successful than students taught by full-time faculty as indicated by final grades in their English classes, and grades as well as retention of concepts from the first level of accounting to the next level of accounting courses.

Based on the debate in higher education over the impact part-time faculty has on student retention, Smith (2010) designed a multi-step research study using a quantitative, descriptive, ex post facto design to analyze whether a statistical correlation exists between the increase in part-time faculty and the decrease in student retention at an urban community college. Smith’s literature review illuminated the lack of research conducted to determine the link between part-time faculty and student retention; it suggested that part-time faculty spend less time instructing students outside of class, preparing for class, advising students, and attending professional development opportunities. The literature led Smith to his research hypotheses suggesting that these factors must negatively impact student retention. Smith’s study supports findings in his literature review. The final logistic regression analysis suggested that increased exposure to part-time faculty predicted the likelihood of decreased student retention of first-time full-time freshmen through sophomore year as well as persistence through graduation.

A quantitative study designed by Nichols (2012) addressed the impact part-time faculty hiring practices have on the retention rates in community colleges. Several factors including employment status, participation in department decisions, professional development, and faculty perceptions of organizational support were studied to determine the impact of each on student retention. From the study, Nichols found that employment status could not be used to predict student retention. A thorough comparison of the methods utilized by the previous researchers
does not reveal a weakness in Nichols’ research design, so no conclusion can be drawn as to why Nichols’ findings were different. Jacoby (2006) and Smith (2010) found evidence suggesting a negative impact of part-time status while Nichols (2012) did not find this relationship, even though each of these studies were all conducted in a community college setting. Perhaps the fact that adjunct faculty are not a monolithic group, and this research did not account for the differences among those faculty with part-time faculty status, could account for the difference in Nichols’ findings. Or perhaps the effects of confounding variables were not accounted for in order to parse out important relationships between variables.

**Job Satisfaction**

A link between job performance and job satisfaction has been studied in the literature. The research on job satisfaction of adjunct faculty is not unanimous. Ambrose, Huston, and Norman (2005), Maynard and Joseph (2008), and Hudson (2013) all found adjunct faculty to be generally dissatisfied with their jobs while Herbst (1994), Antony and Valdez (2002), and Leslie and Gappa (2002) all found adjunct faculty to be generally satisfied with their jobs.

Research suggests that some adjunct faculty are generally satisfied (Antony & Valdez, 2002; Herbst, 1994) while other adjunct faculty are generally dissatisfied (Ambrose, Huston & Norman, 2005; Hudson, 2013; Maynard & Joseph, 2008). Qualitative research conducted by Ambrose, Huston and Norman (2005) found that faculty who were interviewed at this particular university felt disconnected and unsupported by colleagues and the institution. Reasons given for their dissatisfaction included lack of collegiality, feedback and mentoring; ineffective department heads; and the flawed process of reappointment, promotion, and tenure. Maynard and Joseph (2008) and Herbst (1994) divided part-time faculty into two categories, voluntary and
involuntary adjuncts, rather than the four categories in Leslie and Gappa’s (1993) typology which includes Career Enders, Specialist, Expert, or Professional, Aspiring Academics, and Freelancers. The dependent or involuntary adjuncts were those who chose teaching as their primary occupation in hopes of becoming full-time. Maynard and Joseph found that the involuntary part-timers were the least satisfied group of faculty, but voluntary part-timers were as satisfied or more satisfied than full-timers, suggesting that preferred employment status is a more important indicator than employment status alone. Herbst interviewed adjunct faculty categorized as “dependents” because they chose to teach with the goal of securing a full-time faculty position, and found that those she interviewed were generally satisfied with their part-time status because of the intrinsic rewards; it allowed them time for teaching and for family which were the two things they most valued. Antony and Valdez (2002) studied faculty at two-year and four-year institutions and found that part-time faculty were more satisfied and less likely to leave than the full-time faculty. Leslie and Gappa (2002) also found part-time faculty to be generally satisfied with their community college teaching jobs, rating their autonomy and students’ enthusiasm for learning more favorably than full-time employees. Hudson (2013) surveyed non-tenure-track faculty within each of the categories defined by Leslie and Gappa, and found that job satisfaction varied from one category to another category.

While some patterns in the literature are apparent, the most common conclusion is that adjunct faculty are a complex group of employees and a great deal of variation is apparent in their responses to surveys and interview questions regarding job satisfaction. Adjunct faculty are not a monolithic group, but a heterogeneous group with individual preferences, attitudes, and opinions. Because adjunct faculty at ABHE accredited Bible colleges and universities have not
been studied, the characteristics, attitudes, and preferences of this specific group are unknown. Studying the demographics and workplace attitudes including organizational sense of belonging, affective organizational commitment, and religious commitment of this sample filled the gap in the literature and may help administrators and academic leaders at ABHE institutions better understand their adjunct faculty which makes up the majority of their faculty (Association of Biblical Higher Education, 2015).

Characteristics and Demographic Information in the Literature

Research on adjunct and full-time faculty often solicits basic demographic data including primary teaching modality, academic division, race, years at the institution, and gender. However, demographic data are most often used for the purposes of descriptive statistics such as distribution of females. Researchers do not use demographic data to explore inferential statistics such as the influence of specific characteristics on variables such as organizational sense of belonging and affective organizational commitment (Hudson 2013; Merriman, 2010; Quinn, 2005).

Teaching Modality

With the increasing number of institutions, including Bible colleges and universities, offering different course modalities including fully online classes, face to face classes, and hybrid, blended, or flipped classes, this is an important variable to consider; it is also important to differentiate adjunct faculty’s primary teaching modality in the analysis. Betts (2009) and Dolan (2011) found that OSB was even lower for adjunct faculty who teach predominantly online than for adjunct faculty who mostly teach face-to-face classes. Dolan’s qualitative study of 28 online adjunct faculty members found strong evidence of their need to collaborate with
colleagues, share best practices, be recognized as valuable, engage in professional development, and have more frequent communication from administration as a means of reducing their sense of isolation. Betts’ conceptual framework of Online Human Touch training and support has shown evidence of improved retention rates and satisfaction for faculty, trends which are important to impact in online teaching. Because of the importance of organizational sense of belonging and commitment, reducing isolation and providing support for adjunct faculty who teach in different modalities is of utmost importance.

**Academic Division**

Taylor (2005) found that, with regards to academic discipline, full-time faculty who taught in pre-professional fields had significantly higher satisfaction and organizational commitment than those in humanities, physical sciences, and social sciences. Hudson (2013), focusing on organizational sense of belonging rather than satisfaction and commitment, found that faculty in specific divisions such as pre-professionals have a greater sense of belonging than those who teach in other divisions such as humanities and social sciences. Alleman (2012), in studying faculty at Christian colleges, also found that faculty within academic divisions often develop collegial relationships due to their common interest in their content expertise, even when they are not affiliated with the institution’s religious denomination.

**Years at Institution**

When studying organizational sense of belonging and commitment of part-time and full-time faculty, Hudson (2013), Merriman (2010), and Schroder (2008) collected demographic information about the number of years participants were teaching at the institution. Hudson
found that non-tenure track faculty who taught for more than seven years, classified as Career-Enders, reported higher organizational sense of belonging than those who were newer to the institution. Merriman found that adjunct faculty who taught one to three years and more than nine years had higher sense of belonging than adjunct faculty in other categories. Schroder studied part-time and full-time contracted faculty and included longevity in the descriptive statistics. Brown and Sargeant (2007) studied full-time faculty, staff and administration at a Christian university and found that the longer employees worked there, the higher their reported organizational commitment. Since the literature has suggested a connection between length of time at the institution and constructs such as organizational sense of belonging and commitment, this characteristic is included.

**Gender**

Hudson (2013) found that female faculty members had weaker organizational sense of belonging than their male counterparts and that females were less satisfied than males in the areas of advancement opportunities, job security, and salary. Merriman (2010) and Schroder (2008) only used gender for demographic information. Taylor (2005), although not specifically researching adjunct faculty, found that commitment levels were significantly higher for characteristics including females and faculty over age 60. Awareness of potential gender difference among adjunct faculty is important and may provide academic leaders with valuable into increasing support and sensitivity toward adjunct faculty.

**Denominational Affiliation**

Limited research is available regarding denominational affiliation. Schroder’s (2008) research suggested that religion and commitment to their church influenced organizational
commitment and job satisfaction for lay Catholics in institutions affiliated with the Catholic Church and for Seventh-day Adventists in institutions affiliated with the Seventh-day Advent Church. Some colleges and universities in the ABHE are affiliated with specific churches while others are independent from denominational affiliation or non-denominational.

Alleman (2012) sought to explore how faculty members within the Christian denomination made sense of their inclusion and exclusion at the university. Faculty who are insiders because of their employment at the university, but outsiders because they are not from the same denominational affiliation as that of the university, described their experiences. Alleman analyzed existing qualitative data from a larger research project, a 35-year case study of an institution’s organizational culture change, for themes of inclusion and exclusion. Some indicators of insider status were faculty members’ strong connections within the denomination through family connections, familiar family names, strong chapel traditions, shared values, and distinctive theology. On the contrary, Alleman found that some faculty were members of what he called “the insider-outsider group.” They were insiders because they were Christian, but outsiders due to their non-affiliation with the institution’s dominant religio-cultural affiliation. This non-affiliation led to a lack of understanding of specific theological distinctives and traditions. Alleman also found that insider-outsider faculty navigated a complex and often contradictory environment, making sense of their experiences by describing specific times when they felt excluded at the institutional level as a result of their denominational non-affiliation, but felt included within their smaller academic departments. They told of times that they were subtly or explicitly reminded, by individual comments and institutional policies, that they were not truly part of the community as a result of their denominational non-affiliation. Some insider-outsider
faculty members were keenly aware that their professional opportunities were limited as a result of their marginal status; some chose to leave as a result of their marginalization, while others were at peace about staying, citing their relationships with the people as the main reason for not leaving. As the institution grew and diversified, insider-outsider faculty grew in number but remained in the minority, and students who were not from the institution’s denomination sought out faculty who were also not from the institution’s denomination. Denominational affiliation is a unique phenomenon that has not been studied within the context of higher education as it relates to organizational sense of belonging and commitment of adjunct faculty. Since many Bible colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE are affiliated with specific churches or denominations, this characteristic is of particular interest to this research.

**Typology**

In a seminal study that sought to understand who adjunct faculty were and what they seek in their work, Gappa and Leslie (1993) identified four categories of this highly varied group. Their typology of adjunct faculty continues to be relevant and widely used in current research. “Career Enders” include faculty who are retired or in transition from full-time careers to semi-retired, while teaching part time. “Specialist, Expert, or Professional” adjuncts have other full-time employment but are motivated to teach by their sense of professional commitment, community service, or personal satisfaction. “Aspiring Academics” often hold doctoral degrees or are working towards their terminal degree while teaching part time in hopes of securing a full-time faculty position. Gappa and Leslie found that they often work at multiple institutions simultaneously. “Freelancers” are part-time faculty who tend to be resourceful, experienced, and not interested in full-time positions. They often hold other positions and may or may not rely on
their teaching salaries as their primary source of income. Although there are variations within these four categories, these four types are most frequently used for categorizing part-time faculty, and was used for the purposes of this research. Typology is used to explore situations like the differential job satisfaction and sense of belonging among adjunct faculty with different motivations for and expectations of their teaching work (Hudson, 2013; Merriman, 2010).

**Research Findings on OSB, AOC, and RC in Higher Education**


**Organizational Sense of Belonging**

Maslow’s (1962) theory of motivation suggests that the need for food and shelter is the only human need stronger than the need to belong; people must belong to a group, including in the workplace, in order to experience healthy development. Baumeister and Leary (1995) defined OSB as a basic human need to feel connected to other people or entities that is satisfied through meaningful interactions with others, applied by Quinn (2005) to an organizational perspective. Furthermore, Merriman (2010) described organizational belongingness as “the extent to which individual members of the organization are included (or consider themselves to
be included) in opportunities available to all members of the organization” (p. 32-33) which is the definition to be used for this research.

