

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

The use of part-time faculty in higher education is rising dramatically on the nation's campuses. In the period between 1976 and 1994, the use of full-time faculty increased by 21% while the use of part-time faculty increased by 91% (Clery, 1998). According to the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF: 99), 42.6% of all postsecondary faculty are employed on a part-time basis (Berger, Kirshstein, & Rowe, 2001; Zimbler, 2001). This figure is inflated by the numbers of part-time faculty employed by the nation's public community colleges where 63.9% of faculty are employed on a part-time basis (Zimbler, 2001). Although more part-time faculty members are employed on community college campuses than on other campuses, the increase in the overall numbers of part-time faculty is considerable.

The increase in the use of part-time faculty in higher education has led to a great deal of study and discussion. Some areas of interest to scholars have been the political climate surrounding the increased use of part-time faculty (Clery, 1998; Gappa & Leslie, 1997; Leslie, 1998; Walker, 1998), the characteristics of part-time faculty (Gappa & Leslie, 1997; Mellander & Mellander, 1999), and the quality of part-time faculty (Freeland, 1998; Gappa & Leslie, 1997; Leslie, 1998).

The political climate that has fostered the increased use of part-time faculty in postsecondary schools is one area of interest to scholars. Institutions of higher education have been faced with stagnating federal and state funding. At the same time, these institutions have experienced increased enrollments and increases in operating expenses without increases in funding (Clery, 1998; Freeland, 1998; Gappa & Leslie, 1997; Leslie, 1998; Walker, 1998). This climate has led to an imperative to control costs (Clery, 1998; Gappa & Leslie, 1997; Leslie, 1998; Walker, 1998) and to increase flexibility for administrators and convenience to students in scheduling courses (Freeland, 1998; Leslie, 1998).

Confronted by this imperative, administrators of higher education often view the use of part-time faculty as cost effective (Clery, 1998; Mellander & Mellander, 1999; Walker, 1998) and convenient (Freeland, 1998). Faculty salaries are among the largest costs in the budgets of institutions of higher education. Therefore, the use of part-time faculty who are less expensive than full-time faculty is an important mechanism in the control of costs (Leslie, 1998).

There are several savings associated with the use of part-time faculty. First, part-time faculty are generally paid less well than full-time faculty - even when they have similar qualifications (Leslie, 1998; Mellander & Mellander, 1999). Two organizations that track the earnings and working conditions of faculty are the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the Coalition on the Academic Workforce (CAW). Both of these organizations have expressed concern over the growing use of part-time faculty as well as their earnings and working conditions (AAUP, 2002a; CAW, 2002).

A direct comparison of full-time and part-time faculty salaries is difficult because salaries vary greatly by academic rank and by institutional type (e.g. community college, research university) and because teaching loads vary from institution to institution. However, in 2000-2001, the average annual salary of full-time faculty at all ranks and at all institutional types was \$60,070 (AAUP, 2002b). The average annual salary for assistant professors at all institutional types was \$47,358 and the average salary for assistant professors at public two-year institutions was \$41,192 (AAUP, 2002b). In comparison, most part-time faculty members make less than \$3,000.00 for each course they teach (CAW, 2002). At this rate of pay, a part-time faculty member would need to teach 13 courses a year to earn the average salary of an assistant professor at a two-year institution.

Not only do part-time faculty members start out with lower salaries than their full-time peers, but they are also less likely to receive raises (Twigg, 1989). A study of part-time faculty conducted in the Boston area indicated that 54% of part-time faculty who had been teaching for two or more years had received no increase over their previous year's salary (AAUP, 2002c). The lack of raises means that part-time faculty remain less expensive than full-time faculty throughout their employment.

The belief that part-time faculty receive lower pay than full-time faculty is also supported by the results of the NSOPF: 99. In this study, faculty income was calculated in two ways (Zimbler, 2001). First, the basic salary received from the employing institution was considered. Second, the total earned income was considered. The total earned income includes income from consulting as well as from other sources. Results of these calculations indicate that part-time faculty members tend to be poorer than full-time faculty members.

Across institutional type and rank, full-time faculty have a total earned income that is \$22,573 higher than the total income earned by part-time faculty (Zimbler, 2001). When only the basic salary from the institution is considered, the gap widens considerably. Institutions pay full-time faculty a salary of \$45,237 more than they pay part-time faculty.

