Best Practices for Leading Part-time Faculty at Study Abroad Programs:
A Literature Review

Alan Earhart

Abstract:
In the 2017-2018 academic year, 332,727 U.S. university students participated in a study abroad program in a foreign country (Institute of International Education, 2018). Many of these students attended courses taught by part-time faculty, hired locally by study abroad centers with affiliations to U.S. universities. The directors of these centers have responsibility for all aspects of the study abroad programs, including academics and the faculty. This paper reviews best practices for leading part-time faculty from the research literature.

Introduction

In the 2017-2018 academic year, 332,727 students left their universities in the United States to participate in a study abroad program (Institute of International Education, 2018). The number of students studying abroad each year has increased significantly for decades. In the 1962-1963 academic year, the number of students leaving the United States for a study abroad experience was 3,174 (Freeman, 1964). More than five decades later, in the 2017-2018 academic year, New York University alone sent 4,436 abroad (Institute of International Education, 2018). These students are often taking courses that they could have taken on their home campuses. Yet, the explosion in participation rates evidences the rich academic experience that students encounter while taking these courses abroad. What makes these educational experiences unique is the host culture and often the local faculty that teach classes (Stephenson et al., 2005).

Studying abroad has generally been associated with peek student experiences. However, Thomas Jefferson (1785) writing a letter from Europe to his acquaintance John Bannister could see no benefit from an education in Europe other than language acquisition, and listed many reasons

why it was probably a bad idea. Jefferson was particularly disparaging of English education, writing that a student learns drinking, horse-racing, and boxing. Today this negative opinion of study abroad is not widely held, and the participation rates support that. However, as Wallace (1962) pointed out, it is not enough to merely send students abroad for them to be positively affected by their travels. A quality study abroad experience is facilitated by on-site staff and instructors.

A study abroad program permanently based in a foreign country is a complex, mini-campus led by a director who from moment to moment may function as a dean of students, a contracts specialist, or department chair (Goode, 2007; Goodwin & Nacht, 1988; Hornig, 1995; Lucas, 2009; O'Neal & Krueger, 1995). In any case, the study abroad program director is critical to the success of the program and should be an expert administrator, an accomplished academic, fluent in the host culture, and sympathetic to the U.S. American undergraduate learner (Freeman, 1964; Stephenson, 2005).

The problem is that despite all of the competing demands placed upon study abroad campus directors, the key to any study abroad program's success is in the director's ability to effectively lead the academic program, which is often taught primarily by part-time faculty hired locally (Borgioli & Manuelli, 2013; Freeman, 1964; Stephenson et al., 2005; Wallace et al., 2005). Despite the importance of the director's ability to lead the academic program, the contemporary research agenda for study abroad does not include organizational aspects such as management and leadership in the position of the director (Ogden, 2015). Furthermore, this information is vital for directors who, through leadership, hope to improve the work experiences of the part-time faculty and thereby improve the academic and cultural experience of the study abroad students they serve. This paper presents a review of the research on leading part-time faculty.

Review of Literature on Leadership of Part-time Faculty

The researcher conducted an extensive review of the literature on academic leadership of part-time faculty with the purpose of identifying

best practices for leading and supporting part-time faculty in the higher education context. The inclusion criterion for the literature in this review required that the work be narrowly focused on leading and supporting part-time faculty in a higher education context.

The researcher collected journal articles and books using the search terms "academic leadership" and "part-time faculty" from the Colorado State University library, *ERIC*, and *Google Scholar*. Some authors refer to part-time faculty as 'non-tenure track faculty', 'contingent faculty,' or 'adjunct faculty,' and so the researcher included these terms in the literature search. The researcher also included the scant body of writings on part-time faculty at study abroad centers specifically, as well as writings about part-time faculty at study abroad centers in Italy specifically.