Three key studies added to the empirical evidence on the topic of organizational belonging among faculty at secular colleges, all suggesting that OSB is weaker among adjunct faculty than full-time faculty. Quinn (2005) conducted mixed methods research involving analysis of data from a survey, interviews and review of archival records for a case study population of 77 adjuncts. Adjunct faculty were found to have positive organization-based self-esteem, yet weak sense of belonging due to isolation, and they were not included in or eligible for institutionally available funding for career development.

Merriman (2010) compared the survey results of 292 adjunct and full-time faculty at a public research university. By using the Survey of Workplace Relationships, individual OSB and AOC scores were obtained and then analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Results indicated that organizational sense of belonging of adjunct faculty is slightly weaker than that of full-time faculty. A statistically significant linear relationship was found between OSB and AOC, but contributing factors and causality of the relationships were unclear, suggesting a need for further research.

Hudson (2013) conducted a quantitative study to investigate the job satisfaction and organizational sense of belonging of non-tenure track faculty groups at a research university. The job satisfaction and OSB of the 194 respondents across the categories or typologies varied, further supporting previous findings that this is a complex group of faculty in need of additional research to better understand their experiences and work environments.
These three pivotal studies on adjunct faculty and organizational sense of belonging were conducted at secular colleges. They all found weaker OSB among adjunct faculty when compared to their full-time colleagues. The predictors of this lower OSB beyond faculty status, however, were unclear. Furthermore, these studies did not look at potentially mitigating variables that might raise or lower adjuncts’ sense of belonging.

**Organizational Commitment**

Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1982) studied organizational commitment in secular work organizations, developed the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire, and defined OC as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (p. 226). They list three related factors:

1. a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values;
2. a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and
3. a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization. (p. 226)

In addition, Mowday, Porter, and Steers delineated between organizational commitment manifested in actions and behaviors as well as organizational commitment manifested in attitudes and affective responses. Allen and Meyer (1990) distinguished between affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Moreover, they differentiated between the concepts of organizational commitment, which tends to be more stable over time, and job satisfaction, which tends to fluctuate more over time depending on more immediate reactions to work conditions such as pay and supervision. For this reason, although the research on job satisfaction is important to the understanding of adjunct faculty, AOC rather than job satisfaction was the focus of this research.
Johnsrud and Rosser (2002) examined faculty morale as an individual and collective attitude and found a relationship between morale, job performance, and organizational commitment to stay or intention to leave the institution. Furthermore, Johnsrud and Rosser’s research suggested that higher organizational commitment is related to better job performance. Because organizational commitment was found to predict job performance, this current research considered organizational commitment of adjunct faculty at Bible institutions. As previously discussed, research on the effectiveness of adjunct faculty has not been conclusive, so knowing the level of commitment of adjunct faculty might be helpful for administrators who seek to improve job performance of adjunct faculty.

**Religious Commitment**

All of the aforementioned research on organizational sense of belonging and commitment took place in secular colleges and universities, adding to the base of knowledge and understanding of organizational sense of belonging and commitment of faculty, both adjunct and full-time. Merriman’s (2010) research was designed to examine both organizational sense of belonging and organizational commitment of adjunct faculty, providing empirical evidence of the relationship between the two theories. Because this research was conducted at a secular institution, the next logical step is to study OSB and AOC at faith-based institutions to see if religious commitment leads to stronger OSB and AOC. The research by Taylor (2005) comes the closest and adds to this literature by conducting a study of organizational commitment of faculty, yet not specifically adjunct, at Christian colleges. Schroder, (2008) studied the relationship between job satisfaction and factors such as religious commitment of full-time and half-time faculty and administrators as predictors of organizational commitment at a Christian
university and found that OC is most strongly predicted by organizational policy, administration, work itself, and religious commitment. Alleman (2012) studied adjunct and full-time faculty at faith-based institutions, focusing not on OSB and OC due to employment status, but on sense of belonging of those identified through data analysis as having marginal status because they are not part of the college’s dominant religious affiliation. The results of this research led to the inclusion of denominational affiliation as one of the independent variables in this study. These studies each considered a unique perspective and population that had not been studied previously with regards to OSB or AOC.

**Concept of Calling**

Because limited research is available specifically on OSB or AOC of adjunct faculty in religiously-affiliated colleges, the larger field of study regarding religious commitment and faculty has been considered. One common theme in the literature is the importance of the concept of “calling.” Livingston (2011) found that award-winning faculty at Christian Colleges have a strong sense of calling and Swezey (2009) found that the strength of religious calling outweighs factors such as job satisfaction. The faculty in both Livingston’s and Swezey’s research described a certainty of their personal and professional responsibility to their service of teaching as more than a career, for it gives meaning to their life. Vandenberghe (2011) developed an integrative model that included important characteristics such as sense of calling, affective commitment, and job performance, proposing that by creating an environment conducive to workplace spirituality, leaders can help employees find meaning in their work and follow their calling, thus reducing employee turnover and increasing job performance, sense of belonging, and affective commitment.
The concept of calling is part of one’s religious belief that they are chosen by God for their specific work or purpose in life because of their giftedness in teaching and their gratification from teaching. Swezey (2009) further attributes sense of calling to passages in Scripture that give humankind a unique meaning, purpose, or task, also referred to as a calling or summons. Because employment at ABHE institutions is contingent upon religious commitment which includes their sense of calling to the teaching profession, adjunct faculty may be more committed to their college or university as a sense of commitment to their faith.

**Research Findings on DA, OSB, and AOC in Church Congregations**

Church attendees report a decline in denominational affiliation (Chaves & Anderson, 2014; Pew Research, 2012). The data shows a trend in the number of congregations with no denominational affiliation increasing from 18.2% to 23.5% and the attendees in congregations with no denominational affiliation increasing from 10.4% to 15.0% from 1998 to 2012 (Pew Research, 2012). Although identifying with specific traditional denominations is decreasing, the literature continues to support the concept that belief homogeneity or shared beliefs contribute to stronger organizational sense of belonging and organizational commitment in church congregations (Lim & Putnam, 2010; Porter & Emerson, 2013; Putnam & Campbell, 2010). These shared theological beliefs are not always labeled as denominational affiliation, but are often referred to as belief unity, theological unity or sacred canopy (Ghorpade, Lackritz, & Moore, 2011; Stroope, 2011), and ideological uniformity (Stroope & Baker, 2014) in the literature.

Researchers have studied denominational affiliation, organizational sense of belonging, and organizational commitment of attendees and members in church congregations. Ghorpade,
Lackritz, and Moore (2011) found that church participants reported greater sense of belonging under a “unified canopy of ideology” as well as greater affective commitment in congregations that were ideologically unified. Stroope and Baker (2014) analyzed the 2001 U.S. Congregational Life Survey and also found that ideological uniformity positively affects sense of belonging. On the other hand, Pirkey (2015) found that a sense of belonging or community is possible in groups where incongruous ideologies, disagreements, and conflicts exist.

Stroope (2011) analyzed data from U.S. Congregational Life Survey and found that the belief unity of church members, measured by degree of uniformity around Bible belief, positively impacts sense of belonging. Ghorpade, Lackritz, and Moore (2011) studied affective commitment to church congregations at the individual level, rather than at the denominational level, by distributing a questionnaire to individual members of three congregations. They found shared beliefs to be the strongest predictor of affective commitment in all three denominations studied. Stroope and Baker (2013) also used the 2001 U.S. Congregational Life Survey, but focused on the impact of organizational size, social networks, and ideological uniformity on sense of belonging. They found that structural factors such as congregational size and cultural factors such as ideology significantly affect belonging, and that ideological unity increases sense of belonging.

Dougherty and Whitehead (2011) sought to investigate the impact of small group involvement on affective commitment and sense of belonging in relation to congregational size. Examples of small groups, often called “cell groups,” include Sunday school classes, prayer groups, and discussion groups. Using data from the 2001 U.S. Congregational Life Survey and Central Texas Megachurch Survey, Dougherty and Whitehead found that involvement in small
groups within large congregations increased sense of belonging and commitment, and increased frequency of attendance and giving, as did longer tenure at the church. Leaders in higher education might learn from this by encouraging increased participation of adjunct faculty in smaller groups on campus such as committees, task forces, and divisional meetings.

Reviewing the literature related to the key variables including DA, OSB, and AOC of attendees in church congregations supports the significance of shared beliefs, organizational sense of belonging, and affective organizational commitment in higher education. These constructs are important in a variety of settings for the health of the individual as well as for the health of the organization, whether at work or at church.

**History of Instrumentation**

**Survey of Workplace Relationships**

The Survey of Workplace Relationships Scale (SWR) was developed by Merriman (2010) by combining the work/school subscale of the Revised Belongingness Scale (Somers, 1999) and the Affective Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Allen & Meyer, 1990). The resulting instrument yields an OSB score and an AOC score for each participant.

The Belongingness Scale (BES) was originally developed by Somers (1999) in response to what she found to be inadequate measures lacking specificity to her intended population. After much research, Somers determined that instruments measuring belongingness in use as of that date were insufficient for measuring what she intended to study. Previous instruments were developed for a variety of social contexts and for various target populations and age groups. Somers developed the BES in alignment with Baumeister and Leary’s (1995) theory of belongingness for adult men and women in four environments relevant to her study: family,
friends, work/school, and neighborhood. The original 140-item measure was revised when items were determined to be highly intercorrelated, thus redundant. The final version of the study, entitled “Scale of Interpersonal Relations” was the foundation for the OSB Subscale portion of the survey adapted by Merriman (2010) with permission from Somers. Merriman modified the survey only to make the language specific to the context in which it was to be used for her research which was for adjunct and full-time faculty in higher education. With these minor changes in verbiage, Merriman re-established validity of the revised scale through a pilot group.

The Affective Organizational Commitment Questionnaire was developed by Allen and Meyer (1990). The AOC Subscale was later developed by Meyer and Allen (1997) to isolate affective organizational commitment which is related to two valuable qualities of adjunct faculty: adherence to policy and job performance (Mowday et al., 1982; Merriman, 2010). Employees with strong AOC have a strong appreciation for and relationship with the institution and are motivated to work hard to positively impact the institution (Allen & Meyer).

**Religious Commitment Inventory**

The Religious Commitment Inventory – 10 (RCI-10) was developed by Worthington, et al. (2003). Having studied religion and spirituality in the context of psychology, Worthington’s (1988) model included religious commitment as the key variable, also referred to as *intrinsic religious motivation*. Previous instruments measured spirituality and religiosity, but had limitations including the length of the instrument and the population for intended use. Similar items from previous instruments were used as the foundation for the Religious Commitment Inventory, with particular attention to keeping it concise for use in counseling.
The RCI-10, based on Worthington’s (1988) theory of religious values, was modified from earlier versions including a 62-item, 20-item, and 17-item versions of the Religious Commitment Inventory. As the instrument was revised, validity and reliability was re-established. The RCI-10 was developed by Worthington, et al. (2003) to be used in research, counseling, and health psychology. Since this present research is studying religious commitment along with the psycho-social constructs of sense of belonging and organizational commitment, it is appropriate to use the RCI-10 which was derived from research in the field of psychology.

Summary

A review of the literature establishes the longstanding place of biblical higher education in the history of American higher education as well as the ongoing trend of hiring part-time adjunct faculty in lieu of full-time faculty. The findings in the literature review suggest that adjunct faculty are less effective and less satisfied, and they feel less connected and less committed. Previously vetted instruments, Survey of Workplace Relations (OSB and AOC Subscales) and RC-10, were utilized for the purpose of this study.
CHAPTER III
METHODS

Overview of Purpose and Research Questions

Research has provided insight into the importance of organizational sense of belonging and organizational commitment. Little is known about the influence of religious commitment or denominational affiliation on organizational sense of belonging and affective organizational commitment of adjunct faculty at institutions accredited by the ABHE. The research questions and hypotheses for this study are as follows:

1. What is the distribution of denominational affiliation, typology, teaching modality, academic division, race, years at institution, and gender among adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE?
2. What is the level of RC, OSB, and AOC among adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE?
3. To what extent do RC, DA, and other commonly studied characteristics of adjunct faculty influence OSB of adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE?

H1 RC influences OSB and AOC.
H2 DA influences OSB and AOC.
H3 Typology influences OSB and AOC.
H4 Teaching modality influences OSB and AOC
H5 Academic division influences OSB and AOC.
H6 Number of years at the institution influences OSB and AOC.
H7 Gender influences OSB and AOC.
H₈ OSB influences AOC.