The gap in income is evident at all levels of post-secondary education. Full-time faculty in public 2-year institutions earn \$13,171 more than their part-time colleagues (Zimbler, 2001). If only the salary from the institution is calculated, full-time faculty in public 2-year institutions earn \$34,854 more than part-time faculty (Zimbler, 2001).

In addition to generating savings through lower salaries and fewer raises, the use of part-time faculty generates savings in benefits for institutions. Part-time faculty do not usually receive benefits such as insurance, sick leave, or retirement contributions (Berger et al., 2001; Mellander & Mellander, 1999). Sixty three percent (63%) of all part-time faculty who are paid by the course do not receive any benefits at all (CAW, 2002). This results in a significant savings for the institution.

The imperative to control costs and increase flexibility in scheduling and curriculum offerings has been particularly strong for the nation's community colleges. This has resulted in an even higher reliance on part-time faculty at these institutions than at senior institutions (Freeland, 1998; Leslie, 1998; Mellander & Mellander, 1999). In community colleges, 63.9% of all faculty work on a part-time basis (Berger et al., 2001; Zimpler, 2001) and 50% to 75% of all courses taught at a community college are taught by part-time faculty members (Mellander & Mellander, 1999).

Despite strong indications that the use of part-time faculty saves money, there are some concerns about this strategy (Gappa & Leslie, 1997). In institutions where part-time faculty are provided with comprehensive orientation programs and with office space, there are hidden costs associated with the use of part-time faculty. These costs may include the time and human resources used to orient new faculty to the institution, costs of office space for a large number of faculty, and the costs associated with the recruitment and hiring process (Gappa & Leslie, 1997). These costs are difficult to ascertain and are usually not considered, but their careful calculation may reveal that the use of part-time faculty is not as economically viable as previously believed.

In addition to the potential economic savings, the use of part-time faculty provides flexibility to higher education administrators. Administrators often need to change the courses offered each term with little notice due to unexpected changes in enrollments. Because part-time faculty can be hired and fired more readily than full-time faculty, their use allows administrators greater freedom to make these changes (Freeland, 1998; Leslie, 1998).

The ability to arrange class schedules for student convenience is another benefit associated with part-time faculty (Rouche, Rouche, & Milliron, 1995). The use of part-time faculty provides the institution with a greater opportunity to schedule classes outside normal working hours. This flexibility is helpful in attracting non-traditional students to the institution, which helps to generate increased enrollment and funding for the institution.

The benefits to the institution of using part-time faculty are clear. The use of part-time faculty assists the institution to control costs (Clery, 1998; Gappa & Leslie, 1997; Leslie, 1998; Walker, 1998) and to be flexible in scheduling courses (Freeland, 1998; Leslie, 1998; Rouche et al., 1995). However, it is less clear how the use of part-time faculty compares to the use of full-time faculty. One way of exploring this question is by comparing the characteristics of part-time faculty to the characteristics of full-time faculty (Gappa & Leslie, 1997; Mellander & Mellander, 1999).

Two studies that provide a great deal of data regarding the characteristics of part-time faculty are the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF: 93) and the NSOPF: 99 (Gappa & Leslie, 1997; Leslie, 1998; Zimpler, 2001). The results of these studies provide information about the demographic characteristics, the academic preparation, the professional development, and the professional experience of part-time faculty. The studies were conducted in colleges and universities throughout the nation

and data were analyzed to determine how the characteristics of part-time faculty compared to those of their full-time counterparts.

Demographically, part-time faculty and full-time faculty are similar in terms of race and ethnicity (Zimbler, 2001). However, the results of the NSOPF: 99 indicate that part-time and full-time faculty members differ significantly by gender. The majority of part-time faculty are women, with nearly half (47.9 %) of all women faculty working in a part-time capacity (Zimbler, 2001).

It has been suggested that many women prefer part-time positions because such positions provide more flexibility in terms of scheduling (Leslie, 1998). This would explain the high numbers of women who hold part-time faculty positions, but the data from the NSOPF: 93 study does not support this idea. The proportion of women employed as part-time faculty by preference was similar to the proportion of men who preferred to work part-time - 52% (Gappa & Leslie, 1997).

Another characteristic studied by the NSOPF: 99 is the academic preparation of part-time faculty (Zimbler, 2001). Comparing the academic preparation of part-time faculty to that of full-time faculty is one way scholars have evaluated the use of part-time faculty. If part-time faculty members have less academic preparation than their full-time counterparts, then the quality of their instruction may suffer (Clery, 1998; Leslie, 1998).

