

SOCIAL CAPITAL AND PART-TIME PROFESSORS

Building and mobilizing social capital:
A phenomenological study of part-time professors

by

Sarah Jamieson

May 2, 2016

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Arts
In partial fulfillment for a Master of Arts in Communication
Supervisor: Professor Jenepher Lennox Terrion

Department of Communication
Faculty of Arts, University of Ottawa



© Sarah Jamieson, Ottawa, Canada, 2016

Abstract

Social connections are the main determinant of a person's quality and quantity of resources. A person uses social connections to access or use resources; the stronger and more extensive the social network, the greater the resources (i.e. social capital). Connections in social networks allow us to access and use social capital to achieve instrumental or expressive goals. Conversely, a lack of connection is central to many challenges in building social capital. Therefore, social connection is a beneficial concept to examine for those at risk of inadequate social capital. This research explores the experiences of part-time professors and their peer connections at the University of Ottawa. It discusses whether a lack of connection exists and how it may affect the social capital of part-time professors. Twelve part-time faculty members were purposively sampled and interviewed about their experience of being a part-time teacher at the University. One participant asked to be removed from the study. Participants were chosen on the basis that they had worked as a part-time teacher at the institution for five years or fewer. Using Moustakas' (1994) phenomenological approach for collecting and analyzing data and Creswell's (2007) approach for establishing validity, several thematic patterns were exhibited among part-time professors in relation to social capital and the barriers that they face. In conclusion, inadequate social capital among part-time professors may have problematic implications for students, the department, and the University as a whole.

Keywords: Social capital, barriers to communication, phenomenology, qualitative methods, part-time professors

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
<i>Background</i>	1
<i>Theoretical Framework</i>	4
<i>Research Questions</i>	5
<i>Methodology</i>	6
<i>Data Analysis</i>	8
<i>Thesis Structure</i>	9
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	11
<i>Part-time Faculty</i>	11
<i>Social connections among part-time faculty</i>	13
<i>Social Capital</i>	21
<i>Research questions</i>	37
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	39
<i>Sample</i>	40
<i>Procedure</i>	42
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS	46
<i>Theme 1: Feeling Overwhelmed</i>	47
<i>Theme 2: Uncertainty and Impermanence</i>	49
<i>Theme 3: There’s no Place like Home</i>	51
<i>Theme 4: Second-class Citizens</i>	61
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION.....	67
<i>R1: Experiences with Connection</i>	67
<i>R2: Barriers to Connection</i>	72
<i>R3: Participants’ Experiences and Social Capital</i>	75
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION	86
<i>Importance of Results</i>	87
<i>Limitations of Study</i>	88

<i>Possible Areas for Future Research</i>	90
<i>Conclusion</i>	91
References.....	93
Appendices.....	100

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Background

This research aims to examine the experiences of part-time professors through the lens of social capital. Through qualitative interviews, our research leads with three main inquiries: First, investigating the experience with social connections at the university for part-time professors; second, examining the barriers these faculty members face to building these connections; finally, exploring how they navigate these barriers. In sum, these inquiries can help determine how this affects a part-time professor's social capital.

Social capital has been defined in a number of ways. The most common version was published in Robert Putnam's (2000) *Bowling Alone*. He defines social capital as "connections among individuals – social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them" (Putnam, 2000, p. 19). In other words, social capital is a type of "currency" built through relationships. For example, a professor may connect with coworkers and receive support or resources in return.

There is a need to assess social capital amongst part-time professors because they are a large part of the university experience. They may lack adequate social capital due to instability in their career. Additionally, part-time professors may have difficulty attaining social capital if they spend limited time on campus or interact with co-workers sporadically. If they are unable to build relationships by communicating with co-workers, they will likely have difficulty attaining or mobilizing social capital.

Part-time professors are an important group to the University of Ottawa, and their amount of social capital can affect their experience as a part-time professor. In turn, it could shape the experience for students, colleagues, alumni, the institution, and any stakeholders with whom a part-time professor interacts on campus.

The majority of university classes are taught by part-time faculty (Burk, 2000). The University of Ottawa is no different – part-time teachers are the largest faculty group, and the majority of part-time

professors are hired for Faculty of Arts courses (APTPUO, 2014). Part-time professors are defined as faculty members “employed on a per term basis with no guarantee of being rehired for the next academic year or term” (Pearch & Marutz, 2005, p. 30). According to the part-time professor’s union at the University of Ottawa (APTPUO), part-time professors teach over half of the University’s courses – and most of them are undergraduate classes (2014). Additionally, a great deal of research has shown that part-time faculty members often feel alienated, powerless, and invisible, even if they have been at the institution for a long time (Burk, 2000; Dolan, 2011; Gappa, 2000). Given the integral role of part-time professors as members of the University of Ottawa community, it is important to examine how these professors experience social connections within the university.

Being a new part-time professor may produce additional challenges. New part-time professors have less seniority points, which may decrease their chance of securing work. Therefore, they may face more insecurity about their career path and struggle to have consistent income. Also, new part-time professors may have fewer connections at the University if they are new to campus, or if they do not know who to reach out to for information or support. This could prevent them from accessing or mobilizing social capital.

It may be helpful for administration and support systems to explore a new part-time professor’s experience to assess their needs. They are a large part of the university experience, yet there is limited literature on the subject. Exploring their experiences would help us understand how they form connections, what barriers they face, and how they navigate them.

A Lack of Connection

Many part-time professors say they feel disconnected from their peers and the administration (Dolan, 2011). Despite playing an integral role to the functioning of the university, many part-time professors do not feel they are part of the community (Dolan, 2011; Burk, 2000). Burk (2000), an adjunct, shared her experience in an academic talk on the disconfirming communication that adjuncts experience

in community colleges and suggested that adjuncts, or professors who have been at the institution long-term but work part-time, often feel like low-level employees despite high qualifications or a lengthy employment at the organization. Burk said that the majority of adjuncts she interacted with feel marginalized and often have negative relationships with fellow colleagues and their administration. A lack of connection – or only having low-quality connections – may prevent a part-time professor from building or mobilizing social capital.

A second problem with a lack of connection is the potential implication for a part-time professor's quality of teaching. Part-time professors' connection with others could affect their expectations for teaching, understanding of institutional norms, access or use of resources, and emotional support. Therefore, understanding the experience of part-time professors could help guide policies for orientation, as well as opportunities for the provision of resources and emotional support. Addressing a part-time professor's social capital is significant – inadequate social capital correlates with less job satisfaction (Burk, 2000; Putnam, 2000), less productivity as a team member (Dolan, 2011; Henttonen, Johanson, & Janhonen, 2013), and less access to resources or opportunities (Curley, 2010). Therefore, in the case of universities, it would be detrimental to a university's goals of quality education.

In conclusion, quality connections not only provide a sense of support and belonging to peers and the organization, but help part-time professors learn organizational norms and receive information about socialization or job opportunities (Dolan, 2011). Grubb (1999) found that part-time instructors described mentors and colleagues as “powerful forces” for improving teaching and learning “tricks of the trade,” but did not connect often enough to maintain a relationship (p. 49). If part-time professors have stronger connections, they can increase their chances to build or mobilize social capital. In turn, they would have access to more resources (e.g. class materials) and support (e.g. vouching, empathy) for teaching.

Communication barriers. Communication barriers are obstacles that impede the communication process (Button & Rossera, 1990, p.337). These could be interpersonal (such as a difference in opinion)

or physical (e.g. working in a different country). Communication barriers impede the ability to build social capital because they lower the quantity and quality of connections. In effect, communication barriers obstruct the path to connection.

Klimova and Semradova (2011) argued that interpersonal differences resulted in communication barriers. They found that interpersonal differences prevented teachers from being able to effectively communicate with their students. However, using more technology and teaching aids improved communication between teachers and students (Klimova & Semradova, 2011, p. 208).

Button and Rossera (1990) found in their study of communication barriers that a difference in language or age was still the most prevalent communication barrier for individual-to-individual communication. However, they added that a high amount of trust and confidence in an individual improved the chances of effective communication (p. 346). Conversely, a lack of trust led to a “distortion of information” and disrupted information flow, which would prevent people from receiving important information about their practice (Button & Rossera, 1990, p. 346).

Theoretical Framework

This paper aims to use the framework of social capital to look at the experience of being a new part-time professor. There are four major scholars who have contributed to social capital as a social theory: Pierre Bourdieu, James Coleman, Robert Putnam and Michael Woolcock. Pierre Bourdieu explored the definition of social capital and how it can affect people across generations; Coleman explored how people build social capital as result of rational choice; Putnam explored how social capital can affect citizens on a larger scale, resulting in changes in political outcomes and citizen participation; and Woolcock uncovered an additional aspect to social capital that connected people to someone in a position of power. Additionally, Nan Lin brought value to the scholarship by using Putnam’s (2000) definition of social capital and solidifying it into something that can be distinctly measured. The work of each of these scholars will be explored fully in the Literature Review in Chapter 2.

Theoretical Overview

Part-time professors, especially new part-time professors, can face the dilemma of being the largest group of faculty at a university while having limited connection with peers. Therefore, they are a vulnerable population for social capital deficit. Additionally, there is limited research into the experience of part-time professors in relation to social capital, especially their relationships with colleagues. There is limited research on larger institutions such as the University of Ottawa, and Canadian universities in general. Most research has been in small American colleges, and has studied adjuncts (part-time employees with long-term contracts) (e.g. Feldman and Turnley, 2001; Dolan, 2011; Burk, 2000; Gordon, 2002; Thirolf, 2012). The researcher hopes to contribute to the scholarship by examining the experience of being a new part-time professor, specifically looking at connections and the effect of these connections, or a lack thereof, on the creation and mobilization of social capital.

Research Questions

This thesis is an exploratory study examining the experience of new part-time professors and their connections. Research will focus on how these connections relate to social capital, looking at strength and extensity of ties (Lin, 2008). A phenomenological approach was used because it is best suited to studies that revolve around multiple opinions about the same experience (Creswell, 2007). The researcher wanted to know more about the phenomenon of being a new part-time professor – especially the interpersonal barriers they face and how they navigate them. The proposed research aims to examine how this experience affects part-time professors at the University of Ottawa. Three main questions will guide this research:

R1: What is a part-time professors' experience with social connections at the university?

R2: What barriers have they faced in building connections, if any?

R3: How do their experiences with connection affect their social capital?

Methodology

Research Approach

This research concerns the experience of a specific phenomenon – being a new part-time professor (1-5 years) at the University of Ottawa. So, the researcher chose phenomenology as a guiding research method. Phenomenology is a well-suited choice for this study due to its ability to record multiple opinions surrounding one phenomenon in order to understand the essence of the experience (Creswell, 2007). Phenomenology is able to describe the meaning that participants attribute to a lived experience and any common experiences participants have, such as a shared emotion or behaviour (Creswell, 2007, p. 57).

Sampling Strategy and Participants

The population for this study included all faculty members at the University of Ottawa who were on the subscription list for the part-time professor's union, the APTPUO. The sample included part-time professors who have been at the institution for five years or fewer. Our reasoning for this range is twofold. First, after five years, an employee may have made connections but not have a vivid memory of how daily interactions occurred in the early stages of their career. Second, newer faculty will have a recent experience of the barriers facing part-time professors. Therefore, their experience may be more precise than a professor who has been in the institution longer.

The researcher used purposive sampling, which is often used in qualitative and phenomenological studies (Creswell, 2007). Since every part-time professor's experience is different, purposive sampling is preferable over stratification and quoting strategies. This sampling strategy may attract those who want to give feedback to the university about their experience with connection, but they do not know of the proper channels to voice their contribution. Therefore, the sample may provide some knowledge that addresses policies for part-time professors and how to improve connections within the university. This may create a better experience for part-time professors, who play a large part in shaping others' university experience.

A negative aspect of this sample is that it may attract members with particular opinions for the interview. Unlike a random sample, which would increase the chance for generalizable results, it will not be representative of the population (Creswell, 2007). However, phenomenological studies – and qualitative studies in general – are not interested in statistically representative data because everyone’s experience is unique. It looks at specific participants to form a rich, thick description. Therefore, Creswell’s (2007) guidelines for validation were used, as described below.

Data Collection Procedures

The researcher contacted APTPUO, who voiced their interest in assisting in the study. After applying for and receiving ethical approval (see Appendix A), APTPUO agreed to invite participants to the study via email. The mass of part-time professors automatically added to the newsletter received the email. The email had information about the study’s purpose and timeline, an invitation to participate, and the researcher’s contact information (see Appendix C). Although the study was only conducted in English, the researchers chose to send an invitation to participate in both English and French because professors are often bilingual, and thus can participate in an interview in English, but prefer to be contacted in French. It was hoped that this would increase the size of the sample. Professors were invited to email the researcher to participate. 26 part-time professors responded to the email, and those who met the criteria were scheduled for an interview.

Moustakas (1994) states that since phenomenology aims to describe a shared phenomenon, he recommends using a small number of participants and explore their experiences in depth. The researcher recruited 12 participants based on a first-come, first-served basis. Eleven of these participants were included in the analysis. After reviewing the transcript, one participant stated that they preferred to be excluded from the study due to privacy concerns. The interviews were conducted until there was saturation of data.

The researcher asked each professor to discuss their experience in a semi-structured interview using eight open-ended questions (see Appendix B). All of the questions addressed the research questions, giving the researcher an in-depth understanding of part-time professors' experiences at the university – specifically their social connections and how their connections affected their social capital. These questions were adapted from Chen et al.'s (2009) Personal Social Capital Scale. The Personal Social Capital Scale was developed through a quantitative questionnaire which measured individual social capital. However, these researchers did not form questions specifically addressing linking social capital. They justified this absence by suggesting that linking often overlapped with bridging and bonding capital (Chen et al., 2009). To address this gap, the researcher developed open-ended questions from Poulsen et al.'s (2011) social capital scale to engage participants about their linking social capital.

Qualitative interviews are well suited for collecting rich data, since they are more apt for delving into matters of intimacy, privacy, or aberrant behaviour (Reinard, 2008, p. 355). Because this research involved collecting data about the experience of part-time professors at the University of Ottawa, the researcher ensured participants' anonymity and confidentiality. Qualitative interviews are more suitable to ensure anonymity and confidentiality, since participants are interviewed anonymously by the researcher (as opposed to focus groups, where they may face peers). Participants are also protected by removing identifying factors.

Qualitative interviews can provide a thicker description of the participant's feelings and perceptions than other methods (e.g. questionnaires), because perceptions can be explored in depth. Therefore, interviews allowed the researcher to gain a fuller understanding of the phenomenon.

Data Analysis

This research utilized Moustakas' (1994) recommendations for qualitative phenomenological analysis. He recommends that researchers describe their personal experiences with the phenomenon to help the reader understand their worldview. He then recommends categorizing experiences into like

clusters. Experiences were categorized based on participants' responses using Klimova and Semradova's (2011) communication barriers as a guiding framework for coding themes. They used a quantitative survey, but the researcher analyzed the experiences using a qualitative approach.

Validation

The researcher validated her data using Creswell's (2007) methods for ensuring validity in qualitative phenomenological studies. He recommends staying reflexive throughout the research and evaluating the phenomenon using peer-reviewed literature for analysis, as well as evaluating the data accurately and objectively. The researcher met these validation standards by explaining her personal experience with the phenomenon, which exposed bias and thus ensured reflexivity. She also used a well-trusted and peer-reviewed method for phenomenological analysis (see Moustakas, 1994). Finally, the interview transcripts were quoted thoroughly, ensuring that nothing was taken out of context and that the phenomenon was accurately described.

Thesis Structure

This thesis is comprised of six chapters, including the introductory chapter. In chapter two, the literature review explores three areas relevant to answering the research questions. First, it reviews the literature on social capital, specifically its definitions, manifestations, benefits, and restrictions. Second, it reviews the current literature about the experiences of part-time professors in post-secondary institutions. Third, it explores the literature on part-time professors in relation to social capital. In this step, the researcher examines how the literature points to part-time professors having an inequality of social capital due to a lack of connection.

Chapter three describes this study's methodology. It shows the benefits of using a semi-structured interview as a method for collecting data, as well as phenomenology for exploring self-perceived experiences. It also discusses the strengths, limitations, and relevance of the methodology in answering

each research question. After exploring the rationale for sampling, recruitment strategy, analysis and validation, the researcher explains her role in the context of the study.

Chapter four presents the results of the research. It outlines major themes that emerged from the interviews, as well as any specific insight to the experience of new part-time professors at the University of Ottawa.

Chapter five discusses the results and how they address each research question. It also discusses the implications of the research findings in terms of social capital.

The thesis concludes in chapter six with a summary of the research findings, a discussion of the limitations of the study, an exploration of the practical applications of this research, and directions for future research.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review is organized into three sections to cover the scope of this study. The first section reviews the experiences and challenges of being a part-time professor in a higher learning institution. It explores several challenges, including instability and communication barriers. It shows how a lack of connection is central to these challenges and examines the University of Ottawa in this context. The second section explores the literature on social capital and part-time professors, specifically exploring how a deficit of social capital can occur due to isolation, uncertainty and impermanence, and communication barriers. The third section examines the traditional definitions of social capital, along with its benefits, such as group membership, and its detriments, such as inequality. It examines how an actor accesses and mobilizes social capital, and looks at how this concept has been applied to organizations.

Part-time Faculty

Higher learning institutions have continued to rely on part-time professors to teach some (or most) of their courses. All institutions of higher education in Canada now make use of part-time instructors (Somers, 2007). In Ontario, the use of part-time faculty has increased from 62.1% in 2004 to 67.5% of faculty in 2013 (Academica.ca, 2015). Therefore, more part-time professors are being hired than ever before.

At the University of Ottawa, the total number of instruction faculty was just over 1,200 in 2012, over 800 of them being part-time professors (APTPUO, 2014). The increase of hiring part-time professors has increased gradually, with the exception of the brief dip during the recession (APTPUO, 2014). It follows that the University of Ottawa may continue to hire more part-time staff in order to meet two challenges: increasing student enrolment and declining public funds.

A spike in student enrolment correlates with the hiring of more part-time professors. For example, since 2006, the University of British Columbia's general teaching positions have increased by more than 40 per cent to compensate for the growing amount of students. However, there has only been a 12 per cent

rise in tenure-track hires (Simona, 2015). Similarly, in Ontario, the number of university students has grown by 42.7% since 1993, while the number of full-time faculty has only grown only by 16.1% (Academica.ca, 2015). Since the number of undergraduate students has risen dramatically, many universities have hired more part-time professors to compensate.

Another reason for a higher number of part-time professors may be declining government allocated funds. Pupilampu (2004) argues that many universities use funding to provide salaries for professors – without it, they cannot afford to hire enough full-time instructors, or high-calibre researchers. Conversely, part-time instructors can teach the same courses as full-time professors, but for lower pay (CBC.ca, 2016). Therefore, many institutions may use part-time professors to not only provide quality undergraduate instruction, but to stabilize tenured faculty salaries and advance research (Simona, 2015).

Unlike full-time professors, part-time instructors lack the guarantee of a job each semester, as well as the ability to progress through to the highest levels of academia (Simona, 2015). Although part-time instructors teach and may be encouraged to do research depending on the institution, they may not enjoy the same benefits as full-time professors (Pupilampu, 2004).

Types of Part-time Professors

Pupilampu (2004) says that part-time professors in Canada can be characterized as one of three types: moonlighters, who are professionals who already hold full-time jobs elsewhere, but teach part-time; recent doctoral graduates, who are looking for experience and hoping for a full-time position; and those who previously were new graduates, but “got stuck” teaching part-time and are now considered to be “mature graduates” (Pupilampu, 2004, p. 174). Pupilampu does not include current students who are teaching, or professionals or those who have left another career to teach; this research refers to the former as students and the latter as mature professionals in the results.

Members of the moonlighting group may not have a strong affinity with the university because their need for connection may be satisfied by their full-time job. However, recent doctoral graduates, mature

graduates, and graduate students may feel more of an affinity to the university because it is their main source of workplace connection.

Teaching quality. Puplampu (2004) wanted to understand whether the quality of teaching at a Canadian university was affected by a professor being part-time or full-time. His article explored the implications that an increase of part-time labour has on the education in Canadian Universities. He argued that because part-time teachers faced a different experience than full-time teachers, the quality of education for students would suffer.

Puplampu sees several problems with the restructuring of Canada's universities. First, a part-time teacher is solely evaluated by the students on the quality of his or her teaching. Putting this responsibility in the hands of students may cause a conflict of interest – it encourages part-time professors to keep their students “happy” so they can get a good evaluation. If part-time professors receive a poor evaluation for a class, administrators could “fire any of them simply by not renewing their contract” (Puplampu, 2004, p. 54). In short, job security for part-time professors is precarious and hinges, generally, on the evaluations provided by undergraduate students.