4. What combination of characteristics and independent variables best predicts OSB of adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE?

   H₁ RC predicts OSB.
   H₂ DA predicts OSB.
   H₃ Teaching modality predicts OSB.
   H₄ RC, DA, typology, teaching modality and academic division best predict OSB.
   H₅ OSB predicts AOC.

5. To what extent do OSB and AOC vary by institution?

   These questions guided my desire to explore the relationships between these specific variables. Foss and Waters (2007) suggest that the research question “guides your research process, tells you what to look at and what to ignore…” (p. 36). Furthermore, Creswell (2013) encourages writers to use research questions to inform choices in research inquiry. My research questions directed the research process so that my literature review, and research design including data collection and data analysis, were all consistent and appropriate to answering my research questions and testing my hypotheses.

   **Research Design**

   This quantitative research study was designed to examine the extent to which the independent variables impact the dependent variables, organizational sense of belonging and affective organizational commitment. These constructs have been operationalized for quantitative examination, and at this point in the maturity of the research, it was appropriate to gather data from a large group of adjuncts who teach at Christian institutions using a quantitative
research design. The best means of gathering this type and quantity of data is a web-based survey (Field, 2013).

**Population, Sample and Sites**

Participants for this study were adjunct faculty who are teaching in colleges or universities with accreditation from the Association for Biblical Higher Education. A purposeful sampling strategy, criterion sampling, described by Gall, Gall and Borg (2007) was utilized. Only adjunct faculty who met these stated criteria were included in this research. By including adjunct faculty from Bible colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE, the assumption was made that the adjunct faculty member has some level of religious commitment since employment at ABHE institutions requires a profession of faith and most institutions require agreement with their doctrinal statements which may or may not be associated with a denominational affiliation (ABHE, 2015).

Although this study was informed by literature on the broader topics concerning psychosocial theories and adjunct faculty, only adjunct faculty from Bible colleges and universities were included. Adjunct faculty who met this criterion were invited to participate in this study via emailed attachment of the Informed Consent in Appendix D. I initially emailed the “gatekeepers” or academic leaders who had access to the adjunct faculty distribution lists to communicate the purpose and importance of my research, the research design, the timing of the survey, and how adjunct faculty could participate. The academic leaders were asked to forward a total of four emails to their faculty: initial invitation with survey link, reminder at halfway point, final reminder within 24 hours of the close of the survey, and letter of appreciation for participating along with instructions for voluntarily entering a drawing.
Instrumentation

Data was collected by way of an online survey of adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE. Since I sought to measure OSB, AOC, and RC, I used Merriman’s instrument Survey of Workplace Relationships (SWR) with OSB Subscale and AOC Subscale, along with Worthington’s RCI-10. Using these instruments without revision maintained previously established reliability and validity (Merriman, 2010; Worthington, et al., 2003).

Validity and Reliability of Religious Commitment Inventory-10

Validity and reliability of each instrument was established to determine the meaningfulness and usefulness of the inferences and was reported by the authors of each instrument. The reliability and validity of the RCI-10 was evaluated by several statistical methods including confirmatory factor analysis, principal-axis factor structure, internal consistency and subscale intercorrelations, three-week test-retest reliability, construct validity, discriminant validity, and criterion-related validity. Six studies were conducted to refine the RCI-17 to be shorter and more efficient while maintaining strong psychometric data. Sample sizes included a total of more than 1000 people including college students, Christian church-attending married adults, and undergraduates with various religious affiliations such as Buddhists, Muslims, Hindus, and nonreligious. According to Worthington, et al. (2003), the culmination of research on the process of revising from RCI-17 to RCI-10 indicates, “a relatively consistent story suggesting various types of validity of scores on the RCI-10 and its two subscales” (p. 94) with a high Cronbach’s alpha (α=.88). The validity evidence for the full-scale RCI-10 indicates this instrument can be used with confidence to measure religious commitment.
of adjunct faculty at Bible colleges and universities. Since Worthington, et al., found highly intercorrelated scales and limited evidence that scores on each of the subscales were valid, the authors do not advocate using the subscale scores separately. Therefore, I did not use the subscale scores, but the RC-10 scale in its entirety as recommended to measure an independent variable of this research, religious commitment.

**Validity and Reliability of Survey of Workplace Relations**

The Survey of Workplace Relations is divided into two subscales: The OSB Subscale by Somers (1999) and the AOC Subscale of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire developed by Meyer and Allen (1997). These subscales were appropriate since they measure the dependent variables of this research.

**Organizational Sense of Belonging Subscale.** The SWR was evaluated for reliability and validity (Merriman, 2010). Because the original OSB Subscale by Somers (1999) was revised slightly for context, Merriman yielded the suggestion of Creswell (2009) to reestablish validity and reliability. To address content validity of the OSB Subscale, Merriman provided a definition of OSB and asked 12 qualified raters with experience in research of organizational behavior constructs to assess the extent to which each item measures OSB. Responses for all items were “Significantly” or “Adequately” except for the one question about birthdays being personally acknowledged, but that question was not eliminated because of the agreement Merriman made with Somers to use the instrument in its entirety.

To address reliability, Merriman yielded the advice of Creswell (2009) to re-establish reliability during the data analysis phase. Merriman (2010) conducted an analysis of the OSB Subscale using a “split-half coefficient expressed as a Spearman-Brown corrected correlation...
and co-efficient alpha…The analyses yielded values indicating satisfactory reliability: 
Chronbach’s $\alpha = .95$; Spearman-Brown coefficient = .93” (p. 64).

**Affective Organizational Commitment Subscale.** My decision to use the AOC Subscale of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire developed by Meyer and Allen (1997) was soundly rooted in previous research which also isolated affective organizational commitment and used the AOC Subscale separately (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Merriman, 2010) because of its direct relationship to adherence to policy and job performance (Mowday et al, 1982; Merriman, 2010) which are valuable qualities of adjunct faculty. When AOC is strong, employees have a strong affinity towards the institution and are motivated to work towards the good of the institution. Allen and Meyer (1990) reported the internal consistency reliability score of $\alpha = .87$ for the AOC subscale of the OCQ. Furthermore, Merriman wrote, “As part of the data analysis process, co-efficient alpha was computed to estimate reliability of internal consistency for the AOC Subscale. The value, $\alpha = .88$, indicated satisfactory reliability” (p. 66).

**Typology of Adjunct Faculty**

Typology was developed by Gappa and Leslie in 1993 and remains widely used as the accepted standard of categorizing adjunct faculty. Participants were given the names of the four categories with a brief description of each. Career Enders are former full-time academics, retired, but desiring to teach. Specialists, Experts, or Professionals have primary full-time employment in their field of expertise. Aspiring Academics aspire to teach full time. Freelancers do not desire full-time employment. Faculty self-selected the typology with which they most closely associated. The standard language originally used by Gappa and Leslie (1993) was used for the purpose of self-selection of typology, trusting faculty’s ability to choose as
previously established. Merriman (2010) and Hudson (2013) set the precedence for this decision to utilize the original categories and language for current research on adjunct faculty.

**Demographic Survey Questions**

Finally, the survey instrument for this research included six questions to determine basic demographics with regards to denominational affiliation, typology, teaching modality, academic division, race, number of years at the institution, and gender, which were the independent variables for this study. For this research, the SWR, RCI-10, typology, and self-reported demographics were combined into a single 63-question online survey. This instrument was used to determine the extent to which the independent variables influenced and predicted the dependent variables.

**Variables**

The dependent variables, organizational sense of belonging and affective organizational commitment, were both continuous as determined by the scores from the Survey of Workplace Relationships Scale, OSB and AOC Subtests. One independent variable, religious commitment, was continuous as determined by the score from the RCI-10.

The remaining six independent variables, denominational affiliation, typology, teaching modality, academic division, years at institution and gender, were all categorical. Denominational affiliation was divided into three categories: 1) Yes, I am affiliated with the same religious denomination as that of the institution. 2) No, I am not affiliated with the same religious denomination as that of the institution. 3) I am not sure or I choose not to answer. Typology was divided into five categories of part-time faculty: 1) Career Enders; 2) Specialist, Expert, or Professional 3) Aspiring Academics; and 4) Freelancers 5) Other.
Teaching modality was divided into three categories: predominantly face-to-face courses, predominantly online courses, or both modalities.

For academic divisions, participants were given the following choices: 1) Bible, Theology, or Ministry; 2) Business; 3) Education; 4) General Education, Humanities, or Arts and Sciences; 5) Health Sciences; 6) Human Services or Social Sciences; 7) Physical Sciences; 8) Worship Arts, Music, or Fine Arts.

Categories for race were based on the new reporting categories used by Institute of Education Sciences (2015) for Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) reporting. Participants were asked to choose the race with which they most closely associate from the following categories: 1) Hispanic of any race; 2) American Indian or Alaska Native; 3) Asian; 4) Black or African American; 5) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander; 6) White or Caucasian; 7) 2 or more races; 8) Other.

Gender was divided into two categories: 1) Male and 2) Female.

Years at institution was divided into the following options: 1) This is my first year; 2) one to three years; 3) four to six years; 4) seven to nine years; 5) more than nine years.

Data Collection Procedures

Several factors were considered when deciding upon sound data collection procedures. Foss and Waters (2007) emphasize the importance of aligning research questions with the data. Therefore, the primary means of data collection was the online survey, using Western Michigan University’s Select Survey. The survey was piloted at an ABHE college, but the data was not included in the final study. The final survey was available for a three-week timeframe during the month of April which is often conducive to surveying faculty who teach in traditional fall and
spring semesters. This timeframe comes before the summer break which tends to be when the fewest students are taking classes online and on campus, and the fewest adjunct faculty are teaching classes.

Intentional steps were taken to increase the likelihood of a high response rate. After an initial email, I endeavored to make personal contact, either face to face or over the phone, with the gate-keeper (Dean, Vice President of Academics, Chief Academic Officer, or Provost) of the adjunct faculty email distribution list at Bible colleges and universities affiliated with or accredited by the ABHE. I communicated the essence of my research, the research questions I sought to answer, and my stated hypotheses. I invited each leader to seek clarification and ask questions about my research. I followed up with an email communication that was forwarded to the adjunct faculty of their respective ABHE institutions. I made a commitment to disseminate my aggregate results with their institution via email, webinar, conference, or in person as requested and logistically feasible.

**Pilot Study**

The survey was sent to adjunct faculty who teach at a college accredited by the ABHE. Two revisions were made based on feedback from the participants. Participants were asked to respond to three questions: 1) Did you have any trouble with the survey? 2) How long did the survey take to complete? 3) Did you find any questions confusing? If so, which questions?

As a result of the feedback, I fixed the formatting of the demographic question regarding typology. Participants reported that it was difficult to respond because they could not see the drop-down answer bar at the same time as the longer descriptions of the adjunct faculty
typology, making selection of the appropriate category difficult. This issue was fixed, as was one typographical error, prior to sending out the survey.

Participants all stated that the survey took 5-10 minutes to complete. Therefore, on the Informed Consent document, the stated time commitment was adjusted from a one-hour commitment to a ten-minute commitment. This was ethical based on the responses from the participants, and increased the likelihood that more adjunct faculty would participate in the survey.
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Statistical Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the distribution of denominational affiliation, typology, teaching modality, academic division, race, years at institution, and gender among adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE?</td>
<td>SRD, SWR</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution, Central Tendency, Standard Deviation, Chi-square Test, Cross Tabulation, Confirmatory Factor Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the level of RC, OSB, and AOC among adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE?</td>
<td>RC-10, SWR</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution, Standard Deviation, Chi-square Test, Cross Tabulation, T-test, Confirmatory Factor Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do RC, DA, and other commonly studied characteristics of adjunct faculty influence OSB and AOC, of adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE?</td>
<td>RC-10, SWR</td>
<td>ANOVA, Pearson Correlation, General Linear Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What combination of characteristics and independent variables best predict AOC of adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE?</td>
<td>SRD, SWR, RC-10</td>
<td>Simple Linear Regression, Multiple Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do OSB and AOC vary by institution?</td>
<td>SRD, SWR</td>
<td>Hierarchical Linear Modeling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SRD=Self-Report Demographics, SWR=Survey of Workplace Relation, RC-10=Religious Commitment-10

**Data Analysis Procedures**

Descriptive statistics were used to determine the degree of religious commitment, organizational sense of belonging, and affective organizational commitment, as well as other variables including denominational affiliation, typology, teaching modality, academic division, race, number of years at the institution, and gender. Inferential statistical procedures including Simple Linear Regression, Multiple Regression, and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were utilized to determine the extent to which the dependent variables are influenced by the
independent variables. Table 1 includes the research questions, variables, hypotheses, instruments, and statistical procedures. IBM SPSS Statistical Version 22.0 was used to run all descriptive and inferential statistics, and the information was represented in meaningful ways including tables and figures as appropriate.