Part-Time Faculty in Higher Education

Part-time faculty are typically considered to be non-tenure track faculty that work less than full-time (Biles & Tuckman, 1986; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). These individuals are diverse groups who come to an institution with unique perspectives and motivations for their work (Biles & Tuckman, 1986; Leslie et al., 1982). The American Association of University Professors (2006) identified four classifications for part-time faculty: those preferring full-time employment, part-timers by choice with no other employer, those with a full-time job elsewhere, and those who are retired.

Colleges and universities have increasingly relied upon part-time faculty because of the flexibility that their employment affords in terms of costs, scheduling, and staffing (Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008; Gappa et al., 2007; Leslie et al., 1982). Because department heads are required to balance the demands of institutional policies, curricular requirements, and budgets, the use of part-time faculty provides an advantage (Leslie et al., 1982). However, this advantage of greater flexibility should be balanced with suitable working conditions for the part-time faculty member (Biles & Tuckman, 1986).

Despite the advantages of using part-time faculty compared to full-time tenured faculty, many have argued that the practice is often exploit-

ative (American Association of University Professors, 2006; Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008; Biles & Tuckman, 1986; Gappa et al., 2007; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). To earn a living wage, some part-timers teach at multiple institutions (American Association of University Professors, 2006). Part-timers may feel a calling to the teaching profession and will endure low pay and poor work conditions, which they find dissonant with the academy's spirit and its mission (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Some institutions may be driven toward greater reliance on part-time faculty precisely because of the challenging fiscal environment in which they operate (Fryer, 1977).

Practices and Policies for Part-Time Faculty

Researchers have noted that institutions and academic leaders can improve part-time faculty's working environment and job satisfaction by enacting policies that foster a culture of respect for the part-time faculty (Eagan et al., 2015; Leslie et al., 1982; Waltman et al., 2012). Eagan et al. (2015) found that merely recognizing excellence in teaching among part-time faculty contributed to job satisfaction. Waltman et al. (2012) found that part-time faculty job satisfaction and institutional commitment were enhanced by policies that promoted job security, allowed advancement opportunities and fostered inclusive environments. Researchers suggest that greater integration of part-time faculty into the campus community is vital to improving their experience at an institution (Eagan et al., 2015; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Waltman et al., 2012).

Researchers have found that the institution's physical working conditions for part-time faculty will influence their job satisfaction (Eagan et al., 2015; Leslie et al., 1982). Leslie et al. (1982) found that part-time faculty felt alienated and less supported when small things were missing from their working environments, such as office space, access to copying equipment, or nearby parking. Eagan et al. (2015) found that those with a private office space were significantly more satisfied than those that did not have one. The study also found that part-time faculty with shared office space were substantially more satisfied than those with none. Finally, the study found that part-time faculty with a personal computer provid-

ed by the institution were more satisfied than those who did not have one.

The use of part-time faculty at institutions of higher education may continue to increase. The scholarship has provided indications and guidelines which administrators can employ to work more effectively with part-time faculty to address some of the disparities between part-timers and tenured faculty. Table 1 provides a synopsis of some of these findings from the works reviewed.

Table 1
Practices for Managing Part-Time Faculty

The invisible faculty (Gappa & Leslie, 1993)	Factors for satisfaction of PT faculty (Waltman et al., 2012)	New policies for PT faculty (Fryer, 1977)	Supporting the majority (Eagan et al., 2015)
Publicly recognize achievement	Support teaching efforts	Compensation recognizes out-of-classroom work	Recognize excellence in teaching
Seek feedback on supervision	Promote job security and advancement opportunities	A planned development program for PT	Provide access to professional growth opportunities
Treat PT faculty with respect	Create an inclusive climate	Full range of support services	Provide office space, shared office space
Invite to departmental social events		Invite to departmental meetings and committees	Integrate into department and institution

Part-Time Faculty in Overseas Study Abroad Programs

The scholarly work on the use of part-time faculty at overseas study abroad programs is limited. Garraty and Adams (1959) surveyed the state of affairs of U.S. study abroad programs in Western Europe 60 years ago. They quipped that instructional costs were significantly reduced compared to the home campus. In 1959, a highly qualified instructor from France could be hired for $300 to teach a French Composition course (Garraty & Adams, 1959). Freeman (1964) mentions local tutors in discussing models of delivering the curriculum at overseas study abroad programs in Europe. Freeman (1964) noted that study abroad programs employ one

or a combination of the following models: instruction provided by the local university, instruction provided by local university augmented by contract tutors, instruction provided solely by contract tutors, or instruction provided by faculty from home campus.