Although student evaluations can encourage a higher quality of teaching, they can also encourage teachers to lower their expectations so students are pleased with the course. This may involve adopting the minimum number of examinations, over-simplifying examinations, inflating grades or easily giving in to student demands for reassessment or to change marks (Puplampu, 2004). Part-time professors could also stay away from controversial issues in the academic discipline, inadvertently discouraging critical thought about their field (Puplampu, 2004).

Social connections among part-time faculty

Social connections are defined as relationships with peers, support staff, faculty members, and administration. In order to be considered a relationship, communication must be maintained consistently and on a frequent basis. Social connections can benefit part-time professors in several ways, including

providing access to information, learning about careers, or offering emotional support (Odden & Sias, 1997).

Social connections among faculty generally focus on full-time professors (Fugate & Amey, 2000), despite the fact that part-time professors represent the majority of faculty today (AFT Higher Education, 2009). Additionally, the study of interpersonal connections between part-time professors still has a limited scope, despite the benefits of encouraging such connections in practice. However, several themes within the scope of this paper – including isolation, feeling devalued and experiencing instability – have been studied in interdisciplinary ways.

Isolation

Isolation, a feeling of being separated from peers, is a common theme in part-time professorship. Part-time professors may feel isolated because they are less likely to spend a lot of time on campus (CBC.ca, 2016). Feldman and Turnley (2001) found in their mixed methods study of college adjuncts that professors were attracted initially to part-time positions because of the inherent flexibility in these jobs. Part-time teaching allows variability for those who enjoy novelty and change. As well, the position allows part-time professors to work from home and gives them the freedom to juggle other responsibilities such as child rearing and extra work as needed. However, this flexibility might also prevent part-time professors from feeling part of the college or university community because they are rarely on campus (Feldman & Turnley, 2001). Dolan (2011) said that, in her experience, this had been problematic for connection:

Isolation resulting from physical distance seems to be a huge obstacle for nurturing meaningful, rewarding, and personalized relationships. Feelings of disconnection from issues and policies affecting students, as well as from the overall organizational culture, appear to impede efforts in training and development. (p. 66)

Thus, if part-time professors are sporadically on campus, not only do they miss observing cultural norms and participating in the culture of the university, but they also miss the chance for connection with colleagues. In sum, a lack of connection may be due to the isolating nature of the profession.

Part-time professors can also feel isolated when relationships with their peers are not fostered properly. Schrodts, Cawyer and Sanders (2003) determined in their study of part-time professors that relationships on campus were not a common experience for new part-time faculty, especially connections with administrative staff (Schrodts, Cawyer, & Sanders, 2003, p. 18). If part-time professors do not connect with other staff on campus in the first few years of their employment, they may be more likely accept their role with the administration as one of disconnect – and in turn lose an opportunity to build or mobilize social capital.

Dolan (2011) found that isolation may also affect the quality of teaching for part-time professors. Adjuncts felt like “a non-entity within the faculty body and was not well known to management” (p. 70). In turn, adjuncts often felt undervalued and taken for granted if management did not make an effort to connect with them individually. Such feelings of isolation and disconnect may discourage part-time professors, resulting in a lack of motivation to go beyond the bare minimum of their duties. In turn, their teaching quality would suffer and “affect their students’ learning processes significantly” (Dolan, 2011, p. 64).

In effect, Dolan (2011) argued that in order for adjuncts to see the value of being a member of the university, they need to experience a high level of contact with a variety of organizational members, including management, administration, full-time faculty, and other part-time professors (p. 66). Dolan found that part-time professors felt that opportunities for socialization with administration “could yield many benefits, including a heightened sense of affiliation, community, camaraderie, and even motivation on the job” (Dolan, 2011, p. 71). Dolan concluded that the opposite of isolation – a sense of belonging –

not only builds social capital for part-time professors, but might encourage connections between workers that could “improve their own performance as educators” (p. 73).

Job satisfaction. Putnam (2000) stated that connection with coworkers is one of the strongest factors in determining job satisfaction. In this regard, Feldman and Turnley (2001) surveyed 105 non-tenured adjuncts using close-ended and open-ended questions asking them about job satisfaction. They found that part-time professors strived to be part of the university community and develop relationships with their professional colleagues; however, adjuncts that had been with the university longer had more negative opinions about work relationships and conditions than newer adjuncts. For example, most part-time staff felt like they were treated in an “off-hand, cavalier way” by the administration, which made them feel unimportant (Feldman & Turnley, 2001, p. 8). These authors concluded that job attitudes had a direct correlation with job satisfaction and occupational performance.

Lack of representation. Burk (2000) wrote about her own experiences as a part-time faculty member and said that part-time professors feel disempowered and isolated due to a lack of representation in their workplace. She argued that they faced disconfirmation due to “institutional neglect” of their needs (p. 11). She suggested that it could be improved by increasing community opportunities (e.g. appointing liaisons to support part-time faculty), ensuring part-time voices are represented institutionally, encouraging universities to offer faculty development groups (such as allowing adjuncts to share concerns about research with full-time colleagues), and creating mentoring programs.

Uncertainty and Impermanence

Uncertainty and impermanence is often a challenge for part-time professors. Uncertainty, according to Lawrence and Lorsch (1967) is a feeling of hesitation that encompasses three aspects: a lack of clarity in information; long time spans of waiting before receiving definitive feedback; and general ambiguity of causal relationships. Impermanence, conversely, is a feeling of not enduring or feeling temporary – for example, part-time professors may not feel they will be at the same job next year, or they

may not feel like faculty even if they have been at the institution for a long time. According to Sylvain Schetagne, the director of research and political action for the Canadian Association of University teachers (CAUT), “More than 30 per cent of academic staff in Canadian post-secondary institutions are faced with short-term, insecure employment and struggle to find decent work” (CAUT Bulletin Online, 2015). It follows that part-time professors may face difficulties building social connections due to the uncertainty and impermanence of their job. Because their contract is short-term, they may be uncertain about ongoing employment at a single university. Therefore, part-time professors may not see the benefits of connecting because they feel impermanent within the organization, and full-time faculty may not prioritize connecting with part-time professors because they may see them as temporary employees.

Uncertainty and impermanence may also negatively influence a part-time professor’s job satisfaction, which may lead to a higher turnover rate. Monroe and Denman (1991) contend that those in uncertain roles are often less satisfied with their job and more likely to leave the organization, taking the training and knowledge gained from the organization with them (p. 57). Therefore, uncertainty and impermanence may encourage a transient career between multiple higher learning institutions. This could squander a university’s resources if they cannot retain the employees with knowledge and skills they have provided, such as teacher training and course design. Since the quality of an employee’s relationships can also affect the rate of turnover (Graen, Liden & Hoel, 1982; Krackhardt & Porter, 1985), it is important to examine the quantity and quality of part-time professors’ connections.

In conclusion, if part-time positions involve elevated uncertainty and impermanence, this can discourage organizational affinity and commitment to the job (Monroe & Denman, 1991). A lack of connections to peers – including full-time faculty and administrative staff – could reduce a part-time professor’s knowledge of practices, job satisfaction, and commitment to the organization. As a result, a part-time professor’s lowered motivation may lead to doing only the bare minimum of their teaching

duties. In sum, if part-time professors feel uncertain and impermanent, it could lower the quality of education for the university.

Communication Barriers

Social connections among part-time professors may also be affected by communication barriers, which are obstacles to successful communication (Button & Rossera, 1990). Aside from not being able to communicate effectively, communication barriers also impede connection because they lower the quantity or quality of communication (Button & Rossera, 1990). In effect, the severity of a person's communication barriers determines how well and often they can connect with peers.

Klimova and Semradova (2011) looked at how communication barriers affected the quality of education in their study of virtual classrooms. Specifically, they studied conversations between students and their teachers for a virtual course. These authors argued that in order for a teacher to fully commit to high-quality teaching, there must be full understanding on both sides. They wanted to pinpoint the barriers that prevented this understanding, such as when students could not absorb the course material.

The researchers argued that barriers were usually caused by interpersonal differences, both social (tendencies and traits) and historical (past experience and personal background) (Malpas, 2015). In sum, Klimova and Semradova (2011) found that interpersonal differences prevented teachers from being able to effectively communicate with their students; however, using technology and teaching aids seemed to improve communication (Klimova & Semradova, 2011, p. 208).

Conversely, Button and Rossera (1990) say that communication barriers are often either interpersonal (such as a difference in opinion) or physical (working in a different office or country) (p. 337). In their conceptual paper, they found that three of the most relevant barriers to individual-to-individual communication were a difference in language, age, and geographical distance (Button & Rossera, 1990). Button and Rossera (1990) argued that the best way to improve communication barriers was to foster trust in co-workers. A high amount of trust in an individual improves the chances of

effective communication – the person will be more likely to spread the information if they have confidence in the speaker, and spread it as accurately as they can. If there is a lack of trust among employees, this could lead to a “distortion of information” and disrupted information flow (Button & Rossera, 1990, p. 346). Thus, communication barriers could prevent part-time professors from receiving important information about their organization and how to improve their teaching, but a higher level of trust could improve these barriers.

For the scope of our research, we will examine physical (geographical distance) and interpersonal (difference in language, age, or values) barriers based on the research of Button and Rossera (1990). These communication barriers will illustrate road blocks that may occur when a part-time professor tries to access or mobilize social capital.

Difference in Language. Language is the most important variable in order to communicate successfully (Lewis, 1968; Sepulveda, 1973). Lewis (1968) stated that being “unable to communicate in the preferred language” was a commonplace barrier in individual-to-individual communication. Therefore, examining a difference in language is essential to understanding communication barriers. Lewis’ (1968) research focused on communication barriers between participants who had different levels of education – he wanted to know if educational background affected successful communication. He found that a difference in education led to difficulty for participants to communicate even if they spoke the same language (Lewis, 1968). In sum, Lewis (1968) said that misunderstanding can occur if participants have a different mother tongue, dialect, or knowledge of vocabulary (p. 1). Therefore, part-time professors may still face communication challenges if they speak the same language as their peers. Consequently, they may have difficulty connecting with peers and be less able to build and mobilize social capital.

Difference in Age. If employees perceive that they share values, they are more likely to agree on goals, approaches, and group actions (Standifer, Lester, Schultz, & Windsor, 2013). Conversely, if people

do not feel an overlap of values with their co-workers, they are more likely to see their decisions as challenging or problematic (Standifer et al., 2013). Since a difference in age can cause a divergence in values, philosophy, or methods for practices (Hinds and Mortensen, 2005), it follows that it could cause a barrier to communication for some part-time professors. However, Standifer et al. (2013) found that even if members were a similar age, it did not improve communication or lessen conflict. In fact, they found that people who worked in workplaces with a homogenous age group increased the likelihood of interpersonal conflict. In turn, age could be a barrier to part-time professors if most are a similar age. This would decrease the quality and quantity of connections for part-time professors. Conversely, Stone and Tetrick (2013) found in their theoretical paper on ageism in the workplace that age diversity enhances knowledge exchange in organizations and a sense of belonging in teams (p. 726). Therefore, age diversity is a valuable asset to organizations in terms of communicating information and fostering community.

Geographical distance. A great deal of literature about part-time professors addresses that geographical distance affects part-time professors' connection (see Dolan, 2011; Feldman & Turnley, 2001; Hinds and Mortensen, 2005). If part-time professors spend a great deal of time in a geographically distant place from their co-workers – even if it is just a separate office on campus, or sporadically visiting – they are less likely to make connections. This is problematic for two reasons. First, it prevents information flow by limiting contact. For example, if part-time professors never visit their department, they will be less likely to hear about organizational changes, social events, and even job opportunities. This would limit ability to access or mobilize resources, and thus, build their social capital. Second, geographical distance plays a part in forming a sense of fellowship, which lessens interpersonal conflict and encourages communication (Hinds and Mortensen, 2005). Often, a feeling of fellowship is hard to foster with geographical distance because of a limited amount of connection. In turn, geographical distance may prevent part-time professors from building or mobilizing social capital. For part-time

professors at the University of Ottawa, allowing more opportunities for connection may increase feelings of fellowship as well as opportunities to build and mobilize social capital.

Social Capital

Social capital theory has been applied to many disciplines, including studies of health (Kawachi, Kennedy, Lochner, & Prothrow-Stith, 1997; Song & Lin, 2009), political participation (Barnes and Kaase, 1979; Putnam, 2000), economic capital (Solow, 2000; Woolcock, 1998), and trust in communities (Coleman, 1994; Curley, 2010). However, social capital has only recently been applied to communication studies, usually through a network approach (see Lin, 2008). Additionally, its definition has been continuously modified, making it difficult to pinpoint as a concept.

Defining Social Capital

Social capital may refer to a variety of features in a social structure, but for the scope of this paper, we will use a generalized definition on which most theorists agree: social capital refers to resources accessed in social networks, and is built through connection (Flap, 1991; Portes, 1998; Lin, 1999; Tardos 1996).

According to Woolcock (1998), the expression ‘social capital’ first appeared in nineteenth-century economic writing. It began as an economic concept – it was a type of capital that could be translated into economic capital. However, there was an inconsistency in its use, and is often used differently now than how it was once originally understood.

James Coleman (1994) and Pierre Bourdieu (1986) were the two scholars who developed a distinct definition of social capital. Both seemed to agree that social capital was a way of systematizing the effects of social relations, which they had observed in their applied research (Castiglione et al., 2008). However, both established different theories with different purposes in mind, and both redefined their definition throughout their career. Putnam (2000) solidified the definition of social capital, which allowed it to be

expanded into new areas of scholarship. Woolcock (1998) further expanded this definition, and Lin (2011) used Putnam's definition to define social capital in a way that could be clearly quantified.

Pierre Bourdieu. Bourdieu (1986) used social capital to examine the social system of France throughout the 20th century, a culture interwoven with hierarchy. He eventually settled on social capital being “the sum of resources, actual or virtual, that accrue to an individual or a group by virtue of possessing a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 19). In other words, social capital is how many resources you can get through your network, which are accessed through connecting with others. A person can obtain resources by belonging to a group, which forwards his or her individual goals (Bourdieu, 1986).

Bourdieu's interest in social capital originated from his attempt to understand which structures or activities transferred inequality from one generation to the next (1986). Bourdieu argued that families, groups, and classes tend to transfer resources across generations, and this transference occurs through social and historical means. He conceded that aspects of cultural and social capital could be converted into the more material qualities of economic capital.

Bourdieu argued that in order to have access to social capital, an individual had to build it. However, an actor's ability to acquire social capital rests on social status and formalized organizations (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Bourdieu (1980) maintained that individuals with the same economic capital (money) and human capital (education, talent, professional skills) may not receive the same social capital return if they belong to a different social class. Therefore, he suggests that social capital reinforces class barriers and inequality. However, Bourdieu looked at the acquisition of capital instead of its mobilization. Additionally, he did not explain how personality differences affected the accumulation of social capital.

James Coleman. Coleman's definition of social capital overlapped with Bourdieu's, but he used it for a very different purpose – he viewed it as a tool that encourages collective action, reciprocity, and

opportunities for youth in communities (Coleman, 1994). Coleman defined social capital as “the set of resources that inhere in family relations and in community social organisation and that are useful for the cognitive or social development of a child or young person” (Coleman, 1994, p. 300). In other words, youth in marginalized communities could use social capital to gain access to educational resources, and thus to opportunities for advancement.

Coleman’s main intention for social capital was to provide a framework for his intuition that social relations are also a ‘resource’ for individuals (Coleman, 1994). He explored why certain communities practice reciprocity even if their goals are better served by competition. Coleman argued that actors build social capital not because they explicitly set out to, but because they connect over activities for other rational purposes (Coleman, 1994). For example, a person could go into the same shop every week and order a sandwich. Eventually, if the shop keeper and the customer connect, they may build social capital. However, neither set out to do it in the first place – it was the result of an unrelated, rational choice (buying and selling a sandwich).

Coleman wanted to compromise between the rational choice perspective (social action is the result of self-interest) and a social-norm perspective (behaviour is dependent on constraints imposed by norms) (Coleman, 1986). In turn, social capital allowed him to combine individual agency, social structure, and self-interested behaviour in social analysis.

Robert Putnam. Coleman’s and Bourdieu’s theories allowed the concept of social capital to mature, but Putnam established the term firmly in the public discourse. Putnam used Coleman’s understanding of the concept of social capital, despite disagreeing with Coleman’s optimistic assumptions about the gallantry of communities (Castiglione et al., 2008). Putnam (2000) redefined the concept of social capital as “connections among individuals – social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them” (p. 19). In this distinction, social capital is the relationship as well as the resources that arise from them, instead of being one or the other.

Putnam applied this concept to two main studies. In the first, he wanted to understand how political performance differed throughout Italy. He proved that social capital could predict political and possibly economic performance (Putnam, Leonardi, & Nanetti, 1993). In the second study, documented in the book *Bowling Alone* (2000), Putnam applied this concept to civic participation in the U.S.A. He argues that there has been a decline in social capital in the United States since the 1960s, which has caused “reduced levels of civic engagement, less trust in traditional institutions of government, and an erosion of cooperation and tolerance that is essential to the solution of collective problems” (p. 288). He concluded that social capital is an important component of general well-being and policy intervention (Putnam, 2000).

Putnam’s works were important in establishing social capital as a concept in academic and public discourse. Using social capital, he was able to find a causal relationship between different parts of a social structure, focusing on how micro elements have macro effects (Castiglione et al., 2008). However, Putnam still lacked the ability to precisely measure social capital, despite contributing a strong framework on how it could be measured. Additionally, his definition of social capital was still a bit hard to discern because it included social relationships as a type of resource. It would be difficult to measure social capital with confidence because it would be both the cause and the effect of social capital.

Nan Lin. Lin defines social capital as “resources embedded in one’s social networks...that can be accessed or mobilized through ties in the networks (Lin, 2008). Lin’s definition of social capital is one of the most widely accepted conceptualizations of the term because it is more precise and measurable than Putnam’s (2000) definition. Additionally, Lin’s definition (2008) stresses that social capital is contingent on networks because they provide the necessary condition for access to and use of embedded resources (p.58). Therefore, he looks at the patterns of relations in networks to understand social capital.

Lin (2008) argues that social capital serves two functions – to obtain resources (instrumental action) or preserve existing resources (expressive action). Instrumental action could include getting a better job, a

promotion, or building a new school, while expressive action could include anything from keeping the neighbourhood safe to maintaining a relationship with a co-worker (Lin, 2008). Thus, Lin (2008) says that having both binding (expressive) and bonding (instrumental) relations is useful for accessing and mobilizing social capital.

Lin (1999) defines resources as “valued goods in society, however consensually determined” (p. 467). Usually, resources involve wealth, status, or power. Resources can further be categorized by their intended use. A person can use personal resources freely and without much concern for reciprocity, and social resources are accessible through a person’s direct and indirect ties (Lin, 1999). In other words, an actor may borrow or capture other actors’ resources to forward their own interests, but those resources always remain the property of the original owner (Lin, 1999). In turn, Lin proposed three propositions about social capital: First, that social resources (e.g., resources accessed in social networks) affect the outcome of an instrumental action (e.g. attained status); second, that social resources are affected by the original position of a person (previous resources); and third, that social resources are affected by extensity and strength of direct and indirect ties (Lin, 2011). The value of these connections is defined by a person’s ability to access resources, the value of the resources, and the relationship between connections (Lin, 2011).

Bridging, bonding, and linking social capital. Another contention in the literature is how to define the different types of social capital. Putnam (2000) organizes social capital into bonding and bridging networks. Putnam argues that bonding social capital links members of homogenous groups, and bridging links connections across a diverse social group. Therefore, bonding capital is often described as a strong but exclusive social network that strengthens identity, while bridging capital is often seen as horizontal, weak, outward looking, and more inclusive of external members (Putnam, 2000).

Woolcock (2001) took Putnam’s definitions of bridging and bonding social capital and expanded them. He defines bonding capital as “ties between like people in similar situations, such as immediate

family, close friends and neighbours” (Woolcock, 2001, p. 13). This loosens the lines that Putnam drew, because it now included close friends and neighbours, instead of just family. Woolcock (2001) defined bridging social capital as that which “encompasses more distant ties of like persons, such as loose friendships and workmates” (p. 13). Work relationships had not been given a designation in previous definitions.

Woolcock (2001) also added a third dimension to social capital – linking – which he defines as connections with “unlike people in dissimilar situations, such as those who are entirely outside the community, thus enabling members to leverage a far wider range of resources than are available within the community” (p. 14). This can include relationships between people “who are interacting across explicit, formal or institutionalized power or authority gradients in society” (Szreter & Woolcock, 2004, p. 655). Therefore, linking is a vertical relationship – two people may have a connection, but exist on different levels of power within an organization. This connection improves communication and allows support between a person in a position of power and a lower-level employee.

Lin (1999) wanted to expand on Putnam and Woolcock’s bridging and bonding networks. He felt that the terms ‘bonding’ and ‘bridging’ capital were often confused in the literature. He argued this was because social capital does not bind or bridge – social capital is created through connections that bind, bond and bridge. Therefore, he felt it would be more accurate to describe the types of connections that result in the building of social capital, instead of the types of social capital. Additionally, he found that in order to assess whether social relations provided social capital, researchers had to consider the purpose of the action and the richness of embedded resources in the network (Lin, 2008).