To determine the distribution of the categorical characteristics such as denominational affiliation, typology, teaching modality, academic division, years at institution, race, and gender, frequency distribution was conducted. The frequency distribution determined skewness and kurtosis from the normal distribution. Skewness or deviation from perfect symmetry and kurtosis or peakedness, showed how the data was shaped and where the data was clustered (Field, 2013; George & Mallery, 2012; Lomax & Hahs-Vaughn, 2012). Central tendency determined mode, median and mean, and dispersion of distribution determined range, quartiles, percentiles and standard deviation (Field, 2013). Standard deviation measures where scores deviate from the mean, or where the bulk of information and the outliers are on the bell curve (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2007; George & Mallery, 2012). Chi-square test is the appropriate test to compare categorical data (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007; George & Mallery, 2012). Cross tabulation analysis or contingency table analysis was used because it is the appropriate procedure to see how the categorical variables relate to each other (George & Mallery, 2012; Lomax & Hahs-Vaughn, 2012). Confirmatory factor analysis is the appropriate procedure to see how the data behaves (Lomax & Hahs-Vaughn, 2012).

To determine the level of RC, OSB, and AOC, frequency distribution, cross tabulation analysis, and confirmatory factor analyses, as described above, was conducted to analyze the
data. T-tests was used to compare the means of RC, OSB, and AOC (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007; George & Mallery, 2012).

To determine the extent to which RC, DA and other characteristics of adjunct faculty influence OSB and AOC of adjunct faculty, I ran several statistical procedures. To determine what combination of characteristics and independent variables best predicted OSB and AOC of adjunct faculty in the sample, I ran simple linear regression and multiple regression. Multiple regression was used to build a model that best predicted OSB and AOC. Multiple regression was helpful for determining how strong the relationships were between the dependent variables and a number of independent variables (George & Mallery, 2012; Lomax & Hahs-Vaughn).

To determine the extent to which OSB and AOC scores varied by institution, I intended to utilize Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM) to consider two levels, individual and institutional, and because the data was nested, HLM would have been the appropriate statistical technique to analyze this relationship between the predictor and levels (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2007; Lomax & Hahs-Vaughn). However, as discussed in Chapter 4, HLM was not possible due to the number of respondents.

**Delimitations and Limitations**

Marshall and Rossman (2011) define delimitations as boundaries of what the study is and is not. This study examined the extent to which religious commitment, denominational affiliation, typology, academic division, race, number of years at the institution, and gender, influence and predict organizational sense of belonging and affective organizational commitment of adjunct faculty at Bible colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE. Delimitations of this study include the choices I made as the researcher that prevented generalizability of my
results. Because I sought to study adjunct faculty, full-time faculty were not included. While it would have been of interest to the broader field of higher education, I chose not to include adjunct faculty who teach at community colleges or research institutions. Although these choices delimited the generalizability of my results to those populations of full-time faculty and adjunct faculty at secular colleges and universities, the focus on this specific population strengthened the research and deepened the breadth of knowledge about this important segment of faculty, adjuncts at Bible colleges and universities. The most limiting factor was the fact that, because a quantitative design has been chosen, the richness of qualitative data was not realized.

Limitations are the result of the things beyond my control while designing my research (Creswell, 2009). Stratified random sampling was not possible because the senior academic leader was the gate-keeper for the distribution of the survey, so I relied on their willingness to distribute the survey to their adjunct faculty. Because the potential existed for a non-representative sample, there may have been bias in the survey responses. Therefore, I cannot claim generalizability of my findings (Fields, 2013).

**Ethical Considerations**

With regards to ethical procedures, I gained approval from Western Michigan University’s Human Subjects Institutional Review Board and informed consent from all participants. Beyond ethical procedures during the planning, data collection, data analysis, data reporting, and publishing stages, I was sensitive to ethical issues involving people and relationships in my research, as emphasized by Marshall and Rossman (2011) in their discussion about respect for persons, beneficence, and justice. Several steps were taken to ensure the confidentiality of participants. The survey was accessed through Western Michigan University’s
Select Survey, and all survey responses were coded and stored on a password-protected laptop which was only accessed by me. Names were not linked to individual data at any time. If an individual had requested to be removed from the study, the request would have been honored immediately and no further email communication would have taken place, but no one requested to be removed. Participants had the opportunity to enter a drawing for a $100 Amazon gift card. This was communicated in advance, and a separate email was sent inviting participants to enter the drawing. Finally, results were shared in aggregate only and participants were not linked to specific institutions or scores.

**Summary**

This quantitative research design examined the extent to which the independent variables (religious commitment, denominational affiliation, typology, teaching modality, academic division, race, years at institution, and gender) impact the dependent variables (organizational sense of belonging and affective organizational commitment). A web-based survey comprised of Survey of Workplace Relations (OSB and AOC Subscales), RC-10, and Self-Reported Demographics was distributed to adjunct faculty at institutions accredited by the ABHE. Descriptive and inferential statistical procedures were utilized to answer my research questions and to test my hypotheses.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Previous research provided insight into the importance of organizational sense of belonging and organizational commitment. Little was known about the influence of religious commitment or denominational affiliation on organizational sense of belonging and organizational commitment of adjunct faculty at biblical institutions of higher education. The five research questions for this study were as follows:

1) What is the distribution of denominational affiliation, typology, teaching modality, academic division, years at institution, and gender among adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE?

2) What is the level of RC, OSB, and AOC among adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE?

3) To what extent do RC, denominational affiliation, typology, teaching modality, academic division, years at institution and gender influence OSB?

4) What combination of characteristics and independent variables best predicts OSB of adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE?

5) Do OSB and AOC vary by institution? This chapter presents the findings of the statistical analyses of the survey data pertaining to these research questions.

The survey entitled Adjunct Faculty Survey had three components: Survey of Workplace Relations (OSB and AOC sections), Religious Commitment Inventory-10, and Self-Reported Demographics. The survey was distributed online to ten academic leaders at colleges and universities in the United States accredited by the ABHE. The deans, provosts, and chief
academic officers of ten institutions were asked to send the Informed Consent and survey link and to forward subsequent emails to their adjunct faculty distribution list. Five institutions participated and five institutions did not participate for an institutional response rate of 50%. A total of 123 adjunct faculty members took the survey. Two reminders were sent via email and the survey remained open for three weeks. A final email was sent inviting participants to enter a drawing for $100 Amazon Gift Card. The winner was selected and notified via email.

**Missing Values in Data**

Missing values in the data set were carefully analyzed. Of the 123 participants, 6 had missing RC values, 9 had missing AOC values, and 39 had missing OSB values. I decided to delete the surveys for five of the respondents because they had missing data for more than 30% of the OSB survey questions. That left five missing AOC scores and four missing RC scores. Each of the respondents with missing RC or AOC values was only missing one response for one question, so the data was replaced using the series mean method (George & Mallery, 2012). A total of 118 surveys were kept in the final data set.

**Statistical Power**

I checked statistical power on Raosoft, Inc. (2004) which recommends a sample size of 64 for a population size of 1000 adjunct faculty in Bible colleges and universities, confidence level of 90% and margin of error of 10%. Although 5% is standard, my research could tolerate 10% margin of error. With 118 participants, my margin of error was 7.11% which is acceptable (Raosoft.com, 2004). Therefore, we can trust that the non-significant results in this research are truly not significant.
Reliability

Cronbach’s alpha is an acceptable and widely used measure of reliability (George & Mallery, 2012). The OSB score produced a high Cronbach’s alpha of .95 which indicates satisfactory reliability for the OSB scale. This is consistent with Merriman’s (2010) value for Cronbach’s alpha (α=.95) indicating satisfactory reliability. The AOC scale also produced a high Cronbach’s alpha of .85 which indicates satisfactory reliability for the AOC scale. This is similar to Merriman’s value for Cronbach’s alpha (α =.88) indicating satisfactory reliability. Finally, the RCI-10 scale produced a Cronbach’s alpha of .73 which indicates satisfactory reliability for the RC scale compared to Worthington’s (2003) value for Cronbach’s alpha (α=.88). Strong reliability of all three instruments indicates that these instruments will produce the same results each time they are administered to the same person in the same setting (George & Mallery). See Table 2 for measures of reliability.

Table 2

Reliability Analysis for OSB, AOC, and RC Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Characteristics of Participants

To answer the first research question “What is the distribution of denominational affiliation, typology, teaching modality, academic division, race, years at institution, and gender among adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE?” I ran frequency
distribution, cross tabulation, and Chi-square tests. The characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 3.

When asked if they taught in an institution that was affiliated with a specific denomination, an almost equal number of participants responded that their institution is not affiliated with a specific denomination (n=54, 44%) as those who responded that their institution is affiliated with a specific denomination (n=52, 42%), while a smaller number (n=13, 11%) were not sure. Similarly, an almost equal number (n=47, 38%) reported that they are not affiliated with the institution’s same religious denomination as those who responded that they are affiliated with the institution’s same religious denomination (n=48, 39%), and a small number (n=19, 15%) were not sure or chose not to answer.

Almost twice as many males (33% female and 61% male) participated in the survey. Regarding race, 68% (n=83) of participants self-identified as Caucasian, and 29% (n=36) of participants self-identified as a race other than Caucasian. Half of the adjunct faculty who responded taught in the academic division of Bible, Theology, or Ministry (50%) while the other half taught in other divisions. About half (52%) of the adjunct faculty who participated had been with the institution for four or more years. The survey was intentionally sent to institutions that offered both traditional and online education, so the sample had adjunct faculty who taught predominantly face-to-face (42%), predominantly online (30%), and both modalities (26%).

The results of the frequency analysis of adjunct faculty typology indicated that about one-third (36%) of the adjunct faculty self-identified with the Specialist, Expert, or Professional category, about one-quarter (25%) self-identified with the Aspiring Academic category. This is consistent with the distribution of the adjunct faculty participants in Merriman’s (2010) research,
with 31% in the Specialist, Expert, or Professional category and 27% in the Aspiring Academic category. See Table 3 for a complete report of demographic information.
Table 3

Demographics and Characteristics of Survey Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First year at institution</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 9 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic of any race</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more races</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible, Theology, Ministry</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education, Humanities, or Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Sciences or Social Sciences</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Academic Division</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly face-to-face</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly online</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both modalities</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ender</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist, Expert or Professional</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspiring Academic</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free-lancer</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, affiliated with institution’s denomination</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, not affiliated with institution’s denomination</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure or chose not to answer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n=118

For crosstabulation and Pearson’s Chi-square tests, categories were combined to reduce the likelihood of Type I and Type II errors (Field, 2013) since the number in each category was small. For example, race was recoded from eight into two categories: white and non-white,
academic division was recoded from eight into four categories: Bible, General Education, Social Sciences, and Other Academic Divisions, and number of years at the institution was recoded from five into two categories: three or fewer years and four or more years. Field suggests that reducing the number of categories improves the results. However, since the assumption of an expected frequency of at least five per cell was not met for typology and division, there is still a likelihood of a Type I error, although less likely than prior to reducing the categories for each variable.

Chi-square tests show whether there is a statistically significant association between two categorical variables (Field, 2013; George & Mallery, 2012). Table 4 shows the summary of Chi-square tests applied to denominational affiliation and Table 5 shows the summary of Chi-square tests applied to typology. It appears that an association exists between denominational affiliation and all characteristics, as indicated by P values that are statistically significant ($p<0.05$) with the exception of typology ($p=0.215$). A significant relationship exists between denominational affiliation and the following characteristics: teaching modality ($p<0.001$), academic division ($p<0.001$), race ($p<0.001$), years at institution ($p=0.01$), and gender ($p<0.001$) suggesting that it is unlikely these relationships would occur by chance in different samples.

