UNLV | UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones

8-1-2020

Losing Our Faculties: Academic Labor in the Corporate Academy

Mark L. Spinrad

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations

Part of the Education Commons

Repository Citation

Spinrad, Mark L., "Losing Our Faculties: Academic Labor in the Corporate Academy" (2020). *UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones*. 4027.
http://dx.doi.org/10.34917/22110093

This Dissertation is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Scholarship@UNLV with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Dissertation in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Dissertation has been accepted for inclusion in UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@unlv.edu.

LOSING OUR FACULTIES: ACADEMIC LABOR

IN THE CORPORATE ACADEMY

By
Mark L. Spinrad

Bachelor of Arts—Modern Literature
University of California, Santa Cruz
1995

Master of Arts—English: Composition
San Francisco State University
2005

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Doctor of Philosophy – Higher Education

Department of Educational Psychology and Higher Education
College of Education
The Graduate College

University of Nevada, Las Vegas
August 2020

Copyright 2020 Mark Spinrad

All Rights Reserved

UNLV | GRADUATE COLLEGE

Dissertation Approval

The Graduate College
The University of Nevada, Las Vegas

July 2, 2020

This dissertation prepared by

Mark L. Spinrad

entitled

Losing Our Faculties: Academic Labor in the Corporate Academy

is approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy – Higher Education
Department of Educational Psychology and Higher Education

Stefani Relles, Ph.D.
Examination Committee Chair

Vicki Rosser, Ph.D.
Examination Committee Member

Blanca Rincon, Ph.D.
Examination Committee Member

Joseph Morgan, Ph.D.
Graduate College Faculty Representative

Kathryn Hausbeck Korgan, Ph.D.
Graduate College Dean

Abstract

In three studies, I examine corporatization and faculty labor in higher education. The first study is a critical review of the intersecting bodies of corporatization and faculty labor literature. I reviewed literature that describes how higher education institutions have been reshaped into organizations that more closely resemble for-profit corporations, then connected that to literature describing how labor policies that has altered the professoriate. The second and third papers, therefore, explored how corporatized faculty shapes student outcomes and faculty productivity.

The second paper is an embedded case study of corporatization based on the perspectives of contingent faculty. Findings revealed contingent faculty experienced the double-edged sword of autonomy, which freed them from many responsibilities and oversight but also alienated them from other faculty activities. Using complexity theory as an analytic framework, individual, agent-level interactions mostly excluded contingent faculty from the academy. Exclusion is grounded, in part, in the historical memories of higher education institutions which—via academic norms, policies, and relationships—reify non-tenure-track faculty as casual labor. The third paper is an embedded case study of corporatization based on the perspectives of tenure-track faculty. Findings revealed tenure-track faculty were under constant pressure to publish and pursue funding, which they described as a blend of physical and psychosocial stressors. Using academic capitalism as an interpretive framework, tenure-track faculty were entrepreneurs incentivized to pursue remunerative research activities, even as short-term gains—funding, prestige—exacted a significant toll on wellness. Although framed as entrepreneurs, faculty nevertheless are disincentivized away from risk.

Acknowledgements

Indeed, it takes a village to raise a scholar. There is no shortage of people to thank in this section: faculty, administration, fellow colleagues, research participants, family. Each helped bring this to fruition. Special thanks go out to my dissertation chair, Dr. Stefani Relles, and my dissertation committee members, Dr. Vicki Rosser, Dr. Blanca Rincon, and Dr. Joe Morgan. Thank you for your support and guidance. This has been one of the profoundly transformative experiences of my intellectual life. Your efforts are very appreciated. My deepest gratitude goes out to my Ph.D. advisor and mentor, Dr. Relles, for showing me the way. Your guidance helped me move this from a topic—a sample, really—sparked by my own indignation into legitimate scholarship. Your smarts, warmth, generosity, and sharp critiques made all the difference. I also am grateful to Dr. Rosser for her unwavering support and collegiality throughout this entire doctoral journey. To Dr. Rincon, thank you for your formidable scholarly acumen and keen eye. You also are a marvel in the classroom. Lastly, to Dr. Morgan thank you for jumping onboard and having my back. You're a mensch.

Casey and Ellison. You add so many layers of "why" to my what. I love you.

Dad, the pleasure you get from this has been the emotional highlight of my experience. I cannot tell you how much your delight means to me.

Mom, you would have loved this. I miss you.

Dedication

This is dedicated to all the part-time faculty quietly making this world a better place.

Table of Contents

Abstract ... iii

Acknowledgements ... iv

Dedication ... v

Table of Contents ... vi

Losing Our Faculties: Literature Review of Academic Labor in the Corporate Academy ... 1

Method ... 4

Data Presentation ... 6

Discussion ... 20

References ... 27

Losing Our Faculties: Non-Tenure-Track Faculty in the Corporate Academy ... 43

Literature Review ... 47

Method ... 55

Data Presentation ... 59

Discussion ... 69

References ... 80

Losing Our Faculties: Tenure-Track Faculty in the Corporate Academy ... 95

Literature Review ... 98

Method ... 103

Data Presentation 107

Discussion 117

References 126

Curriculum Vitae 137

Losing Our Faculties: Literature Review of Academic Labor in the Corporate Academy

Public higher education is facing unparalleled financial challenges. For decades, institutions have grappled with reduced state investment and uncertain federal research funding (Archibald & Feldman, 2006; Zusman, 1999). Shrinking appropriations—compounded by several cycles of economic recession—have left institutions to make up the financial difference (Armstrong, 2016). As a result, universities and colleges function in ways that more closely resemble for-profit corporations than social institutions charged with creating and disseminating knowledge (Bok, 2003; Giroux, 2002; Kezar, 2004; Slaughter, 1993). Thus, the term "corporate academy" calls attention to financial pressures that pervade institutional decisions, often to the detriment of public missions. Practices and norms associated with the public good have been subsumed by business-minded values that prioritize efficiency over traditional academic values (Baltodano, 2012; Rhoads & Rhoades, 2005). Resultant policies and practices minimize non-financial goals, prioritize top-down decision making and accountability, and employ at-will labor in service to the bottom line (Magolda, 2016; Taylor, 2017).

While institutions have many ways to offset funding cutbacks, policy approaches often include faculty labor (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). One pervasive strategy, for example, involves the outsourcing of instruction to a largely contingent workforce in order to decrease educational costs. Part-time and full-time non-tenure track faculty now comprise approximately two-thirds of appointments at American postsecondary institutions and more than 75% of instructional positions (Kezar, 2013b; U.S. GAO, 2017; U.S. House Committee, 2014). Concurrently, universities have turned to research as a source of revenue (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Tenure-track faculty at research institutions have been incentivized away from teaching and advising students as a priority (Solomon, 2011), limiting student-faculty contact (Kezar,

2004). Instead, policies encourage them to pursue agendas linked to financial remuneration (Chan & Fisher, 2008; Mendoza, Kuntz, & Berger, 2012; Price & Cotten, 2006; Neumann & Guthrie, 2002; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). This also includes public-private partnerships that bring the corporate sector inside the university (Rudy et al., 2007; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). These policies are consistent with corporatized labor ideals that prioritize cost incentives and market flexibility. In the corporate academy, contingent faculty are experts integral to educational missions (U.S. House Committee, 2014) and a cost-savings measure unsupported by faculty norms and easily dismissed or reappointed based on managerial need and consumer demand (Liu & Zhang, 2013). Meanwhile, tenure-track faculty can be viewed as "entrepreneurs" (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004) navigating "all-in" productivity demands to pursue remunerative research agendas (Solomon, 2011), even as other professional responsibilities demand their time and attention (Aronowitz, 2000; Mohanty, 2003).

One problem, however, is the relationship between faculty policies and student outcomes. To meet workforce needs and improve living standards, U.S. leaders strived to graduate an additional eight million students by the beginning of the decade, including those who are historically under-represented (Kezar, 2012). At the same time, however, administrators have largely sub-contracted instruction to a contingent workforce (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2008) that provides subject matter expertise but often are limited in their capacities to meet student needs (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Leslie & Gappa, 2002; Schmidt, 2008; U.S. GAO, 2017; U.S. House Committee, 2014). Although student success is affected by many factors, research linked contingent faculty increases with negative student outcomes (Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Jacoby, 2006; Jaeger & Eagan, 2011; Jaeger & Hinz, 2008; Schibik & Harrington, 2004; Umbach, 2007). This is especially alarming for first-year students, especially

those at-risk, as contingent faculty teach most developmental and introductory courses (Hollenshead et al., 2007; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Essentially, institutions pair the most vulnerable students with the least resourced faculty, possibly reducing their chances of success. In turn, poor graduation rates impact workforce participation and productivity, while undermining American competitiveness in the global economy (Schneider & Yin, 2011). This tension between labor policies and negative student outcomes suggests the need for policy responses that address both fiscal realities and student success. Yet, research to support solutions is thin. The purpose of the review, then, is to assess the relationship between faculty labor policies and student outcomes. I offer stakeholders—policymakers, institutional leaders, scholars—an empirical review of studies that can help clarify this relationship.