Scholars have also raised concerns about the quality of education provided by local part-time faculty at study abroad programs (Freeman, 1964; Garraty & Adams, 1959). Some have commented on the differences between the United States and Western Europe in the teaching style of faculty, characterizing European faculty as more distant and tending not to coddle students as much as their American counterparts (Garraty et al., 1976). More recently, scholars have highlighted the importance of the cultural ambassador role to students held by local part-time faculty in study abroad programs (Stephenson et al., 2005). In general, there is a lack of scholarly commentary on the organizational aspects of managing part-time faculty at overseas study abroad programs.

Some news outlets more recently covered the perceived exploitation of part-time faculty at study abroad programs in Italy (Guttenplan, 2012; Redden, 2013). Part-time faculty in Florence, Italy that tried to organize better contracts through local labor organizations, reported professional consequences (Guttenplan, 2012). After the introduction of new labor laws in Italy, at least one large study abroad program faced lawsuits from disgruntled part-time faculty over how the institution handled the matter (Redden, 2013).

Scholarship on Leading Part-Time Faculty

A search for scholarship on leading and supporting part-time faculty yielded several studies. Eleven were selected for review, as shown in Table 2, where they are sorted by the method and then the publication year: five employed qualitative methods and six used quantitative methods.

Table 2
Characteristics of U.S.-Based Studies Examining Organizational Aspects of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF)

Reference	Purpose	Methods	Participants & setting
Gappa and Leslie (1993)	Identify practices and policies to support NTTF.	Qualitative case study	467 participants (administrators, faculty deans, department chairs, faculty leaders, and part-time faculty) at 18 different universities.
Cunningham (2010)	Identify practices and policies to support NTTF.	Qualitative case study	17 contingent faculty at extended campus locations of a central university.
Waltman et al. (2012)	Identify practices and policies to support NTTF.	Qualitative focus groups	24 focus groups with 220 non-tenure-track-faculty (both full and part-time) at 12 research universities.
Kezar and Sam (2013)	Identify practices and policies to support NTTF.	Qualitative case study	45 faculty leaders (40 contingent and 5 tenured) at 30 institutions that either have positive institutional policies for contingent faculty or are working towards them.
Kezar (2013)	Identify practices and policies to support NTTF.	Qualitative case study	107 non-tenure-track faculty in 25 departments at three large four-year public universities.
Hoyt (2012)	Identify factors predicting NTTF satisfaction and loyalty.	Quantitative survey	358 adjunct faculty at one satellite campus of Brigham Young University.
Eagan et al. (2015)	Identify factors predicting NTTF satisfaction.	Quantitative, secondary data	4169 respondents on original survey who identified as part-time faculty. 279 four-year colleges and universities.
Gehrke and Kezar (2015)	Understand decision-making process of leaders supporting NTTF.	Quantitative, secondary data	278 deans of either colleges of arts and sciences or colleges of liberal arts across many institutions.
Delotell and Cates (2017)	Correlate leadership of chairs and commitment of NTTF.	Quantitative Survey	560 online adjunct faculty at a single, for-profit institution.
Ervin (2018)	Identify practices and policies to support NTTF.	Quantitative survey	309 adjuncts at two extended campuses of a central university.
Barnett (2018)	Correlate leadership and satisfaction of NTTF.	Quantitative survey	77 online adjunct faculty at one for-profit university.

The five qualitative studies in Table 2 vary somewhat in their discreet purpose, but for the most part, they are seeking to identify practices and policies that support non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) at higher education institutions in the United States. NTTF are usually working on a part-time contract.