The results of the NSOPF: 99 help address this issue by providing information about the experience and academic preparation of part-time faculty members (Zimbler, 2001). Part-time faculty members tend to be less well educated than their full-time peers, with most (54.1 %) holding a master's degree as their highest degree earned. Only 26.9 % of part-time faculty have earned a doctor of philosophy or professional degree, while 67% of full-time faculty have earned this degree (Leslie, 1998). The lower levels of education attained by part-time faculty may be due in part to the high number of part-time faculty who are employed in community colleges. In these institutions, 58.6% of all part-time faculty hold a master's degree, but only 10.9 % have earned a doctorate of professional degree (Zimbler, 2001).

Proponents of the use of part-time faculty maintain that professional experience can be as important as educational preparation, especially in applied majors where such experience is important (Cline, 1993; Leslie, 1998). Approximately 77% of part-time faculty are employed outside of the institution (Zimbler, 2001), with many holding full-time positions in the field in which they teach (Gappa & Leslie, 1997). This means that they have a great deal of professional expertise. However, the results of the NSOPF: 93 indicate that there is not a significant difference in the number of part-time faculty employed in majors that require professional experience and in majors that do not require such experience (Gappa & Leslie, 1997; Leslie, 1998).

In considering the importance of professional experience in relationship to academic preparation, it is necessary to look at the academic fields in which part-time faculty are most likely to be employed. The proportion of faculty members who are

employed on a part-time basis differs by academic discipline. Law is the field that employs the highest percentage (61.4%) of part-time faculty members (Leslie, 1998). It seems reasonable to believe that professional experience would be important in this field.

After law, however, the fields that employ the most part-time faculty include fine arts, English, computer sciences, and mathematics (Gappa & Leslie, 1997). Fewer part-time faculty are found in the fields of agriculture, home economics, political science, and the biological and physical sciences (Gappa & Leslie, 1997). There does not appear to be a relationship between the vocational nature of the academic field and the percentage of part-time faculty employed to teach in that field. These findings suggest that the need for professional experience is not an important consideration in the hiring of part-time faculty (Gappa & Leslie, 1997; Leslie, 1998).

Investigations have provided information about the demographic characteristics, the academic preparation, the professional development, and the professional experience of part-time faculty (Gappa & Leslie, 1997; Leslie, 1998; Zimble, 2001). These investigations have not provided much insight on the quality of instruction provided by part-time faculty.

The quality of instruction is the primary concern surrounding the use of part-time faculty (Clery, 1998; Fedler, 1989; Gappa & Leslie, 1997; Leslie, 1998; Mellander & Mellander, 1999; Spangler, 1990). Scholars have addressed this issue by looking at the standards maintained in the classroom (Fedler, 1998; Spangler, 1990), the quality of education outside of the classroom (Clery, 1998; Mellander & Mellander, 1999), and the participation of part-time faculty in the governance of their employing institution (Gappa & Leslie, 1997).

Some researchers have found that part-time faculty do not maintain the same standards in the classroom as full-time faculty (Fedler, 1989; Spangler, 1990). Data from one study indicated that students in English classes taught by part-time faculty do less well on reading and writing exams than those students taught by full-time faculty (Spangler, 1990). Results of another study demonstrated that part-time faculty tend to award higher grades than their full-time counterparts (Fedler, 1989). Studies such as these point to potentially important drawbacks associated with the extensive use of part-time faculty.

The use of part-time faculty may affect the quality of education outside of the classroom as well. Part-time faculty are less available to students than full-time faculty because they are less likely to maintain office hours (Clery, 1998; Mellander & Mellander, 1999). This means that students are less likely to receive individual responses to their questions and assistance with their problems from part-time faculty.

The use of part-time faculty may also affect the overall quality of the institution of higher education. Faculty members play an important role in the governance of institutions of higher education. Part-time faculty, however, often do not participate in

campus committees or in strategic planning activities (Gappa & Leslie, 1997). This can mean that fewer people have a voice in issues that affect the campus as a whole.