The research question driving this inquiry is: What do we know about the interdependence of faculty labor policies and student outcomes? The answer is derived from a review of literature on corporatization, extending consideration to relevant contingent and tenure-line faculty studies. Data for the study came from 138 sources, including 86 peer reviewed journal articles. To avoid repetition, I offered a more fulsome discussion of contingent faculty issues with the implication that many of the issues transfer to tenure-track faculty who, as increasingly managed professionals (Rhoades, 1998), report academic norms that align with economic goals, expanded administrative control, and work-lives that emphasize efficiency and cost (Brown, 2016; Giroux, 2005; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Solomon, 2011). To interpret data, I used open and in vivo coding strategies, as well as content analysis techniques to identify themes in the data (Berg, 2001; Hsieh & Shannon, 2005).

In preview, the data demonstrated that corporatization has altered faculty labor with implications for student outcomes. This review divides into three sections as follows. First, I

describe the method used to gather and analyze existing literature. Next, I present the three frames that differentiate corporatized outputs from traditional higher educational ones with respect to faculty labor. Last, I consider the implications for policies, practices, and future research.

Method

I conducted a systematic review of studies in peer reviewed research journals, book chapters, policy documents, and resource guides in order to answer the research question: What do we know about the interdependence of faculty labor policies and student outcomes? To collect studies for the review, I developed parameters with regard to publication date, keywords, and sample.

Selection Criteria

I initially targeted the date of publication range for peer reviewed articles to coincide with faculty labor studies during and subsequent to the economic recession that began in 2007. Research conducted since then promised insights into how faculty labor—and, by implication, student outcomes—has been reshaped by economic crises that exacerbated already strained public coffers (SHEEO, 2018). However, institutions have grappled with declining public investment and research funding for decades. Neoliberal ideals—reflected in state and federal policy decisions dating to the 1980s (Slaughter & Rhoades, 1996)—have long since realigned the "public good" with the ethos of "individualism, private enterprise, [and] economic goals" and linked educational goals to individual rather than societal interests (Kezar, 2004, p. 450). So, while I focused on research from the last 13 years, I also included pertinent scholarship prior to the recession dating from the 1990s to give necessary context and depth to the nexus of corporatization and faculty labor.

Keywords were informed by an initial search of peer reviewed articles, resource guides, policy documents, and book chapters. For example, based on Magolda (2016) and Schrecker (2010), I used "corporatization" as a keyword. Based on Slaughter and Rhoades (2004), I included "academic capitalism." Based on Deem (2001), I included "entrepreneurialism." I targeted relevant faculty studies targeting contingent and tenure-track faculty for insights into the relationship between corporatized labor policies and student outcomes. Using keywords "non-tenure-track faculty," "part-time faculty," "tenure-track faculty" and iterations of "corporatization," a search of university databases revealed 86 peer reviewed journal articles, including 63 articles published in 33 different education-focused journals, 26 books, five chapters, 15 policy documents or resource guides, four unpublished dissertations, and two papers presented at conferences.

Analysis

To review the literature, I used content analysis techniques, a method for interpreting content through the systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns (Berg, 2001; Creswell, 2013; Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). The deductive codebook reflected the intention to identify research design elements and corporatization-related descriptors. Design elements included theoretical frameworks, targets of inquiry, and methodological approaches. Data were coded deductively line-by-line using codes derived from prior descriptions in the literature. Codes, for example, included terms such as "cheap labor," "flexible labor," and "economic priorities" (Boyatzis, 1998). Concurrently, data were inductively coded using open and in vivo techniques. Codes enabled me to discern themes based on code types to reduce redundancy and locate insight in the literature (Mishler 1979; Morehouse & Maykut, 2002; Ryan & Bernard, 2003).

Data Presentation

The review divides the literature into three frames that differentiate corporatized outputs from traditional higher educational outputs with regard to faculty labor: corporatization and instructional efficiencies; corporatization and governance efficiencies; corporatization and work-life efficiencies. The first frame examined the instructional implications of corporatized labor policies, as increasing numbers of contingent faculty are responsible for undergraduate instruction (U.S. GAO, 2017; U.S. House Committee, 2014). Concurrently, tenured and tenure-track faculty are incentivized away from teaching in pursuit of research and funding. The second theme assessed governance implications, as increasing numbers of administrators and decreasing numbers of tenured and tenure-track faculty participate in the academy. Meanwhile, contingent faculty are excluded from most governance processes. The third theme identified work-life implications, as working environments are shaped by performance pressures and an emphasis on economic values over other metrics. This has compromised autonomy, decreased satisfaction, and undermined professionalism.

Corporatization and Instructional Efficiencies

To countermand shrinking budgets and expanding costs in other areas of the academy, administrations have implemented labor policies to reduce educational costs, largely through the use of contingent faculty (Bok, 2003; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Taylor, 2017). This is indicated, in part, by shifts in faculty appointment types at American postsecondary institutions over the past few decades that include significant increases in contingent faculty (AAUP, 2011; U.S. GAO, 2017; U.S. House Committee, 2014). From a business-minded perspective, tenured and tenure-track faculty are a fixed operational cost that must be paid regardless of whether revenues increase or decrease (Berube & Ruth, 2015; Ginsberg, 2013; Rosow & Kriger, 2010;

Scheuerman & Kriger, 2004). In contrast, contingent faculty—part-time and full-time non-tenure track faculty—are contracted on a per-course or yearly basis, respectively, and typically earn far less per course (Monks, 2007; U.S. GAO, 2017; U.S. House Committee, 2014). The following studies demonstrated how corporatized policies have reimagined instructional labor in service to bottom lines, though the proliferation of contingent faculty infers negative student outcomes.

Decreasing Instructional Costs

Studies documented both increased contingent faculty numbers (Liu & Zhang, 2013; McNaughtan, García, & Nehls, 2017; U.S. GAO, 2017; U.S. House Committee, 2014) and their role as a cost-savings measure (Curtis & Thornton, 2013; Monks, 2007; U.S. GAO, 2017; U.S. House Committee, 2014). Hirings support efforts to decrease instructional costs across disciplines and institutional types (Schrecker, 2010; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Compensation studies confirmed contingent faculty are remunerated less than their faculty colleagues, despite performing many of the same tasks. A study by Monks (2007), for example, examined earnings of faculty in all fields of higher education. He reported contingent faculty were significantly less compensated than tenure-track faculty, even after controlling for hours worked. Similarly, Curtis and Thornton's (2013) report suggested contingent faculty remain a significant, long-term cost-savings measure, even as economics have improved after the recession. Independent of funding swings, institutions have adopted labor policies in which contingent faculty help administrators manage their resource dependence (Liu & Zhang, 2013; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997).

While contingent faculty allow for less friction when balancing budgets (Bok, 2003; Fichtenbaum, 2014; Gould, 2003; Muzzin, 2008; Steck, 2003), studies indicated they negatively affected student outcomes at the institutional level (Bettinger & Long, 2004; Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Jacoby, 2006; Jaeger & Eagan, 2009; Jaeger & Eagan, 2011;

Jaeger & Hinz, 2008; Ronco and Cahill, 2004). They also can negatively affect student outcomes at the classroom level (Bowden & Gonzalez, 2012; Carrell & West, 2010; Cavanaugh, 2006; Xiaotao & Di Xu, 2019), perhaps, due to pedagogical issues (Allison-Jones & Hirt, 2004; Bowden & Gonzalez, 2012; Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Hudd et al., 2009; Jacoby, 2006; Meixner, Kruck, & Madden, 2010; Umbach, 2007).

Institutional Outcomes. Findings from a majority of studies indicated contingent faculty—part-time faculty, in particular—negatively influenced educational outcomes across institution types. This includes graduation (Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Jacoby, 2006; Jaeger & Hinz, 2008), transferring (Eagan & Jaeger, 2009), retention (Jaeger & Eagan, 2011) and persistence (Bettinger & Long, 2004; Ronco & Cahill, 2004; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Jaeger & Hinz, 2008). For example, students who took more classes with contingent faculty at four-year colleges graduated at lower rates (Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005). Similarly, as the percentage of part-time faculty increased at two-year institutes, graduation rates decreased (Jacoby, 2006). Other research calibrated the negative impact on graduation and transfer rates. Studies reported a 10% increase in overall exposure to part-timers resulted in a 1% reduction in the likelihood of earning an associate's degree (Jaeger & Eagan, 2009) and 2% less likely to transfer (Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Jaeger & Eagan, 2011). In concrete terms, students who averaged 50% of classroom time with part-time instructors were at least 5% less likely to graduate and 10% less likely to transfer to pursue baccalaureate degrees than students with only full-time faculty.