Lin argues that individuals within a social structure form social relations with others for expressive (venting, bonding) and instrumental (attaining a higher status) purposes (Lin, 2008). Therefore, he felt that social relations should be categorized based on these two motivations. He defines the first category, binding ties, as “ties that share sentiment and provide mutual support” (Lin, 2008, p. 60). Actors generally

use this type of tie for expressive purposes, such as forming close, interpersonal bonds. The second type of tie, bonding, involves sharing information and resources (Lin, 2008). Therefore, it is generally for instrumental purposes. It is worth noting that Lin (2008) specifies that social capital does not bind or bridge itself; the ties bind, bond, or bridge.

Lin said that these relations could vary in intensity and reciprocity, and he separated them into three levels. The first level includes intimate and confiding relations, such as kin and confidants. These relationships generally involve an obligation to reciprocate exchanges and services to one another (Lin, 2008). The second category is reserved for relations that share information and resources (Lin, 2008). These connections may be composed of strong and weak ties, so there may not be equally strong and reciprocal relations among everyone. Not all members may have direct interaction with one another consistently, but sharing certain interests and characteristics keeps the ties in a 'social circle' (Lin, 2008, p. 60). The third level is characterized by shared membership and identity, even if members do not necessarily interact among themselves (Lin, 2008). Members form a sense of belonging through collectivity itself. An institution such as a university or church is a good example of where a sense of belonging can form through collectivity (Lin, 2008).

Benefits of social capital. Social capital underpins how networks matter in organizational studies. Adequate social capital increases trust, reciprocity, information, and cooperation within a social network. This comes through connection with others. These benefits serve either instrumental or expressive needs of an actor. Therefore, social capital is often beneficial for achieving a goal.

In the context of organizations, a high amount of social capital among employees can result in an increased sense of belonging, which often correlates with job satisfaction (Putnam, 2000). Putnam (2000) argues that job satisfaction is largely based on the connections an actor has at work; therefore, social capital may be beneficial for employee satisfaction. Additionally, Cummings, Heeks, & Huysman (2006) argue if organizational members have more social capital, they are motivated to go above and beyond at

work: “With high level of social capital, people are motivated, and are both able to and have the opportunity to share knowledge with each other in a network” (p. 582). Therefore, a higher level of social capital among employees could increase the quality of the employee’s work.

Inequality of social capital. Communities that lack connections, whether formal or informal, find it harder to share information and mobilize to achieve opportunities or resist threats (Putnam, 2000, p. 289). In *Bowling Alone*, Putnam (2000) argues that if members lack individual social capital, their economic prospects are seriously reduced even if they have a great deal of human capital such as education and training (p. 88).

Curley (2010) assessed the factors that shape the development of trust, norms, and reciprocity in communities. Specifically, she wanted to know what role institutions, facilities and public spaces play in building social capital in neighbourhoods (Curley, 2010). She found two things. First, residents who are disadvantaged, marginalized, or disconnected from hegemonic norms and values may have limited access to resources such as information or opportunities (Curley, 2010, p. 34). Second, connections are imperative to building social capital. Therefore, engaging mechanisms such as storytelling increase the likelihood of building social capital, even if the conversation seems trivial (Curley, 2010, p. 116). In turn, residents can develop trust and communicate norms and knowledge.

However, having too much social capital in a group is not necessarily ideal either, because it can encourage an inequality of social capital across groups. It is conceivable that different groups have different access to social capital because of their structural positions or social networks. This inequality of social capital can decrease the ability to build trust, a sense of belonging, and forward instrumental and expressive goals. Additionally, social capital can be inequality enhancing; thus, an increase of social capital for one group does not necessarily mean better social outcomes for all (Durlauf, 2008). Membership, by definition, must exclude someone in order to exist, so social capital inequality can hurt non-members.

Accessing and mobilizing social capital

Defining what social capital looks like as well as how to access or mobilize it is a continuing aspect of research. However, Lin (2008) says two approaches can be used to assess the effects of social capital: its capacity (accessed resources) and actual uses for particular actions (mobilized resources).

Accessed social capital estimates an actor's degree of access to resources or a potential pool of resources (Lin, 2011). Access depends on an actor's ability to connect with others who share resources, agree with preserving resources, and are prepared to provide support or help (Lin, 2011). If a person has a great amount of social capital, he or she will have a richer pool of resources embedded in his or her social networks. In turn, he or she may have access to better resources, which promises a better return. However, he or she may not be able to actually use the capital, even if he or she has access to it. Therefore, the second approach looks at the ability of a person to mobilize, or use, their capital. The better the capital used, the better the return (Lin, 2011).

Mobilized social capital reflects the actual use of a particular social tie and its resources (Lin, 1999). For example, using a contact to get a job would be mobilizing social capital. Lin (1999) argues that status attainment is the best way to measure mobilized social capital for specific actions, because status often allows more access to resources in order to attain a higher socioeconomic standing (p. 467). In short, status attainment leads to more social gains. In order to understand how actors access and mobilize social capital, researchers often examine an actor's strength of ties and extensity of ties.

Strength of ties. Strength of ties assesses the frequency and intensity of the connection between two persons in a network. For example, a close friend would be a strong tie. You talk frequently and have a deep connection with one another. Conversely, a weak tie often includes connections that are sporadic or superficial. For example, if you were to bump into an old co-worker at a coffee shop and catch up while waiting in line, you would be unlikely to share your deepest secrets or plan to start seeing each other regularly. However, both of these ties might be likely to share career opportunities and information.

Additionally, weak ties are more likely to reach out vertically rather than horizontally (Castiglione et al., 2008). Therefore, weak ties may be beneficial for instrumental purposes such as attaining a higher status.

Research has failed to prove consistently that the strength of a person's ties directly affects their status (Granovetter, 1973; Marsden & Hurlbert, 1988) or that weaker ties allow access to better resources (Lin, 2011). However, a study has verified that weaker ties are useful for instrumental goals. Lin, Paul, and Greenwald (1978) wanted to understand how networks disseminated information in their study. They gave participants a packet of information and asked the participants to get the packet to a specific person. However, participants were only allowed to hand the packet to people they knew on a first-name basis. Once that person had the packet, they would try to get it closer to the target person by passing it to someone they knew on a first name basis, and so on. They found that the participants who were successful in getting their packet to the proper person often passed it to someone they did not know very well. Participants explained that they felt that it was more appropriate to pass the packet to a weaker tie that may have better access to the target person. In other words, weaker ties are useful for instrumental actions that do not require a certain level of intimacy. Therefore, close ties may be more likely to be used for expressive actions, since they require more reciprocity and trust (Lin, 2011).

Extensivity of ties. Unlike strength of ties, Lin (2011) argues that a person's extensivity of ties can directly affect status attainment. This is because the diversity and size of an actor's network has a direct correlation with the richness and diversity in social resources. An employee who has a variety of connections (i.e. strong and weak ties) will have more access to resources. Additionally, when an actor reaches out of their inner circle they are more likely to make connections that will give them access to diverse characteristics and resources (Granovetter, 1973; Lin 2008). Lin (2011) argues that when this happens, the connections tend to reach vertically towards a person in power. Therefore, it is important to maintain both weak and strong ties in order to access and mobilize different types of social capital.

This research is concerned with a part-time professor's experience of accessing and mobilizing social capital, so it will apply Lin's theoretical approach to social capital and bridging and binding ties. Additionally, it will use Lin's suggestion for measuring social capital – specifically, using an individual's strength and extensity of ties in order to measure access, and examining status attainment as a measure for mobilization.

Social capital and Organizations

Organizational studies have shown the importance of social capital for knowledge sharing, lower transaction costs, low turnover rates of both employees and customers, and greater coherence of action (Cohen and Prusak, 2001). Additionally, social capital has proven a key factor in hiring (Fernandez, Castilla, & Moore, 2000; Granovetter 1995), in the production of inventions and innovations (Burt, 2004; Ruef, 2002), and for accessing scarce resources (Light, 1972; Lovas & Sorenson, 2008; Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993).

Often, social capital has been applied to network analysis studies. These studies helped confirm how social capital works within a social network and how important the quantity and quality of the relationships need to be to receive resources. Mark Granovetter (1995) conducted a seminal study on 282 professional and managerial men in Newton, Massachusetts, which suggested that the men who used interpersonal channels landed better jobs and were happier with their choice. In turn, Granovetter (1973) proposed a network theory for information flow based on social ties (i.e. relationships). He found that weaker ties tend to form bridges that linked individuals to other social circles, and that this would allow them to obtain useful information that they would otherwise never receive in their own circles.

Cohen and Prusak (2001) argued in *In Good Company: How Social Capital Makes Organizations Work* that trust, mutual understanding, and commitment provide stability and connection, which sustain organizations, especially in uncertain economic markets. They argued that in the long term social capital helps lower costs for orientation and training because there is often a lower turnover in organizations with

high quantities of social capital. Cohen and Prusak's (2001) work has been helpful because it examined how organizations form social capital through social connections. They began a framework that they hoped would help organizations understand how to build social capital. They found that the biggest challenge of this problem is that social capital can only be built organically over time:

Engineering social capital does not work. Although encouragement works, every managerial decision – be it visions, strategies, hiring, firing, promotion, putting in new technology, setting travel budgets, or even office space layout – sends messages regarding how the organization really views social capital. (p. 55)

In other words, management's encouragement to build social capital is often countered by their actions. An uncertain job market, for example, creates a barrier to building social capital because trust and commitment are reduced within the organization. For this reason, Cohen and Prusak (2001) admit that it is difficult to establish trust, commitment, networks, and communities among part-time employees.

Fang, Duffy, & Shaw (2011) agreed that social capital could be built through connections, but said this could occur through organizational practices such as training, employee orientation and social events. They concluded that since these practices created occasions for individuals to connect with other members, they facilitated the development of social capital. Therefore, they recommended that organizations develop more opportunities for employees to build social relationships. However, Fang et al. (2011) feel similarly to Cohen and Prusak (2001) by saying that social capital can be encouraged, but not necessarily manufactured. In the end, employees have to understand the benefits of connecting and want to engage with one another.

Part-time professors and social capital. Part-time professors may lack social capital because of the isolation and ambiguity of their positions. This has mostly been studied in the literature through group membership and identification. Group membership, or belonging to a group, is important for building social capital because it encourages connections between members (Dolan, 2011). However, part-time

professors may lack group membership due to isolation, the uncertainty and impermanence of their position, and communication barriers between peers. In turn, inadequate social capital can affect their identity (including group and organizational identity) and competitive drive.

Group membership. Group membership, also seen as a sense of belonging to a group, continues to be a concept that often goes hand-in-hand with social capital. Dolan (2011) found that group membership is an important goal for adjuncts, and that it would improve their quality of teaching and research. Dolan (2011) showed in her research that motivated faculty are more likely to thrive in both of these activities if they have a strong sense of belonging to the institution and feel connected to the student body (Dolan, 2011, p. 63).

Dolan (2011) studied the perceptions of adjuncts who only taught online courses. She wanted to understand how adjunct instructors felt about their academic institutions' efforts to establish a relationship based on trust, loyalty, sense of affiliation, and a commitment to high-quality services. Specifically, Dolan wanted to understand whether periodically meeting face-to-face would nurture a stronger personal connection between academic management and faculty, and if that connection would meet an instructor's social, instrumental, and emotional needs. She hypothesized that if the connection made the professor feel respected, he or she would be motivated to provide students with the best possible learning experience (Dolan, 2011).

However, Dolan (2011) found that many adjuncts "did not feel they belonged to the organization they worked for" and "A large number did not see themselves as part of a team working with a common vision and goal" (Dolan, 2011, p. 70). One of the reasons Dolan (2011) attributed their lack of group identification was to rarely being on campus. In turn, Dolan (2011) says many high education institutions are struggling to define strategies for creating trust and loyalty among instructors who are not on campus regularly. A lack of connection may mean a loss of motivation, which would be detrimental to quality in education. Additionally, she concluded that the professor's inability to identify with the university

affected retention rates and job satisfaction, which would also affect the education quality (Dolan, 2011). Dolan's (2011) prognosis was cynical, as she said that a considerable effort would be required to bridge the interpersonal gap between management and faculty. But, many universities are still struggling for a successful connection strategy among part-time professors.

Additionally, part-time professors may have to face the stigma of being seen as an outsider, also known as being part of the 'out-group' (Brewer, 1979). Brewer (1979) claims in her study on intergroup discrimination that when groups separate into insiders of the organization and outsiders of an organization, it has detriments to the community as a whole. In-group bias may encourage favourability toward the in-group (full-time professors and the administration) and hostility toward the out-group (part-time professors). However, the "enhancement of in-group bias" is more likely to increase favouritism for the in-group rather than to increase hostility towards out-group members (p. 307). Brewer (1979) argues that competitiveness amplifies this bias, which is a common occurrence for part-time professors. In turn, part-time professors may be seen as the out-group, particularly if they do not interact with full-time staff and administration to form quality relationships.

Organizational identification. Connections create shared meaning between members in a group. When a member identifies oneself with a group through shared meaning, it often creates a sense of belonging. Therefore, connections are an important aspect of organizational identification. Organizational identification is defined as "the perception of oneness with or belongingness to an organization, where the individual defines him or herself in terms of the organization in which he or she is a member" (Mael and Ashforth, 1992, p. 104). Group membership improves retention and productivity, so it is an important factor to assess when examining how it affects a university's reputation (Crain, 2010). If part-time professors do not form a sense of belonging they may struggle with connectedness, which may affect their access to career opportunities, information about their job, and opportunities for forming interpersonal relationships for emotional support or advice.

Group identification can still occur among organizational members who do not necessarily work towards a shared goal, such as when part-time professors teach in different subjects or faculties. In order for an employee to identify with a group, he or she only has to perceive him or herself as “psychologically intertwined with the fate of the group” (Ashforth and Mael, 1989, p. 21). Camaraderie can form through identification, and may be a crucial factor for a newcomer’s feelings of connectedness (Schrodt, Cawyer, & Sanders, 2003, p. 17).

Thirolf (2012) conducted semi-structured, one-on-one interviews with part-time faculty who had been recently hired by a community college. He found that adjuncts form a positive group identity through teaching and interactions with their students, but often have negative encounters with their faculty peers. This was due a lack of connection and a feeling of being a second-class citizen in the university (Thirolf, 2012). Similarly, Gordon’s (2002) quantitative survey of 28 Florida community colleges showed that adjuncts felt like a “sort of migrant underclass in academia” who are accused of degrading “academic quality and integrity of the institution, because their teaching skills are inferior to full-time faculty” (p. 1). This would make them feel like outsiders, and they would not identify with their organization or peers. Gordon (2002) concluded that dissatisfied adjuncts would have negative consequences for the quality of education at universities due to a lack of organizational identification.

Identity. A high level of identification produces a strong identity, which is a potent indicator of how well a team functions (Henttonen, Johanson, & Janhonen, 2014). If members have internalized the identity of the group, they will have a stronger identity. Although a stronger identity generally leads to higher team effectiveness, having too much group social capital from one source (strong closure within a group, for example) can negatively affect the group’s effectiveness (Henttonen et al., 2014).

Henttonen et al. (2014) focused on bridging and bonding networks in their study of team identity. They use Lembke and Wilson’s (1998) definition of team identity, which is “a group-level construct representing the collective level of identification among all members” (Henttonen et al., 2014, p. 331).

These authors wanted to understand the extent to which bonding and bridging social relationships predict performance effectiveness and identity outcomes. Specifically, they wanted to reveal how bridging or bonding networks affect the creation of a team identity. Because individuals identify with the team through the social networks to which they belong to, team identity matters because those who identify more with their work teams perform more effectively (Henttonen et al., 2014).

The research was survey-based, involving 76 work teams and a total of 499 employees in 48 organisations. They found that there was a statistically significant positive relationship between bonding and bridging relationships and performance effectiveness and identity outcomes. Although the study failed to specifically investigate behavioural outcomes of bridging and bonding interactions, it proved that in order to improve performance effectiveness, managerial attention should focus on building a team and social networks (Henttonen et al., 2014).

Competition. Tajfel and Turner (2012) found in their study of social identity that participants were more likely to want to join a group when they thought it would be a competitive situation, and preferred autonomy when they expected to be in cooperative interactions. Despite the negative effects of competitiveness for part-time professors, it may also build opportunity for connection.

Bauder (2005) wrote a conceptual article that addressed the issues that his department had due to hiring a great deal of part-time professors who had to compete with one another for their livelihood. He says that part-time professors (in this case, those within a Canadian geography department) have either certain types of social capital (such as being part of a well-known research group) or cultural capital (such as a degree from a prestigious university or publications in high status journals) (Bauder, 2005). Individuals lacking this capital are more likely to be permanently relegated to temporary and part-time status (Bauder, 2005, 232-233).

He also argues that the segmentation of labour (i.e. where some workers are valued less than others) results in lower wages, fewer benefits and less recognition, despite having similar qualifications. With the

current growth of part-time or permanently temporary labour, sessional faculty should be concerned about their diminishing chances for upward mobility, despite their qualifications (Bauder, 2005).

Bauder (2005) says competition may be a new reality due to the shifting business models of some universities. He argues that academia has more recently mimicked the private sector by creating similar competitive expectations as corporations. This encourages rising competition for resources between university disciplines (Bauder, 2005). The effect of intensifying competition, he argues, is that academics stretch themselves too thin within their department and lower their quality of life.

Bourdieu (1988) suggested in a related context that the competition principle only works if the pool of competitors is small enough to have a reasonable chance at gaining the position, but still large enough to not guarantee its acquisition. Since a majority of departments may have a larger pool to choose from for part-time professors, it may not occur ubiquitously.

Research questions

The purpose of this study is to describe the experience of new part-time professors and their social connections. This research will examine how these connections relate to social capital, looking at Lin's (2011) strength and intensity of ties.

Using Moustakas' (1994) phenomenological approach for collecting and analyzing data and Creswell's (2007) approach for establishing validity, this research uncovers several thematic patterns among part-time professors in relation to accessing and mobilizing social capital – specifically, the barriers they face and the methods they use for navigating these barriers.

Three main questions guide this research:

1. What is a part-time professors' experience with social connections at the university?
2. What barriers have they faced in forming social connections, if any?
3. How does this affect their social capital?

The first question seeks a part-time professor's relationships with peers, students, and administration. It will examine a professor's strength and extensity of ties to assess whether they have adequate social connections. The researcher defines "adequate" social connections as having enough strength and variability in a social network to access and mobilize the necessary resources for achieving instrumental or expressive goals. For example, if a part-time professor indicated that they were able to access and mobilize enough resources to complete their job, they had adequate connections. Therefore, the adequacy of a part-time professor's connections will be measured by examining their perceived ability to access and mobilize resources. It will also examine whether a part-time professor has a strong identity with peers, administration, and the university.

The second question addresses the barriers to social connection among part-time faculty, such as feeling overwhelmed, uncertainty and impermanence, physical or interpersonal communication barriers, and feeling like a second-class citizen. It will also examine whether they were able to overcome these obstacles if they experienced them, and how they did it.

The third question addresses how a part-time professor's connection affects the return on their social capital. It will examine whether there is an inequality of social capital and look at how part-time professors are able to access and mobilize social capital. In conclusion, it will examine the effect this has on a part-time professor's work, organizational membership, identity, and competition within the university.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

This study aims to explore the experience of being a new part-time professor (1-5 years) at the University of Ottawa. It embraces a phenomenological approach, which Smith (2012) defines as the study of conscious experience as lived from the first-person perspective (Zahavi, 2012). The phenomenological approach tries to understand specific phenomena, or occurrences, by studying the structure of a person's experience (Smith, 2003). Structures of experiences could include such things as the perception, memory, emotion, and social activity of a sample (Smith, 2003). This research will use these structures of experience to understand the phenomenon.

A major aspect of an experience is intentionality, which is a conscious representation of a person's perceptions of an object (e.g. a person or institution) or state of affairs (e.g. an emotional state or status) (Smith, 2003). A person's thoughts, concepts, ideas, and images make up the content and meaning of their experience (Smith, 2003). In turn, phenomenology addresses the meaning of objects, events and the self through the lens of a person's experiences (Smith, 2003). By examining a person's experiences (i.e. consciousness), phenomenology develops a complex account of their perception of everyday connections as well as self-awareness, purpose/intention in action, feelings of empathy and collectivity, communication patterns, and social interactions (including collective action) (Smith, 2003).

Phenomenology is a well-suited choice for this study due to its ability to address multiple opinions surrounding one phenomenon. In turn, it can understand the essence of the experience (Creswell, 2007). Phenomenology can describe the meaning that a participant attributes to a lived experience and any common experience participants have, such as a shared emotion (Creswell, 2007, p. 57). For this study, the researcher used the phenomenological approach to explore the shared experiences of new part-time professors.