The book by Gappa and Leslie (1993) provides very little information about the data analysis techniques used for the case study. It does reproduce the questionnaires directed at different stakeholders for the interviews. It describes the participants and institutions only generically. The study does boast a large population across many institutions, which adds strength to the findings and their generalizability. The conclusions produced 43 recommendations for supporting NTTF. Some of these are listed below in bullet points. Some were omitted because they were not central to the relationship between a supervisor and a part-time faculty member.

- Recommended practice 25: "Develop objective performance criteria and procedures for evaluating part-time faculty and use the results as the basis for decisions about reappointment" (p. 259).
- Recommended practice 26: "Provide support services to part-time faculty" (p. 260).
- Recommended Practice 27: "Communicate the message that part-time faculty are important to the institution" (p. 263).
- Recommended practice 30: "Invite part-time faculty to share their perceptions of effective supervisory practice at department chair training sessions" (p. 265).
- Recommended practice 35: "Appoint part-time faculty to committees" (p. 268).
- Recommended practice 37: "Invite part-time faculty to social events" (p. 269).
- Recommended Practice 38: "Publicly recognize part-time faculty for their achievements and contributions" (p. 270).
- Recommended practice 39: "Orient part-time faculty to the in-

stitution and to the expectations the institution has for them" (p. 271).
- Recommended practice 41: "Provide in-service professional development opportunities for part-time faculty" (p. 273).
- Recommended practice 42: "Provide incentives for good performance" (p. 274).
- Recommended Practice 43: "Use teaching evaluations to help part-time faculty improve" (p. 275).

The dissertation study by Cunningham (2010) and the research article by Waltman et al. (2012) found somewhat conflicting results between them. Cunningham's case study interviewed 17 contingent faculty at one extended campus, and in contrast Waltman et al. conducted 24 focus groups with 220 NTTF at 12 research universities. Waltman et al. found four themes that emerged, two for satisfaction and two for dissatisfaction among NTTF. Satisfaction was associated with "teaching and students" and "personal life and flexibility." Dissatisfaction was associated with "terms of employment" and "respect and inclusion." The results for respect and inclusion contradict the findings from (Cunningham, 2010) but the study sites and participants are very different. The study by Waltman et al. (2012) included 12 institutions and Cunningham (2010) included only one with extended campuses. Waltman et al. (2012) found that the level of satisfaction with integration into the campus and departmental culture was directly tied to the department chair's activities and leadership, just as Gappa and Leslie (1993) had found.

The final two qualitative studies in Table 2 by Kezar (2013) and Kezar and Sam (2013) approach the topic of supporting NTTF in two novel ways. Both studies employ a qualitative case study methodology. Kezar focused on NTTF in teaching roles in departments that had either implemented favorable policies for NTTF or failed to do so and asked how this affected the NTTF's perceived ability to teach well and create a positive student learning environment. The study used the concept of "opportunity to perform" which competes with Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene the-

ory (1959) to measure job satisfaction. Kezar argued that the work environment can have a direct influence on work performance. In Herzberg's model, work satisfaction is a mediating variable whereby the environment influences worker motivation (satisfaction or dissatisfaction), which in turn influences work performance. Table 3 lists the results.

Table 3

Kezar's (2013) Departmental Policies that Positively or Negatively Impact NTTF Perceived Ability to Create a Positive Learning Environment

Negative impact	Positive impact
Last-minute course scheduling	Departmental orientation and onboarding
Working at multiple institutions plus lack of departmental commitment to rehire	Provide academic freedom and encourage experimentation in pedagogy
Lack of input into curriculum	NTTF coordinator or advocate
Lack of learning resources Lack of feedback or meaningful input from the administrative leadership Lack of office support	

The six quantitative studies from Table 2 examine the relationships between organizational aspects such as policies or leadership and specific outcomes for NTTF, such as commitment or job satisfaction.