Beyond completion and transfer rates, studies also noted their influence on retention and progression. For example, Jaeger and Eagan (2011) noted for every 10% increase in first-year students' exposure to part-time faculty, the likelihood they persisted into the second year dropped by 4%. This effect was consistent across institution type. Similarly, students at doctoral-

granting institutions were increasingly less likely to persist into the second year based on exposure to part-time faculty (Jaeger & Hinz, 2008). These are consistent with prior studies that noted contingent faculty lowered overall student persistence (Ronco & Cahill, 2004; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005) and decreased the likelihood that students will take subsequent classes in that subject (Bettinger & Long, 2004).

Several studies, however, complicated those findings, suggesting negligible or, in certain circumstances, positive influences. Yu, Campbell, and Mendoza (2015), for example, found the proportion of part-time faculty had a non-significant relationship with students' likelihood of earning degrees or certification. Similarly, Hoffmann and Oreopoulos (2009) reported whether or not instructors teach full-time or part-time, conduct research, are tenured, or are highly paid has little influence on the likelihood students drop a course or take subsequent courses in the same subject. Likewise, appointment type was not a factor in developmental math grades or completion rates at community college (Fike & Fike, 2007). In fact, Bettinger and Long (2010) noted contingent faculty can have a positive effect on enrollment patterns in professional fields.

Classroom Outcomes. Studies examined the impact of contingent faculty on student outcomes in the classroom, reporting less impactful learning (Carrell & West, 2010; Cavanaugh, 2006; Xiaotao & Di Xu, 2019) and less effective pedagogies (Allison-Jones & Hirt, 2004; Bowden & Gonzalez, 2012; Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Hudd et al., 2009; Jacoby, 2006; Meixner et al., 2010; Umbach, 2007). This may be related to unconducive working conditions (Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Landrum, 2009; Rhoades, 1996).

Classes taught by contingent faculty resulted in immediate gains in GPA but long-term losses in learning. Ran and Xu (2018), for example, found contingent faculty positively impacted current course grades but negatively impacted subsequent grading outcomes—a finding more

pronounced for part-time faculty than those hired with long-term contracts. Similarly, Carrell and West (2010) reported students performed significantly better in contemporaneous courses but significantly worse in subsequent, related curriculum. In contrast, more experienced, qualified professors produced students who performed better in follow-up curriculum. This suggests students earned better grades in classes taught by contingent faculty, then suffered the consequences of a less rigorous learning environment in succeeding courses. In fact, issues of grade inflation appeared across studies, even when controlling for other factors. Consistent with prior studies (e.g. McArthur, 1999; Sonner, 2000), Cavanaugh (2006) noted contingent faculty give higher grades even after accounting for alternative explanations for grade differences.

Poorer outcomes, however, may be the result of contingent faculty using less effective pedagogies while operating in less supportive working conditions (Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Landrum, 2009; Rhoades, 1996). Studies found they had lower expectations for students, used less innovative teaching strategies, relied on less effective assessment strategies, spent less time preparing for classes, had fewer opportunities for student contact, and had fewer interactions with students outside of the classroom (Bowden & Gonzalez, 2012; Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Jacoby, 2006; Umbach, 2007). Contingent faculty also struggled with motivating and engaging students and with establishing effective policies for classroom management (Meixner et al., 2010). Students rated them as significantly less effective than full-time faculty in teaching ability and personality (Allison-Jones & Hirt, 2004) More alarming, they were less likely to address academic integrity issues, whether discussing issues in-class, enacting preventative measures, reporting violations, or sanctioning students for cheating (Hudd et al., 2009).

Decreasing Faculty Involvement

Corporatized labor policies have contributed to poorer student outcomes in less obvious ways. Overlapping with decreased instructional costs, policies incentivize tenure-track faculty to pursue external funding (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Solomon (2011) found pre-tenured faculty at research universities either organized their lives around professional responsibilities to publish and pursue grants or felt they risked jeopardizing their professional success. This is consistent with studies of tenure requirements and universities expectations that faculty prioritize external funding and publish at increasingly high rates (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997), even as teaching and service compete for attention (Aronowitz, 2000; Mohanty, 2003). It also was consistent with research describing the unbundling of teaching tasks—curricular design, material preparation, and implementation—that has dis-aggregated instructional labor and subjected it "to central authority" (Steck, 2003, p. 81). Taken together, this infers poorer classroom outcomes are, in part, an unintended consequence of diverting tenure-line faculty from teaching and limiting student-faculty contact (Bok, 2003; Kezar, 2004).

Corporatization and Governance Efficiencies

Another tenet of corporatization is the emphasis on top-down decision making, marked by expanded managerial supervision and assessment (Magolda, 2016; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Studies suggested the expansion is related to the restructuring of the faculty workforce. While administrative positions have grown exponentially (Bowen & Buck, 2004), policies have led to fewer tenure-line faculty (Donoghue, 2008; Geiger, 2004; Lerner, 2008; Taylor, 2017) alongside expanded contingent labor. This shift has implications for shared governance. Traditionally, tenure-line faculty are autonomous labor who participate in governance processes (Fichtenbaum, 2014; Schrecker, 2010). In the corporatized model,

however, tenure is an impediment to institutional flexibility and control (Donoghue, 2008; Lerner, 2008; Taylor, 2017). Contingent faculty, in contrast, often lack basic academic freedoms (Fjortoft, Winkler, & Mai, 2012; Giroux, 2005) and are excluded from most shared governance processes at institutional (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Curtis & Thornton, 2013; Jones, et al., 2017; Hollenshead et al., 2007) and departmental levels (Gehrke & Kezar, 2015; Kezar 2013a, 2013b). The following studies demonstrated how administration has grown in numbers and, by implication, control (Bowen & Buck, 2004; Brenner, 2006; Matthews, 1997; Schrecker, 2010). Meanwhile, the proliferation of contingent faculty has tipped the political scales, as increasing numbers of administrators and decreasing numbers of faculty participate in shared governance. The implication is that corporatized policies and practices have contributed to less collaborative environments. Policies that strain tenure-line faculty and marginalize contingent faculty are juxtaposed by an expanded administrative class that, by implication, solidifies top-down control.

Expanding Administrative Control

Institutions have long since invested more in outreach efforts such as fundraising, public relations, and advertising than in undergraduate instruction, libraries, and student financial aid (Brenner, 2006; Matthews, 1997). However, since the 1980s, administrative positions have grown exponentially compared to the rate of full-time faculty (Bowen & Buck, 2004). Schrecker (2010) reported this growth as an investment in business-oriented non-academics who have commercial expertise to handle increasingly complex campus operations. However, it also has concretized corporatized values and strategies, shifting decision-making criteria from “mission and quality to competitiveness, efficiency, and cost effectiveness” (Kezar, 2004, p. 440). Decisions heretofore negotiated through governance processes are routinely made by small

factions of decision makers detached from those doing the work of the university (Giroux, 2005; Magolda, 2016).

Beyond the balance sheet, stakeholders have internalized these values in less obvious ways. Shared decision-making, for example, is cast as dated, inefficient, and wedded to the status quo (Lustig, 2010). Instead, policies emphasize top-down management strategies and accountability measures in service to productivity goals; rewards and punishment are based on performances gleaned from objective, data-driven assessments (Levin, 2006; Magolda, 2016; Steck, 2003). Expanded administrative influence also was evidenced in the language used by campus actors to describe strategic responses to financial difficulties. Gumport (1993), for example, reported campus stakeholders—from power brokers to retrenched faculty—described program reductions using similar language that capitulated to top-down decision-making. He found stakeholders expressed tensions between traditional and corporatized processes, yet recognized the inevitability of top-down control. Similarly, Magolda (2016) noted the pervasive use of “managerial idioms” (p. 140) to discuss strategic responses to difficult economic times. Strategic responses, he reported, called for labor “downsizing, outsourcing, and subcontracting” (p. 140). Taken together, these studies allude to the subtle, yet unmistakable altering of traditional higher education governance models in favor of administrative control.

Shrinking Faculty Presence

In concert with expanded administrative numbers, corporatized labor policies have led to fewer faculty involved in campus governance. More conservative hiring and promotion policies (Geiger, 2004) have led to fewer full-time, tenured faculty (Donoghue, 2008; Lerner, 2008; Taylor, 2017). By now, the predominantly tenured professoriate of 40 years ago has given way to an ever-increasing, mostly disenfranchised contingent workforce (Lerner, 2008; Steck, 2003).