Sample

The population for this study was new part-time professors (1-5 years) at the University of Ottawa. A purposive sample of 12 new part-time professors participated in the study, and 11 were used for the final sample. One participant asked to be removed before coding due to confidentiality concerns. Participants were predominantly women (83%) and many were between 25-35 years old (58%), with the remainder of participants being 40-45 (16%) and 50+ (25%). Most described themselves as fluently bilingual (75%), some had a working proficiency of French (16%), and a few participants were unable to speak French (8%). All participants had a Master's degree or higher, with over half having a Ph.D (54%). Many were former University of Ottawa students. Two participants had another full-time or part-time job, one participant was retired from a full-time job but returned to the workforce to teach part-time, five had taught for a few years after graduating, two recent graduates (one PhD and one Masters), and one participant had a full-time job in education, but decided to leave in order to teach at the university level. Because the researcher's main concern was the experience of new part-time professors and not their employment category, these categorical subtypes were not used for recruitment, but as a guiding framework for analysis in order to understand how each type may have a different rapport with peers.

Inclusion criteria for the sample were a) working as a part-time professor at the University of Ottawa, b) being employed as a part-time professor no earlier than 2010, and c) the ability to communicate fluently in English.

The reasoning for sampling new part-time professors is due to the assumption that after five years, the experience may not be as novel or easy to recall. The participants had to be fluent in English due to the researcher's limited proficiency in French.

Sampling strategy

The sample for this study included faculty members at the University of Ottawa that were on the English and French mailing lists for the APTPUO, the part-time professor's union. Although the

APTPUO was unable to confirm the exact number that subscribed to their emails, they maintained it would reach the majority of part-time professors at the University because part-time professors were automatically added to the list after the hiring process was complete.

This sampling strategy attracted more participants than anticipated. Over twenty respondents were scheduled for an interview that would take place at a time of the part-time professor's convenience. Interviews took place in the researcher's office except for one instance, which took place in a part-time professor's office. The researcher reached data saturation at 12 participants – after sampling, one participant asked to be removed from the study, leaving the data sample at 11 participants. She contacted the remaining participants via email to cancel the interviews, explaining that the study had reached saturation, and thanked them for their time and interest. The high response rate confirmed that this is a subject of interest to participants. However, it should be noted that this sample is more likely to contain participants who wish to voice a specific concern because the onus was on them to contact the researcher. Therefore, this knowledge must be kept in mind when understanding the phenomenon.

Research Design

Phenomenology is best suited for research in which it is important to understand several individuals' common or shared experiences of a phenomenon (Creswell, 2007, p. 60). Because part-time professors are a diverse group who have a shared experience (being a new part-time professor), it is an apt method for this study. Creswell (2007) argues that it is important to examine a group's shared experiences in order to develop practices and policies and to understand the phenomenon holistically (p.61).

In phenomenology, the researcher attempts to lessen her experiential bias by setting aside past beliefs and being open to understanding a phenomenon faithfully (Creswell, 2007). Moustakas (1994) recommends that researchers using this approach “bracket” their past experiences and describe their personal experiences with the phenomenon, which will help explain their worldview in the study.

As a student and peer of part-time professors, it was necessary for the researcher to acknowledge and attempt to bracket those past experiences. The researcher is a student of the University of Ottawa and has had a great deal of contact with part-time professors at the undergraduate and graduate level. During her time as a student at the University of Ottawa, professors remarked to her about the lack of connection and resources available to part-time professors. Additionally, her spouse has shared his experience as a part-time teacher in a different post-secondary institution. In order to bracket these experiences, the researcher collected data from part-time professors who she had not had as an instructor.

Procedure

Recruitment. The researcher obtained a letter of attestation from Robert Johnson, the President of the APTUO, which specified the recruitment procedures for the study. The researcher approached APTPUO because they could access a large sample of part-time professors through their email list. The APTPUO agreed to send a call to participate to its members on its English and French email lists. The email included the researcher's contact information and the instruction that they should contact the researcher directly if they wanted to participate in the study.

The researcher created an English and French version of the recruitment letter (See Appendix C). Since the researcher is not fully bilingual, the French copy was written by a bilingual peer and confirmed by her supervisor. Afterwards, the APTPUO Communications Director verified the copy and emailed it to all French and English contacts, inviting part-time professors to participate by emailing the researcher. The recruitment text stressed fluency in English for the interview in both versions of the text.

A total of 26 participants voiced their interest to the researcher via email, and those who met the inclusion criteria were scheduled for an interview on a first-come, first served basis. Twenty participants were scheduled, and the first 12 participants were chosen for the sample. The remainder, two participants, were notified via email that the study had reached saturation. The remaining six cancelled their interview, failed to show up for their interview, or could no longer commit to the interview after initial scheduling.

Interviews. Semi-structured interviews were conducted over a four-week period at the researcher's office – and once at a part-time professor's office – after obtaining informed consent (see Appendix D). Interviews lasted between 45 and 85 minutes and proceeded until the researcher achieved saturation with the interview questions.

The researcher conducted all interviews, asking each part-time professor to discuss their experience through six main open-ended questions about their experience and social connections at the University of Ottawa (see Appendix B). There were no formal incentives for participation. Interviews were transcribed by the researcher and a transcribing service. The transcriber signed a confidentiality agreement before accessing the data (See Appendix E).

Individual interviews ensure a greater chance of anonymity and confidentiality, and therefore it was an imperative method for this research (Reinard, 2008, p. 355). Through interviewing, the participant's feelings and attitudes towards the phenomenon can be revealed without the fear of consequences, unlike other methods (e.g. focus groups). Anonymity and confidentiality were rigorously addressed by using pseudonyms and generalizing specific details that would identify a participant in the thesis. By addressing this issue, the researcher was able to use the method to increase a part-time professor's feelings of safety and openness with describing their connections, ensuring a thick description of their experiences. Additionally, individual interviews were easier to schedule than focus groups, given the participants' irregular schedules and limited time on campus.

The interview questions were developed from Chen et al.'s (2009) Personal Social Capital Scale, which measured the social capital of an individual, and Poulsen, Christensen, Lund, and Avlund's (2011) scale, which was used as a guide for assessing collective social capital. The researcher used the close-ended questions from both scales and adapted them into open-ended questions to ensure qualitative description.

Data Analysis

As recommended by Creswell (2007), all transcripts were read several times to obtain an overall feeling for them. The researcher then developed a list of significant statements by choosing phrases that pertained directly to a part-time professor's experiences and connections. Although the research did not focus on experiences with students, some statements included student relationships if the connection continued after the student's graduation. As recommended by Moustakas (1994) on his discussion on analysis, the researcher treated all significant statements as having equal worth (horizontalization).

The researcher used a qualitative data program, Atlas.ti, to organize and code the data. Moustakas' (1994) methods were used to analyze participant's transcripts. First, the researcher coded textural description ("what" the participants experienced) and a structural description ("how" the experience happened). From that output, the researcher coded the emergent "meaning units," or common themes of the shared experience, from the significant statements and phrases (Moustakas, 1994). The formulated meanings were then clustered into themes common to all of the participants' transcripts. The results were then integrated into an in-depth description of the phenomenon.

Validation

The data was validated using Creswell's (2007) methods for ensuring validity and reliability in qualitative phenomenology studies. He recommends staying reflexive throughout the research and evaluating the phenomenon using peer-reviewed literature for analysis, as well as evaluating the data accurately and objectively.

Validation was addressed in three ways. First, the researcher attained triangulation through academic literature searches, interviews, and gathering quantitative data from APTPUO's website. Second, validation was ensured through thick description. The researcher recorded a thorough account of participants' experience by using verbatim quotations and collecting background data for each participant.

Finally, the data was externally reviewed by a peer, who challenged any doubts on methods or meanings of the significant statements.

Reliability

Reliability was ensured through tape recording interviews, taking detailed field notes, bracketing past experiences, and transcribing participants' experience verbatim (Creswell, 2007, p. 61). The researcher also gave participants the opportunity to review their transcripts after transcription, and interviewed the sample until saturation of data was achieved. Finally, the researcher ensured transparency by organizing the data into three phases of analysis in Atlas.ti. In turn, each step could be verified if the data's validity needed to be confirmed.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

The essence of part-time professors' experience was represented by looking at the barriers they faced, how they navigated such barriers, and how it affected their social capital. These areas provided results that could answer the research questions. The results encompass aspects that frequently show up in the literature about part-time professors – feelings of isolation, uncertainty and impermanence, and communication barriers (most notably, a difference in geographical distance, age, values or language). Each theme is linked to the theory and concepts discussed in the literature review.

The findings outlined below have narrative examples from participants to demonstrate each theme. The researcher extracted the significant statements from 11 verbatim transcripts. A statement was considered significant if a participant spoke directly about the phenomenon in question (being a new part-time professor, connections with peers), as recommended by Creswell (2007). The researcher interpreted the meanings of these phrases as an informed reader of the literature and context from the participant.

The themes emerged from a combination of the literature and the data results. An interpretation of the statements revealed four overarching features of the phenomenon, which formed the main themes: “Feeling Overwhelmed,” “Uncertainty and Impermanence,” “There’s no Place like Home,” and “Second-class Citizens.”

The first theme, “Feeling Overwhelmed,” represents a part-time professor’s perceived struggle to meet the minimum requirements of their lives (i.e. social and teaching duties). The second theme, “Uncertainty and Impermanence,” was composed of two areas: “Uncertainty” was used to describe feelings of insecurity or ambiguity, and “Impermanence” was used to describe a feeling of not being permanent or enduring. They were combined into one theme because they overlapped frequently in part-time professors’ experiences. The third theme, “There’s no Place like Home,” focused on the relationships of part-time professors and their sense of belonging. The fourth and final theme, “Second-class Citizens,” focused on how part-time professors perceived their status. See Appendix F for an example of a

significant statement for each theme, its subthemes (explained in more detail below), and the formulated meaning of each statement.

Theme 1: Feeling Overwhelmed

The theme “Feeling Overwhelmed” represents a part-time professor’s struggle to meet the minimum requirements of their lives (i.e. social requirements, teaching requirements). The theme reflects participants’ perceived success or failure to carry out their duties due to their work environment. Struggling was a pervasive image for many part-time professors, specifically due to scarce resources such as time and finances. Two specific struggles emerged, forming the subthemes: keeping pace with teaching duties and sacrificing social life.

Keeping Pace with Teaching Duties

This subtheme represents the difficulty that new part-time professors had with “keeping up” with their teaching duties, such as class preparation and meeting with students. Participants expressed the anxiety, fear and stress they felt trying to “keep up”:

The hours are difficult. I’m developing strategies now to, um, protect myself [from burnout], which I think is absolutely essential....There’s also this constant push and pull between doing what you feel is the best thing pedagogically and what you can actually physically manage as a human being....I got so burnt out, so stressed, I was exhausted....I’ve since realised that...it is just not feasible for one human being to do effectively and maintain their sanity. (Sam)

Sam said that she would frequently break into tears due to the stress of the workload. One participant had to design or redesign four courses in one semester, and described the experience as “it’s so much work you kind of lose your mind.” He said that if a fellow professor had not shared class materials with him, he “probably would have quit.” Another expressed that she frequently – and mostly – was motivated to overwork herself because she feared not being “able to land,” or secure permanent employment.

Participants felt that keeping pace with teaching prevented them from accomplishing other long-term goals, such as doing academic research in order to eventually secure a full-time academic position. Many participants voiced their concern about the difficulty of doing research while teaching. One

participant felt that teaching while trying to publish was like “trying to keep your head above water,” emphasizing that it took great mental and physical stamina to maintain the necessary pace. She maintained that the increased workload and limited timelines of part-time professorship would inevitably lead to the exclusion of people with disabilities or mental health issues.

Participants pointed out that a heavy teaching load was required to gain enough income to “live,” but “if you want to have time to write, you can’t actually teach too much,” creating an inescapable dilemma for many. Several participants had taught at multiple universities and cities in order to gain enough income, but found that the teaching occupied time they would have otherwise spent on research.

Sink then swim. Although many felt like they were “trying to keep their head above water” in the beginning, most part-time professors quickly learned to “swim” after a few weeks of teaching. One participant said that her initial anxiety was her insecurities, but once she “got started” she “was fine.” Another participant described it as “overcoming a great challenge,” saying that it took “tons of work,” to get to a level of comfort in her own abilities. Others stated that their knowledge “evolved” as they became more settled into the role, and they “found their way” with experience, and noticed they were “becoming better and better” at coping with their teaching duties:

So there was a lot of anxiety until like the third or fourth week of class, like, “OK, I’m cool. I’m cool with this. I’ve got my head out of water finally.” So, it’s almost like the confidence and the happiness level in a semester, it just grows. At the beginning it’s really stressful, you don’t know how....and then, it just evolves. By the end of the semester, you know what you’re doing, most of it is done, you’re not worried about how you’ll construct assignments, the students seem happy and it’s like “Woah. I survived.” (Marc)

Social Life Sacrificed

This subtheme denoted the impact of being a part-time professor on participants’ socialization. Many participants reported that in order to meet the expected requirements, they had to forfeit their social life. When teaching took priority, many participants struggled in their relationships or socialized less with peers, friends and family.

Social life? You put everything aside. If you want to be a full-time professor and that’s like your

plan A, everything is set aside. (Michelle)

One participant neglected her relationships so much that it caused a breakup with a significant other.

Another said that despite feeling financially secure, she had sacrificed her social life and it was “killing” her. Another said that the workload did not interfere with her personal life, but it prevented her from socializing with other faculty members.

Theme 2: Uncertainty and Impermanence

In this theme, participants described the unpredictability, ambiguity, and instability associated with being a part-time professor. “Uncertainty” was used to describe feelings of insecurity or ambiguity, while “Impermanence” was used to describe a feeling of not being permanent or enduring. Both feelings frequently occurred in the context of job security and knowledge of organizational practice. Hesitation primarily stemmed from a desire to know more about the university’s rules and regulations and who they should contact for administrative or teaching tasks. Many felt more certain and permanent if they received support from another organizational member such as an administrative assistant, former thesis supervisor, or other faculty members (both full-time and part-time).

“Uncertainty and Impermanence” was further broken down into subthemes that were based on the guiding literature and participant’s responses. First, feelings of *temporariness* were common for part-time professors, resulting in uncertainty and impermanence. Second, part-time professors faced a *discontinuity of courses* – the inability to get a course twice – which prevented them from building on their previous resources. Thus, not being able to get a continuity of courses resulted in an uncertainty and impermanence in their teaching duties and position.

Temporariness

Participants described their feelings of temporariness as employees at the University of Ottawa. Most were unsure if they would have a job the next semester. Many felt “expendable” and that they could “easily be replaced.” One described herself as a Band-Aid, or “a temporary solution that can be removed

at any time.” Others described the unpredictability in terms of their lack of ability to “plan for finances,” start a family, or have relationships. One participant said that the uncertainty of her permanence led to many discussions with her family about where they were going to live. Many participants felt that part-time professorship was a transitional role which would not lead to a sustainable career:

You might start to think that you do have a network and a place, but the reality is you don't. There is no job coming, we know that.... I think that's the one benefit about the job market: you don't have to be discreet that you're looking for a job because everybody knows that you're here in a temporary way. (Ashley)

Another said that any “appearance of stability” was “just a perception, and not reality.” One mature graduate said that the only options part-time professors had were to remain nomadic or wait for a full-time position that may never come. One recent graduate said it was “scary” because she still had student debt, and her ability to pay it depended on her ability to secure a position every semester.

Although most participants felt impermanent and described this experience in negative terms, many also felt that using part-time work as a “supplemental” option was an ideal situation and thus viewed it positively. One participant, who also owned her own business, reflected that being a part-time professor actually helped her secure her financial situation by being supplemental to her contract work. Other participants pointed to fact that, while the job was impermanent, it did provide regular employment every semester, given the number of courses available and thus offered stability in the long-term. In this sense, they felt that they were able to secure consistent employment, but were still anxious because it was not guaranteed.

Discontinuity of Courses

Many part-time professors felt they did not know what they would be teaching until a few weeks beforehand. Many spoke of the consequences of being unable to secure the same course twice, which was a common occurrence. Most taught a course only once, and therefore could not use their class materials for subsequent semesters. Most noted this discontinuity of courses as one of the biggest challenges of being a part-time professor.

What I find difficult...I'm making new classes and preparing new classes each year for...five years now. There's some classes that I gave two times, but sometimes they don't offer them, so it's a bit difficult to navigate. I think a class is good after the third time that you give it....There's only one class that I gave three times, and I could see the difference in my own assurance...in front of the class and in my...knowledge of the subject that I presented, and my ability to navigate without my notes. (Anne-Marie)

Most part-time professors expressed how this lack of continuity prevented them from flourishing in their teaching. One stated that she felt so precarious and rushed each time she built a course, and that it was only up to her standards the third time she taught it. She noted that those with a permanent position would have that time for their “courses to evolve,” which would cause a difference in the quality of teaching.

In one case, a discontinuity of courses prevented one participant from gaining a higher status in her career. She had been trying to become a Class B teacher, who could only have their course “taken away” was if the person was also a Class B and had seniority. In order to become a Class B teacher, she needed to teach a course three times or more and have satisfactory student ratings – although she had the ratings, she was continuously hired for new courses, preventing her from gaining a higher status.

Administration was able to remove the ambiguity of part-time employment for one participant. She was grateful to know what classes she would be teaching because it allowed her to achieve work/life balance by planning time with family:

I was the only one basically teaching that [class]. So then it was a little bit obvious, so the director said “okay let’s stop this nonsense, you are still teaching next year.” Which I appreciated from knowing what the dates are going to be, when I can take some holidays, when I can go and visit relatives. (Martine)

Theme 3: There’s no Place like Home

In this theme, part-time professors focused on their relationships and sense of belonging in the departmental or faculty community. Many expressed that they felt part of a larger community and hoped to stay in their department. Most had positive relationships with peers, the majority with a research supervisor. One participant said this relationship progressed into a close friendship because he “treated

her as an equal.” Another sited she was thankful for her supervisor, ash she was as a consistent source for support and mentorship:

I have been working with [my MA supervisor] now for at least five years, quite closely, and she’s someone who I feel like no matter what question or feeling I have, I can talk to her about it. It’s a pretty powerful thing to have, I think, and I think a lot of people don’t have that, so I’m really grateful... to have that in my life. (Sam)

Many also formed relationships with full-time faculty through causal relationships. One participant said she met with one full-time faculty member to discuss concerns about specific students in the program, and they formed a connection. She said this encouraged her to go to a social event at the end of the year, which part-time professors do not often attend.

Many said the department they presently worked in was a positive working environment; one participant stated that it was “very collegial,” which was a reason she wanted to work there. However, two participants also reported having to leave departments in which they did not feel respected or supported. One participant said that even though he still heard negative gossip about his old department, his life was “just wonderful” since he had moved to his new department.

Un Electron Libre

“Un Electron Libre” was used to describe the feeling of not being connected to peers or the university community. Although many found the autonomy of the job freeing, others felt isolation due to disconnection from peers:

I had the impression that I’m, like, a...an electron libre. I’m alone, I’m [by] myself. I prepare my classes [at] home and then I come to the university. I give my class and I come back home and I don’t really have anyone to talk to. (Anne Marie)

For many, their lack of connection was partially due to communication barriers, both physical (e.g. not being at the office enough for connection) and interpersonal (having a different set of values, speaking a different language, or being a specific age). Being “Un Electron Libre” was categorized into three aspects based on responses from participants: Autonomy, isolation, and inclusion. The following subthemes are described in detail below.

Autonomy. Many part-time professors felt autonomous, independent and in control of their day-to-day lives, saying that “no one” was “checking in” on them to make sure specific things were added to their curriculum. Many said that administration “didn’t know what they [part-time professors] were doing,” and another said that “they give you a blank canvas....everything is in your power to do.”

Others expressed the “freedom” of being able to leave an institution on their own terms if they no longer wanted to teach – one stated that full-time faculty would have to apply for a sabbatical, where she had the freedom to “just go somewhere else.”

Isolation. Many part-time professors felt conflicted about being “Un Electron Libre” – on the one hand, they “enjoyed the freedom,” and on the other hand, they felt as if they were “alone” and “isolated.” One participant described academia as a “lonely, isolating type job in many ways” because despite having opportunities to connect and the means to do so, research required a fair amount of “sitting in a room on my own...on a computer.” Another said that connection with other part-time professors was important because they were “so isolated” and although it felt like home, her experience there was “distant.” This sense of isolation negatively impacted a participant’s likelihood to receive interpersonal support such as feedback. One participant said that “the feedback from the departmental administrators is very formulaic... [it’s based] on student response, they have no idea, none, what you’d done.” In some cases, this led to a feeling of being abandoned:

They send you an email saying, you’re teaching this course, and that’s the last thing you hear from anyone and...I had all these questions, you know... What’s proper? What’s not proper? What do you do when this happens? What do you do when that happens? There is lots of information out there and I know colleagues who I could talk to, but it is a very isolating feeling when you... especially when you’re first starting out. (Sam)

Many participants cited student connections made during class were the best way for them to alleviate isolation.