Hoyt (2012) conducted a study at a single satellite campus of Brigham Young University in Utah. The regression analyses used data from a single survey administered to the adjunct faculty at the satellite campus. Several variables significantly predicted job satisfaction with an adjusted R^2 of .57. These variables included pay, work preference, quality of students, faculty support, teaching schedule, collaborative research with tenured faculty, classroom facilities, and teaching load. The study also found several variables that significantly predicted job loyalty with an adjusted R^2 of .45. These variables included work preference, pay, facilities, autonomy, faculty support, and quality of students. The study is

limited by a number of factors.

Although Hoyt (2012) did include data from 358 adjunct faculty, these are all at one satellite campus for Brigham Young University. Adjunct faculty may have felt a sense of calling or duty to teach at the institution because of religious beliefs. This is a mechanism that may not be present at most institutions, and therefore the results are less generalizable. Finally, the study suffered from common-rater bias where both the independent and dependent variables for the regression analyses were derived from a single survey administered on one occasion, which can significantly inflate correlation values (Meier & Toole, 2012).

Eagan et al. (2015) used data from the 2010-2011 administration of the HERI faculty survey and sought to ascertain institutional characteristics and NTTF characteristics that predict job satisfaction. The researchers found that only 3.5% of the variance in workplace satisfaction was attributed to differences between institutions. Despite this low percentage, they argue that hierarchical linear modeling is appropriate because their model has more than one level and the data are nested. McNeish et al. (2017) point out that researchers in psychology tend to overuse hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) for clustered data. They offer that other techniques may be just as appropriate to use, robust, and can handle clustered data. Population-averaged methods (PAMs) account for clustered data without splitting the model into multiple levels. Clustered robust standard errors (CR-SE) are another technique that does not require multiple levels and uses more straightforward calculations that produce more standard outputs like R^2. Furthermore, compared to these more straightforward techniques, HLM carries a more extensive list of assumptions that introduce more potential for flawed analysis if not met. HLM may be overly complicated and unnecessarily powerful for the context in the study by Eagan et al. (2015).

Despite potential issues stemming from HLM, Eagan et al. (2015) found that involuntary part-timers who wanted full-time appointments (underemployed) were less likely to have a positive working relationship with administration compared to voluntary part-timers. The involun-

tary part-time faculty were less satisfied with their work than voluntary part-timers. The underemployed part-time faculty were also less likely to feel respected by full-time faculty. The researchers report that the lower levels of workplace satisfaction among involuntary part-time faculty are associated with more mediocre relationships with administration and less respect from full-time colleagues.

These findings may not translate into the context of study abroad programs in Italy, where workplace satisfaction among part-time faculty may be linked to their perception of their relationship with the director. It is less likely that their workplace satisfaction will be linked to perceptions of lack of respect from full-time faculty because as Borgioli and Manueli (2013) report, part-time faculty at these programs are in an overwhelming majority.

Also included in Table 2 is a quantitative study by Barnett (2018) that examined the predictive relationship between administrators' leadership behaviors and the job satisfaction of online adjunct faculty at a for-profit university. The results showed that transformational leadership was a significant, positive predictor of job satisfaction (t (73) = 4.85, $p <$ .0005; 95% CI (1.78, 4.26)), and transactional leadership was a significant, negative predictor of job satisfaction (t (73) = -2.81, p = .006; 95% CI (-7.61, -1.29)). The coefficient for transformational leadership was B = 3.02, indicating that overall job satisfaction increases by 3 for each 1-point increase in the transformational leadership scores. The results may be inflated due to the issue of common-rater bias as previously mentioned.

The quantitative study by Gehrke and Kezar (2015) is included in Table 2 and investigated the decision-making process of deans of colleges of liberal arts or colleges of arts and sciences in supporting NTTF. The study found that deans more strongly support the deployment of policies and resources to support full-time NTTF than they do policies to support part-time NTTF. For example, on a 5-point Likert scale, the deans were supportive of providing orientation (M = 4.67, SD = 0.81), office supplies (M = 4.65, SD = 0.81), medical benefits (M = 4.63, SD = 0.83), and office space (M = 4.61, SD = 0.83) for full-time NTTF. On the other hand, for part-time NTTF deans supported only orientation (M = 4.30, SD = 1.05),

office supplies (M = 4.19, SD = 0.94), and administrative support (M = 4.12, SD = 1.01). Considering most instructors at study abroad centers in Italy are part-time, outnumbering full time instructors ten to one on average (Borgioli & Manuelli, 2013), the results from the study by Gehrke and Kezar (2015) may not be as meaningful in the context of the study abroad centers in Italy.