This has left permanent faculty more vulnerable to the vagaries of administrative responses to budgetary concerns and market demands (Bok, 2003; Fichtenbaum, 2014; Gould, 2003; Muzzin, 2008; Steck, 2003). Organizational restructuring, for example, is now easier and faster (Muzzin, 2008). With fewer faculty checks on administrative power (Brown, 2001), programs and educators are more easily altered or eliminated. Giroux (2005) and Aronowitz (2000) argued these changes are consistent with institutional logics of corporatization that function to maximize managerial control. By curbing faculty autonomy (Rhoades, 1998), capacity to dissent is diminished (Aronowitz, 2000; Fichtenbaum, 2014; Giroux, 2002). In other words, labor policies have kept workforces lean and hiring practices and conditions flexible (Magolda, 2016).

As a consequence, campuses have become less collaborative. Environments for contingent faculty are defined by little socialization, assessment, governance opportunities, and curricular development (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Kezar, 2013b; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). While there are many explanations for their limited influence, the lack of inclusion inferred imbalances at both the institutional (Jones et al., 2017) and departmental level (Clouse, 2017; Kezar, 2013a; 2013b). Jones and colleagues (2017), for example, investigated eligibility for faculty senates at "very high research activity" universities. While full-time contingent faculty were eligible for limited participation at many institutions, part-timers were eligible at only 11% of institutions. Essentially, the vast majority of contingents—who comprise the largest, fastest-growing faculty segment (McNaughtan et al., 2017)—did not have a seat at the table.

Instead, contingent faculty are left to rely on administrators or influential faculty to secure support at the institutional level (Lyons & Burnstad, 2007). This is complicated by their contradictory attitudes towards contingent faculty. A study by Kezar and Gehrke (2016), for example, reported deans' decision-making processes are influenced primarily by external

pressures, such as economic conditions, legislation, and political actors. Despite their concern with the over-reliance on contingent faculty, fiscal pressures mandated hiring policies, even if they felt it compromised the institution. Yet, related research contradicted the notion that their administrative hands were tied. Gehrke and Kezar (2015) reported a significant relationship between deans' attitudes towards contingent faculty and the existence of supportive campus policies. While economics and organizational norms contributed to policy decisions, deans' attitudes were, in fact, predictive of campus policy support and ratification. Collectively, these findings illustrate the ambiguous, even incoherent, attitudes towards contingent faculty. Deans were both vulnerable to external influences that drive policy decisions and a key influencer of policy agendas. Relevant faculty policies, then, were both beyond the purview of their administrative reach and reflective of their feelings and values.

Studies also reported contingent faculty were mostly excluded from department-level governance. Despite subject matter expertise, contingent instructors have less input or control over curricula (Rhoades, 1998). Often, they deferred to department leaders to create cultures that support, ignore, or inhibit inclusiveness and productivity (Clouse, 2017; Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Kezar, 2013a; 2013b; Kezar & Lester, 2009). Department chairs, specifically, drove policies, practices, and programs (Gappa et al., 2007). They were instrumental in faculty integration and retention (Diegel, 2013). They provided contingent faculty with collegial support (Kezar & Lester, 2009). They are viewed as the locus of decision-making, schedule setting, and other daily operations (Clouse, 2017). However, chairs more often contributed to environments that ignored contingent faculty needs or actively undermined them (Kezar, 2013a). Collectively, findings suggested department leaders may be unaware, uninterested, or unprepared to accommodate contingent faculty. This is consistent with other research suggesting department

leaders do not take regular action to integrate contingents. This has led to professional environments of disconnection, isolation, and lack of recognition that intensified over time (Dolan, 2011; Thirolf, 2013). The implication is that contingent faculty do not have the agency to participate in departmental politics. Instead, they are dependent on leadership to create cultures that support inclusivity (Kezar, 2013a).

Overall, contingent faculty remain largely unaccounted for in decision-making processes. As a general consequence, less participation meant fewer opportunities to foster constructive, multi-dimensional conflicts that enhance decision-making (Minor, 2005). As a specific consequence, contingent faculty were denied access to an important vehicle for organizational change (Kezar & Sam 2013). Even when they are permitted to contribute, eligibility policies do not facilitate participation. Leaders may assume inclusive policies ensure contributions; however, this ignores complications (Kezar & Sam, 2014), such as lack of communication, time, or incentives, or “token" inclusion policies with partial or no voting rights (Kezar & Sam, 2013).

Corporatization and Workplace Efficiencies

Corporatization also infers a shift in work-lives related to performance pressures and an emphasis on business values—such as efficiency and cost—over other metrics (Baltodano, 2012; Brown, 2016; Giroux, 2002; Rhoads & Rhoades, 2005; Schrecker, 2010; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Research examining the influence of corporatization in higher education, for example, suggested the willingness to give up quality for efficiency (Baltodano, 2012; Rhoads & Rhoades, 2005). This was consistent with a study of educational ideologies that reported cultural influences have remade higher education values and ethics of public service into an ideology of “venture and risk” (Barnett, 2003, p. 65). The following studies demonstrated how the primacy of business values has reshaped faculty work-lives, regardless of appointment status. For

contingent faculty, in particular, work-lives were further compromised by their provisional status. The implication is that corporatized labor policies have contributed to more stressful, less autonomous, satisfying faculty work-lives, regardless of appointment type.

Increased Pressures, Decreased Control

Tenure-line faculty work-lives were hindered by increased pressures and external controls. Studies suggested potential costs to professional identities, commitment, and motivation, regardless of appointment status. Overly controlled environments, for example, altered (Hao, 2015) or delayed the development of professional identities (Hao, 2016; Winter, 2009). Summarizing data from a survey conducted by more than a hundred scholars from eighteen countries, Hao (2015) reported performance pressures have transitioned faculty from a “community of scholars in a knowledge community” to “a community of workers in a knowledge enterprise” (p. 113-114). Further, faculty who described higher levels of regulations and performance pressures also reported being less fulfilled by academia and more likely to leave (Brown, 2016). They also expressed decreased motivation to work in controlled environments with less input over policies or involvement in campus governance (Adams, 2014). This is consistent with other research describing tenure-track faculty as more burdened by labor policies (Mendoza, Kuntz, & Berger, 2012) and more vulnerable to work-life imbalances (Solomon, 2011) and tenure ambiguities (Price & Cotten, 2006; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Increasingly top-down productivity demands contributed to feelings of stress and anxiety, which have implications for productivity, commitment, motivation, and morale (Brown, 2016; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002; Mendoza et al., 2012; Olsen & Crawford, 1998; Ponjuan, Conley, & Trower, 2011; Solomon, 2011; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). This is a troubling portent, in light of

research connecting high stress levels to faculty willingness to leave positions if or when other opportunities appear (Smart, 1990).

Provisional Status, Conditional Professionalism

Studies specifically targeting contingent faculty work-lives further evidenced external controls that marginalized or excluded. They reported conflicted professional identities marked by contrasting feelings of inclusion and exclusion (Antony & Hayden, 2002; Antony & Hayden, 2011; Levin & Hernandez, 2014; Maynard & Joseph, 2008; Schibik & Harrington, 2004). Across institution types, contingent faculty viewed themselves both as professionals with expertise and as undervalued affiliates lacking status and autonomy (Levin & Hernandez, 2014; Thirolf, 2013). Levin and Shaker (2011), for example, reported full-time non-tenure track faculty as having a hybrid identity. They identified as experts when with students; however, in interactions with tenured faculty or administration, they perceived their status as diminished in the academic hierarchy. Similarly, Schrecker (2010) noted their "double-consciousness" of being viewed by students as professors, yet largely excluded from decision making processes and viewed by colleagues with ambivalence (p. 211). Other research reported contingent faculty struggled with inconsistent department expectations (Hollenshead et al., 2007), as well as job insecurity and feelings of being undercompensated (Shaker, 2008).

Part-time faculty, in particular, experienced conditions that undermined professionalism. Levin and Hernandez (2014) found part-time faculty felt like specialized professionals with self-efficacy in the classroom that was absent in other organizational contexts. This diminished confidence in their professional value. Other research suggested negative self-perceptions can deepen over time. Thirolf (2013) noted part-time faculty initially developed a positive identity through teaching and interacting with students; over time, however, commitment and

professional pride lessened, especially when comparing themselves to the rights and privileges of full-time colleagues. Both were consistent with Kezar's (2013c) study of how contingent faculty construct their work environments. She found they regularly operated in unsupportive cultures and struggled to integrate into departments.

Conflicted feelings reported by contingent faculty may be tacitly reiterated by campus leaders, who expressed ambivalent attitudes and low expectations (Dolan, 2011; Fjortoft et al., 2012; Gappa et al., 2007; Kezar, 2013b; Maxey & Kezar, 2015; Meyer, 2017; Morphew, Ward, & Wolf-Wendel, 2017; Moorehead, 2011). In a study of independent colleges and universities, chief academic officers indicated they did not expect contingent faculty to engage with campus communities nor did they provide them with the necessary support to participate in a range of faculty roles (Morphew et al., 2017). Similarly, Maxey and Kezar (2015) found leaders from a range of groups associated with academe (e.g. governing boards, accreditation agencies, faculty groups, state compacts, unions) were aware that contingent faculty practices and conditions are poorly aligned with student outcomes and faculty professionalism. However, they indicated institutional conditions constrained their capacity to respond, even at the cost of student outcomes.