Inclusion. Part-time professors described whether they felt connected based on their perceived inclusion and participation in social, academic, faculty, or departmental activities (e.g. seminars, graduation

ceremonies, committee work). Many felt disconnected from peers and the university. One participant described full-time faculty as “a little clique...they live together, they share coffee,” but said they were “very welcoming... [and] appreciative,” when she would attend events that she was not paid for. Another said that she was always surprised about how many people included her in discussions at work and “value my opinion.” One participant stated that she felt included if there were “no restrictions” on the use of office equipment, such as the photocopier. Others said that that sitting on a departmental assembly was a good source of inclusion and a sense of belonging. Many voiced their dissent about no longer being able to participate on such committees, since it prevented them from affecting change in their department:

Everybody seems to be on some committee or another. It doesn't reach down to me...they're not particularly interested in the input of part timers generally. (John)

A few participants – mostly recent and mature graduates – attributed their sense of inclusion to a relationship with a superior, such as the dean or their former thesis supervisor, but stated that did not expand to the department as a whole. One participant said “that sense of community” was “priceless” for her, and contributed to her “being satisfied” with her position at the university. However, not everyone felt included in their community. One participant said there “could be more that is done to create a sense of community,” and another said that although she was invited to social gatherings, she knew that part-time professors were usually not included. She attributed this exclusion as faculty not wanting to “exploit their labour when they are already exploited...and give them false expectations by making them feel welcome.” The participant often referred to part-time professors as “them,” and corrected herself several times, since she was herself a part-time professor. She stated that she did not identify with the group due to her fellowship – she said the award resulted in her being treated with a higher status than the “regular contract professor” and made her feel more welcome. Another participant said that she had been made not to feel welcome for the same reason – that there would be no chance of a full-time position. Another applied for a full-time position, and was excited to “have benefits...supervise, be part of a committee....

be faculty,” but was rejected by the dean. As a result, she felt that her status had been taken away since she had already been accepted by the department.

On the edges. Many attributed a lack of inclusion to not being well known within the department. One participant said that he thought that most of the faculty “wouldn’t know I existed.” Many felt that part-time professors were “totally on the edges” of their community, and “needed an in” to connect with peers. Two participants said that as they nurtured their connections, they formed “real friendships” through a broader sense of community and collegiality. In turn, they were often invited to events more, such as lectures.

Communication Barriers

This theme, based on the literature, explored part-time professors’ perceptions of barriers to connection. We organized these barriers into *physical* (e.g. not being in the office enough, not being on the departmental mailing list) or *interpersonal* (e.g. having different values, speaking a different language, being a certain age).

Physical barriers. Part-time professors were not often on campus or included in departmental communications unless they explicitly asked. One participant said that she would never see her director except on the rare occasion when she shared an elevator with him. This lack of connection with departmental colleagues prevented many part-time professors from hearing about academic information and social events:

I mentioned [a seminar] to another part-time prof coming from Montreal, and I said “Mary, that might interest you.” She had no clue what I was talking about... it was a topic that was relevant for her, but she didn’t know, because she wasn’t on the departmental mailing list....the part-time profs who are coming from out of town with no office, they just come in, teach the course, and then go home, so they’re not aware of a lot of things that are going on in the department.
(Charlotte)

Interpersonal barriers. Interpersonal barriers are personality differences that prevent effective communication. Participants reported facing several obstacles to communication, including a speaking a different language, age barriers, and a difference in values.

Language barriers. Most participants were bilingual, but stated that they knew colleagues who had difficulty with the University's dynamic because of their limited English. One participant who had limited French stated that it was "a challenge" in group settings because she knew it was important for her to be "part of a group," and that she felt like "an outsider" at events and meetings because she was not fluent in the language. This caused a barrier to communication when in formal group settings, such as meetings. However, all participants blamed themselves for this barrier and maintained that the bilingual dynamic made the University of Ottawa "unique." All denied that it affected their ability to connect with peers outside of formal settings, because peers would often switch to their language of choice.

Age barriers. Part-time professors also found that age sometimes formed a barrier to communication, and therefore, connection. Surprisingly, this was the most prevalent with a participant in her mid-twenties (the youngest of the sample). She said that she did not feel she had the same goals and values as other people that were a similar age in her department – she did not want to be a "stereotypical professor," which she felt others were striving for. However, she also acknowledged that because of her age, she may also approach teaching differently than seasoned faculty, which also may cause barriers among peers.

I do feel sometimes that my age is a big factor on why I do things differently, and that doing things differently has, I feel, put up a barrier between me and some of the people who I work with. To some degree I think that barrier is internalised. I feel like, if I tell people the really unconventional way I do things, they'll tell me I'm crazy. They'll tell me, you shouldn't do it like that. And maybe, in reality, if I was really vocal about how I did things, then people would say, it's really cool, maybe I'll do that. But, in my limited experience, that hasn't been the case. (Sam)

Most participants felt the opposite way about age, stating that it was not a barrier to connection. One participant said she was "old" so she "fit in," while others in who were in their 20s and 30s felt it did not affect their "relationships in any way."

Difference in values. Some part-time professors faced barriers to communication due to a difference in values. Often, this was due to a different teaching philosophy, such as focusing on theoretical material versus practical, career-based exercises. Many participants said they did not connect with those who did

not share their teaching values because they had little else in common, one saying that she felt that her and one professor in particular “come from very different places in terms of what we’re trying to do here” and had a very different temperament. She said this barrier had prevented her from reaching out for resources or support in the past. Most participants navigated these barriers by avoiding the peer altogether or taking their advice with extreme prejudice.

Reaching out

A large part of feeling part of a community resulted from *reaching out* to colleagues for interpersonal support or resources. Part-time professors discussed the likelihood of their reaching out to peers for support. One participant said she “made an effort” to reach out to professors, usually by asking them to lunch. Others reached out by asking for advice or material for courses. Many had relationships with reception staff who were “very helpful” whenever participants asked for anything. In sum, part-time teachers reached out for three reasons: *interpersonal support* (mentoring, empathy), *teaching materials* (course outlines, presentations), *pedagogical or technological support* (labs, training and certifications), and for *career opportunities* (information, influence for positions).

Interpersonal support. Many part-time professors reported reaching out for interpersonal support. This involved connecting with someone in times of need to achieve a more positive self-image or get helpful advice. Often, this was for comfort or coping with stress at work:

She’s a full-time professor. And...she’s also one of my best friends at work. I remember one time I was going through a rough time with my girlfriend, and I went to her. We go for coffee at least twice a year. So we’ll talk about stuff like that. When you’re chatting with a friend, you feel better for just having chatted about it. (Marc)

Many expressed a sense of gratitude because they were able to seek support for “stress relief,” whether it was a personal or a professional concern. One participant said she did not think she would “have been able to cope” if she did not have friends that she could talk to that would understand the challenges of part-time professorship. Most attributed this stress to the uncertainty and ambiguity of the position, which one participant said a full-time professor alleviated when she reassured her that it was “normal, [and]

everybody felt that way.” Many others, especially new and mature graduates, said it felt good “just to know you’re not alone, facing these challenges.” A few participants said they received support and encouragement from seasoned part-time professors, who they often shared an office with. Often, participants reached out to full-time professors for interpersonal support or for advice about their courses. In one case, this helped a teacher understand how to help a student with a disability get the resources he needed for her class:

One professor helped me when I had my special needs student and it was my first semester, so I had no idea what to do. He’s the one who directed me to human resources to make sure that I knew how to properly take care of him, because... his particular evaluation had to be done differently than others because of his limitations. And I wouldn’t have known that unless my colleague had told me this is where you’ve got to go, these are the people you talk to. It was very helpful....I figured if anybody would know, it’s him. [laugh] (Danielle)

Teaching materials. Many also reached out to full-time professors in the department when they needed teaching materials such as previous course outlines and presentations. Many were able to mention at least one instance where they reached out for resources such as teaching materials. Getting teaching resources from peers could “relieve a lot of stress” due to the short turnaround required for designing a course – many part-time professors said they had anywhere from three days to two weeks to prepare a course for the department’s approval.

You’re teaching a new class, and they [administration] tell you three days in advance that you’re teaching it. Because one class got cancelled, and then suddenly you have to prepare a whole course from scratch, and you only have a couple of days to think about it. So, you try to contact the professors that have taught that class before, so they can give you an example of resources they have used at class. (Marc)

He said that teachers were sometimes “very protective of their material” and that he had reached out and been refused access to a professor’s slides once. Otherwise, many full-time professors who had formerly taught the course were reported to share their course materials with part-time professors and participants recounted being grateful for this collegiality.

Technological or pedagogical support. Part-time professors also reached out for technological or pedagogical support services such as TLSS (Teaching and Learning Support Services) and the

Multimedia Centre (support for using interactive teaching tools, such as Blackboard Learn and LectureTools). Most participants were successful with reaching out for support in this context, whether they considered themselves technologically literate or “a bit of a luddite.” One participant said she saw the TLSS team as peers after training for her certificate in teaching, taking “pretty much every course they have to offer,” and learning how to develop a Blended Learning (mixed media) course.

For career. Part-time professors often reached out for information or support in regards to their career. Many said that it was a subject that “came up often” in informal talks at conferences, and it was also acceptable to talk about it freely among faculty. One participant said that part-time professors are aware of the full-time positions that their colleagues are applying for and that it is common to show solidarity by asking how their applications are going. However, they were most likely to hear about career information and opportunities from full-time faculty, who would “help in any way” they could by writing reference letters and “looking around” for job opportunities in their network. This also included vouching for the participant if they knew they had applied to a position within the department.

In one case, the dean offered a participant a position at the University of Ottawa in order to encourage the participant – who had received a prestigious fellowship – to stay at the University. She felt that because “people know how badly” a part-time professor wants tenure, this information can be used manipulatively and that, in her case, the Dean actually tried to “hang it over her” as bait.

So the year I got the fellowship, I also got a tenure track job at a very small university that was very remote. The Dean really wanted that fellowship—it’s prestigious for him to have it here. So in a meeting, he was like, “We’ll make a position for you” etc., etc. And so, weighing a lot of personal and professional things, I decided to take a gamble and turned down the tenure track job—despite all the precariousness. Then that was just an empty promise: there was no way to get a job here....I got a better job in the end but it didn’t pay off in getting a job here, which was kind of the hope. (Ashley)

Reasons for not reaching out. Those who did not reach out attributed their behaviour to not “having the time.” Moonlighters and mature graduates often said they were not physically around, had other responsibilities that took priority, or had no need to reach out unless it was essential. One participant

said she only talked to administration unless she had a problem, because “we don’t have much to say to each other.” Many felt that it was their responsibility to reach out and not the University’s, but said that they had difficulty fitting time for these connections into their schedule because they did “something on the side” and were on campus enough to reach out.

Working Together

In this theme, participants described the level of cooperation in their community, specifically when collaborating on mutual goals. Most agreed that conferences were the best place to make connections and collaborate with peers for research or teaching but admitted that collaboration was rare, since part-time professors no longer were “invited to meetings.” Others stated that the work atmosphere involved less collaboration than other types of organizations. The most common reason for collaboration was when a part-time professor had to work with full-time faculty for a “Section B” course. “Section B” courses are due to over-registration of students in “Section A,” so they are often seen as an extension of a full-time professor’s class. Many felt that teaching the same material was necessary, even if the syllabus did not specify that specific course material had to be covered. Others divided up the work in order to teach their specialty, and thus taught for half a semester:

I taught the front half of the course and she [a permanent professor] taught the last. I taught the front half because it was the international side, and I frankly know a hell of a lot more than she does on [the subject]. It was very much, ‘okay you’re taking this up to this, you’re covering these things,’ and she was going to cover the other aspects. (John)

For some, working together was a challenging experience. One person felt he had to play “monkey in the middle,” because a conflict between a Section A and Section B professor resulted in barriers to communication. Another participant was satisfied with the resources she was provided by her Section A professor, but had disagreements over “the way I’ve been doing things.” Both likened this to personality differences and different values in teaching. Many stated that other than collaborating on courses, they had “no contact with professors whatsoever,” unless they saw them by chance in the department or at a conference.

Theme 4: Second-class Citizens

In this theme, part-time professors focused on the perception of their status, both how they perceived themselves and how they felt others perceived them in the community. Four subthemes emerged based on a combination of the literature and participants' responses. First, many felt they were *scavenging for resources* because they took the "leftovers" from full-time professors and were unable to get the courses that they specialized in due to their limited seniority. Second, most did not feel strongly about *self-identification as a part-time professor*. In effect, a few participants thought they should have a different identity label that was both representative of their contributions and gave them a higher status in the community. Third, many participants felt they had *no leverage* – that is, they did not have much influence in the community – due to their status as a part-time professor. Finally, they felt that their department or faculty communicated the message that part-time professors were *not that valued* in the community. Perceptions of not being valued led to feelings of inadequacy and a lower status for many. Many felt they were on a "lower tier," and had less status than full-time or adjunct faculty. However, one participant felt she was never "second fiddle" because she was able to do research with colleagues.

Scavenging for resources

Part-time professors frequently gave the impression that they were foraging for whatever they could get in terms of classes, positions, and resources (i.e. office space). Many attributed the need to scavenge to their part-time status and lower seniority than other professors, full or part-time. One participant said that if she had a Ph.D she would have more options, and another said she felt like she was "picking up crumbs." One participant voiced his dissent at full-time professors, who always "got at least one of their choices," and he did not because of his status. Another expressed that since she was a new part-time professor, her reality involved applying "for everything and hope I get a job." This situation was common for many, and participants either expressed inspiration and excitement in this uncertainty or indifference and a sense of defeat, saying that it was "just the way it is" and they had to adjust to the

reality of their situation. In turn, many reached out for classes that they felt they were not entirely suited for:

I'm applying to all the classes I know I can teach. And those are far-reaching classes that I know I can teach but I'm not nearly as comfortable teaching as the others...I apply to them anyway because I want to have a class. (Martine)

It was especially difficult for new part-time professors to get classes because they were competing with full-time professors and Ph.D. students, who often took priority. One participant recognized that this was necessary for students in order to get a “good dossier,” but found the competition made it more difficult to get the classes she desired. However, competition did not deter one participant from supporting another peer. She gave a student advice on the application process for a position she was also competing for, and outlined what timeline to expect. She justified this support by claiming that it would not change the status of her application because she is “either the strongest candidate or I’m not.” In this case, even though competition may have served her best interests in the short-term, She felt that “paying it forward” was more important than competition. She attributed this to continuing the support her supervisor had given her and returning the favour to her community.

A few part-time professors also stated that they would possibly have to scavenge if they took any time away from the University. One participant said it was important to “stay in the system” in order to get opportunity for employment – part-time professors had to “show [their] face” in order to get people in the department to “think about you” for job positions. Many part-time professors agreed that former thesis supervisors and previous teachers were the best ally in getting a class:

My formal supervisor [helps me out when getting a class]. People who knew me as a student, had me as a TA, or as an RA. Their confidence is already there, so for them it's easy to give a good reference for me....Sometimes, when they go on sabbatical, those people will just drop your name as a potential. So if the department doesn't find someone, you can be this defacto person to take a class. (Michelle)

Another rare resource was commonly scavenged for was office space. Many struggled to get enough access to meet with their students, store their materials, or have a place to work. Many said that

they had office hours for “two hours every week,” but did not have the ability to meet students outside of those hours because the office was shared. Others said that although you could occupy the office outside of your office hours if it was free, many had to fight for space and could not “squat in the office all the time.” Many part-time professors chose to meet with students in a public, such as a café or hallway. One participant noted that she would not have this inconvenience if she were a full-time professor.

Moonlighters and some mature students said that the lack of office space did not bother them, as they worked mostly from home anyway.

Self-identification as a part-time professor

Focusing on the negative consequences of their status was a pervasive image for many part-time professors, especially for self-identification (associating oneself with certain labels, characteristics, or qualities). Many felt that the classification of “part-time professor” was a lower status, and some did not accept the label “part-time professor” for self-identification at all. Some made an effort to self-identify with another term, including “contractual professor” or “sessional lecturer.” One participant changed her title on her business cards to reflect her full-time status, because she found that the implication that she was part-time was “a huge slap in the face” – she was working 13 to 14 hours every day of the week. Another expressed that identifying as a part-time professor felt like she was only “half a professor.” One participant noted that a lack of classification in the department was an obstacle to building relationships with peers – the ambiguity of causal relationships lead to full-time faculty not knowing “how to react to you.”

Many participants felt that part-time professors only existed because they had not been able to secure a higher position yet. A few participants acknowledged that they knew peers who were happy being a part-time instructor, but felt they would have to wait an uncertain amount of time for a position:

So the situation now is that it's really, really, really difficult to get a full time position and people are just part-time professors in many universities. This is not something that I wanted to do....but some people are doing it and they are happy. I am not happy, but I have some of my friends that are [part-time professors] in different universities and they are running more than I am...and they

are happy with that. (Anne Marie)

Several participants did not feel comfortable with the label “professor” as self-identification either. To many participants, a professor was a full-time faculty member. One participant felt that when her students called her a professor, she immediately rejected that label because “I’m just like, a lecturer.... not a full professor.” Many said they did not feel comfortable adopting the label of “professor” because it was not long-term and could be taken away if their contract was not renewed:

We like to think of ourselves as professors at the university, but at the end of the day, if my contract is not renewed I am not a professor for the university. (Martine)

One participant said that she still felt like a “student who hasn’t moved on,” and was not equal to other faculty unless she could secure a full-time position. Interestingly, both male participants classified themselves as professors, “even if it’s part-time.” Both enjoyed the status that it gave them outside the university, one saying he enjoyed being able to say “I occasionally teach courses at the university” and another saying it helped him make connections with professors in another country.

No leverage

Many part-time professors felt they had *no leverage*, or influence in the community, due to their status as a part-time professor. One participant said that a full-time professor has a higher status because they are able to attend departmental assemblies, have direct colleagues, and access to their own office. Many believed they did not have access to support and resources because of their status, one saying it was “almost impossible” to get funding for her class because she was a part-time professor – applying took too much time and she was “more focused on preparing classes than trying to secure money.”

Many part-time professors associated their secondary status with seniority. APTPUO awards part-time teachers with seniority points for their experience in a classroom – a resource they need to get their desired classes and work in general. Participants said that they had the least seniority in the department because they were newer than other faculty members. Many felt that “the unions only value seniority” when assigning a class, which they found unfair and “backward.” Most felt that they should be hired

through merit. One participant said that she did not get a class due to seniority despite having the most favourable teaching evaluations in the department. Others expressed the frustration of developing a course, sometimes several times, and then losing it to someone with more seniority despite positive feedback from students and administration. Many participants felt that merit (good teaching evaluations, knowledge of a subject) should be valued over seniority in respect to getting work.

Not that Valued

In this theme, participants focused on two things. First, they voiced their perceptions of their own inadequacy, which they internalized because of their lower status within the community. Second, they voiced how they thought their peers saw them due to their status. Some participants said that “the message you get as a part-time prof” is that they are “not that valued” and “easily replaceable.”

Additionally, one participant developed “imposter syndrome” due to her feelings of inadequacy:

I feel like sometimes people look at me and say...she's not qualified to be here. I've had a couple of uncomfortable conversations with people who know way more than I do about things and who expect that I should as well. I met with another professor [who is teaching the same course as me], just to run by what I was doing and see what she thought, and I think she was really concerned...that she felt like I didn't have the experience or the knowledge required to be effective at my job. (Sam)

All assumed they were of lesser value than full-time professors, and that they were not much of a “threat” because they were “outsiders with no status or seniority.” Many felt stuck in a “devalued” position because they were “still doing the same job that a Master’s student is doing,” which they felt was “depressing.” Most were unable to increase their status despite the desire to “reap the benefits” of working hard in the position. In order to feel valued, participants said they would have to have access to higher pay, support, and influence with peers (i.e. a tenure-track position). Despite accepting and internalizing a feeling of not being valued, most part-time professors still acknowledged that they were essential to the operation of the university.

In closing, analysis of the data resulted in four main themes: “Feeling Overwhelmed,” “Uncertainty and Impermanence,” “There’s no Place like Home,” and “Second-class Citizens.” The first

theme, “Feeling Overwhelmed,” represented a part-time professor’s perceived struggle with keeping pace with teaching duties, socializing, and scavenging for resources. The second theme, “Uncertainty and Impermanence,” explored the feelings of ambiguity that part-time professors had in their jobs, as well as their feeling of not being permanent or enduring. The third theme, “There’s no Place like Home,” focused on the relationships of part-time professors and their sense of belonging – specifically, how connected they felt to peers, what barriers to connection they faced, how they reached out for help, and experiences with collaboration. The final theme, “Second-class Citizens,” focused on how part-time professors perceived their status – specifically, how they perceived themselves as a part-time professor, as well as how they thought others perceived them. The following chapter will discuss the meaning of these findings.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

In this study, participants focused on their experiences of being a new part-time professor. This chapter will discuss the relevance of the participants' experiences and respond to the research questions in three ways. First, it will touch on what a part-time professor's experience was with social connections at the university; second, it will answer what barriers they faced in building connections; finally, it will discuss how their experiences with connection affected their social capital.