Arguments about quality of education are frequently presented in the debate about the use of part-time faculty (Clery, 1998; Fedler, 1989; Mellander & Mellander, 1999; Spangler, 1990). While the use of part-time faculty may lead to questions about quality, it may not be the characteristics of part-time faculty members or their teaching abilities that affect the quality of an institution or program. Rather, the employment practices that interfere with the part-time faculty members' ability to excel may be a crucial factor (Gappa & Leslie, 1997; Leslie, 1998).

This argument is supported by results of the NSOPF: 93 (Gappa & Leslie, 1997; Leslie, 1998). Although part-time faculty members are generally not involved in the governance of their institution, they are generally committed to their hiring institution. Forty-five percent (45%) of all part-time faculty have taught for more than four years in their current teaching position and on average have been there for six years (Leslie, 1998). This commitment indicates that part-time faculty might participate in the governance of this institution if encouraged to do so (Gappa & Leslie, 1997; Leslie, 1998).

When discussing the quality of education provided by part-time faculty, it is important to examine their working conditions. Employment practices in regard to part-time faculty vary widely from institution to institution (Freeland, 1998; Gappa & Leslie, 1997; Leslie, 1998). However, as a rule, part-time faculty are paid less well than full-time faculty, have fewer benefits, and fewer opportunities for advancement (Berger et al. 2001; Clery, 1998; Mellander & Mellander, 1999).

It is not uncommon for part-time faculty members to receive their teaching assignments at the last minute, and have little time to prepare their classes. Conversely, it is also not uncommon for them to engage in extensive course preparation, only to learn that their course will not be offered or that another faculty member will teach it (Gappa & Leslie, 1997). In addition, part-time faculty members experience a lack of variety in teaching assignments and are typically assigned poor office space (Gappa & Leslie, 1997).

Gappa & Leslie (1997) have suggested that these differences between part-time and full-time faculty leads to a bifurcated work force. In this work force, tenured faculty are the elite and part-time faculty occupy a lower status. Tenured faculty are able to enjoy good salaries, job security, benefits, opportunities to engage in research, and opportunities for advancement. Part-time faculty members enjoy none of these benefits.

It is interesting to note that most part-time faculty members (52%) indicate that they are part-time by choice (Gappa & Leslie, 1997) despite their lack of standing and security. Most (63.7%) hold full-time jobs outside of academia. These findings help to dispel the myth that part-time faculty members only accept their positions because they are unable to get full-time work in academia.

One area in which this is particularly true is in nursing education. A national nursing shortage has led to the highest rate in vacant nursing positions ever recorded (Sherman, 2001). This means that qualified nurses have a great deal of freedom in choosing the areas in which they work and whether they wish to be employed on a part-time or a full-time basis.

Nurses who decide to become part-time clinical nursing faculty do so for a variety of reasons. The opportunity for personal and professional growth is considered to be one important factor in this decision (Adams, 1992). The position of part-time nursing faculty also provides the opportunity to meet home responsibilities (Soehnlén, 1994).

Most part-time clinical nursing faculty are employed in associate degree nursing programs (Soehnlén, 1994). The associate degree in nursing (ADN) is a two-year degree and is one of three avenues leading to licensure as a Registered Nurse (RN). Other avenues include a diploma in nursing and a baccalaureate degree in nursing. Students who complete any of these educational programs are eligible to take the National Council Licensing Exam for Registered Nurses (NCLEX-RN). Students who do not pass the NCLEX-RN do not become RNs.

In nursing, as in other fields, teaching effectiveness by full-time and by part-time faculty is an important issue affecting the quality of education. The teaching methods used by effective faculty consist of varying and complex sets of skills and activities (deTornyay, 1984; Morton, 1987).

It is difficult to identify specific teaching skills that are considered effective (de Tornyay, 1984; Morton, 1987). Different sets of skills and activities may be identified as effective by students in different class sizes and in different courses. The age and experience of the evaluator also affects which teaching skills and activities are judged as effective (Koon & Murray, 1995; Smith & Cranton, 1992).

One area in which teaching effectiveness has been of interest to researchers is in clinical nursing education (Barham, 1965; Jacobson, 1966; Kiker, 1973, O'Shea & Parsons, 1979). Clinical instruction in nursing provides students with a real-life laboratory. In this setting, nursing students learn to integrate theoretical concepts learned from prerequisite science courses, humanity courses, and from nursing lectures into the skills and behaviors required for successful nursing practice. Effective clinical instruction allows students to develop the problem solving and decision-making skills essential for a professional nurse (Meleca, Schimpfhauser, Witteman, & Sachs, 1981; Massarweh, 1999).