Mid-level administrators expressed similar attitudes of ambivalence towards contingent faculty. Meyer's (2017) study of deans and directors of nursing schools described the dual-purpose roles of contingent faculty: They were seen as a source of diversity beneficial to students who also degraded instructional consistency; they were workers who freed up full-time faculty to pursue scholarship, yet burdened the remaining full-time faculty with departmental responsibilities such as advising, faculty governance, and committee work; they were an inexpensive, flexible workforce that lack commitment, making it difficult to find and keep

qualified faculty.

Departmental ambivalence further complicated how contingent faculty construct professional identities (Kezar, 2013b). While department chairs seemed sensitive to contingent faculty needs—voicing concerns about poor communication, lack of recognition or opportunities to develop faculty (Dolan, 2011)—they reported frustration and overwhelm. They appreciated the flexibility of contingent faculty, though they struggled with the added workloads (Fjortoft et al., 2012). Other research noted they often overlook contingent faculty in the face of administrative responsibilities that impel them to prioritize other department needs (Gappa et al., 2007). This is especially true of part-time faculty, who were largely absent from department functions and rarely expected to contribute outside of the classroom. Moorehead (2011), for example, noted chairs have lower expectations for part-time faculty and were less invested in integrating them into their departments. They rarely tracked faculty beyond basic hiring information, instead relying on student evaluations for assessment and reappointment (Langen, 2011). This is consistent with research that reported chairs used part-time faculty chiefly because they did not have enough full-time faculty; nearly 80% would prefer to replace all part-time faculty with full-time tenure track faculty (Price et al., 2011). Collectively, these findings help contextualize contingent faculty perceptions. As a direct point of contact, chairs support contingents to achieve departmental goals (Kezar & Maxey, 2012). At the same time, they also view them as burdensome institutional realities.

Discussion

This review converged corporatization literature with relevant faculty studies. Prior studies indicated corporatized policymaking is consistent with changes to faculty labor. Those

changes have implications for student success. In what follows, I review key findings from the literature. I close with implications for faculty labor policies, practices, and future research.

Corporatization and Faculty Labor

The dataset, first, revealed how corporatized labor policies have changed the professoriate. Traditional notions of the singular, "mutually reinforcing" teacher-scholar (Fairweather, 1996, p. 100) are belied by more recent studies that divide faculty into separate roles based on appointment type: A contingent work force implements instructional missions. Tenure-line faculty are recast as "entrepreneurs" who create new "circuits of knowledge" that connect higher education institutions to the economy (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004, p. 1). As a benefit, policies have decreased instructional costs (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004) and provided increased flexibility. This has enabled administrators to quickly respond to student demands. Concurrently, research agendas offer potential alternative revenue streams. The compromise, however, is that corporatized labor suggests poorer student outcomes at the institutional level, including graduation, retention, and persistence. Corporatization also infers poorer instruction in the classroom, including less impactful learning for students subject to less effective pedagogies from faculty operating in less supportive working conditions. Essentially, the negative impact on student outcomes is an apparent, if unintended, consequence of corporate approaches to faculty labor.

The dataset, next, revealed how policies have tacitly moved institutions towards top-down decision-making models. Administrative positions have grown exponentially in the last few decades (Bowen & Buck, 2004). As a benefit, the addition of business-oriented non-academics has supported institutions to handle increasing complex, commercial operations (Schrecker, 2010). However, growth also corresponds with shrinking numbers of tenure-line

faculty and the proliferation of contingent faculty. The sum effect is fewer faculty stretched thinner to participate in shared governance. As a result, the data suggest faculty are potentially more vulnerable to administrative control and have fewer checks on administrative power (Bok, 2003; Brown, 2001; Fichtenbaum, 2014; Gould, 2003; Muzzin, 2008; Steck, 2003). In particular, contingent faculty are rarely involved in making decisions, even as it pertains to the classroom. Ultimately, corporate policies and practices suggest less collaborative environments.

The dataset, last, revealed how policies have reshaped work environments. The emphasis on productivity and efficiency—manifest as performance pressures and external controls—suggests traditional academic values being replaced by business-minded ones (Baltodano, 2012; Rhoads & Rhoades, 2005). Studies reported overly regulated and pressurized environments diminished commitment (Brown, 2016) and motivation (Adams, 2014), while compromising professional identities, regardless of appointment type (Hao, 2015, 2016; Levin & Hernandez, 2014; Levin & Shaker, 2011; Schrecker, 2010; Thirolf, 2013; Winter, 2009). This was particularly evident in studies of contingent faculty, who struggled to get their professional footing in environments dependent on their expertise, yet largely unsupportive. Effectively, corporatized policies and practices have contributed to more stressful, less autonomous, satisfying faculty work-lives.

Implications

Studies connected policies to poorer student outcomes, as institutions have "essentially outsourced instructional production workers, replacing full-time faculty" with an increasingly contingent workforce (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2008, p. 41). However, findings paint a complex picture of higher education systems struggling to bridge the incongruities of public service and private enterprise. As we should expect, corporatized labor policies come with a price tag.

Accordingly, I offer educational and institutional implications of cheap labor policies and practices, then propose future research studies.

First, as evidenced by the data, the traditional professoriate theorized by scholars has receded in the face of cheap labor policies. Findings that indicated less collaborative decision making, increased pressures, less professional autonomy, and lower satisfaction also revealed how institutions have adapted to decreased public support by enacting policies that favor efficiency and cost. The data suggest instructional faculty are less intellectuals educating students to be critical thinkers than at-will labor implementing department-mandated curricula (Giroux, 2002, 2013). Accordingly, we should expect student outcomes to track with those compromises made by higher education institutions. If leaders are willing to prioritize efficiency and cost as guiding metrics, then they need only to find an acceptable trade-off between student outcomes and instructional expenditures. Based on the logic of corporatization, dips in student success can be weighed against (and justified by) decreased instructional costs. This is merely the cost of doing business in the corporate academy. It should come as no surprise that cheap labor policies have provided public institutions with immediate savings and flexibility, but at a price to student success (Bettinger & Long, 2004; Jacoby, 2006; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Jaeger & Eagan, 2011; Jaeger & Hinz, 2008), academic environments (Baltodano, 2012; Rhoads & Rhoades, 2005; Schrecker, 2010; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006), and faculty work-lives (Adams, 2014; Brown, 2016; Hao, 2015, 2016; Winter, 2009).

Data also indicated cheap labor policies have bifurcated the professoriate. The once singular, “mutually reinforcing” role of the teacher-scholar (Fairweather, 1996, p. 100) has ceded ground to policies that divide labor based on appointment type. Consistent with sharp increases to contingent labor, faculty are tasked with implementing overlapping, yet separate elements of

an institution's mission. What, then, are the implications of bifurcation for student success? On the one hand, the division of labor is consistent with business-minded tenets of efficiency: Contingent faculty fill an instructional void. This enables colleagues to attend to research priorities, while institutions address instruction for a fraction of the cost. On the other hand, the division of labor regularly pairs the most vulnerable students with the least resourced faculty, who are largely disconnected from institutions (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Curtis & Thornton, 2013; Fjortoft et al., 2012; Gehrke & Kezar, 2015; Giroux, 2005; Hollenshead et al., 2007; Jones, et al., 2017; Kezar 2013a, 2013b; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Beyond decreasing the odds of student success, the division of labor infers multiple levels of disconnection—for example, between lower division instruction and other coursework or, say, curricular redesign and implementation—no longer fixable through traditional channels of collaboration. An unintended consequence of less collaborative faculty environments is less robust learning environments.

The division of labor also invites consideration for how and to what extent poor student outcomes are a result of institutional priorities. Faculty are "academia's key 'stakeholders" (Schrecker, 2010, p. 154) and "the heart" that determines "the health" of every higher education institution (Gappa et al., 2007). Thus, labor policies are a proxy, in this case, for attitudes towards undergraduate instruction. Increasingly, student tuition and fees account for an ever-growing portion of revenues; in over half of all states, the majority of higher education revenues come from student tuition (SHEEO, 2019). Including educational appropriations, decreased spending on instruction is even more sharply contrasted by the total monies institutions earn as a result of student enrollments (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2008). Yet, instruction remains a place to cut costs. This contradiction between revenues and expenditures—two guiding metrics in the corporate academy—has one simple implication: Undergraduate instruction is valued for the

tuition money it generates and the certification it bestows. So, rather than frame cheap labor policies as an effort to reduce instructional costs, perhaps, it would be more accurately cast as the willingness to divest of student education.