The results confirmed many of the findings found in the literature, with one exception. Feeling overwhelmed was an emergent theme that was not often found in the literature, other than in a newspaper article that highlighted the stress of being a part-time professor (see CAUT, 2015). However, many aspects of Uncertainty and Impermanence (teaching quality, job satisfaction, lack of representation), Communication Barriers (age, values, language, physical distance) and feeling like Second-class Citizens (social capital, competition) overlapped with the literature. We will discuss the similarities and differences of each below.

R1: Experiences with Connection

When participants described their connections within their department, many said they felt disconnected from peers, but felt as a whole that their academic department was cooperative (i.e. getting along) and collaborative (i.e. working well together). This perception was especially prevalent among the moonlighters (those who had other jobs, or were retired), who rarely spent time on campus. Mature and some recent graduates said that they did not collaborate as much as they would have liked to, because the position did not warrant such action with others. A few also collaborated or participated less due to physical barriers (not being on campus regularly) and interpersonal barriers (a difference in language, values, or age). This resulted in participants feeling "isolated" and "like an outsider."

Puplampu's (2004) professor types (moonlighters, recent graduates, mature graduates) and the added professor types (student, mature professional) did approach work differently, which resulted in

different levels of motivation for social connection (see Table 1). For example, Puplampu (2004) argued that moonlighting participants would not have a strong affinity with the university because their need for connection was satisfied by their full-time job, students, and social networks outside academia. In the results, moonlighters did express that they were less motivated to connect with peers because they had a solid network at their primary workplace. In this context, they were least likely to reach out for resources compared to any other professor type. These categories were not mutually exclusive – especially when examining their reasons for working or motivations to connect – and therefore they were not necessarily representative of each type’s experience.

Table 1
Types of Part-time Professors, Reasons for Working, and Approaches to Connection

Professor Type	Description	Reasons for working	Motivation to connect
Moonlighters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supplemental income Working at another full-time job, part-time job, or retired 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Status of being a “professor at the university” Supplemental income for another job, such as contract work 	Low; connection with students and network outside of the university is “enough”
Recent Graduates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dependent income Recently attained a graduate or post-graduate degree 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Looking for a position as a full-time or tenured professor Experience and networking for research, writing, and teaching 	High; effort to connect and grow network is a top priority to forward career and personal needs
Mature Graduates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dependent income Were recent graduates, but got “stuck” in part-time professorship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Looking for a position as a full-time or tenured professor Dependent on income to “survive” 	Moderate; some feel the effort to connect is important and actively do so, but others do not see the benefit of connection
Mature Professionals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dependent income Had a full-time job but switched careers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Status of being a “professor at the university” Dependent on income to “survive” 	Moderate; some feel the effort to connect is important and actively do so, but others do not see the benefit of connection

Recent and mature graduates were more motivated to nurture and build rapport through relationships, as they felt it improved their chances of permanence in the institution. This group seemed to have a stronger affinity to the University in general; this was presumably due to the previous integration with their respective departments. Many had regular connections with others due to their graduate work; one participant said that she was living inside a “bubble” as a student but had to face a different reality

once she recently became a part-time professor. Recent graduates were often the most likely to reach out for support (e.g. advice, empathy, knowledge of practice) or resources (e.g. teaching materials, technological and pedagogical support, career opportunities).

Mature graduates and professionals did not always reach out for support or resources. Many attributed this to a limited amount of time (teaching with a full course load) or other responsibilities that took priority, such as a full-time job.

There's no Place Like Home

Participants expressed that they felt they are part of an academic community and hope to stay in their department. Conversely, they also said that they were not connected to peers or the university community. Academics felt they were part of a larger “collegiality,” or shared identity and membership with academia as a whole – but not to the institution itself. As Lin (2008) describes, this is the most generalized type of social connection. However, it is also the most abstract; therefore, a grander sense of academic collegiality may not be as helpful for building or mobilizing social capital as other methods of connection. However, one participant said that this allowed him to socialize internationally with other academics and feel part of a group. In sum, as an “electron libre,” part-time professors could be members of a grander academia community but not identify as belonging specifically to the University of Ottawa community.

Participants formed ties to a variety of peers, including former supervisors, other instructors, or administrative staff in their department. Participants discussed the strength and intensity of their connections (i.e. ties) and their feelings of fellowship with others (e.g. group and organizational identification), which provided insight into their experience. The adequacy of a part-time professor's connections was measured by examining their perceived ability to access and mobilize such resources as office space, funding, or support.

Strength and extensity of ties. Strength of ties assesses how frequent and intense the connection is between two persons in a network. The stronger the tie, the more likely a person will have access to interpersonal support at work. Conversely, weak ties can be beneficial for instrumental purposes that do not require a certain intimacy, such as gaining information or attaining a higher status (see Lin, Dayton, & Greenwald, 1978). A person's extensity of ties is an assessment of the richness and diversity of their network; therefore it is a good measure of the value of their resources. A part-time professor who has a variety of connections (i.e. strong and weak ties, varied networks) should have more access to a rich assortment of resources.

As a group, participants had a diverse strength of ties; they built weak ties with administration, faculty, and management, and strong ties with former thesis supervisors, other part-time professors, and full-time faculty members. Having varied strength of ties would be beneficial to participants – it allows them to access or mobilize different types of social capital (Lin, 2008). However, participants had difficulty in forming an extensity of ties, or richness of their network, which would give them access to different types of resources. Most participants did not speak with more than one or two colleagues, showing a lack of network breadth. This may have contributed to the perception of having access to a shallow pool of resources, which many participants stated as a difficulty they had to navigate as a new part-time professor.

Bonding and binding ties. Lin argues that individuals within a social structure form social relations with others for expressive (venting, bonding) and instrumental (attaining a higher status) purposes (Lin, 2008). Binding ties are “ties that share sentiment and provide mutual support” (Lin, 2008). Actors generally use this type of tie for expressive purposes, such as forming close, interpersonal bonds. Bonding ties involve sharing information and resources; therefore, they are generally used for instrumental purposes (Lin, 2008).

Many participants – especially the younger participants – noted the importance of having a binding tie for expressive purposes, as Lin argues. One said she was “very fortunate” to have the ability to vent and bond with her former thesis supervisor. Three participants noted that they had other part-time professors (usually those who shared an office or were in a carpool) who they looked to for sentiment and mutual support. Many binding ties were also bonding ties for part-time professors, since they had so few connections. Peers who provided expressive support also provided instrumental support such as knowledge and resources for their practice and job opportunities. Many did not create adequate bonding ties; however, some said that faculty they “barely knew” would tell them about job opportunities, and others were able to make bonding connections during academic conferences, so they were not concerned.

Perception of belonging to an organization. Connections are an important aspect of organizational identification, or “the perception of belongingness to an organization, where the individual defines him or herself in terms of the organization in which he or she is a member” (Mael & Ashforth, 1992, p. 104). Group membership improves retention and productivity, so it is an important factor to assess when examining how it affects a part-time professor’s experience (Crain, 2010, p. 1203).

Some mature graduates, moonlighters, and mature professionals saw themselves as members of the university; however, the majority did not seem to express an overt perception of organizational identification with the University of Ottawa. One mature graduate said she felt like “un electron libre,” or a free agent, that was not bound to the institution at all. Another said that if the University did not offer her enough work, she had no qualms about going to another – the University did not “owe” her anything. Although most formed a connection with coworkers, this did not seem to extend to the university as a whole, except for three participants – most only felt a sense of collegiality as academic professionals, not as University of Ottawa faculty.

Most participants enjoyed the ability to leave the institution for a semester and return without consequences. However, many also thought it was difficult to “get back in” after being absent from the

department for a semester or more. This may cause a fragmented employment history with the University, and become a barrier to forming a sense of belonging. Therefore, not being affiliated with an institution – or going to different universities in order to meet ad hoc employment needs – could prevent participants from forming a group identity through a sense of belonging.

Additionally, if part-time professors cannot form a sense of belonging – which some had difficulty with due to limited connections – they have less access to career opportunities, information about their job, and the ability to access emotional support or advice. A high amount of fellowship is an indicator of a team's functionality; therefore, a limited amount may be detrimental to the department. In effect, a lack of connection among part-time professors may have larger repercussions for the university.

R2: Barriers to Connection

Many participants faced obstacles to connection such as communication barriers. Foremost, they experienced physical barriers, such as not being on campus enough. Others faced interpersonal barriers like language, values, and age. Many of these barriers resulted in isolation or lowered the likelihood of forming quality connections.

Physical barriers. Button and Rossera (1990) argued that communication barriers could be physical, such as when an employee works for an organization but lives in a different country. In the case of participants, most were not on campus a great deal of time, and therefore did not have excessive opportunity for connection with peers. The literature confirms this concern, saying that part-time professors may feel physically isolated because they are less likely to spend a lot of time on campus (Cbc.ca, 2016). Due to physical isolation, participants were often not included in departmental communications unless they asked. This could prevent part-time professors from hearing about academic information and social events, which would amplify their sense of isolation. In turn, physical barriers would prevent them from forming connections with peers.

Participants also felt isolated due to the autonomy of the position. Many were, as Feldman and Turnley (2001) argued, attracted to the occupation by the autonomy but experienced isolation as a result. This was a double-edged sword for many participants – on the one hand, they “enjoyed the freedom,” and on the other hand, they felt as if they were on their own if they ran into difficulties. One participant stated that administration gave her a “carte blanche” for course design; others said they felt “privileged” to work for the University because of this freedom. However, others felt that they had to solve teaching challenges on their own. In effect, autonomy allowed them complete control of their course content and schedules – permitting them to work whenever and wherever they wanted – but it did not give them a foundation to structure their expectations or knowledge of practice.

Our research also had several parallels to Dolan’s theory on isolation among part-time workers. First, Dolan (2011) argued that in order for adjuncts to see the value of being a member of the university, they need to experience a high level of contact with a variety of organizational members, even if the contact was trivial (p. 66). Without it, connections could not be made, and isolation would persist. Interestingly, some participants felt part of a community despite also feeling isolated – as long as they had connections with peers, they felt they could “approach” anyone whenever they needed to, even though they had not mobilized this resource by connecting with others.

Button and Rossera (year) argued that having a high level of trust in another individual breaks down communication barriers by improving the quality and quantity of communication. This was consistent with the results of this study, specifically in terms of receiving information about departmental policies, activities, and job opportunities. Often, participants had the most successful connections with those whom they trusted, such as a former thesis supervisor or teacher. In turn, they received more information about their practice, social activities, and job opportunities.

Lack of motivation. Dolan (2011) argued that physical isolation may cause a lack of motivation among part-time professors. In turn, he suggests, this deficit lowers teaching quality and “affects their

students' learning processes significantly" (Dolan, 2011, p. 64). The results showed that isolation did not necessarily affect motivation among new part-time professors, despite their feelings of disconnection from peers and administration. For a few participants, this was due to the need to "prove yourself" in the first few years of part-time professorship. Most were focused on improving their practice, regardless of their lack of connection with others.

Interpersonal barriers. Interpersonal barriers are personality differences that prevent effective face-to-face communication. For participants, this included speaking a different language, having different values (e.g. a difference pedagogical philosophy), or differing in age from colleagues. We have cross-referenced each with the literature below.

Speaking a different language. Lewis (1968) stated that being "unable to communicate in the preferred language" was a commonplace barrier in individual-to-individual communication, saying that misunderstandings can occur if participants have a different mother tongue, dialect, or knowledge of vocabulary (p. 1). Most participants were bilingual in our research, and thus did not experience many language barriers, provided it was in English or French. Those who were not bilingual said that their limited knowledge of French caused a significant communication barrier in formal group settings (i.e. meetings, labs, and seminars), one saying it made her feel like a "delinquent" who did not have the necessary skills to communicate with peers. None of the native French speakers felt they faced a barrier to communication; however, two participants were able to name one colleague that faced challenges because they were not fluent in English.

Values. If employees perceive that they share values with their co-workers, they are more likely to agree on goals, approaches, and group actions (Standifer, Lester, Schultz, & Windsor, 2013). Conversely, if people do not feel an overlap of values with their co-workers, they are more likely to see their decisions as challenging or problematic (Standifer et al., p. 1605). Most employees who stated that they had different values from a peer (i.e. pedagogical philosophy) said it did not affect their interpersonal

communication. However, many admitted that they successfully navigated such potential barriers by avoiding the peer altogether. One participant said that she had experienced conflict with peers due to a difference in teaching values; She did not want to form a connection with them because she was “trying to do something different” (e.g. using less conventional pedagogical methods). She said that this mentality had led to another peer seeing her teaching decisions as problematic. This was consistent with what Standifer et al. (2013) argued. Another participant said that she was less likely to connect with other full-time faculty because her “eye was on the field” (i.e. focused on practical applications of theory) and her perception was that full-time professors only valued theory. In turn, she saw their methods as problematic as well. In effect, participants did not build a connection with those who they felt had different values, and if they did, saw their peer’s decisions as challenging or problematic.

Age barriers. Part-time professors also found that age sometimes formed a barrier to communication, and therefore, connection. Surprisingly, this was the most prevalent with the youngest participant. She stated that professors who were the same age as her were “trying to act smart” by “dressing up to the nines” and putting on a professor-like persona. In turn, she felt she could not form a strong tie with them. Curiously, this may support Standifer et al. (2013) who found that if most organizational members were a similar age, it increased the likelihood of interpersonal conflict and decreased the quality of communication. In turn, a similarity in age does not guarantee the ability to build connections or break down communication barriers.

R3: Participants’ Experiences and Social Capital

The research results uncovered that part-time professors experienced a limited connection with peers. In turn, this may affect their social capital. Several factors showed that participants had difficulty building and mobilizing their social capital. First, they described feelings of Being Overwhelmed due to an inability to access or use resources; if a participant had adequate social capital, they would be able to access and utilize resources to complete their work. Second, participants felt Uncertainty and

Impermanence in their workplace, which was partially due to a lack of diversity and varying strength of ties. Such manifestations signal inadequate social capital for part-time professors. Finally, many participants felt that they were Second-class Citizens in their department, and that they did not have power to change their position in the institution – this indicates that there may be an inequality of social capital between part-time professors and full-time faculty. Each of these findings will be discussed in detail and confirmed by the literature below.

Feeling Overwhelmed

Feeling overwhelmed was a pervasive image in many participants' descriptions. Many felt like they were “trying to keep their head above water,” or that they were just “surviving” with their teaching duties. One participant said that “revamping a class” – that is, preparing old class materials for a new course – was so much work “you kind of lose your mind.” Another said she had to create strategies to “protect” herself from burnout. Participants often coped with feeling overwhelmed by socializing less or reduced their perceived standards of teaching excellence (e.g. providing online content for students later than anticipated, limiting guest speakers, or giving “less individualized feedback” to students). One said as a half-joke that he used wine as a coping mechanism.

Feeling overwhelmed with teaching also prevented part-time professors from accomplishing other long-term goals, such as doing academic research to ultimately secure a full-time academic position. Feeling Overwhelmed could be due to a heavy teaching load, a reality that was cited by many study participants. A heavy teaching load is considered a requirement for most part-time professors to “live,” so feeling overwhelmed may be a pervasive aspect of the experience. However, participants who were supported by peers – either emotionally or through sharing resources – were able to overcome feelings of being overwhelmed. Most were eventually able to adjust to the fast-paced environment, but thought “the ones who can't keep up” (such as peers with a chronic illness or young families) would eventually be excluded from teaching and research opportunities. One participant thought that this would prevent the

creation of a diverse faculty; as a result, it could reduce the University's educational and research scope.

According to CAUT (2015), feeling overwhelmed may also be a manifestation of financial, intellectual and emotional strain in part-time professors. CAUT (2015) maintains that part-time professors are often scrambling to prepare their lectures one week at a time, which may leave them with a feeling of being stressed (i.e. overwhelmed) if they are not supported appropriately by their department. This is consistent with participants' responses; those who did not have support tended to feel more overwhelmed than those who did. However, those who had support still felt overwhelmed, albeit less severely.

Uncertainty and Impermanence

Participants admitted to struggling to find an ideal position and dealt with insecure employment. Others described the unpredictability of planning for finances, starting a family, or having relationships. James Gerlach, a contract teacher at Wilfrid Laurier University, said that "the inability to plan is a major issue and a great cause of stress in the lives of contract academics" (CAUT, 2015). This is consistent with several participant answers – one said after she achieved tenure at another university she felt "physically better" because she would no longer have to deal with the "precariousness" of being a part-time professor. Many felt "expendable" and that they could "easily be replaced," and therefore were less likely to build new relationships at work. Part-time professors found themselves in a cycle of having less social capital, but were unable to build their social capital due to a continuing lack of connection.

Teaching quality. Similarly to the components of uncertainty identified by Lawrence and Lorsch (1967), some participants felt hesitation about their practice due to a lack of clarity in information, long time spans between receiving definitive feedback, and general insecurity about their relationships at work. Many felt they "did not know" what was expected for teaching quality, and only received feedback once a year from students, which was too long of a time span for them to make changes to the present course. Most did not receive feedback from administration or management unless there were "specific"

challenges or they were in “trouble” (for example, one woman said she never heard from the Dean until she gave too many high grades to her students).

Puplampu (2004) argued that if part-time professors are only judged based on their evaluations, it encourages them to keep their students satisfied with their marks so they can secure employment; however, most participants stated that seniority was valued more than evaluations, so they did not consider student satisfaction a concern for their livelihood. Consequently, this may not have been a variable affecting teaching quality. Many part-time professors were able to approach people in their department for feedback, but most did not pursue a lot of connections because of their perceived temporariness.

Job satisfaction. Similarly to Monroe and Denman (1991), participants who felt they were in an uncertain role were less satisfied with their job and more likely to want to leave the organization. One participant specifically said she no longer wanted to be a part-time professor due to the instability of the position. She had made significant investments in her practice, including taking several pedagogical courses to improve her teaching, but decided to leave the profession altogether.

Putnam (2000) argues that job satisfaction is largely based on the connections (i.e. social capital) that an employee has at work. It follows that those who have a sense of belonging would have a higher job satisfaction; however, this was not the case with participants. Many who said they felt a sense of belonging were also dissatisfied with their job. Two participants had already planned to leave the University at the time of the interviews due to their discontent with the position. This may be due to the amount and quality of their connections – the first participant stated that she did not have a lot of ties, while the second was disillusioned after a false promise of employment from the dean.

Part-time professors who said they were proud to work for the University of Ottawa usually had at least one close tie at work. Others said that the low quality of connection had driven them from other departments. This is consistent with Graen, Liden, and Hoel (1982) and Krackhardt and Porter (1985),

who claim that the quality of an employee's relationships can also affect their job satisfaction. Those who had moved to a new department expressed that it made them happier with their job.

Lack of representation. Burk (2000) argued that part-time professors feel uncertain and impermanent due to a lack of representation and an "institutional neglect" of their needs (p. 11). She suggested that feelings of uncertainty and impermanence could be improved by increasing opportunities for connection and representing part-time voices institutionally. Participants felt they were adequately represented by the APTPUO, but said they could not add their voices to groups or activities that would change their work conditions or the department's policies. One participant said that faculty were not "interested in the input of part-timers, generally," and another said that faculty "no longer asked" part-time professors to participate in committees because they could not afford to pay them for their work. One part-time professor justified this by saying full-time professors did not want to "take advantage" of an overworked and underpaid group by asking them to do committee work for free.

Second-class Citizens

Many part-time professors referred to themselves as having a lower status than others because they felt like they had no leverage and influence. This may be due to a lack of connection, which results in the feeling of being a second-class citizen in the university (Thirolf, 2012). Bauer (2005) argues that when some workers are valued less than others, the consequence is lower wages, fewer benefits, and less recognition for the same work, despite having similar qualifications. This seems consistent with participants' perceptions – many felt they were poorly paid, did not have proper benefits (e.g. maternity leave), and did not get recognition from peers because they were a "ghost in the hall." One participant said he "felt sorry" for those who were just starting out (he was retired from his full-time job) because those with the same qualifications as tenured professors often ended up being paid substantially less in a part-time position.

Those who felt like second-class citizens said they received an indirect message from peers that they were insufficient employees. One participant said that she felt like others did not think she was “qualified enough to be here” due to being a new (and young) part-time professor. This overlaps with the assumption that Gordon (2002) found; adjuncts felt like a “sort of migrant underclass in academia” who were accused of diminishing teaching excellence because “their teaching skills are inferior to full-time faculty” (p. 1). If part-time professors continually feel less valued and like second class citizens, it would be difficult to feel group membership and build connection.