Also included in the quantitative studies in Table 2 is a correlational study by Delotell and Cates (2017) that administered a survey to online adjuncts at a single institution, seeking to measure the relationship between the transformational leadership of departmental chairs and the continuance commitment of the faculty. The analysis results showed that the transformational leadership component of the MLQ-5X was the only one that exhibited a statistically significant relationship to the continuance commitment of the online adjunct faculty that responded (R = .487, R^2 = .237, F = 34.249, p < .001). This large correlation for a social phenomenon as complicated as leadership and continuance commitment is likely inflated due to common rater bias problems, as discussed above. The study results also found that transformational leadership accounted for 42.8% (partial correlation coefficient) of the variance observed in the outcome variable (continuance commitment). This percentage is unusually large.

Finally, the last study to be discussed from Table 2 was a dissertation by Ervin (2018) studying the motivation (Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale) from Tremblay et al. (2009) and perceived organizational support (POS) from Eisenberger et al. (1986) among adjunct faculty at two extended campuses of a single university. The results showed that most adjunct faculty members perceived being supported by the institution (M = 5.039, SD + 1.342, 7-point Likert Scale). The study also found that adjunct faculty members who were more self-determined (intrinsic motivation) reported higher levels of POS (r = .272, p <.001).

The studies in Table 2 provided some indications about the relationships between the leadership of the director and the experiences of the part-time faculty. The studies provided useful information on the leadership behaviors that might bolster job satisfaction or the policies that might

positively affect their work experience. None of the studies addressed the specific context of study abroad centers in Italy.

Many of the researchers listed in Table 2 have called for research studies at more institutional types on the policies and practices supporting part-time faculty (Hoyt, 2012; Kezar & Sam, 2013; Waltman et al., 2012). Delotell and Cates (2017) called for research that considers the specific dimensions of transformational leadership in the context of leading adjunct faculty. Deyo (2018) called for an investigation, specifically in the context of overseas study abroad programs that consider the training and rules that directors give to local staff, including faculty. One well-known scholar in leadership and part-time faculty stated that she could not recall ever seeing any scholarship specifically on part-time faculty leadership at study abroad centers (A. Kezar, personal communication, May 31, 2019). A thorough literature review corroborated Kezar's statement of a lack of any studies specifically on the leadership of PT faculty at study abroad centers. The researcher recently published a dissertation research study specifically on the leadership of part-time faculty at study abroad centers in Italy.

Discussion

Leadership scholarship has advanced significantly over the last century and has been identified as strategically important in the higher education context (Kezar et al., 2006; Ramsden, 1998). Leadership, specifically in the context of overseas study abroad programs, has not been adequately addressed. Some scholars have provided descriptions of the role of the director or noted the job complexity and the many hats that directors must wear to lead a program successfully (Goode, 2007; Goodwin & Nacht, 1988; Hornig, 1995; Lucas, 2009; O'Neal & Krueger, 1995; Stephenson & Forward, 2005; Stephenson et al., 2005). Still, these commentaries do not address leadership specifically.

The increased reliance on part-time faculty appointments in higher education has spawned a body of research on these individuals' plight and the policies and practices that might improve their station within the academy. Due to various scholars cited above, these individuals are no

longer invisible in the higher education landscape in the United States of America. There is an echo of this trend among part-time faculty of U.S. study abroad programs in Italy too. In 2009 the Association of Scholars at American Universities in Italy (ASAUI) was formed and had recently partnered with the Sociology Department of the University of Florence and an Italian labor organization to conduct the first-ever exploratory poll to understand the situation of these professionals in Italy better.