Faculty are the engine that powers higher education, long after students have graduated and administrators have moved on or up the ladder. They also are proxies for institutional health; it is incumbent on scholars to pursue empirical studies of faculty to support policymakers to make informed, policy decisions about the well-being of the corporate academy. The evidence suggests this has not been the case. The widespread use of contingent faculty, for example, appears to be an ongoing response to fiscal crises and haphazard short-term planning rather than thoughtful strategy employed in the long-term betterment of education (Kezar & Maxey, 2012). That contingents have not been folded into long-term visions indicates a continued lack of planning for faculty labor and undergraduate instruction, even as administrators repeatedly re-hire the same faculty semester after semester (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Benjamin, 2003). In other words, universities and colleges are still winging it, even though the widespread reliance on contingent faculty suggests an institutionalized practice. I am cynical about policy fixes for student outcomes or faculty work-lives—contingent faculty, in particular. In appropriating corporatized norms, higher education institutions have evolved into poorly run businesses. In the face of cratering public support, institutions must rethink how they marshal their most valuable resource. To that end, scholars should assess whether research is sufficiently remunerative or, at least, cost effective for public institutions. Labor policies may be emphasizing the wrong outcomes to the detriment of faculty, students, and institutional outcomes. Scholars also should rethink how institutions use and integrate contingent faculty. As long as faculty remain disconnected, universities and colleges are not leveraging them to their full capacities. Studies

should ask and answer how to best harness their expertise. Lastly, studies should take note of specific policies, practices, and conditions that inhibit or contribute to faculty well-being. As they go, there goes the academy.

References

AAUP. (2011). *Trends in faculty employment status, 1975-2011*. Retrieved from www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/Faculty_Trends_0.pdf

Adams, C. G. (2014). *Faculty perception of autonomous motivation in higher education: An exploratory qualitative inquiry* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation) Capella University, Minneapolis, MN.

Allison-Jones, L. L., & Hirt, J. B. (2004). Comparing the teaching effectiveness of part-time & full-time clinical nurse faculty. *Nursing Education Perspectives, 25*(5), 238-243.

Antony, J. S., & Valadez, J. R. (2002). Exploring the satisfaction of part-time college faculty in the United States. *The Review of Higher Education, 26*(1), 41-56.

Antony, J. S., & Hayden, R. A. (2011). Job satisfaction of American part-time college faculty: Results from a national study a decade later. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *35*(9), 689-709.

Aronowitz, S. (2000). *The knowledge factory: Dismantling the corporate university and creating true higher learning.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Aronowitz, S., & Giroux, H. (2000). The corporate university and the politics of education. *The Educational Forum, 64*(4), 332–339.

Baldwin, R. G., & Chronister, J. L. (2001). *Teaching without tenure: Policies and practices for a new era*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Baltodano, M. (2012). Neoliberalism and the demise of public education: The corporatization of schools of education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 25*(4), 487-507.

Banasik, M. D., & Dean, J. L. (2016). Non-tenure track faculty and learning communities:

Bridging the divide to enhance teaching quality. *Innovative Higher Education*, *41*(4), 333-342.

Barnett, R. (2003). *Beyond all reason: Living with ideology in the university*. Buckingham, UK: Routledge.

Benjamin, E. (2003). Editor's notes. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *123*, 1-13.

Berg, B.L. (2001). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bess, J. L., & Dee, J. R. (2008). *Understanding college and university organization: Theories for effective policy and practice* (Vol. 1). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Bettinger, E., & Long, B. T. (2004). Do college instructors matter? The effects of adjuncts and graduate assistants on students' interests and success (No. w10370). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bowden, R., & Gonzalez, L. P. (2012). The rise of contingent faculty: its impact on the professoriate and higher education. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, *4*(1), 5-22.

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal, 9*(2), 27-40.

Bowen, R. W. & Buck, J. L. (2004). College presidents are hard-working, talented, and vastly overpaid. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *50*(35).

Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Brenner, D. (2006). Performative pedagogy: Resignifying teaching in the corporatized university. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 28*(1), 3-24.

Brown Jr., W. O. (2001). Faculty participation in university governance and the effects on university performance. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, 44*(2), 129-143.

Brown, A. D. (2016). *Corporatized higher education: A quantitative study examining faculty motivation using self-determination theory* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Burk, N. M. (2000). *The invisible professor at-risk: How departmental disconfirmation disempower adjunct faculty*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association (86th, Seattle, WA, November 9-12, 2000)

Cavanaugh, J. K. (2006). What did you get? A faculty grade comparison. *Quality Assurance in Education, 14*(2), 179-186.

Carrell, S. E., & West, J. E. (2010). Does professor quality matter? Evidence from random assignment of students to professors. *Journal of Political Economy, 118*(3), 409-432.

Chan A. S. & Fisher, D. (2008). Academic culture and the research-intensive university: The impact of commercialism and scientism. In Chan, A. S., & Fisher, D. (Eds.). *The exchange university: Corporatization of academic culture*, (p. 49-69). Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Clouse, P. J. (2017). *The departmental work lives of full-time non-tenure track faculty* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY.

Conley, V. M., & Leslie, D. W. (2002). *Part-time instructional faculty and staff: Who they are, what they do, and what they think*. 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF: 93). Statistical Analysis Report.

Creswell, J. W. (2016). *30 essential skills for the qualitative researcher.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into Practice, 39*(3), 124-130.

Creswell, J. W. & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Curtis, J. W., & Thornton, S. (2013). The annual report on the economic status of the profession, 2012–2013. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors. Retrieved from www.aaup.org/report/heres-news-annual-report-economic-status-profession-2012-13.

Danley-Scott, J., & Tompsett-Makin, D. (2013). Balancing optimal assessment with part-time faculty participation: A discipline's dilemma. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *37*(1), 64-67.

Diegel, B. L. (2013). Perceptions of community college adjunct faculty and division chairpersons: Support, mentoring, and professional development to sustain academic quality. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 37*(8), 596-607.

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.

Donoghue, F. (2008). *The last professors: The corporate university and the fate of the humanities*. New York, NY: Fordham University Press.

Eagan, M. K., & Jaeger, A. J. (2009). Effects of exposure to part-time faculty on community college transfer. *Research in Higher Education*, *50*(2), 168.

Eagan Jr, 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.

Ehrenberg, R. G., & Zhang, L. (2005). Do tenured and tenure-track faculty matter?. *Journal of Human Resources*, *40*(3), 647-659.

Fairweather, J. S. (1996). *Faculty work and public trust: Restoring the value of teaching and public service in American academic life*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Feldman, D. C., & Turnley, W. H. (2001). A field study of adjunct faculty: The impact of career stage on reactions to non-tenure-track jobs. *Journal of Career Development, 28*(1), 1-16.

Fichtenbaum, R. (September-October, 2014). From the president: Inequality, corporatization, and the casualization of academic labor. *Academe Online.* Retrieved from www.aaup.org/article/president-inequality-corporatization-and-casualization-academic-labor#.XRphant7mwA.

Fike, D. S., & Fike, R. (2008). Predictors of first-year student retention in the community college. *Community College Review, 36*(2), 68-88.

Fjortoft, N., Winkler, S. R., & Mai, T. (2012). Pharmacy practice department chairs' perspectives on part-time faculty members. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 76*(4), 59.

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

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

Gappa, J. M. (2001). Academic careers for the 21st century: More options for new faculty. In J.

C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research,* (p. 425–475). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

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.

Geiger, R. (2004). *Knowledge and money: Research universities and the paradox of the marketplace*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Giroux, H. (2002). Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a democratic public sphere. *Harvard Educational Review, 72*(4), 425-464.

Giroux, H. A. (2005). Academic entrepreneurs: The corporate takeover of higher education. *Tikkun, 20*(2), 18-28.

Giroux, H. A. (2013). Neoliberalism's war against teachers in dark times. *Cultural Studies? Critical Methodologies, 13*(6), 458-468.

Giroux, H. A. (2014). When schools become dead zones of the imagination: A critical pedagogy manifesto. *Policy Futures in Education, 12*(4), 491-499.

Gould, E. (2003). *The university in a corporate culture.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Gumport, P. (1993). The contested terrain of academic program reduction. *Journal* of Higher *Education, 64*(3), 283–311.

Halfond, J. A. (2000). When adjunct faculty are in the majority: Focusing on those who make us what we are. *Continuing Higher Education Review*, *64*, 47-55.

Hao, Z. (2015). Commercialization and corporatization versus professorial roles and academic freedom in the United States and Greater China. *Chinese Sociological Review, 47*(2), 103-127.

Hao, Z. (2016). In search of a professional identity: higher education in Macau and the academic role of faculty. *Higher Education, 72*(1), 101-113.