Clinical instruction in nursing has two important variables that are not common to most other types of formal teaching experiences (Bergman & Gaitskill, 1990; Brown, 1981; Jacobson, 1996). First, teaching in the clinical arena is usually incidental to the main purpose of the clinical setting – the care of patients. This means that clinical nursing faculty have little control over the clinical setting and the experiences to which the

nursing student is exposed. Clinical nursing faculty must always be prepared to adapt the teaching plan to unexpected and unpredictable events.

In addition to a lack of control, clinical nursing faculty must juggle two equally important but frequently competing goals. The first is to prepare the student for the role of the professional nurse. The second goal is to maintain the safety and well being of the patient. This dual focus requires special and distinct teaching skills or characteristics (Bergman & Gaitskill, 1990; Brown, 1981; Jacobson, 1996). These characteristics are not innate but are developed over time and with experience (Scanlan, 1996).

The exact nature of the teaching skills required by clinical nursing faculty has been the subject of many research studies (Barham, 1965; Jacobson, 1966; Kiker, 1973; O'Shea & Parsons, 1979). In one early study, ADN students and faculty were asked to write descriptions of effective and ineffective teaching behaviors observed in the clinical setting, in the classroom setting, and in counseling sessions (Barham, 1965). The behaviors identified as effective were analyzed and grouped into 19 categories:

- 1) accepting students as individuals; 2) admitting limitations honestly; 3) avoiding humiliating students in front of others; 4) being available when appropriate; 5) counseling without humiliation; 6) demonstrating confidence in the student; 7) demonstrating flexibility so that learning can take place, 8) demonstrating understanding in working with students; 9) empathizing with students; 10) establishing rapport with students; 11) exhibiting appropriate preparation; 12) explaining for understanding; 13) giving students a feeling of importance; 14) going into problem-situation with students; 15) producing a defensive response 16) recognizing individual needs; 17) setting an example; 18) showing restraint so that own anxiety does not influence situation; and 19) stimulating and involving students (Barham, 1965, p. 67).

The 19 categories identified in Barham's (1965) study mainly relate to the clinical nursing faculty member's personality traits and interactions with students. Only one of the categories, exhibiting appropriate preparation, relates to the role of the clinical nursing faculty as nursing experts. Results of subsequent studies demonstrate that this role is an important one for clinical nursing faculty (Jacobson, 1966).

In a later study, students from five undergraduate nursing programs were asked to describe effective and ineffective teaching behaviors (Jacobson, 1966). Six categories of effective teaching behaviors were identified. First, the effective instructor remains available to the students. Second, the effective instructor is professionally competent. Third, the effective instructor establishes good interpersonal relationships with student and others. Fourth, the effective teacher uses good teaching methods in the classroom and the clinical setting. Fifth, the effective instructor is honest and conveys warmth and acceptance to students. Finally, the effective instructor uses fair and pertinent evaluation practices.

A review of Jacobson's (1966) categories of effective teaching behaviors reveals that three of the categories are directly related to the clinical nursing faculty member's

expertise in nursing and teaching. These categories address the clinical nursing faculty member's professional competence, teaching methods, and evaluation practices. The remaining three categories are related to the faculty member's personality traits and relationships with students.

O'Shea and Parsons (1979) studied nursing students' and faculty members' perceptions of effective clinical instruction by developing a two-question questionnaire. The first question asked for examples of behaviors that facilitated clinical learning. The second question asked for examples of behaviors that interfered with clinical learning. The examples provided by their respondents were then grouped into three categories: instructive/assistive behaviors, personal characteristics, and evaluation.

Instructive/assistive behaviors are those behaviors that the clinical nursing faculty employs to help the student with motor skills or with problem-solving skills (O'Shea & Parsons, 1979). Being available in the clinical setting is an example of a facilitative behavior in this category. Taking over the student's assignment is a behavior that interferes with clinical learning.

Personal characteristics are subjective feelings that the subjects reported about clinical nursing faculty behaviors (O'Shea & Parsons, 1979). Behaviors that support the student's learning include facilitating student experiences. Behaviors that interfere with student learning include behaving in an authoritarian manner.

The final category identified by O'Shea and Parsons (1979) was evaluative behaviors. Providing positive feedback was a behavior that subjects viewed as facilitative. Providing insufficient feedback was identified as an interfering evaluative behavior.