The part-time faculty teach the majority of courses at study abroad centers in Italy (Borgioli & Manuelli, 2013) and are often the primary facilitator of the study abroad experience for program participants. This literature review has offered some insight into the leadership practices and policies that might provide greater support and satisfaction to the part-time faculty at study abroad centers. Future research should be conducted at study abroad centers that include information from both administration and faculty on effective leadership practices.

Select Bibliography

American Association of University Professors. (2006). The status of part-time faculty. In *Policy Documents & Reports* (10th ed., pp. 73–83).

Barnett, D. E. (2018). Online adjunct faculty: A quantitative examination of the predictive relationship between leadership and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, *4*(1), 226–236. https://doi.org/10.21890/ijres.383159

Bergquist, W. H., & Pawlak, K. (2008). *Engaging the six cultures of the academy: Revised and expanded edition of the four cultures of the academy*. Jossey-Bass.

Biles, G., & Tuckman, H. (1986). *Part-time faculty personnel management policies*. Macmillan Publishing Company.

Borgioli, A., & Manuelli, A. (2013). *Educating in paradise: The value of north american study abroad programs in Italy - characteristics, impact and prospects*. https://aacupi.files.wordpress.com/2017/08/irpet_study_2_eng.pdf

Cunningham, E. (2010). *Contingent faculty at extended campuses: Framework for leaders*. University of Missouri.

Delotell, P., & Cates, S. (2017). The relationship between the department chairs' transformational leadership style and the continuance commitment of online adjuncts. *International Journal of Management and Human Resources*, *5*(1), 65–77.

Deyo, M. E. (2018). *Perceptions of program coordinators, program advisors, and resident directors of study abroad regarding their professional responsibilities: A qualitative social constructionist inquiry*. University of Nevada, Reno.

Eagan, M. K., Jaeger, A. J., & Grantham, A. (2015). Supporting the academic majority: Policies and

practices related to part-time faculty's job satisfaction. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *86*(3), 448–483. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2015.11777371

Ervin, K. A. (2018). *Motivation and perceived organizational support of adjunct business faculty members teaching face-to-face at a private institution's off campus locations*. Kansas State University.

Freeman, S. A. (1964). *Undergraduate study abroad*. Institute of International Education.

Fryer, T. W. (1977). New policies for the part-time faculty. In R. W. Heyns (Ed.), *Leadership for higher education: The campus view* (pp. 50–59). American Council on Education.

Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E., & Trice, A. G. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's strategic imperative*. Jossey-Bass.

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

Garraty, J. A., & Adams, W. (1959). *From main street to the left bank: Students and scholars abroad*. Michigan State University Press.

Garraty, J. A., von Klemperer, L., & Taylor, C. J. H. (1976). *The new guide to study abroad: 1976–1977 edition*. Harper & Row.

Gehrke, S. J., & Kezar, A. (2015). Supporting non-tenure-track Faculty at 4-year colleges and universities: A national study of deans' values and decisions. *Educational Policy*, *29*(6), 926–960. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904814531651

Goode, M. L. (2007). The role of faculty study abroad directors: A case study. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, *15*, (149–172). https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v15i1.224

Goodwin, C. D., & Nacht, M. (1988). *Abroad and beyond: Patterns in American overseas education*. Cambridge University Press.

Guttenplan, D. D. (2012, June 17). For lecturers, trouble in an Italian paradise. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/18/world/europe/18iht-educlede18.html

Hornig, J. F. (1995). The toughest job you'll ever love: Faculty find rewards: And responsibilities: In study abroad programs. *Academe*, *81*(5), 22–26. https://doi.org/10.2307/40250873

Hoyt, J. E. (2012). Predicting the satisfaction and loyalty of adjunct faculty. *Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, *60*(3), 132–142. https://doi.org/10.1080/07377363.2013.722417

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *71*(3), 500–507. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500

Institute of International Education. (2018). *IIE open doors data 2016-2017*. Institute of International Education. https://opendoorsdata.org/data/us-study-abroad/all-destinations/

Jefferson, T. (1785, October 15). *From Thomas Jefferson to John Banister, Jr., 15 October 1785*. Founders Online. https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Jefferson/01-08-02-0499

Kezar, A. (2013). Examining non-tenure track faculty perceptions of how departmental policies and practices shape their performance and ability to create student learning at four-year institutions. *Research in Higher Education*, *54*(5), 571–598. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-013-9288-5

Kezar, A. J., Carducci, R., & Contreras-McGavin, M. (2006). Rethinking the "L" word in higher education. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, *31*(6), 1–218.