Haviland, D., Alleman, N. F., & Cliburn Allen, C. (2017). 'Separate but not quite equal': Collegiality experiences of full-time non-tenure-track faculty members. *The Journal of Higher Education, 88*(4), 505-528.

Hoffmann, F., & Oreopoulos, P. (2009). Professor qualities and student achievement. *The Review of Economics and Statistics, 91*(1), 83-92.

Hollenshead, C., Waltman, J., August, L., Miller, J., Smith, G., & Bell, A. (2007). *Making the best of both worlds: Findings from a national institution-level survey on non-tenure-track faculty*. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for the Education of Women.

Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 15*(9), 1277-1288.

Hudd, S. S., Apgar, C., Bronson, E. F., & Lee, R. G. (2009). Creating a campus culture of integrity: Comparing the perspectives of full-and part-time faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education, 80*(2), 146-177.

Jacoby, D. (2006). Effects of part-time faculty employment on community college graduation rates. *Journal of Higher Education*, *77*(6), 1081-1103.

Jaeger, A. J., & Eagan Jr, M. K. (2009). Unintended consequences: Examining the effect of part-time faculty members on associate's degree completion. *Community College Review, 36*(3), 167-194.

Jaeger, A. J., & Eagan, M. K. (2011). Examining retention and contingent faculty use in a state system of public higher education. *Educational Policy*, *25*(3), 507-537.

Jaeger, A. J., & Hinz, D. (2008). The effects of part-time faculty on first semester freshmen retention: A predictive model using logistic regression. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 10*(3), 265-286.

Johnsrud, L. K., & Rosser, V. J. (2002). Faculty members' morale and their intention to leave: A multilevel explanation. The Journal of Higher Education, 73(4), 518-542.

Jones, W. A., Hutchens, N. H., Hulbert, A., Lewis, W. D., & Brown, D. M. (2017). Shared governance among the new majority: Non-tenure track faculty eligibility for election to university faculty senates. *Innovative Higher Education, 42*(5-6), 505-519.

Kezar, A. J. (2004). Obtaining integrity? Reviewing and examining the charter between higher education and society. *The Review of Higher Education, 27*(4), 429-459.

Kezar, A. (Ed.). (2012). *Embracing non-tenure track faculty: Changing campuses for the new faculty majority*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Kezar, A. (2013a). Departmental cultures and non-tenure-track faculty: Willingness, capacity, and opportunity to perform at four-year institutions. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *84*(2), 153-188.

Kezar, A. (2013b). 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.

Kezar, A. (2013c). Non-Tenure-Track Faculty's Social Construction of a Supportive Work Environment. *Teachers College Record*, *115*(12), n12.

Kezar, A., & Gehrke, S. (2016). Faculty composition in four-year institutions: The role of pressures, values, and organizational processes in academic decision-making. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *87*(3), 390-419.

Kezar, A., & Lester, J. (2009). Supporting faculty grassroots leadership. *Research in Higher Education, 50*(7), 715-740.

Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (2012). *The changing faculty and student success: Report on the project working meeting*. Los Angeles: The Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success. Retrieved from uscrossier.org/pullias/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/Delphi-Project_Report-on-Working-Meeting_Web-Version-2.pdf

Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (2014). Understanding key stakeholder belief systems or institutional logics related to non-tenure-track faculty and the changing professoriate. *Teachers College Record, 116*(10).

Kezar, A., Maxey, D., & Holcombe, E. (2015). *The professoriate reconsidered: A study of new faculty models*. Pullias Center for Higher Education, University of Southern California.

Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2011). Understanding non-tenure track faculty: New assumptions and theories for conceptualizing behavior. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *55*(11), 1419-1442

Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2013). Institutionalizing equitable policies and practices for contingent faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *84*(1), 56-87.

Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2014). Governance as a catalyst for policy change: Creating a contingent faculty friendly academy. *Educational Policy*, *28*(3), 425-462.

Landrum, R. E. (2009). Are there instructional differences between full-time and part-time faculty?. *College Teaching, 57*(1), 23-26.

Langen, J. M. (2011). Evaluation of adjunct faculty in higher education institutions. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 36(2), 185-196.

Lechuga, V. M. (2006). *The changing landscape of the academic profession: Faculty culture at for-profit colleges and universities*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Lerner, G. (2008). Corporatizing higher education. *The History Teacher, 41*(2), 219-227.

Leslie, D.W., & Gappa, J.M. (2002). Part-time faculty: Competent and committed. In C. Outcalt (Ed.), *Community college faculty: Characteristics, practices, and challenges* (p. 59-67). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levin, J. S. (2005). Faculty in the US community college: Corporate labour. *Management in Education, 19*(3), 8-11.

Levin, J. S. (2006). Faculty work: Tensions between educational and economic values. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(1), 62-88.

Levin, J. S., & Hernandez, V. M. (2014). Divided identity: Part-time faculty in public colleges and universities. *The Review of Higher Education*, *37*(4), 531-557.

Levin, J. S., & Shaker, G. G. (2011). The hybrid and dualistic identity of full-time non-tenure-track faculty. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *55*(11), 1461-1484.

Liu, X., & Zhang, L. (2013). Flexibility at the core: What determines employment of part-time faculty in academia. *Relations Industrielles/Industrial Relations, 68*(2), 312-339.

Lyons, R. E., Burnstad, H. (2007). *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty*. Retrieved from citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.464.6670&rep=rep1&type=pdf.

Magolda, P. M. (2016). *The lives of campus custodians: Insights into corporatization and civic disengagement in the academy*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Marsh, F. K. (2010). High performance team: Building a business program with part-and full-time faculty. *Journal of Education for Business, 85*(4), 187-194.

Matthews, A. (1997). *Bright college years: Inside the American campus today*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Maxey, D., & Kezar, A. (2015). Revealing opportunities and obstacles for changing non-

tenure-track faculty practices: An examination of stakeholders' awareness of institutional contradictions. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *86*(4), 564-594.

Maynard, D. C., & Joseph, T. A. (2008). Are all part-time faculty underemployed? The influence of faculty status preference on satisfaction and commitment. *Higher Education*, *55*(2), 139.

McArthur, R. C. (1999). A comparison of grading patterns between full-and part-time humanities faculty: A preliminary study. *Community College Review, 27*(3), 65-76.

McNaughtan, J., García, H. A., & Nehls, K. (2017). Understanding the growth of contingent faculty. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 2017*(176), 9-26.

Meixner, C., Kruck, S. E., & Madden, L. T. (2010). Inclusion of part-time faculty for the benefit of faculty and students. *College Teaching*, *58*(4), 141-147.

Mendoza, P., Kuntz, A. M., & Berger, J. B. (2012). Bourdieu and academic capitalism: Faculty "habitus" in materials science and engineering. *The Journal of Higher Education, 83*(4), 558-581.

Meyer, J. R. (2017). Administrator perspectives of advantages and challenges of employing part-time faculty in nursing education programs: Two sides of the same coin. *Nursing Education Perspectives, 38*(2), 80-84.

Minor, J. T. (2005). Faculty governance at historically black colleges and universities. *Academe*, *91*(3), 34.

Mishler, E. (1979). Meaning in context: Is there any other kind?. *Harvard Educational Review*, *49*(1), 1-19.

Mohanty, C. (2003). *Feminism without borders: Decolonizing theory, practicing solidarity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Morley, L., & Rassool, N. (2000). School effectiveness: New managerialism, quality and the Japanization of education. *Journal of Education Policy, 15*(2), 169-183.

Morehouse, R. E., & Maykut, P. (2002). *Beginning qualitative research: A philosophical and practical guide*. London, UK: Routledge.

Morphew, C., Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2017). Contingent faculty composition and utilization: Perspectives from independent colleges and universities. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 2017*(176), 67-81.

Muzzin, L. (2008). How fares equity in an era of academic capitalism? The role of contingent faculty. In Chan, A. S., & Fisher, D. (Eds.). *The exchange university: Corporatization of academic culture*, (p. 105-124). Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

National Center for Educational Statistics. (2018). *Characteristics of Postsecondary Faculty*. Retrieved from nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_csc.asp.

Neumann, R., & Guthrie, J. (2002). The corporatization of research in Australian higher education. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting, 13*(5-6), 721-741. 93-329.

Ott, M., & Cisneros, J. (2015). Understanding the changing faculty workforce in higher education: A comparison of full-time non-tenure track and tenure line experiences. *Education Policy Analysis Archives/Archivos Analíticos de Políticas Educativas*, (23).

Ott, M. C., & Dippold, L. K. (2018). Adjunct employment preference: Who wants to be full-time faculty?. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 42*(3), 190-203.

Ponjuan, L., Conley, V. M., & Trower, C. (2011). Career stage differences in pre-tenure track faculty perceptions of professional and personal relationships with colleagues. *The Journal of Higher Education, 82*(3), 319-346.