Some part-time professors assumed that full-time professors were better at teaching than they were. As a result, part-time professors usually followed instructions without giving suggestions when collaborating with a full-time faculty member on a Section B course. They used the full-time professor’s outline and did not alter anything without asking “permission” first. When questioned about this, the participant explained that all full-time faculty were better at building courses, which is why they were full-time. However, one participant was able to implement his suggestions to a Section A course professor. He worked in collaboration with a full-time and part-time professor and felt he “knew what he was doing” enough to challenge her about an outdated rule she was enforcing. He said his other colleague in the work group was not in a position to challenge the full-time professor because he was so new and did not know his boundaries yet. In turn, being second-class citizens due to a lack of experience or influence may affect the ability for part-time professors to build and mobilize social capital.

Social capital. Lin (1999) defines social capital’s resources as “valued goods in society, however consensually determined” (p. 467). In our research, we found that the main resources valued among part-time professors were interpersonal support from peers, teaching materials (e.g. previous course outlines, presentations), technological pedagogical support (e.g. pedagogical method workshops, tech support), career support (e.g. vouching, guidance), a preferred course, and on-campus office space. Lin (2008) argues that social capital serves two functions – to obtain resources (instrumental action) or preserve

existing resources (expressive action). For part-time professors, instrumental action included getting a better job, a promotion, or teaching materials; expressive action included maintaining a relationship with a former peer, usually a former thesis supervisor (Lin, 2008).

Accessing and mobilizing social capital. Lin (2008) says social capital's effects can be seen through its capacity (accessed resources) and the extent to which it is used (mobilized resources) (p. 64). Most part-time professors felt that their struggle to access resources such as on-campus office space or the "right" courses was a hindrance that affected their experience. Additionally, others expressed a limited access to a variety of resources, such as funding, information about their job, or pedagogical and technological services. For example, one participant was unable to get a guest speaker and another was unable to convert her class into a blended course because she did not have enough time and knowledge to submit the application. In turn, neither could access nor mobilize a resource that would have improved their class.

Some were able to mobilize resources in their network through others. One participant received funding for a guest speaker from a full-time faculty member, which improved the experience for students. However, many did not seem able to mobilize their social capital for a desired status attainment (i.e., being full-time faculty). One part-time professor was almost able to mobilize her social capital to obtain a position, and it had been "okayed by the Dean," but in the end, management denied the request and she went back to "just a part-time professor." Since Lin (1999) argues that status attainment is the best way to measure mobilized social capital, it follows that part-time professors lack social capital for specific actions, such as status attainment. This is important to note because status often allows more access to resources in order to attain a higher socioeconomic standing, leading to social gains (p. 467). Consequently, part-time professors may face an inequality of social capital compared to their full-time peers because their connections are sparse and limited.

Bauder (2005) said professors lacking specific types of social capital (such as being part of a well-known research group) or cultural capital (such as a degree from a prestigious university or publications in high status journals) are more likely to remain part-time (pp. 232-233). This seems consistent with the findings for some participants who said that a lack of publications or a degree from a less prestigious university had posed a problem for them. However, the same participant had received a prestigious fellowship, which helped her gain a position as a postdoctoral fellow at the University as a result. In turn, she was able to mobilize her social capital and garner time and funding for research. In the end, she was able to gain tenure at another university due to her qualifications. Conversely, one participant could not do research due to limited time and funds; as a consequence, she could not attain the status of a researcher through publication.

Inequality of social capital. Putnam (2000) argues that if members lack individual social capital, their economic prospects are seriously reduced even if they have a great deal of human capital such as education and training (p. 88). This overlapped in our research as many participants thought the best way to get employment was by knowing someone in the department – the extent of their education or experience was secondary to this connection. After a participant was able to secure a course they could build seniority points, a resource that gave them a higher status by improving the possibility of getting the courses they wanted and continual employment. Therefore, individual social capital greatly affected whether or not a part-time professor was able to gain better options, such as preferred classes or continual employment.

Many participants received their first position because someone in the department reached out to them. This was usually during or shortly after graduating. However, they seemed unable to build social capital once they were in the organization. Participants expressed that they were “on a lower tier” compared to full-time faculty, which indicated that there may be an inequality of social capital between part-time and full-time professors. This was confirmed when two participants assumed that research

opportunities and teaching resources were only available to full-time professors. When questioned about this, they replied that they did not even try to access these resources or opportunities; instead, they internalized the message that it was not available to them. This confirms the conclusions of Curley (2010), who found that people who are disadvantaged, marginalized, or disconnected from norms and values due to a lack of connection may have limited access to resources such as information or opportunities (p.34).

Many participants perceived that their status was not recognized by administration and full-time faculty members, and that they were “on their own” to handle problems. In the literature, part-time? faculty have labeled themselves as lacking status recognition, feeling invisible or ignored by administration and full-time faculty (Burk, 2000; Dolan, 2011). Connections with management can underpin such perceptions of value and a sense of recognition. Since a sense of self-worth can come from others in the institution, it is important to foster connection to influence how much a part-time professor reaches out to connect with others. Although being valued by students was a common theme for participants, perceptions of being valued by peers, management and the administration can have a greater effect on self-worth due to the higher status of these colleagues.

In conclusion, it is conceivable that an inequality of social capital may exist between full-time and part-time professors. Both groups have different access to social capital because of their structural positions or social networks. This can also decrease the ability to build trust, a sense of belonging, and increase segregation between groups (see Durlauf, 2008). In the end, it would be a challenge for the department to forward instrumental and expressive goals with part-time professors, and may have larger repercussions for the University.

Competition. An inequality of social capital can lead to in-group bias, or favouritism towards an in-group (in this case, full-time faculty). A high amount of competition may amplify this bias (Brewer, 1979, p. 307). In turn, departments may be more likely to hire those within their network in times of high

competition. This manifested in two ways for participants. One participant said that if a full-time faculty member “is reaching out to you,” (e.g. asking if you would like a position) the part-time professor would probably get it, barring the trump of seniority points. Thus, the bias towards one’s own network helped some part-time professors get their first position. On the other hand, it made it difficult for other part-time professors in the “out-group” to get a job (e.g. those who had had been a student in a different university). Additionally, many participants said that seniority points were a form of in-group favouritism that was “unfair,” insisting they should be judged on their knowledge and proficiency rather than on seniority. This stance seems to coincide with the Bauder (2005), who argues that academic organizations are slowly adapting the expectations and structures similar to some private sector corporations.

Most did not feel competitive with peers and did not see it as problematic for connection. This is synonymous with Bourdieu’s (1988) view, which suggested that if there was a larger pool of candidates to choose from, it would prevent peers from feeling the pang of competition. Many participants preferred autonomy and did not feel the need to join a group, partially because they viewed their department as collaborative and partly because they did not perceive competition to be a threat. This is consistent with what Tajfel and Turner (2012) found in their research. However, one felt the competition of the job market was “just brutal,” and made an effort to connect with peers in her department. In the end, she was able to secure a tenure track job at another university, mobilizing her social capital at last.

Bauder (2005) argues that the effect of intensifying competition is that academics squeeze the “substance” out of their lives by stretching themselves too thin within their department. This may be evident especially among the younger participants; one said that her relationships suffered a great deal, and another said he had to take a semester off due to burnout. One participant who was a new mother felt she could not step away from her work while she was on maternity leave – she felt she would be left behind in her career.

Alternatively, part-time professors may not be the only ones stretching themselves too thin. Full-time faculty may have to fill in the gaps if part-time professors are not allowed to take administrative roles. Preventing part-time professors from participating not only limits feedback from a large group of instructors— it also puts the burden on full-time faculty to pick up the slack. This would be problematic for faculty, the department, and university as a whole.

In conclusion, this research discussed participants' experiences with connections at the University, what barriers to connection they faced, and how this affected their social capital. Participants faced several barriers to connection that affected their social capital (most notably, a difference in values, age, or physical distance). There appears to be room for improvement when fostering connections among part-time professors – much more can be done to encourage an inclusive workplace and help build a variety of relationships.

The results revealed three overarching themes for participants: Feeling Overwhelmed, Uncertainty and Impermanence, There's no Place like Home, and Second-class Citizens. All three themes addressed the possibility that part-time professors lack the ability to build and mobilize social capital, which has a profound effect on their experience as well as their peers, students, and the institution as a whole. In the following chapter, the implications of these results will be discussed, along with the limitations of the study and future areas for research.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

By exploring the phenomenon of being a new part-time professor using a qualitative lens, this research revealed participants' experience with connection – specifically, feelings of being overwhelmed, uncertain and impermanent, or like second-class citizens within their community. The researcher used semi-structured individual interviews to complete this research. The questions from the interviews featured an overarching exploration of part-time professors' connections, barriers to communication, and their ability to access or mobilize social capital. The participants revealed several aspects of their experience which contributed to understanding the phenomenon.

First, professors felt overwhelmed by their workload and often sacrificed their social life to keep up with teaching duties. Almost all participants were unable to use their accumulated resources from previous courses (i.e. teaching materials and knowledge) because they rarely taught the same course more than once. Some said this was their greatest challenge and posed a “question of quality” for a student's education, since a teacher is rarely satisfied with the content the first time it is taught.

Many felt uncertain or impermanent in their position, seeing themselves as a temporary solution that could be removed from the University at any time. This discouraged a lot of participants from forming quality relationships with peers, and resulted in isolation for a number of participants.

Participants also faced barriers to connection due to geographical distance (e.g., not being on campus regularly). Some experienced communication barriers such as language, values, and age, which affected participants' ability to connect and feel “part of a group.” However, many felt that people in their department were getting along and working well together, even if they did not talk with peers or participate in departmental activities often.

Most new graduates and some mature graduates reached out for interpersonal support (e.g. advice, empathy, knowledge of practice) or resources (e.g. teaching materials, technological and pedagogical support, career opportunities), and were generally successful in receiving them. Moonlighters, mature

professionals, and a few mature graduates did not reach out for support or resources because it was deemed unnecessary or other tasks took priority, such as a full-time job.

Participants also perceived themselves as being a second-class citizen, or having a “lower tier” status, because they did not have leverage or influence in the department. Conversely, participants knew that they were integral to the university, despite feeling underappreciated. Many felt that because of their status, they were scavenging for resources such as desirable courses and office space. Additionally, some participants found that the label that defined their status – “part-time professor” – was not an accurate or favourable description. A few proposed that they should be called something else, such as a contract instructor.

Understanding these experiences can explain how part-time professors relate to peers, students, and the University as a whole. The following section will discuss the implications of this research in three sections: The importance of the results, the limitations of the study, and possible areas for future research.

Importance of Results

This research indicated that most part-time professors have the necessary tools to communicate to peers virtually, but there is still a large gap in connection due to an inability to meet face-to-face on a regular basis. Many spend sporadic time on campus and lack permanent office space; this affects the ability to build a variety of relationships, which is necessary for accessing and using different types of resources in social networks (Granovetter, 1973; Lin 2008).

Second, if part-time professors face a discontinuity of courses, they may have challenges with communicating ideas clearly. They are in a constant cycle of learning new material in a short time span, which could affect depth and breadth of the subject. However, many part-time professors expressed enthusiasm and passion for their craft, which could provide a positive experience for students.

Third, feelings of being overwhelmed, isolated or inferior may have a negative impact on job attitudes for part-time professors. Because Feldman and Turnley (2001) argue that job attitudes directly

affect job satisfaction and occupational performance, the negative job attitudes expressed by part-time professors – despite their love of the craft – may have negative consequences on their job satisfaction and occupational performance.

There was also significant evidence to suggest that part-time professors have less social capital than their peers. According to Cohen and Prusak (2001), this could have an effect on the University's reputation. Although the University of Ottawa may be able to choose from a large pool of part-time professors for employment, a lack of social capital reduces job satisfaction, causes feeling of being undervalued, reduces commitment to the organization, and increases turnover. In effect, these aspects could waste training resources because it encourages employees to take learned skills elsewhere in order to find a stable position.

Social capital can be built through organizational practices such as training, employee orientation and social events (Fang et al., 2011). Although training is offered at the University, it is not mandatory for part-time professors. In turn, many do not participate or even have knowledge of such practices. According to one participant, orientation was nonexistent and part-time professors were rarely invited to social events. Not only does this lessen the opportunity for connection, but it prevents part-time professors from building a substantial foundation for knowledge of their practice. Such connections must be encouraged in organizations in order to build social capital; however, this must be built organically through encouragement rather than through manipulative means. In turn, part-time professors face a harrowing challenge to the quality and quantity of connection.

Limitations of Study

This research was influenced by four limitations: the sampling method, the recruitment method, the bias of the researcher, and the exclusion of full-time professors. First, purposive sampling can be a subjective process in choosing participants; this makes it more susceptible to researcher bias than probability sampling. There is a risk that the researcher will choose a participant based on their own

perceived bias of the population. The researcher chose participants on a first-come, first-served basis, which lowered the risk of bias; however, those who answered the study may have done so with a specific purpose in mind, such as using it as an outlet to voice specific concerns. For example, many said they came forward to voice dissent about the organizational structure of the university, such as the hiring process. Therefore, this research should not be considered representative of all part-time professors' experiences, since their own reasons for stepping forward may skew the representability of the population. Additionally, there were no part-time professors who were currently teaching during an advanced degree such as a Masters or PhD. In other words, although the sample is appropriate for a phenomenological study, the data is not generalizable. Each experience is unique to the participant; therefore, we cannot assume that these experiences represent those of part-time professors as a whole. However, we discovered that the findings in the results overlapped with many aspects of the literature – for example, the importance of strong and weak ties, a lack of group and organizational identification, feeling less valued than full-time faculty, and experiencing isolation due to communication barriers. In turn, the literature supports the validity of the results.

The recruitment methods were far-reaching for part-time professors if they were on the mailing list for APTPUO, but may have not reached all part-time professors at the University of Ottawa if they were not subscribers or they filtered out APTPUO emails. The APTPUO was not able to confirm how many part-time professors may have received the invitation to participate; therefore, it is possible that some could be excluded, which may have shaped the explanation of the phenomenon. To balance this possibility, the researcher interviewed the sample until saturation (e.g. receiving the same data multiple times), ensuring that the phenomenon was explained in full.

A small amount of the population responded to the inquiry, which the data may explain – many said that they felt unheard, but at the same time acknowledged that they did not have time or motivation

to reach out for opportunities to voice their opinion, such as this research. Therefore, not as many part-time professors may have reached out for the opportunity to participate.

These results are based on the interpretations of the researcher. Although the researcher attempted to bracket her past experiences with the phenomenon, there is always a risk of bias. In order to reduce bias, the interpretations of the significant statements were confirmed with a peer. Confirming the meanings of statements with a peer reduces the risk of researcher bias; it allows the researcher to ensure that she is describing the phenomenon accurately. In conclusion, it ensures validity because the interpretations do not rely solely on the researcher's perceptions.

Lastly, although the views and perspectives of full-time professors would provide some insight into the conclusions of this research, collection of this data is outside of the scope of this project. The researcher sought to know about the experience of part-time professors from a first-person perspective; therefore, interviewing full-time professors was not warranted.

Possible Areas for Future Research

This research can serve as a foundation for several areas of scholarship. It can be a basis on which to consult for studies on Canadian part-time professors, which presently has received limited attention in the literature. This research could also be beneficial for studies on social capital for part-time employees.

There are four recommended areas for future research based on the results of this study. First, a feminist perspective could be a beneficial framework to use when examining the experiences of part-time professors. The majority of participants were women, which CAUT (2015) confirms is typical for most Canadian Universities (CAUT, 2015). Additionally, one of the main concerns for several participants was insufficient conditions for maternity leave, including ample financial support and codified guidelines. Therefore, this research shows that there are still major gender-specific challenges for women who are part-time professors.

Second, investigating the experience of full-time professors would enrich and add some insight into the conclusions of this research. It would be also valuable to examine part-time professors who have been at the institution for longer than five years in order to see what their experiences have been. Longitudinal studies that explore part-time professors' experiences at different stages in their career would be a great way to measure changes over time. Such samples may yield diverse results compared to this research. Presumably, this is because a long-term, part-time professor may have a higher amount and quality of connections. Examining these connections over time can help us understand how they manifest and develop social capital.

Finally, this study could benefit by honing in on certain populations, such as younger part-time professors or FSL/ESL professors, to see how their experience affects their ability to connect with peers and students. A few participants raised the concern that the bilingual dynamic at the University of Ottawa created difficulties in communication and connection on multiple levels, the biggest being connection with students and the ability to participate in formal group meetings.

Conclusion

This study confirms that part-time professors face numerous barriers to connection leading to perceptions of being overwhelmed, uncertain, or impermanent. They perceive their status as lower than full-time faculty or part-time professors with more seniority, and face barriers to communication that affect their ability to connect with peers. Although many part-time professors seemed able to form a variety of tie strengths, they did not have a healthy extensity of ties, which Lin (2011) argues is the only type to directly affect status attainment. Part-time teachers reached out for three reasons: *interpersonal support* (mentoring, empathy), *teaching materials* (course outlines, presentations), *pedagogical or technological support* (labs, training and certifications), and for *career opportunities* (information, influence for positions).

Due to a lack of connection, part-time professors seem unable to build and mobilize social capital in order to improve their situation (e.g. secure permanent employment) at the University. A lack of connection or status recognition from peers can also leave part-time professors feeling like outsiders and less likely to identify with their organization or peers. Since faculty are more likely to thrive in teaching and research if they have a strong sense of belonging to the institution (Dolan, 2011), it is imperative to foster relationships in order to ensure teaching quality. However, more research needs to be done to identify the ways that connections between part-time professors and their institution can be nurtured.

In the end, a dilemma exists for part-time professors – they have high expectations for their classes, but are unable to meet these expectations due to a lack of connection. In turn, this warrants a closer examination in order to improve the quality of education for the University of Ottawa, as well as to enhance the experience of part-time professors.

References

- Academica.ca. (2015). Part-time Faculty: What We Know, and What We Don't. *Academica Group: Research and Consulting for Higher Education*. Retrieved 22 February 2016 from <http://academica.ca/blog/part-time-faculty-what-we-know-and-what-we-dont>
- AFT Higher Education. (2009). *American academic: The state of the higher education workforce, 1997–2007*. Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers.
- APTPUO. (2014). Retrieved 26 January 2015 from <http://www.aptpuo.ca/en/about/40-about-aptpuo>
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, *14*(1), 20–39.
- Barnes, S. H., Allerbeck, K. R., Farah, B. G., Heunks, F. J., Inglehart, R. F., Jennings, M. K., & Rosenmayr, L. (1979). Political action: Mass participation in five western democracies.
- Bauder, H. (2005). The segmentation of academic labour: A Canadian example. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, *4*(2), 228-239.
- Bourdieu, P. (1980). Le capital social. *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales*, *31*(1), 2-3.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J.G. Richardson (ed.). *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. (pp. 241-258). Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo Academicus*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Brewer, M. B. (1979). In-group bias in the minimal intergroup situation: A cognitive-motivational analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *86*(2), 307-324.
- Burk, N.M. (2000). The Invisible Professor At-Risk: How Departmental Disconfirmation Disempower Adjunct Faculty. Proceedings from NCA 2000: Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association, Seattle, WA: November 9–12.

- Burt, R.S. (2004). Structural holes and good ideas. *American Journal of Sociology*, 110(2), 349-399.
- Button, K., & Rossera, F. (1990). Barriers to communication. *The annals of regional science*, 24(4), 337-357.
- Castiglione, D., Deth, Jan W. van, & Wolleb, Guglielmo. (2008). *The handbook of social capital*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- CAUT Bulletin Online. (2015). Retrieved 22 February 2016 from https://www.cautbulletin.ca/en_article.asp?ArticleID=4074
- CBC.ca. (2016). 'Dirty little secret': Poorly paid part-timers now teach most undergrads. Retrieved 22 February 2016 from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/most-university-undergrads-now-taught-by-poorly-paid-part-timers-1.2756024>
- Chen, S., Gong, F., & Li, X. (2009). Personal Social Capital Scale: An instrument for health and behavioral research. *Health education research*, 24(2), 306-317.
- Cohen, D., & Prusak, L. (2001). *In good company: How social capital makes organizations work*. Boston: Harvard Business Press.
- Coleman, J.S. (1994). *Foundations of social theory*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Crain, M. (2009). Managing identity: buying into the brand at work. *Iowa L. Rev.*, 95, 1179.
- Creswell, J. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Cummings, S., Heeks, R., & Huysman, M. (2006). Knowledge and learning in online networks in development: A social capital perspective. *Development in Practice*, 16(6), 570-586.
- Curley, A. (2010). Neighborhood institutions, facilities, and public space: A missing link for HOPE VI residents' development of social capital? *Cityscape*, 12(1), 33-63.
- Dolan, V. L. (2011). The isolation of online adjunct faculty and its impact on their performance. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 12(2), 62-77.