Kezar, A. J., & Sam, C. (2013). Institutionalizing equitable policies and practices for contingent faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *84*(1), 56–87. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2013.11777278

Leslie, D. W., Kellams, S. E., & Gunne, M. G. (1982). *Part-time faculty in American higher education*. Praeger.

Lucas, J. (2009). Over-stressed, overwhelmed, and over here: Resident directors and the challenges of student mental health abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, *18*, 187–215. https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v18i1.261

McNeish, D., Stapleton, L. M., & Silverman, R. D. (2017). On the unnecessary ubiquity of hierarchical linear modeling. *Psychological Methods*, *22*(1), 114–140. https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000078

Meier, K. J., & Toole, L. J. O. (2012). Subjective organizational performance and measurement error :

Common source bias and spurious relationships. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *23*(July), 429–456. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mus057

O'Neal, J. C., & Krueger, R. L. (1995). Directing a program abroad. *Academe*, *81*(5), 28–34. https://doi.org/10.2307/40250874

Ogden, A. C. (2015). Toward a research agenda for U.S. education abroad. In E. Brewer (Ed.), *AIEA research agendas for the internationalization of higher education* (pp. 1–52). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acra.2004.01.020

Redden, E. (2013, May). Face-off in Florence. *Inside Higher Ed*. https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/05/06/shake-teaching-staff-nyu-florence-raises-concerns

Stephenson, S. (2005). The program director and the program. In J. L. Brockington, W. W. Hoffa, & P. Martin (Eds.), *NAFSA's guide to education abroad for advisers and administrators* (3rd ed., pp. 539–552). NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

Stephenson, S., & Forward, M. L. (2005). Managing students and issues on-site. In J. L. Brockington, W. W. Hoffa, & P. C. Martin (Eds.), *NAFSA's guide to education abroad for advisers and administrators* (3rd ed., pp. 573–585). NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

Stephenson, S., Ogden, A., Rodriguez, K., & Smith-Simonet, M. (2005). The overseas program cycle and critical components. In J. L. Brockington, W. W. Hoffa, & P. C. Martin (Eds.), *NAFSA's guide to education abroad for advisers and administrators* (3rd ed., pp. 553–571). NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

The Forum on Education Abroad. (n.d.). Retrieved March 11, 2019, from https://forumea.org/resources/glossary/

Tremblay, M. A., Blanchard, C. M., Taylor, S., Pelletier, L. G., & Villeneuve, M. (2009). Work extrinsic and intrinsic motivation scale: Its value for organizational psychology research. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, *41*(4), 213–226. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015167

Wallace, J. A. (1962). Characteristics of programs for study abroad. *Journal of General Education*, *13*(4), 251–261. https://jstor.org/stable/27795694

Wallace, J., Cates, S., Ricks, T., & Robinson, R. (2005). Faculty roles. In J. L. Brockington, W. W. Hoffa, & P. C. Martin (Eds.), *NAFSA's guide to education abroad for advisers and administrators* (3rd ed., pp. 75–92). NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

Waltman, J., Bergom, I., Hollenshead, C., Miller, J., & August, L. (2012). Factors contributing to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among non-tenure-track faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *83*(3), 411–434. https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2012.0014

Alan Earhart holds a Ph.D in Higher Education Leadership from Colorado State University. His research focuses on the experiences of study abroad directors in Italy providing leadership to parttime faculty. Dr. Earhart is currently the Director of International Programs and Partnerships at the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley. He held numerous leadership positions in Italy including Administrative Director of Georgetown University at Villa Le Balze in Fiesole.