There appears to be an association between typology and all other characteristics, as indicated by P values that are statistically significant ($p<0.05$) with the exception of gender ($p=0.068$) which approaches significance and falls within the .071 range for power. A significant relationship exists between typology and the following characteristics: teaching modality ($p<0.001$), academic division ($p<0.001$), race ($p<0.001$), and years at institution ($p=0.001$). Although significant Chi-square tests suggest a relationship, it does not prove causality.
Further crosstab and Chi-square exploration suggests that more males taught in the Bible, Theology, or Ministry division \((p=<0.001)\) while more females taught in the General Education division \((p=<0.001)\). There appears to be an association between denominational affiliation and academic division \((p=<0.001)\) and between the number of years at the institution and the teaching modality \((p=<0.001)\). In this sample, adjunct faculty who have been at the institution fewer years are more likely to teach predominantly online or through both face-to-face and online modalities while adjunct faculty who have taught longer are more likely to teach predominantly face-to-face. These results suggest that faculty in the Bible division have higher RC, and are more likely to be males and to teach predominantly face to face in this sample. General Education faculty are more likely to be females and have weaker RC in this sample.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Chi-square Tests Applied to Denominational Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct faculty typology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years at institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. \(n=118\), DF=degrees of freedom, \(^a\)=cells with expected count less than 5

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Chi-square Tests Applied to Adjunct Faculty Typology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denominational affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years at institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. \(n=118\), DF=degrees of freedom, \(^a\)=cells with expected count less than 5
Level of RC, OSB, and AOC

To answer the second research question “What is the level of RC, OSB, and AOC among adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE?” frequency distribution, t-tests, and standard deviation statistics were analyzed. An OSB score, AOC score, and RC score for each participant was calculated by summing the numerical values of responses on the OSB Subscale, AOC Subscale, and RCI-10 survey questions. The range of possible OSB scores was from 38 to 140. The range of possible AOC scores was from 8 to 56. The range of possible RCI-10 scores was from 10 to 50.

Frequency distribution indicated that skewness of OSB was fairly normal (-.21), AOC was slightly negatively skewed (-.64) and RC was moderately negatively skewed (-1.56) meaning that the bulk of the scores were at the high end of the distribution for both AOC and RC. As expected with a sample of adjunct faculty from Bible colleges and universities, the level of religious commitment was strong. More RC scores were in the higher end of the distribution with the most frequent score of 40 and a mean of 36 out of a possible score of 50 on the RCI-10. The distribution of scores for affective organizational commitment was slightly greater in the higher end with the most frequent score of 36 and a mean of 35 out of a possible score of 56 on the AOC subscale. The scores for organizational sense of belonging were clustered in the middle of the distribution with the most frequent score of 98 and a mean of 98 out of a possible score of 140 on the OSB subscale. Table 6 shows that the mean scores tend to be quite high (AOC=35/40, RC=36/50, OSB=98/140) and the standard deviation for RC was less varied (SD=3.85) than for OSB (SD=18.63) and AOC (SD=8.61). In other words, OSB scores were more varied than AOC and RC scores.
Using the general rule suggested by Lomax and Hahs-Vaughn (2012) that skewness and kurtosis should fall within an absolute value of 2.0, Kurtosis for OSB (.218) and AOC (-.140) have fairly normal distributions while RC (4.19) has a platykurtic distribution, or a relatively flat and broad peakedness.

Table 6

| Measures of Central Tendencies and Measures of Dispersion of RC, OSB, and AOC |
|-----------------|-------|------|-----|
| Variable        | Mean  | SD   | N   |
| RC              | 35.92 | 3.85 | 118 |
| OSB             | 97.58 | 18.63| 118 |
| AOC             | 34.68 | 8.61 | 118 |

Note. SD=standard deviation

Influences on OSB and AOC

To answer the third research question “To what extent do RC, denominational affiliation, typology, teaching modality, academic division, race, years at institution and gender influence OSB and AOC?” one-way ANOVA and Pearson Correlation were conducted. Table 7 shows the summary of one-way ANOVAs for OSB and AOC. The results suggested that DA significantly influences OSB (p=.04), but not AOC (p=.41). None of the other one-way ANOVAs were significant (p=>.05) for OSB as the outcome variable meaning that none of the characteristics or independent variables significantly influences OSB directly. The only significant finding for AOC as the outcome variable was OSB (p=.05) as the predictor. In other words, OSB significantly influences AOC, but none of the other independent variables or characteristics significantly influence AOC.

Out of curiosity, I ran one-way ANOVAs with RC as the outcome variable for Typology, Division, and DA; there were no significant findings (p=>.05) so no post hoc tests were
necessary. Because the mean for RC was so high and the standard deviation was so narrow for RC, it seems to not have a significant influence on OSB or AOC. In the context of Bible colleges and universities, the sample is too homogenized to show much differentiation of OSB and AOC scores. Therefore, there is no significant difference, and further analysis for RC yielded no interesting findings for RC as an independent variable. As one would expect, adjunct faculty in ABHE institutions have a strong religious commitment and this analysis confirmed that assumption.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>OSB</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>AOC</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n=118; Df=degrees of freedom within groups; F=F ratios; *p<0.05

To determine if there were any relationships between the independent and dependent variables, a Pearson correlation coefficient was computed using an alpha of .05. Table 8 shows the bivariate correlations between variables. A positive correlation was found between OSB and AOC ($r=.52$, $p<0.05$) meaning as OSB increases, AOC increases. Correlation indicates an association or relationship, but does not indicate causality (George & Mallery, 2012). No other significant correlations were found between the continuous variables.
I then computed a multivariate General Linear Model (GLM) analysis to determine whether RC, DA, and other variables influence OSB and AOC. GLM analysis indicated that DA significantly influences OSB ($p=.02$) but not AOC ($p=.43$). Faculty who are from the same denomination as their institution are more likely to report feeling a higher sense of belonging to the institution, but they are not necessarily more committed to the institution. However, the data from the one-way ANOVA suggests that higher OSB overall does lead to higher AOC. Therefore, although the results suggest that DA does not directly influence AOC, OSB appears to be a latent variable influencing AOC. According to results of general linear modeling, no other variables significantly predicted OSB or AOC.

A strong correlation ($p<.001$) between institutional DA and individual DA and a significant ANOVA ($p<.001$) led to the decision to create the new variable, DA interaction, which is the product of institutional DA and individual DA. For the remainder of the calculations, unless otherwise indicated, this new variable was used.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bivariate correlations between variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. OSB Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. RC Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. AOC Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  
**p < .01  
***p < .001
Predictive Models of OSB

To answer the fourth research question “What combination of characteristics and independent variables best predicts AOC of adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE?” simple linear regression and multiple regression analyses were conducted. Simple linear regression was calculated to see if Individual DA predicts OSB. The significant findings were as follows: Individual DA has a significant predictive value on OSB ($r=.25$, $p=.007$) but only explains 6% of the variance. In other words, adjunct faculty members who were affiliated with the same denomination as that of the institution were more likely to have a slightly stronger organizational sense of belonging than those who were not from the same denominational affiliation.

To determine the impact of OSB on AOC, I ran simple linear regression analysis. The significant results ($p<.001$) suggest that there is a linear path from OSB to AOC. In other words, OSB has a strong predictive value on AOC. Results indicated that 27% of AOC’s variance can be explained by the OSB scores. Faculty with strong OSB are more likely to have strong AOC. See Table 9.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Simple Linear Regression Analysis for AOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $SE=$standard error

To determine the impact of RC on OSB, I then ran linear regression analysis with OSB as the outcome variable. Results indicated RC does not have a significant impact on OSB. Finally,
I ran linear regression analysis to determine the impact of RC on AOC. Results indicated RC does not have a significant impact on AOC. See Tables 10 and 11.

Table 10

Summary of Simple Linear Regression Analysis for OSB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>75.20</td>
<td>16.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11

Summary of Simple Linear Regression Analysis for AOC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>23.16</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of multiple regression analysis for OSB can be found in Table 12. I used simultaneous regression which is described by Lomax and Hahs-Vaughn (2012) as a method of entering predictors such that all predictors to be used are selected a priori, in advance, and entered simultaneously. Teaching in the Bible Division (p=.04) and Denominational Affiliation (p=.05) were found to have significant predictive value for OSB. Faculty in the Bible Division and faculty who are from the same denominational affiliation are more likely to have greater sense of belonging. R-square value indicates that about 21% of variance for OSB is explained by the twelve predictor variables.
Table 12

**Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for OSB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>83.55</td>
<td>17.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-5.82</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible Division</td>
<td>-8.59</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Division</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face Teaching Modality</td>
<td>-4.16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Enders Typology</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>7.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Typology</td>
<td>-7.21</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspiring Academics Typology</td>
<td>-6.57</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freelancers Typology</td>
<td>-9.10</td>
<td>7.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Denominational</td>
<td>-5.71</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Commitment</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SE Standard Error

The next model included the two significant predictor variables from the initial model, Individual DA and Bible Division. R-square value indicates that about 9% of variance for OSB is explained by Individual DA and Bible Division with a weak significant relationship ($p=.006$, $r=23$) See Table 13 for multiple regression analysis summary.

Table 13

**Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for OSB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>102.47</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible Division</td>
<td>-4.39</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual DA</td>
<td>-1.98</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The final model was determined after systematically removing variables and calculating multiple regression for different combinations of variables. The final model included Individual DA, Freelancers Typology, Bible Division, Face to Face Teaching Modality, and Religious Commitment as the predictors. This model yielded the results shown in Table 14, indicating that 16.1% of the variance for OSB is explained by this combination of variables. \((p=.002, r=.38)\).

Table 14

*Final Multiple Regression Model for OSB*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\beta)</td>
<td>(SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>101.73</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual DA</td>
<td>-5.68</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible Division</td>
<td>-8.90</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freelancers Typology</td>
<td>-9.37</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face Teaching Modality</td>
<td>-4.80</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Commitment</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Effect on OSB and AOC**

The fifth and final research question is “To what extent do OSB and AOC vary by institution?” The goal was to obtain a minimum of ten survey responses from at least ten different institutions, but five of the institutions did not participate. Therefore, I was unable to do Hierarchical Linear Modeling. Instead, I recoded the Survey ID variable so that each individual institution was coded separately. Then I ran frequency distribution, correlation, Chi-square tests, crosstabs, and ANOVAs for each institution. Finally, I ran simple linear regressions for each institution.
Mean OSB and AOC scores as well as standard deviation for OSB and AOC for each institution are recorded on Table 15. Additionally, the combined mean OSB and AOC scores as well as standard deviation for OSB and AOC are recorded on the table for comparison. Because there were only two participants from institution ID 989, this institution was eliminated for future calculations. Institution ID 990 had the highest OSB and AOC while ID 987 had the lowest OSB and AOC.

Table 15

| Measures of Central Tendencies and Measures of Dispersion of OSB and AOC by Institution |
|---------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| ID 983 | ID 985 | ID 987 | ID 989 | ID 990 | Combined |
| OSB Mean | 99.48 | 94.12 | 92.86 | 100.80 | 102.67 | 97.58 |
| SD | 17.16 | 22.80 | 15.41 | 4.54 | 18.74 | 18.63 |
| N | 43 | 29 | 21 | 2 | 22 | 118 |
| AOC Mean | 35.11 | 35.76 | 30.22 | 36.34 | 36.52 | 34.68 |
| SD | 8.42 | 7.73 | 10.00 | 2.35 | 8.37 | 8.61 |
| N | 43 | 29 | 21 | 2 | 22 | 118 |

Note. ID=institutional identification, SD=standard deviation

Results of Chi-square tests applied by institution indicate that statistically significant P values exist for all variables except gender suggesting it is unlikely these relationships would exist by chance. See Table 16. Chi-square tests by institution were found to be statistically significant for teaching modality (p=<.001), academic division (p=<.002), years (p=<.001), race (p=<.001) individual DA (p=<.001) and institutional DA (p=<.001). The Chi-square test was not found to be statistically significant for gender (p=<.36) or typology (p=<.80). Each significant Chi-square test indicates an association or relationship between the variables, but not necessarily direction.
To better understand the context of these findings, I utilized the crosstabulations analysis and researched the denominational affiliation of institutions participating in this study. According to their websites, ID 983 is a university affiliated with the Wesleyan denomination. ID 985 is a university affiliated with the Baptist tradition. ID 987 is a university affiliated with the Pentecostal denomination. ID 990 is a non-denominational institution that teaches from a dispensational perspective rooted in Calvinistic tradition.