Student perceptions of effective teaching vary according to the situation (Koon & Murray, 1995; Smith & Cranton, 1992). Therefore, it is important to use an evaluation tool that is appropriate for the situation. Knox and Mogan (1985) have pointed out that evaluation methods that are used in general education courses are not appropriate for clinical settings because clinical settings require unique sets of skills and activities.

One instrument used to identify the characteristics of effective clinical nursing faculty was developed by Mogan and Knox. To develop this tool, Mogan and Knox (1983) conducted a qualitative study in which three questions were asked. First, students were asked to rate the effectiveness of their nursing clinical faculty. Then, they were asked to identify the most effective aspects of their nursing clinical faculty. Finally, they were asked how clinical faculty could become more effective. Results of this study were used to develop the Nursing Clinical Teacher Effectiveness Inventory (NCTEI).

The NCTEI consists of 48 items divided into five categories similar to those identified by previous researchers (Brown, 1981; Jacobson, 1966; O'Shea & Parsons, 1979). These categories include: teaching ability, nursing competence, evaluation, interpersonal relationships, and personality traits (Knox & Mogan, 1985). Jacobson

(1966) identified a sixth trait, availability to students, that Knox and Mogan (1985) included under the category of teaching ability.

In conclusion, student evaluation of faculty is an effective measurement of faculty effectiveness if the appropriate evaluation tool is used (deTornyay, 1984; Fong & McCauley, 1993; Morton, 1972). This tool should reflect the varying and complex sets of skills and activities specific for the subject and the teaching situation (de Tornyay, 1984; Koon & Murray, 1995; Morton, 1972; Smith & Cranton, 1992). The NCTEI is an example of an effective tool to use to evaluate clinical nursing faculty.

Scholars have examined the reasons for the increased use of part-time faculty in higher education (Clery, 1998; Gappa & Leslie, 1997; Leslie, 1998; Walker, 1998), the characteristics of part-time faculty (Gappa & Leslie, 1997; Mellander & Mellander, 1999), and the quality of part-time faculty (Freeland, 1998; Gappa & Leslie, 1997; Leslie, 1998). However, there has been little direct comparison of full-time faculty and part-time faculty from the student's perspective. This study was intended to address this gap by providing the student's perspective to the discussion of part-time faculty.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to compare the teaching effectiveness of part-time and full-time clinical nursing faculty. For this study, part-time clinical faculty were defined as those faculty members who teach in the clinical setting and who are not considered full-time staff members of their employing institution. Full-time clinical faculty were defined as those faculty members who teach in the clinical setting and who are considered full-time staff members of their employing institution. The clinical setting was any setting in which the student was expected to apply nursing theory to practice. Examples include the on-campus nursing laboratory, the hospital, and outpatient settings such as physician's offices, clinics, and primary schools.

To achieve the purpose of the study, the Nursing Clinical Teacher Effectiveness Inventory (NCTEI) was adapted for use in measuring student and faculty perceptions of part-time faculty and of full-time faculty. The NCTEI was designed to measure five categories important in clinical nursing instruction (Knox & Mogan, 1985). These categories include personality traits, interpersonal relationships, nursing competence, teaching ability, and evaluation.

There were three components of the study. First, students completed questionnaires about the effectiveness of their part-time and full-time clinical nursing faculty. Second, part-time and full-time clinical nursing faculty completed questionnaires about their perceptions of their own effectiveness. Finally, results were compared with the percentage of first-time pass rates on the National Council Licensing Exam for Registered Nurses (NCLEX-RN).

The instrument was administered to students and faculty in seven ADN programs located in a mid-Atlantic state. Both first-year and second-year students participated in the study.

Research Questions

Specifically, the study was designed to explore the following questions:

1. Do ADN students perceive that the effectiveness of instruction of part-time clinical nursing faculty differs from the effectiveness of instruction of full-time clinical nursing faculty?
2. Are there differences in the way full-time and part-time ADN clinical nursing faculty perceive their own teaching effectiveness?
3. What differences are there in the way ADN students perceive clinical instruction by nursing faculty and the way faculty perceive their own instruction?
4. How do student ratings of effectiveness compare with the percentage of first-time pass rates on the NCLEX-RN?

Significance of the Study

This study added to the literature concerning the use of part-time faculty. It had significance for future practice, research and policy.