- Durlauf, S. (2008). Membership and inequality. In D. Castiglione, V. Deth & Wolleb, G. (Eds.). *The handbook of social capital*. (pp.594-623). Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fang, R., Duffy, M., & Shaw, J. (2011). The organizational socialization process: Review and development of a social capital model. *Journal of Management*, 37(1), 127–152.
- Feldman, D., & Turnley, W. (2001). A field study of part-time professors: The impact of career stage on reactions to nontenure-track jobs. *Journal of Career Development*, 28(1), 1-16.
- Fernandez, R. M., Castilla, E. J., & Moore, P. (2000). Social capital at work: Networks and employment at a phone center. *American Journal of Sociology* 105(5), 1288-1356.
- Field, J. (2003). *Social capital: Key ideas*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Flap, H. (1991). Social capital in the reproduction of inequality. *Comparative Sociology of Family, Health and Education*, 20(6), 179-202.
- Fugate, A. L., & Amey, M. L. (2000). Career stages of community college faculty: A qualitative analysis of their career paths, roles, and development. *Community College Review*, 28(1), 1–22.
- Gappa, J. M. (2000). The new faculty majority: Somewhat satisfied but not eligible for tenure. *New directions for institutional research*, 2000(105), 77-86.
- Gordon, M. (2002). *Part-time faculty in community colleges: The jury is still out*. Clearwater: St. Petersburg College. Retrieved 10 June 2015 from ERIC Document Reproduction Service, No. ED472020.
- Graen, G. B., Liden, R. C., & Hoel, W. (1982). Role of leadership in the employee withdrawal process. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67(6), 868.
- Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 6, 1360-1380.
- Granovetter, M.S. (1995). *Getting a Job*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Grubb, W. (1999). *Honored but invisible: An inside look at teaching in community colleges*. New York: Psychology Press.

- Henttonen, K., Johanson, J., & Janhonen, M. (2014). Work-team bonding and bridging social networks, team identity and performance effectiveness. *Personnel Review*, 43(3), 330-349.
- Kawachi, I., Kennedy, B. P., Lochner, K., & Prothrow-Stith, D. (1997). Social capital, income inequality, and mortality. *American Journal of Public Health*, 87(9), 1491-1498.
- Klimova, B.F., & Semradova, I. (2011). Barriers to communication. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 31, 207-211.
- Krackhardt, D., & Porter, L. W. (1985). When friends leave: A structural analysis of the relationship between turnover and stayers' attitudes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30, 242-261.
- Kram, K., & Isabella, L. (1985). Mentoring Alternatives: The Role of Peer Relationships in Career Development. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 28(1), 110-132.
- Lawrence, P., & Lorsch, J.W. (1967). *Organization and environment; Managing differentiation and integration*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Lewis, H. (1968). Communication barriers between educated and uneducated persons. *Literacy Discussion*.
- Light, I. (1972). *Ethnic enterprise in America: Business and welfare among Chinese, Japanese, and blacks*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Lin, N. (1999). Social networks and status attainment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25, 467-487.
- Lin, N. (2008). A network theory of social capital. In D. Castiglione, V. Deth & Wolleb, G. (Eds.). *The handbook of social capital*. pp.50-69. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lin, N. (2011). *Social capital: Critical concepts in the social sciences*. New York: Routledge.
- Lin, N., Dayton, P. W., & Greenwald, P. (1978). Analyzing the instrumental use of relations in the context of social structure. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 7(2), 149-166.
- Macleans.ca. (2015). University Rankings 2016: Comprehensive. Retrieved 15 March 2016 from <http://www.macleans.ca/education/unirankings/university-rankings-2015-comprehensive/>

- Mael, F., & Ashforth, B.E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(2), 103–123.
- Malpas, J. (2015). Hans-Georg Gadamer, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved 22 February 2016 from <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2015/entries/gadamer/>.
- Marsden, P., & Hurlbert, J. (1988). Social resources and occupational status attainment. *Social Forces*, 59, 11163-11181.
- Monroe, C., & Denman, S. (1991). Assimilating adjunct faculty: Problems and opportunities. *ACA Bulletin*, 77, 56-62.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. London: SAGE.
- Odden, Christie M., & Sias, Patricia M. (1997). Peer Communication Relationships and Psychological Climate. *Communication Quarterly*, 45(3), 153-66.
- Pearch, W. J., & Marutz, L. (2005). Retention of part-time professors in community colleges. *Community College Enterprise*, 11(1), 29-44.
- Pocklington, T., & Tupper, A. (2002). *No place to learn: Why universities aren't working*. Vancouver, B.C.: UBC Press.
- Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22, 1-24.
- Portes, A., & Sensenbrenner, J. (1993). Embeddedness and immigration: Notes on the social determinants of economic action. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98(6), 1320-1350.
- Poulsen, T., Christensen, U., Lund, R., & Avlund, K. (2011). Measuring aspects of social capital in a gerontological perspective. *European Journal of Ageing*, 8(4), 221-232.
- Puplampu, K. (2004). The restructuring of higher education and part-time instructors: theoretical and political analysis of undergraduate teaching in Canada. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 9(2), 171-18.

- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Putnam, R., Leonardi, R., & Nanetti, R. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Reinard, J. (2008). *Introduction to communication research*. Boston: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Ruef, M. (2002). Strong ties, weak ties and islands: Structural and cultural predictors of organizational innovation. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 11(3), 427-449.
- Schrodt, P., Cawyer, C. S., & Sanders, R. (2003). An examination of academic mentoring behaviors and new faculty members' satisfaction with socialization and tenure and promotion processes. *Communication Education*, 52(1), 17-29.
- Sepulveda, B. R. (1973). The language barrier and its effect on learning. *Elementary English*, 50(2), 209-217.
- Simona, C. (2015, October 6). Rise of the Teaching Class. *Globe and Mail*. Retrieved 10 September 2015 from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/rise-of-the-teaching-class-changing-makeup-of-canadasuniversities/article26603696/>
- Smith, D. W. (2003). "Pure" logic, ontology, and phenomenology. *Revue Internationale de Philosophie*, 57(224), 133-156.
- Smith, D. (2012). *The Oxford handbook of contemporary phenomenology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Solow, R. M. (2000). Notes on social capital and economic performance. *Social capital: A multifaceted perspective*, 6(10).
- Song, L., & Lin, N. (2009). Social capital and health inequality: Evidence from Taiwan. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 50(2), 149-163.

- Somers, M. A. (2007). *The Effect of the Maclean's University Rankings on the Demand and Supply Side Outcomes of Canadian Universities*. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- Standifer, R., Lester, S., Schultz, N., & Windsor, J. (2013). How age similarity preference, uncertainty, and workplace challenges affect conflict. *Human Relations, 66*(12), 1597-1618.
- Szreter, S., & Woolcock, M. (2004). Health by association? Social capital, social theory, and the political economy of public health. *International Journal of Epidemiology, 33*(4), 650-667.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *The social psychology of intergroup relations, 33*(47), 74.
- Tardos, R. (1996). Some Remarks On the Interpretation and Possible Uses of the Social Capital Concept With Special Regard To the Hungarian Case. *Bulletin de Methodologie Sociologique, 53*(1), 52-62.
- Thirolf, K. (2012). The faculty identities of community college adjuncts teaching in the humanities: A discourse analysis study. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 36*(4), 269-278.
- Woolcock, M. (1998). Social capital and economic development: Toward a theoretical synthesis and policy framework. *Theory and Society, 27*(2), 151-208.
- Woolcock, M. (2001). The place of social capital in understanding social and economic outcomes. *Canadian Journal of Policy Research, 2*(1), 11-17.
- Zahavi, D. (2012). *The Oxford handbook of contemporary phenomenology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appendices

Appendix A

Ethics Approval Notice

**Social Sciences and Humanities REB**

Principal Investigator / Supervisor / Co-investigator(s) / Student(s)

<u>First Name</u>	<u>Last Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>Role</u>
Jenepher Lennox Terrion		Arts / Communication	Supervisor
Sarah	Jamieson	Arts / Communication	Student Researcher

File Number: 08-15-34

Type of Project: Master's Thesis

Title: A phenomenological study of building and mobilizing social capital of part time professors

Approval Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Expiry Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Approval Type
09/28/2015	09/27/2016	Ia

(Ia: Approval, Ib: Approval for initial stage only)

Special Conditions / Comments:

N/A

Université d'Ottawa University of Ottawa
Bureau d'éthique et d'intégrité de la recherche Office of Research Ethics and Integrity

This is to confirm that the University of Ottawa Research Ethics Board identified above, which operates in accordance with the Tri-Council Policy Statement (2010) and other applicable laws and regulations in Ontario, has examined and approved the ethics application for the above named research project. Ethics approval is valid for the period indicated above and subject to the conditions listed in the section entitled "Special Conditions / Comments".

During the course of the project, the protocol may not be modified without prior written approval from the REB except when necessary to remove participants from immediate endangerment or when the modification(s) pertain to only administrative or logistical components of the project (e.g., change of telephone number). Investigators must also promptly alert the REB of any changes which increase the risk to participant(s), any changes which considerably affect the conduct of the project, all unanticipated and harmful events that occur, and new information that may negatively affect the conduct of the project and safety of the participant(s). Modifications to the project, including consent and recruitment documentation, should be submitted to the Ethics Office for approval using the "Modification to research project" form available at: <http://research.uottawa.ca/ethics/submissions-and-reviews>.

Please submit an annual report to the Ethics Office four weeks before the above-referenced expiry date to request a renewal of this ethics approval. To close the file, a final report must be submitted. These documents can be found at: <http://research.uottawa.ca/ethics/submissions-and-reviews>.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the Ethics Office at extension 5387 or by e-mail at: ethics@uOttawa.ca.

Riana Marcotte
Protocol Officer for Ethics in Research
For Barbara Graves, Chair of the Social Sciences and Humanities REB

Appendix B

Interview Guide

I am going to ask you about your relationships with others at the University of Ottawa. I may refer to these relationships as being with “peers,” but please keep in mind that the questions may also apply to your connections with administration members, other part-time professors, full-time professors, union representatives, support services, or students.

Interview profile

- Where are you from?
- What is your first language?
- What faculty are you in?
- What subject(s) do you teach?
- How long have you been teaching at the university?

Part-time professors: Experience

1. What is it like to be a part-time professor here at the University of Ottawa? Please describe what it is like for you.
 - Can you tell me about your everyday connections with peers?
 - Who do you talk to?
 - Do you talk to your peers often? Please describe.
 - How do people get along in your department?

Part-time professors: Social capital

2. Do you feel like you are part of a community here? Please describe.

3. Do you collaborate with peers? In which ways? What is it like collaborating with peers?
 - a. Do any of your peers feel like close friends or even family? Please describe.
 - b. Do you talk to peers that are in a different department or job description than you?
Who are they?
 - c. Do you talk to people in positions of power at the university? Who are they?

4. Have you had any experiences where a peer:
 - a. Helped you get information? Please describe.
 - b. Resources? Please describe.
 - c. Supported you emotionally? Please describe.

5. Have you had an experience where someone engaged in an activity that would devalue the community such as academic fraud, or harassment? Please describe.

Part-time professors: Communication barriers

6. Has there been a time where you had trouble accessing information, getting help with resources, or receiving emotional support from peers due to:
 - a. Cultural differences? Please describe.
 - b. Language barriers? Please describe.
 - c. Differences in personality or character? Please describe.
 - d. A different way of thinking or rationalizing? Please describe.

- e. A seniority difference? Please describe.
- f. An age difference? Please describe.
- g. Difference in experience or knowledge? Please describe.

Part-time professors: Impact

- 7. How has being a part-time professor at the University of Ottawa affected your work life?
- 8. What kind of impact has it had on your life outside work?

Appendix C

Recruitment Letter

Headline: Communication Study: Part-time professors needed

--

I am a full-time Master's student in the Department of Communication, University of Ottawa. I am looking to interview part-time professors who have been at the University of Ottawa for five years or fewer.

This interview is focused on the experience of part-time professors at the University of Ottawa – specifically, their connections with others on campus, as well as the barriers they face and how they navigate them. The interview will be conducted in English, and therefore participants should be fluent in the language.

Interviews will be held during the months of October and November and will last no longer than 60 minutes. Some interviews may require a follow-up with the participant's permission. After

confirming a specific interview time and neutral place agreed upon by the researcher and participant, we will go through the process of informed consent before conducting the interview. This study has been approved by the Research Ethics Board (REB) of the University of Ottawa.

We hope you are interested in participating in this research. Your feedback could contribute greatly to understanding the needs and experiences of part-time professors.

If you are interested in participating or have any questions, please contact me via email at s*****@uottawa.ca or by phone at (613) *****.

Please contact me before October 14, 2015 to participate.

Thank you for considering my request.

Sincerely,

Sarah Jamieson

s*****@uottawa.ca

Graduate student

Department of Communication, Faculty of Arts

University of Ottawa

Bonjour,

Je suis une étudiante à temps plein à la maîtrise au département de communication de l'Université d'Ottawa. Je cherche à interviewer les professeur.e.s à temps partiel qui enseignent à l'Université d'Ottawa depuis cinq ans ou moins.

Cette entrevue est axée sur l'expérience des professeur.e.s à temps partiel à l'Université d'Ottawa - spécifiquement, leurs connexions avec les autres membres de la communauté sur le campus, ainsi que les obstacles auxquels ils/elles font face et comment ils/elles les surmontent. L'entrevue sera menée en anglais seulement, et donc les participant.e.s doivent être capables de communiquer dans cette langue.

Les entrevues auront lieu pendant les mois d'octobre et novembre et durera au plus 60 minutes. Certaines entrevues peuvent nécessiter un suivi avec la permission du participant ou de la participante. Après la confirmation d'un temps d'entrevue spécifique et d'un endroit neutre convenu par le chercheur et le participant ou la participante, nous allons passer par le processus de consentement éclairé avant de procéder à l'entretien. Cette étude a été approuvée par le Comité d'éthique de la recherche (CER) de l'Université d'Ottawa.

Nous espérons que vous serez intéressé.e à participer à ce projet de recherche. Vos commentaires pourraient grandement contribuer à la compréhension des besoins et des expériences des professeur.e.s à temps partiel.

Si vous êtes intéressé.e à participer ou si vous avez des questions, s'il vous plaît contactez-moi par courriel à s*****@uottawa.ca ou par téléphone au (613) *****.

S'il vous plaît me contacter avant le 31 octobre 2015 pour participer.

Merci de considérer ma demande.

Cordialement,

Sarah Jamieson

s*****@uottawa.ca

Étudiant diplômé

Département de la communication, Faculté des arts

Université d'Ottawa

Appendix D

Interview Consent Form



uOttawa

Université d'Ottawa

Faculté des arts
Communication

University of Ottawa

Faculty of Arts
Communication

Project Title: A phenomenological study of building and mobilizing social capital of part-time professors

Researchers:

Dr. Jenepher Lennox Terrion (supervisor)

Department of Communication, Faculty of Arts

University of Ottawa

1 (613) ***** (ext *****)

J*****@uottawa.ca

Sarah Jamieson (Graduate student)

Department of Communication, Faculty of Arts

University of Ottawa

1 (613) *****

S*****@uottawa.ca

Invitation to participate: I am invited to participate in the research study *A phenomenological study of building and mobilizing social capital of part-time professors*. The research is led by Sarah Jamieson and supervised by Dr.

Jenepher Lennox Terrion. As the interview is in English, you should be fluent in English.

Purpose of the Study: This research study is focused on understanding the experiences and needs of part-time professors who have worked at the University of Ottawa for five years or fewer. It aims to assess aspects of social connections of part-time professors at work, what barriers they have faced, and how they have navigated them.

Participation: My participation will primarily consist of an interview session of approximately 60 minutes with a graduate student researcher. I will answer questions from the researcher about my experience as a part-time professor, any challenges I have faced, coping methods I have used, and my social connections with peers at the University of Ottawa. The interview will be scheduled during the months of October and November and will be audio recorded. The interviews will be scheduled at the convenience of the participant, whether that be during school hours or outside of school hours. Interviews will occur in the researcher's office, the participant's office, or a third neutral location agreed upon by the researcher and the participant.

Risks: I understand that my participation in this research requires that I provide information about my experience as a part-time professor at the University of Ottawa. There is some risk that I could be identified due to context in

quotations. However, the researcher will ensure that all identifying markers will be genericized to ensure anonymity.

Benefits: My participation in this research will effectively contribute to the advancement of knowledge in the field of communication as well as provide a guideline for administration and support services to serve the needs of part-time professors.

Confidentiality and anonymity: I have the assurance of the researcher that any information that I will share that could lead to my identification will remain strictly confidential. However, due to the nature of this research, there is some risk of being identified due to context-specific quotations. Anonymity will be granted as follows: my full name and my specific job title will not be mentioned in published documents, and any specific names of persons, places or titles in this interview will be genericized. I will be referred to using a pseudonym and generic markers which will not allow readers to identify me. I expect that the content is used only for research purposes and, according to confidentiality, only the researchers will have access to identifiable data collected during the interviews.

Data Retention: Audio data that is collected will be transcribed into computer files. The documents will also be printed and stored securely in a locked cabinet for a period of five years in the office of the supervisor (Jenepher Lennox Terrion). The electronic data will also be stored for five years protected by a password only known to the researcher and the supervisor.

Voluntary Participation: My participation in this research is voluntary and I am free to withdraw at any time, and/or refuse to answer certain questions without negative consequences. Should I wish to withdraw from the study, I will also be given the opportunity to withdraw my data from the study.

Ethics: The Research Ethics Board (REB) of the University of Ottawa has approved this study. The REB considers the ethical aspects of all research projects involving human subjects at the University of Ottawa. You can contact the Research Ethics Office by calling 613***** or via email at ***** with any questions or concerns.

Consent to Participate in Research: I voluntarily agree to participate in this study conducted by Sarah Jamieson and supervised by Dr. Jenepher Lennox Terrion of the Department of Communication, Faculty of Arts, University of Ottawa, and consent to the interview being recorded. There are two copies of this consent form – one copy for the researcher, and one for me to keep.

Reviewing Transcripts: I can review the transcript to my interview to ensure clarity and context (optional). If I choose yes, the researcher will provide a password for me before the interview, will contact me via email when the transcript is completed and attach a password protected document for my revision. I have two weeks from the receipt of the email to correct any errors and return same password protected document to the researcher with revisions.

I would like to review the transcript of the interview (optional).

Yes

No

I agree to a follow-up interview if needed (optional).

Yes

No

Participant's Name: _____

Participant's Signature: _____

Researcher's signature: _____

Date : _____

Appendix E

Transcription Confidentiality Agreement

Project Title: A phenomenological study of building and mobilizing social capital of part-time professors

Researchers:

Sarah Jamieson (Graduate student)

Department of Communication, Faculty of Arts

University of Ottawa

1 (613) *****

s*****@uottawa.ca

Dr. Jenefer Lennox Terrion (supervisor)

Department of Communication, Faculty of Arts

University of Ottawa

1 (613) ***** (ext *****)

j*****@uottawa.ca

As a transcriber of this research study, I understand that I will be hearing recordings of confidential interviews. I will have access to highly sensitive material which was revealed by people who participated in this project on good faith that their identities would remain strictly confidential. I understand that I have a responsibility to honor this confidentiality agreement.

I hereby agree not to share any information in these recordings with anyone except the researchers of this study. Any violation of this agreement would constitute a serious breach of ethical standards, and I pledge not to do so. I agree to delete any computer files associated with this project within one week of transferring the files to Sarah Jamieson.

This acknowledgement is governed by the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act as well as other applicable federal, provincial, university and local laws, rules and regulations.

Date

Printed name

Signature of transcriber

Appendix F

Selected Examples of Significant Statements of Part-time professors
and Related Formulated Meanings

Theme	Associated Meanings of theme	Significant Statement	Formulated Meaning
Feeling Overwhelmed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeping pace with teaching duties • Social life sacrificed 	Had she not [provided class materials], I probably would have quit because I was so overwhelmed with fear, anxiety, and just facing my class....She was literally a life saver.	Teaching a class for the first time is overwhelming. A part-time professor needs support for <i>keeping pace with teaching duties</i> , or may have difficulties coping.
Uncertainty and Impermanence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporariness • Discontinuity of courses 	So you either go and take one-year jobs here and there and you move like tumbleweed or you sit here and you hope that you get—you'd make a career out of being part-time professor.	As a part-time professor, you live in a state of <i>uncertainty and impermanence</i> . You feel like un <i>electron libre</i> and may feel <i>temporariness</i> at the university.
There's no Place like Home	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Un electron libre • Communication barriers • Reaching out • Working together 	I don't know the part-time teachers, but I know the teachers more, and I feel that they are working together, and this is one of the reasons why I took a class [here], because I like this department.	Part-time professors do not connect often. They are <i>reaching out</i> to full-time staff more. They prefer working in environments that seem to be <i>working together</i> .
Second-class Citizens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scavenging for resources • Self-identification as a part-time professor • No leverage • Not that valued 	They should change that name [part-time] because it's a huge slap in the face to me, excuse me, part-time? I'm working, like, 13, 14 hours a day every day of the week...that is not part-time.	<i>Self-identification as a part-time professor</i> is insulting because they work full-time. It misrepresents their role in the organization and makes them feel <i>not that valued</i> .