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual DA</td>
<td>52.24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional DA</td>
<td>60.87</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Modality</td>
<td>93.45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Division</td>
<td>30.56</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years at Institution</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>36.81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Typology</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. n=118, DF=degrees of freedom, \(^a\)=cells with expected count less than 5

To create a profile for each institution, I represented the results of the crosstabulations in Table 17. All four of the participating institutions had adjunct faculty who were predominantly male. Three of the institutions predominantly employed adjunct faculty who were White and the fourth institution predominantly employed adjunct faculty of color, as evidenced by the demographics of the respondents. All of the institutions had adjunct faculty who identified more closely with Aspiring Academics and Specialists than with Career Enders and Free-lancers. Three of the institutions had more respondents who taught in Bible, Theology or Ministry while the fourth institution had more respondents who taught in General Education Division.
Table 17

Demographics and Characteristics of Survey Participants by Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution ID Denominational Affiliation</th>
<th>ID 983 Wesleyan</th>
<th>ID 985 Baptist</th>
<th>ID 987 Pentecostal</th>
<th>ID 990 Non-DA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years or less</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years or more</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other than Caucasian</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible, Theology, Ministry</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Academic Division</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly face-to-face</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both modalities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ender</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist, Professional</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspiring Academic</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free-lancer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, institutional DA</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, institutional DA</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure of institutional DA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, same DA as institution</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, not same DA as institution</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure/chose not to answer</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n=118

Regarding denominational affiliation, Institution ID 983 is affiliated with the Wesleyan denomination, yet almost half of the respondents (43%) said the institution is not affiliated with a specific denomination and more than half (67%) said they are not from the same denomination.
as that of the institution. Institution ID 985 is affiliated with the Baptist tradition, and most of the respondents (86%) indicated that the institution is denominationally affiliated and most (86%) were a part of that denomination. Institution ID 987 is affiliated with the Pentecostal faith and had the lowest mean OSB and AOC scores; the majority of the respondents (86%) said the institution is denominationally affiliated, and almost half (48%) indicated that they are from that denomination. Finally, Institution ID 990 is non-denominational with dispensational Calvinistic theological beliefs; this institution had the highest OSB and AOC scores. Almost all (95%) responded that the institution is not affiliated with a specific denomination and almost half (45%) indicated that they are not from the same DA as the institution. It is possible that the respondents were considering non-denominational as a specific denominational category.

Results of simple linear regression analyses for OSB by each institution and for AOC by each institution suggest that although there are differences among institutions, these differences are not significantly predictive for the outcomes OSB and AOC. Summaries of simple linear regression analysis for each variable, OSB and AOC, can be found in Tables 18 and 19.

Table 18

Summary of Simple Linear Regression Analysis for OSB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>99.72</td>
<td>10.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional ID 983</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>11.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional ID 985</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>11.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional ID 987</td>
<td>-6.87</td>
<td>11.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional ID 990</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>11.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SE Standard Error
Table 19

Summary of Simple Linear Regression Analysis for AOC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>36.23</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional ID 983</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional ID 985</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional ID 987</td>
<td>-6.00</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional ID 990</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SE Standard Error

Summary

This study was conducted to assess the level of organizational sense of belonging and affective organizational commitment of adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE. The study also investigated the influence of specific characteristics on OSB and AOC, and evaluated which variables best predict OSB and AOC. Finally, this study sought to determine whether there is an institutional effect on OSB and AOC. Adjunct faculty are not a homogenous group of employees. In fact, they are as varied as the institutions that employ them. Adjunct faculty come to the profession from a variety of backgrounds and they teach for a variety of reasons in a variety of biblical institutions.

The data indicated that adjunct faculty at Bible colleges and universities are a complex group with distinct characteristics, yet they have a homogenously high level of religious commitment. Their organizational sense of belonging and affective organizational commitment tends to be strong. Results suggest that their individual denominational affiliation influences and predicts their organizational sense of belonging. Additionally, the findings demonstrate that
OSB influences and predicts AOC. Table 20 highlights a summary of the findings and conclusions for each research question and hypothesis.

Table 20

**Summary of Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) What is the distribution of denominational affiliation, typology, teaching</td>
<td>H1 RC influences OSB and AOC.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No, No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modality, academic division, race, years at institution, and gender among</td>
<td>H2 DA influences OSB and AOC.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes ((p = .04)), No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE?</td>
<td>H3 Typology influences OSB and AOC.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No, No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H4 Teaching modality influences OSB and AOC.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No, No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H5 Academic division influences OSB and AOC.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No, No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H6 Number of years at the institution influences OSB and AOC.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No, No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H7 Gender influences OSB and AOC.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No, No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H8 OSB influences AOC.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes ((p &lt; .05))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) What is the level of RC, OSB, and AOC among adjunct faculty at colleges and</td>
<td>RC mean score 35.92</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>universities accredited by the ABHE?</td>
<td>OSB mean score 97.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AOC mean score 34.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) To what extent do RC, DA, and other commonly studied characteristics of</td>
<td>H1 RC predicts OSB.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjunct faculty influence OSB and AOC of adjunct faculty at colleges and</td>
<td>H2 DA predicts OSB</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes ((p = .01))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>universities accredited by the ABHE?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE?</td>
<td>H₃ Teaching modality predicts OSB.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H₄ RC, DA, typology, teaching modality and academic division best predict OSB.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H₅ OSB predicts AOC.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes (p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) To what extent do OSB and AOC vary by institution?</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>OSB and AOC vary by institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Significance p< .05
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This study sought to answer the following questions:

1) What is the distribution of denominational affiliation, typology, teaching modality, academic division, years at institution, and gender among adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE?

2) What is the level of RC, OSB, and AOC among adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE?

3) To what extent do RC, denominational affiliation, typology, teaching modality, academic division, years at institution and gender influence OSB which in turn predicts AOC?

4) What combination of characteristics and independent variables best predicts AOC of adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE?

5) Do OSB and AOC vary by institution? This chapter presents the conclusions and recommendations of the statistical analyses of the survey data pertaining to the research questions.

Previous research, as discussed in Chapter 2, shows that adjunct faculty in secular and faith-based institution have poor job performance and low job satisfaction while lacking organizational sense of belonging and affective organizational commitment when compared to their full-time counterparts. Denominational affiliation and religious commitment might mitigate the effects of adjunct faculty status on OSB and AOC, but no research focused on these independent variables prior to this study. This quantitative research study used validated
instruments capturing characteristics, RC, OSB, and AOC to explore the impact of
denominational affiliation, religious commitment, and other variables on organizational sense of
belonging and affective organizational commitment among adjunct faculty at colleges and
universities accredited by the Association for Biblical Higher Education. The findings in the
literature review in Chapter 2 suggested that adjunct faculty are less effective and satisfied, and
they feel less connected and committed. To collect the data, a previously vetted survey
comprised of Survey of Workplace Relations (OSB and AOC Subscales), RC-10, and Self-
Reported Demographics was distributed online to adjunct faculty at institutions accredited by the
ABHE.

This quantitative research design examined the extent to which the independent variables
(religious commitment, denominational affiliation, typology, teaching modality, academic
division, race, years at institution and gender) influenced the dependent variables (organizational
sense of belonging and affective organizational commitment). I used descriptive statistics
including frequency distribution, Chi-square tests, and crosstabulation. I also utilized inferential
statistical procedures including simple linear regression and multiple regression to determine the
extent to which the dependent variables were influenced by the independent variables.

This study was conducted to determine the distribution of denominational affiliation,
typology, teaching modality, academic division, race, years at institution, and gender of the
participants and to assess the level of religious commitment, organizational sense of belonging
and affective organizational commitment of adjunct faculty at colleges and universities
accredited by the ABHE. The study also investigated the influence of specific characteristics on
OSB and AOC, and evaluated which variables best predict OSB and AOC. Finally, this study sought to determine whether there is an institutional effect on OSB and AOC for this sample.

**Significant Findings**

The results of this research suggest that adjunct faculty at Bible colleges and universities are a complex group. They come from diverse backgrounds and teach for a variety of reasons. Adjunct faculty at biblical institutions are a heterogeneous group of employees who have varying levels of OSB and AOC, but uniformly strong religious commitment. The adjunct faculty members at biblical institutions are diverse, as are the institutions where they teach.

Organizational sense of belonging and affective organizational commitment of adjunct faculty at Bible colleges and universities tend to be strong. Results suggest that their individual denominational affiliation influences and predicts their organizational sense of belonging. Furthermore, the findings demonstrate that OSB influences and predicts AOC. These findings revealed some inconsistencies with the previous literature regarding adjunct faculty at secular colleges and universities.

**Relationship of Results to Existing Studies**

When comparing my results to those of Merriman’s (2010), our findings had some similarities. Unfortunately, I was unable to compare my OSB scores for adjunct faculty with those of Merriman’s because, although the range for OSB scores on the OSB Subscale should fall between 38 and 140, some of Merriman’s scores were outside of that range so it was difficult to compare her OSB scores for adjunct faculty with the scores for my sample. Merriman expected to find that typology would have a greater influence on OSB based on previous
literature, but she found that only 5% of the variance for OSB was explained by adjunct faculty typology. Similarly, I found that a small percentage, less than 1% of the variance for OSB, was explained by adjunct faculty typology ($p=.849, r=.02$). In fact, none of the independent variables in my study had a significant influence on OSB or explained more than 1% of the variance for OSB when entered separately into the simple linear regression for OSB with the exception of Individual Denominational Affiliation which explained 6% of the variance and had a significant influence ($p=.007, r=.25$). Like Merriman’s results, my findings were inconsistent with what previous literature suggested would influence and predict OSB. This begs the question, if these independent variables are not significantly influencing OSB or explaining the variance, then what factors are influencing the OSB of adjunct faculty? Further research is necessary to explore the possibilities.

Schroder (2008), although using different instruments, found that religious commitment, work, organizational policy and administration, were significant predictors of organizational commitment of university faculty. Conversely, religious commitment was not a significant variable in my sample, so it was not part of the final predictive model in my study. Religious commitment was so uniformly high, there was not enough variability to make a statistically significant impact on OSB and AOC.

Hudson’s (2013), like Merriman’s (2010) and my research, found that the majority of the adjunct faculty self-identified as being part of the Specialist, Expert, or Professional category, or the Aspiring Academics category. Unlike Hudson, Merriman, Quinn, and Schroder who all found the majority of the faculty to be females, my sample was predominantly male. Perhaps this can be attributed to the fact that most ABHE Bible colleges hold to a patriarchal tradition, so
those who teach in the Bible, Theology and Ministry Division are predominantly males. More than half of the respondents to my survey taught in the Bible Division.

Unlike Betts (2009) and Dolan (2011) who both found online adjunct faculty to feel more isolated than adjunct faculty who teach predominantly on campus, my data did not find teaching modality to influence organizational sense of belonging or affective organizational commitment. All of the institutions in my sample offered both online and face-to-face courses, but teaching modality was not an influential or predictive factor. It is possible that my results regarding teaching modality differed from those of Betts and Dolan because my research study was conducted in comparatively small private institutions while both Betts and Dolan conducted their research studies in larger public university settings. According to the Association for Biblical Higher Education (2015) statistics, the average student count of the institutions in the sample for this study was 1,121 students, partly because one of the largest Bible colleges was included, while the average student count at public universities is significantly higher. Further research would provide greater insights into why teaching modality is significantly influential and predictive at public universities, but not at private Bible colleges. Better understanding the experience of adjunct faculty at Bible colleges and universities has the potential to help academic leaders create a sense of community for those faculty teaching online and on campus.