In terms of practice, this study provided information to administrators who are responsible for hiring part-time faculty. The results of this study provided administrators with information about the way students perceive clinical nursing faculty. This information might help administrators decide if the use of part-time clinical faculty is appropriate for their ADN program.

The results of this study may also be helpful to the full-time faculty who work with part-time clinical faculty. By providing information about students' perceptions of clinical faculty, this study may help full-time faculty compare the strengths and weaknesses of part-time and full-time clinical faculty. This information might be used to develop strategies to ensure that all faculty are used effectively.

Full-time faculty who do not work with part-time faculty might also find the results of this study useful. This study provided information about students' perceptions of clinical faculty. This information could be used by full-time faculty as a basis for improving their own clinical teaching skills.

In much the same way, the results of this study might also inform people seeking positions as clinical faculty. It provided information about the way that students perceive part-time and full-time faculty. An understanding of students' perceptions may help aspiring faculty determine how to approach their teaching assignments.

In addition to the implications for practice, the results of this study had implications for future research. The present study examined only student and faculty

perceptions of those faculty members who teach in nursing programs. Future scholars may wish to examine student and faculty perceptions of part-time versus full-time faculty in other fields. Such a study might advance knowledge about the ways that students and faculty in a variety of programs perceive faculty who serve in different capacities.

In this study, the sample consisted of students and faculty from nursing programs situated in community colleges. Another study about student and faculty perceptions of faculty might be conducted in baccalaureate nursing programs. Such a study would contribute to the body of knowledge about differences in student perceptions of part-time faculty versus full-time by type of nursing degree program.

The participants in this study were nursing students from one state. Future studies might be conducted on students from other states or from a national sample. These studies would provide information about the student and faculty perceptions of part-time versus full-time faculty from a broader sample.

This study also had implications for policy makers in higher education. The study provided information about ADN student and faculty perceptions of part-time versus full-time clinical faculty. Policy makers could use this information to establish appropriate ratios of full-time to part-time faculty.

Policy makers responsible for the evaluation of institutional policies related to the hiring of part-time faculty could also use the results of this study. This study provided information about students' perceptions of part-time faculty versus full-time faculty. Policy makers could use this information to support or to change hiring policies.

Finally, nursing accreditation policy makers could use the results of this study to determine the appropriate ratio of part-time to full-time clinical faculty. This study provided information about student and faculty perceptions of part-time faculty versus full-time faculty. This information could be used to develop guidelines for nursing schools to use when hiring faculty.

Limitations of the Study

There were several initial limitations to this study. These included limitations related to the use of student perceptions as a tool to study clinical faculty, the sample, and the instrument.

The first limitation concerned the use of student perceptions as a tool to study clinical faculty. Students may have unsophisticated views of the faculty role. Use of their perceptions might mean that there are responsibilities of clinical faculty that are not addressed by this study. For example, students may not be aware of the clinical faculty member's role in maintaining appropriate relationships with clinical sites. If students were insufficiently aware of faculty members' roles, the results of the study might have been influenced.

The second limitation of this study related to the sample. This study employed a convenience sample consisting of ADN students and faculty within a mid-Atlantic state. These students and faculty might differ in some way from ADN students and faculty in other states. If so, these differences might have influenced the results.

A third limitation of the study also involved the sample. This study was conducted with ADN students and faculty only. Students in other types of nursing programs might perceive part-time and full-time clinical faculty differently. These different perceptions might influence the results of the study.

The use of a questionnaire is the fourth limitation of the study. The use of this technique meant that the respondents only had an opportunity to rate factors included on the instrument. If the instrument did not include all of the factors relating to clinical instruction, the results might have been influenced.

Despite these limitations, this study provided initial information about ADN student and faculty perceptions of part-time and full-time clinical faculty. Additional information about this topic may provide a clearer picture of the benefits and limitations of the use of part-time faculty in nursing programs.

Organization of the Study

This study is organized around five chapters. The first chapter provided an overview of the topic under study and the research questions posed in the study. Chapter Two contains a review of the current literature on student evaluation of faculty and on instruction in the clinical setting. The methodology for the study, including the sample selection procedures, the instrument employed in the study, and the procedures used to collect and analyze the data is provided in the third chapter. The results of the study are reported in the fourth chapter. A discussion of those results and their implications for future practice is offered in the final chapter.