The findings in the research on RC, DA, OSB, and AOC of members in church congregations were supported by my research of these variables in biblical institutions. Lim and Putnam (2010), Porter and Emerson (2013), and Putnam and Cambell (2010) found a link between greater sense of belonging in and commitment to the church congregation. Similarly, I found a link between these constructs in the context of biblical higher education. In addition,
Dougherty and Whitehead (2011), Stroope, (2011), and Stroope and Baker (2014) all found that theological unity or denominational affiliation positively affects sense of belonging in churches while Ghorpade, Lackritz and Moore (2011) and Vandenberghe (2011) found that DA affects commitment to church congregations. These results were similar and were supported by the empirical evidence in my study which indicated that DA significantly influences and predicts OSB which significantly influences and predicts AOC in adjunct faculty in biblical colleges and universities.

After completing my research, I reviewed the literature to see if any related studies had been published recently. This search did not reveal any additional research had been done on the topics of organizational sense of belonging, affective organizational commitment, religious commitment, or denominational affiliation of adjunct faculty. Therefore, no new findings have been included here.

**Application for Academic Leaders**

Although my results were somewhat different from those found in previous literature, perhaps the greatest similarity is that adjunct faculty, whether they teach at secular or Bible colleges and universities, are not a monolithic group. Therefore, those in academic leadership roles should be aware of the uniqueness of each adjunct faculty member. In my opinion, relationship-building, communication, and intentionality are important components of effective leadership when working with adjunct faculty. Leaders must take time to get to know their individual adjunct faculty members, and not assume that they all have the same motivations and desires. Qualitative research would likely reveal some themes and insights into what issues influence their organizational sense of belonging and commitment. This quantitative research
study would inform the questions generated for subsequent qualitative research. For instance, a qualitative approach would allow for deeper exploration into how adjunct faculty make sense of their academic identity at Bible colleges and how their religious commitment and denominational affiliation fit into their professional commitments.

During the hiring process, it is vital that the leader, especially at a Bible college, has a forthright conversation with the prospective adjunct faculty member about the denominational affiliation of the institution and gives the interviewee the opportunity to explain their theological beliefs, ask questions, and seek clarification. This increases the likelihood that the employer and the employee would make an informed decision about the right fit. Since denominational affiliation influences sense of belonging which influences organizational commitment, this topic should be approached early in the process and should be part of ongoing conversations. Furthermore, better understanding of adjunct faculty sense of belonging and commitment, as well as denominational affiliation, has the potential to improve retention of quality adjunct faculty. While uniformity of thought is not essential to sense of belonging and commitment, on the contrary, in my opinion uniformity has the potential of diminishing the valuable richness of diversity, it is essential that a mutual respect and appreciation for diversity of thought is present. This diversity of thought and theology has the potential to promote critical thinking, questioning and reasoning, all critical components of academia.

As leaders make policy decisions about issues such as shared governance, professional development, curriculum, the evaluation process, and promotions, including their adjunct faculty in these processes and initiatives is of utmost importance. Inviting adjunct faculty members to participate on decision-making committees, such as the Faculty Senate, ensures that their voices
are considered. Previous literature, as discussed in Chapter 2, suggests that it is critical to consider policies that might exclude or isolate adjunct faculty. For example, providing adjunct faculty professional development and mentoring with regards to curriculum development enriches their opportunities to serve in this valuable area of faculty domain. Academic leaders must be mindful of the presence and importance of adjunct faculty, and provide leadership accordingly that intentionally fosters increased organizational sense of belonging and commitment. Although it can be a logistical challenge to include adjunct faculty who are not on campus during typical business hours, the act of inviting them to participate communicates their value. Adjunct faculty are certainly worth the investment of time and resources.

Since organizational belongingness of adjunct faculty influences organizational commitment, it is beneficial for institutions to create an environment where adjunct faculty feel valued and valuable. Academic leaders contribute to this environment. Their words and actions can create division or unity, belongingness or isolation. Gaining further understanding through additional research would be of benefit to the adjunct faculty members, to the academic leaders, to the students, and to the institutions. Although previous literature, as discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, suggests that adjunct faculty are generally less satisfied and less effective, and that they generally have weaker organizational sense of belonging and commitment, my findings suggest that this is not true of adjunct faculty who teach at Bible colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE.
New Conceptual Framework

My findings resulted in revisions to my initial conceptual framework. The new conceptual framework represents the relationships between the multiple variables tested in this research. Variables including typology, teaching modality, academic division, race, years at institution, and gender were part of the demographics considered when studying adjunct faculty at institutions accredited by the ABHE. The primary focus of this study was on the two independent variables, religious commitment and denominational affiliation, which have not yet been considered as they relate to or predict OSB and AOC. The new conceptual framework developed as a result of this study is illustrated in Figure 2.

The significant relationships are depicted in the model by the directionality and boldness of the arrows. I expected to find that the effects of demographic variables would be consistent with previous findings from the literature on part-time and full-time faculty, as described in Chapter 2. Although the previous literature suggests that these characteristics may influence or predict OSB and AOC, my results did not support this premise.

The two variables of particular interest in this study were RC and DA. I expected that RC and DA would influence the outcome variables, OSB and AOC. Furthermore, I expected to find that a specific combination of characteristics and independent variables would best predict the dependent variables. Although some correlations were evident as described in Chapter 4, other variables including typology, teaching modality, academic division, race, years at institution, and gender did not have a significant influence on OSB or AOC. In this sample, denominational affiliation had a significant influence on organizational sense of belonging.
Additionally, organizational sense of belonging had a significant influence on affective organizational commitment.
Figure 2 New Conceptual Framework
Suggestions for Future Research

My first recommendation for future research is to revise the Organizational Sense of Belonging Scale. Fewer participants completed the OSB section which has 38 questions than the AOC Scale which has eight questions and the RCI-10 which has ten questions. Only 83 of the 124 participants completed the OSB Scale. Conversely, 114 participants completed the entire AOC Scale and 117 participants completed the entire RCI-10. Many of the 38 questions on OSB seem to be redundant, and perhaps the participants became fatigued, frustrated, or bored with the repetitive nature of the questions. Confirmatory Factor Analysis indicated a strong Cronbach alpha (.95) for all questions suggesting that eliminating questions would not adversely affect the reliability of the instrument. A revised OSB scale of ten questions could be equally strong while avoiding respondent fatigue. In addition, a revised OSB-10 could be used by academic leaders to quickly assess the organizational sense of belonging of adjunct faculty in individual departments as well as that of adjunct faculty who teach online and on campus. Since empirical evidence suggests that OSB significantly influences and predicts AOC, this instrument could be most beneficial for intervention and retention of quality adjunct faculty.

Secondly, I would like to repeat this study and survey adjunct faculty at religiously-affiliated, faith-based, or Christian institutions affiliated with the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) that are not accredited by the ABHE, where declaration of agreement with doctrinal statement may not be required. How would their OSB, AOC and RC scores compare to those of adjunct faculty at ABHE institutions? Would their RC be as uniformly high, or would there be more variation? Would their OSB and AOC scores be higher or lower?
Answers to these questions would be beneficial to academic leaders as they seek to support their faculty and create an atmosphere where they feel connected and committed.

My third recommendation for future research is to conduct qualitative research to explore the nuances of these findings. If religious commitment and other characteristics of adjunct faculty at Bible colleges and universities do not significantly influence OSB and AOC in my sample as the literature suggests in other samples, then what influences the OSB and AOC of adjunct faculty at ABHE institutions? Individual interviews of adjunct faculty who teach at colleges and universities accredited by the ABHE, or focus groups comprised of that sample, might yield interesting findings that would help leaders better understand the sense of belonging and commitment of adjunct faculty. For example, what leadership qualities are exhibited in institutions where adjunct faculty have greater OSB and AOC? This would further inform decisions made by academic leaders to help adjunct faculty feel greater sense of belonging and commitment.

Finally, I would recommend further exploring the concept of denominational affiliation. In this sample, there seemed to be some discrepancies or confusion about institutional and individual denominational affiliation. It would be interesting and beneficial to have respondents participate in a qualitative study involving “think aloud” as they answer the questions to determine the rationale for their choices. For example, if the institution has no institutional denominational affiliation, why would they have selected “Yes, I am affiliated with the same denomination as the institution”? Perhaps they considered non-denominational a specific denominational affiliation. Elaboration about how they answered the questions related to DA would provide clarification and shed light on the results. Furthermore, I would recommend
interviewing adjunct faculty members who are part of what Allerman (2012) calls the “insider-outsider” group. They are insiders as employees and insiders as fellow Christians, but outsiders because they are not part of the institution’s denominational affiliation. How do they make sense of their experiences as adjunct faculty at Bible colleges or universities when they feel included as a fellow Christian employee, but not fully accepted as a result of their non-affiliation with the same denomination as the majority of their colleagues? A better understanding of the “insider-outsider” phenomenon has the potential to foster a less divisive campus community by creating awareness of the language and subtle macroaggressions that may contribute to weaker organizational sense of belonging and commitment.

Limitations

Although the decisions and choices about methodology were based on sound practices in the field of educational research, some limitations became apparent as this study was executed. Raosoft (2004) recommends a sample size of 64 for a population size of 1000 adjunct faculty in Bible colleges and universities with a confidence level of 90% and a margin of error of 10%. My margin of error is 7.11%, which is in the acceptable range. This indicates that we can trust the non-significant findings; however, the groupings of categories in some instances might be too small. Therefore, those findings when the categories have fewer than 64 participants should be interpreted with caution. Further exploration is needed to determine whether the results would be consistent with a greater number of participants in each category such as categories of typology or academic divisions.

Because of the small number of Bible colleges and universities selected to participate in the study, and because of the small number of faculty at those colleges and universities, the
number of respondents was limited. Additionally, I had to rely on those with access to the adjunct faculty distribution lists at each institution. Despite my best efforts to increase the participation rate, only half of the institutions participated. This hindered my ability to do hierarchical linear modeling. I was, however, able to determine institutional differences and compare institutions through other statistical procedures. For these reasons, adjustments should be made in the research design to limit the effects of these limitations.

My target sample was adjunct faculty at colleges and universities accredited by the Association for Biblical Higher Education. Therefore, adjunct faculty at secular private, public, and for-profit institutions were not included in this study. For these reasons, and because I met statistical power, my results are generalizable to other Bible colleges and universities, but not to the broader field of secular higher education. However, the results are beneficial to those in academic leadership positions regardless of the type of institutions, but they should be interpreted with caution.

Because of the way the questions were asked and the lack of qualitative data following the survey, it is difficult to decipher if the participants considered “non-denominational affiliation” as a specific category of denominational affiliation. The evidence from the Pew Research Center (2012) suggests that the number of churches not affiliated with a specific denomination is increasing, as is the number of individuals not affiliated with a specific denomination. As this trend continues, how will this affect their level of organizational sense of belonging and affective organizational commitment at Bible colleges and universities?
Conclusion

Very little research has been conducted at institutions accredited by the Association of Biblical Higher Education. Therefore, very little empirical evidence exists about the adjunct faculty who teach in these institutions. Furthermore, research has not explored the impact of denominational affiliation and religious commitment on organizational sense of belonging and affective organizational commitment. This research provides insights and fosters better understanding of adjunct faculty at ABHE colleges and universities.

Denominational affiliation significantly influences and predicts OSB, and OSB significantly influences and predicts AOC. This empirical evidence contributes to the understanding of adjunct faculty, informs the decisions of those in academic leadership positions, promotes workplace relationships and collegiality, and is beneficial for hiring and retaining quality employees. Adjunct faculty who have strong organizational sense of belonging and affective organizational commitment are more likely to be more effective and satisfied, likely resulting in higher quality education for students at colleges and universities.
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Appendix A

Permission to use Survey of Workplace Relationships

Kim,

Thank you for your email. I would love an opportunity to further discuss your research. I have recently been promoted to associate dean so my schedule is pretty crazy but let’s touch base later in the semester. In the meantime, you definitely have my permission to use my survey instrument.

Connie Merriman
Connie Merriman, PhD
Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs
Director, Executive Mentor Program
Strome College of Business
Old Dominion University
2012 Constant Hall
Norfolk, VA 23529
cmerrima@odu.edu
757 683-6548

From: Pilieci, Kim [mailto: kpilieci@gbcol.edu]
Sent: Saturday, February 06, 2016 10:15 AM
To: Merriman, Connie
Subject: Permission to use Survey of Workplace Relations

Dear Dr. Merriman,

I was fascinated to find your published dissertation a few years ago. It is so closely aligned with my research that I have read specific sections multiple times and cited it many times. I would appreciate the opportunity to connect with you. I am close to submitting my first three chapters for approval.

I am writing to request your permission to use your Survey of Workplace Relations (OSB Subscale and AOC Subscale) for my doctoral research on the religious commitment, organizational sense of belonging, and affective organizational commitment of adjunct faculty at Bible colleges. I will keep the OSB and AOC Subscales exactly as you have published them, correctly citing your work and giving credit to the originals by Somers (1999) and Allen and Meyer, (1990). Since my independent variables are different, I will need to revise the questions related to demographics.

I would be happy to share more information with you as needed. I welcome the opportunity to discuss the similarities and differences in our research.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kim Pilieci
Provost
"Graduating Godly Individuals Prepared To Serve Christ in Church and Society."
Grace Bible College
1011 Aldon Street SW
P.O. Box 910
Grand Rapids, MI 49509
616.538.2330 Phone
kpilieci@gbcol.edu
Appendix B

Survey of Workplace Relationships

Section 1 -- Organizational Sense of Belonging Scale

Choose one:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never True</td>
<td>Rarely True</td>
<td>Sometimes True</td>
<td>Often True</td>
<td>Always True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I feel like I fit in with other faculty in my department.
2. It is important to feel accepted by your coworkers.
3. Faculty I work with in my department see me as a competent person.
4. Others in my department offer to help me when they sense I need.
5. I make an effort to help new hires feel welcome.
6. I receive sufficient feedback about my work.
7. I view my department as a place to experience a sense of belonging.
8. I receive support from other faculty in my department when I need it.
9. I have opportunities for social interaction with my faculty coworkers.
10. I like the faculty I work with in my department.
11. I feel discriminated against in my department.
12. I offer to help other faculty in my department, even if they don’t ask for it.
13. I have opportunities for social interaction with college administrators.
14. It is important to me that someone I work with acknowledge my birthday.
15. I invite my faculty coworkers to eat lunch/dinner with me.
16. As a faculty member in my department, I feel like an outsider.
17. There are faculty I work with in my department who share my values.
18. Others in my department ask for my ideas or opinions about different matters.
19. I feel understood by others in my department.
20. I feel comfortable contacting my department chair if I have the need to do so.
21. I make an effort to be involved with other faculty in my department in some way.
22. I am supportive of other faculty in my department.
23. I ask for advice from other faculty in my department.
24. Faculty I work with in my department accept me when I am just being myself.
25. I am uncomfortable attending social functions at my department because I feel like I don’t belong.
26. When I approach a group of faculty coworkers, I feel welcomed.
27. Feeling “a part of things” is one of the things I like about being a faculty member in my department.
28. There are faculty in my department with whom I feel a strong bond.
29. As a faculty member, I keep my personal life to myself at work.
30. It seems that faculty I work with in my department like me.
31. I let other faculty in my department know I care about them by asking how things are going for them and their family.
32. I am satisfied with the level of supervision I receive as a faculty member.
33. Other faculty in my department notice when I am absent from work or social gatherings.
34. One or more of the faculty in my department confides in me.
35. I let other faculty in my department know that I appreciate them.
36. I ask other faculty in my department for help when I need it.
37. I like the department where I teach.
38. I feel free to share disappointments with at least one other faculty member in my department.

Section 2 -- Affective Organizational Commitment Scale

Choose one:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>5 Slightly Agree</th>
<th>6 Agree</th>
<th>7 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of teaching career at this college.
2. I enjoy discussing my college with people outside of it.
3. I really feel as if this college’s problems are my own.
4. I think I could easily become as attached to another college as I am to this one.
5. I do not feel “a member of the family” at this college.
6. I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this college.
7. This college has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
8. I do not have a strong sense of belonging to this college.

Section 3 – Demographics

1. Do you attend a church affiliated with the institution’s specific denominational affiliation? (Yes, I am affiliated with the same religious denomination as that of the institution / No, I am not affiliated with the same religious denomination as that of the institution / I am not sure or I choose not to answer)
2. What is your primary teaching modality? (predominantly face-to-face / predominantly online / both modalities)
3. In which academic division do you most often teach? (Bible, Theology, Ministry / Business / Education / General Education, Humanities, or Arts & Sciences / Health Sciences / Human Sciences or Social Sciences / Physical Sciences / Worship Arts, Music, or Fine Arts)
4. How many years have you been teaching at this institution? (This is my first year / 1-3 years / 4-6 years / 7-9 years / More than 9 years)
5. What is your gender? (male / female)
6. With which race do you most closely associate? Hispanic of any race / American Indian or Alaska Native / Asian / Black or African American / Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander / White or Caucasian / 2 or more races / Other
7. Choose one Adjunct Faculty Type:
   Researchers have established categories of adjunct faculty based upon personal and employment-related characteristics. Please read the following descriptions and choose the category you feel BEST describes you as an adjunct faculty member. If none of these categories appropriately describes your circumstances, please select “Other.”
   
   - Career Ender (former full time academics, fully retired individuals, or individual in transition from a well-established career outside of higher education to a pre-retired or retired status in which part-time teaching plays a significant role)
   - Specialist, Expert or Professional (having a primary, usually full time career elsewhere)
- Aspiring Academic (aspiring to teach full time)
- Free-lancer (not employed full time elsewhere and part time faculty by choice)
- Other
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Religious Commitment Inventory-10

Instructions: Read each of the following statements. Using the scale to the right, choose that best describes how true each statement is for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all true of me</th>
<th>Somewhat true of me</th>
<th>Moderately true of me</th>
<th>Mostly true of me</th>
<th>Totally true of me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I often read books and magazines about my faith.  
2. I make financial contributions to my religious organization.  
3. I spend time trying to grow in understanding of my faith.  
4. Religion is especially important to me because it answers many questions about the meaning of life.  
5. My religious beliefs lie behind my whole approach to life.  
6. I enjoy spending time with others of my religious affiliation.  
7. Religious beliefs influence all my dealings in life.  
8. It is important to me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and reflection.  
9. I enjoy working in the activities of my religious affiliation.  
10. I keep well informed about my local religious group and have some influence in its decisions.
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Informed Consent

Western Michigan University

Educational Leadership

Principal Investigator: Andrea Beach, Ph.D.

Student Investigator: Kimberly Pilieci, A.B.D.

Title of Study: The Impact of Denominational Affiliation on Organizational Sense of Belonging and Commitment of Adjunct Faculty at Bible Colleges and Universities

You have been invited to participate in a research project titled, “Organizational Sense of Belonging and Commitment of Adjunct Faculty at Bible Colleges and Universities: Do Religious Commitment and Denominational Affiliation Matter?” This project will serve as Kimberly Pilieci’s dissertation for the requirements of the Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Leadership Program. This consent document will explain the purpose of this research project and will go over all of the time commitments, the procedures used in the study, and the risks and benefits of participating in this research project. Please read this consent form carefully and completely and please ask any questions if you need more clarification.

What are we trying to find out in this study?

The literature suggests that adjunct faculty lack organizational sense of belonging and commitment. In other words, adjunct faculty often report feeling less connected and less
committed than their full-time counterparts. Most of the research on this subject to date has been conducted at secular institutions such as research universities and community colleges rather than at biblical institutions. In addition, previous research has not explored whether religious commitment or denominational affiliation might mitigate the effects of adjunct status. This research will fill that void.

Who can participate in this study?
Adjunct faculty who teach at institutions accredited by the Association for Biblical Higher Education (ABHE) will be included in this research. Full-time faculty will be excluded, as will adjunct faculty who do not teach at ABHE institutions.

Where will this study take place?
Adjunct faculty who teach at institutions accredited by the ABHE will be surveyed through an online survey which will be sent via email.

What is the time commitment for participating in this study?
The web-based survey is comprised of 64 questions and is designed to elicit quick responses, so the survey should not take more than ten minutes to complete.

What will you be asked to do if you choose to participate in this study?
You will be asked to respond to one 64-question web-based survey. The survey will take about ten minutes to complete and will be open for three weeks. Upon close of the survey, you will be
sent an email inviting you to voluntarily enter into a drawing for a $100 Amazon gift card. No further commitment is expected.

**What information is being measured during the study?**

The survey is comprised of four sections. The Survey of Workplace Relationships will measure organizational sense of belonging and affective organizational commitment. The demographics section will ask questions about denominational affiliation, teaching modality, academic division, number of years at institution, gender, race, and part-time employment status. The Religious Commitment Inventory-10 will measure religious commitment.

**What are the risks of participating in this study and how will these risks be minimized?**

The likelihood of possible physical, psychological, social, economic risks is minimal. The nature of the risks includes mild discomforts, inconvenience, and potential for disclosure of sensitive information. Measures will be taken to protect you from possible risks or discomforts. For example, the survey will be piloted to ensure an accurate estimate of time is communicated with participants. To reduce the risk of compromising confidential information, the survey will be set to collect anonymous responses and data will be stored separate from names of participating institutions on a password protected computer.

**What are the benefits of participating in this study?**

There are no direct benefits to the individual participants other than the personal gratification of having participated in valuable research regarding organizational sense of belonging and
affective organizational commitment of adjunct faculty at Bible colleges and universities thus adding to the knowledge base and yielding practical recommendations for academic leaders who seek to improve the experience and effectiveness of adjunct faculty.

Are there any costs associated with participating in this study?
There are no costs associated with participating, other than a time commitment of approximately ten minutes.

Is there any compensation for participating in this study?
There is no compensation for participating and no penalty for not participating. You will be invited to voluntarily enter a drawing for a $100 Amazon gift card.

Who will have access to the information collected during this study?
Precautions will be taken to ensure your privacy and confidentiality of information. Names of participating institutions will be kept separate from data and will not be reported. The survey tool will collect anonymous responses using the University’s approved system for surveys, Select Survey, so your name and email address will not be associated with your responses. Because federal regulations require that data must be maintained for at least three years, data will be stored at Western Michigan University for a minimum of three years after the close of the study on a secure password-protected computer. Results will be reported in summary form only. Specific names and institutions will not be identified and individual institutional results will not
be shared. Survey results will be reported in aggregate in my dissertation and possibly at the 
ABHE Annual Conference.

What if you want to stop participating in this study?
You can choose to stop participating in the study at any time for any reason by simply exiting the 
survey. If you exit the survey any time before clicking “submit” your responses will be deleted 
and not included in this study. You will not suffer any prejudice, penalty, or consequences for 
your decision to stop your participation.

Should you have any questions prior to or during the study, you can contact the primary 
investigator, Dr. Andrea Beach at 616-402-9111 or andrea.beach@wmich.edu. You may also 
contact the Chair, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at 269-387-8293 or the Vice 
President for Research at 269-387-8298 if questions arise during the course of the study.

This consent has been approved by the Western Michigan Human Subjects Institutional Review 
Board (HSIRB) on April 11, 2016. Do not participate in this study after April 10, 2017.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

I have read this informed consent document. The risks and benefits have been explained to me. I 
agree to take part in this study by clicking on the following link or pasting it into the address bar 
of my web browser, answering the questions, and clicking “submit” at the end of the survey.
<SURVEY LINK HERE>
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Human Subject Institutional Review Board Approval

Date: April 11, 2016

To: Andrea Beach, Principal Investigator
    Kimberly Pulicci, Student Investigator for dissertation

From: Amy Naugle, Ph.D., Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number 16-04-09

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project titled “Organizational Sense of Belonging and Commitment of Adjunct Faculty at Bible Colleges and Universities: Do Religious Commitment and Denominational Affiliation Matter?” has been approved under the exempt category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note: This research may only be conducted exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project (e.g., you must request a post approval change to enroll subjects beyond the number stated in your application under “Number of subjects you want to complete the study”). Failure to obtain approval for changes will result in a protocol deviation. In addition, if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

Reapproval of the project is required if it extends beyond the termination date stated below.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: April 10, 2017