Price, J. H., Braun, R. E., McKinney, M. A., & Thompson, A. (2011). Perceptions of part-time

faculty by chairpersons of undergraduate health education programs. *Health Promotion Practice, 12*(6), 923-931.

Rhoades, G. (1996). Reorganizing the faculty workforce for flexibility: Part-time professional labor. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *67*(6), 626-659.

Rhoades, G. (1998). *Managed professionals: Unionized faculty and restructuring academic labor*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Rhoads, R. A., & Rhoades, G. (2005). Graduate employee unionization as symbol of and challenge to the corporatization of US research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education, 76*(3), 243-275.

Ryan, G. W., & Bernard, H. R. (2003). Techniques to identify themes. *Field Methods, 15*(1), 85-109.

Rudy, A. P., Coppin, D., Konefal, J., Shaw, B. T, Ten Eyck, T. A., Harris, C., Busch, L. (2007). *Universities in the age of corporate science: The UC Berkeley-Novartis controversy*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Schell, E. E., & Stock, P. L. (2001). *Moving a mountain: Transforming the role of contingent faculty in composition studies and higher education*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Scheuerman, W., & Kriger, T. (2004). The concept of corporatization: A useful tool or feel-good slogan?. Rosow, S. J. & Kriger, T. (Ed.). *Transforming higher education: Economy, democracy, and the university*, (p. 83-94). Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield Publishing.

Schibik, T. J., & Harrington, C. F. (2004). The outsourcing of classroom instruction in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 26*(3), 393-400.

Schmidt, P. (2008). Use of Part-Time Instructors Tied to Lower Students Success. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 55(12).

Schneider, M., & Yin, L. (2011, August 22). The High Cost of Low Graduation Rates: How Much Does Dropping Out of College Really Cost? Retrieved from air.org/sites/ default/files/downloads/report AIR_High_Cost_of_Low_Graduation_Aug2011_0.pdf.

Schrecker, E. (2010). *The lost soul of higher education: Corporatization, the assault on academic freedom, and the end of the American university*. New York, NY: The New Press.

Schuster, J. H., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore, MD: JHU Press.

Shaker, G. (2008). *Off the track: The full-time nontenure-track faculty experience in English* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

Slaughter, S. A. (1993). Retrenchment in the 1980s: The politics of prestige and gender. *Journal of Higher Education, 64*(3), 250–282.

Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (1997). Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the *entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (2001). Expanding and elaborating the concept of academic capitalism. *Organization, 8*(2), 154-161.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (1993). Changes in intellectual property statutes and policies at a public university: Revising the terms of professional labor. *Higher Education, 26*(3), 287-312.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2008). The academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime. In Chan, A. S., & Fisher, D. (Eds.). *The exchange university: Corporatization of academic culture*, (p. 19-48). Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Smart, J. C. (1990). A causal model of faculty turnover intentions. *Research in Higher Education, 31*(5), 405-424.

Sonner, B.S. (2000). A is for 'adjunct': Examining grade inflation in higher education. *Journal of Education for Business, 76*(1), 5-9.

State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO). (2018). *State Higher Education Finance (SHEF) Fiscal Year 2018.* Retrieved from sheeo.org.

State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO). (2019). *State Higher Education Finance (SHEF) Fiscal Year 2019.* Retrieved from sheeo.org.

Steck, H. (2003). Corporatization of the university: Seeking conceptual clarity. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 585*(1), 66-83.

Taylor, A. (2017). Perspectives on the university as a business: The corporate management structure, neoliberalism and higher education. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 15*(1), 117.

Thirolf, K. Q. (2013). How faculty identity discourses of community college part-time faculty change over time. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *37*(3), 177-184.

Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Abany, New York: SUNY Press.

Umbach, P. D. (2007). How effective are they? Exploring the impact of contingent faculty on undergraduate education. *The Review of Higher Education*, *30*(2), 91-123.

U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2017). *Contingent workforce: Size, characteristics,*

compensation, and work experience of adjunct and other non-tenure-track faculty. Retrieved from www.gao.gov/assets/690/687871.pdf.

U.S. House Committee on Education and the Workforce. (2014). *The just-in-time professor: A staff report summarizing eForum responses on the working conditions of contingent faculty in higher education*. Retrieved from house.gov/imo/media/doc/1.24.14-AdjunctEforumReport.pdf.

Washburn, J. (2008). *University, Inc.: The corporate corruption of higher education*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Winter, R. (2009). Academic manager or managed academic? Academic identity schisms in higher education. *Journal of higher education policy and management*, *31*(2), 121-131.

Xiaotao, F., & Di Xu, R. (2019). Does contractual form matter? The impact of different types of non-tenure-track faculty on college students' academic outcomes. *Journal of Human Resources, 54*(4), 1081-1120.

Yu, H., Campbell, D., & Mendoza, P. (2015). The relationship between the employment of part-time faculty and student degree and/or certificate completion in two-year community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 39*(11), 986-1006.

Zusman, A. (2005). Challenges facing higher education in the twenty-first century. Retrieved from www.educationanddemocracy.org/Resources/Zusman.pdf.

Losing Our Faculties: Non-Tenure-Track Faculty in the Corporate Academy

Higher education faces unprecedented fiscal challenges. For decades, public institutions have grappled with declining state investment (Archibald & Feldman, 2006), uncertain federal research funds, and shifting attitudes towards labor and the marketplace (Magolda, 2016; Zusman, 1999). This shift is rooted in neoliberal ideals that have steadily realigned the public good with tenets of "individualism, private enterprise, [and] economic goals," linking educational purposes to individual rather than societal interests (Kezar, 2004, p. 450). As a consequence of shrinking appropriations, public institutions have faced considerable financial pressures to make up the difference, whose real costs typically increase 3-4% annually (Armstrong, 2016). Resultantly, public universities have been reshaped into organizations that more closely resemble for-profit corporations than social institutions charged with creating and disseminating knowledge (Bok, 2003; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Hence, the "corporate academy" is not a reference to for-profit institutions. Rather, the term highlights the underlying financial pressures that mediate institutional decisions, often at the expense of their public missions. Practices and norms associated with the public good have been subsumed by values that emphasize top-down decision making and employ at-will labor in service to the bottom line (Magolda, 2016; Taylor, 2017).

While there are many ways that institutions offset funding cuts, among the most common is the use of contingent faculty to decrease instructional costs (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Part-time and full-time non-tenure track faculty now comprise approximately two-thirds of appointments at American postsecondary institutions and more than 75% of instructional positions (U.S. GAO, 2017; U.S. House Committee, 2014). Part-time faculty comprise 47% of all postsecondary faculties (NCES, 2018), having increased by nearly 400% between 1970 and

2003 (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Approximately 15% of contingent faculty are full-time (Curtis & Thornton, 2013). Such increases align with business-minded ideals that prioritize cost incentives and market flexibility. They also are consistent with decreases in spending on undergraduate instruction (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2008). In the corporate university, contingent faculty are both experts integral to educational missions (U.S. House Committee, 2014) and a cost-savings measure dismissed or reappointed based on consumer demand (Liu & Zhang, 2013).

The problem, however, is the relationship between contingent faculty increases and student outcomes. U.S. leaders have set ambitious graduation goals to meet workforce demands and improve living standards, aiming for an additional eight million students by 2020, including those who are historically under-represented (Kezar, 2012). At the same time, administrators have outsourced instructional missions to a largely contingent workforce (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2008). Contingents offers subject matter expertise, but also administrative flexibility, savings, and control, while typically receiving lower pay, fewer benefits, limited office space, restricted access to governance, little clerical and administrative support, and no job security (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Leslie & Gappa, 2002; Schmidt, 2008; U.S. GAO, 2017; U.S. House Committee, 2014). Although factors that influence student success are varied, research linked increases in contingent faculty with poorer student outcomes and compromises to undergraduate instruction (Carrell & West, 2008; Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Jacoby, 2006; Jaeger & Eagan, 2011; Jaeger & Hinz, 2008; Schibik & Harrington, 2004; Umbach, 2007). This is particularly concerning for first-year students, especially those who are at-risk or historically under-represented, as contingent faculty teach most developmental and introductory courses (Hollenshead et al., 2007; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Essentially, instructional cost-

savings strategies pair the most vulnerable students with the least resourced faculty, potentially diminishing their odds of success.

Such findings invite policymakers and institutional leaders to ask questions about how business-minded policies affect contingent faculty work-lives, and, by implication, student outcomes. Unfortunately, gaps in the literature on faculty policies and practices limit understanding the hidden costs of an increasingly contingent workforce (Kezar & Maxey, 2012). Empirical research that can support leaders to make fact-based policies and strategic planning decisions is thin. What little we know suggests policies affect academic cultures and democratic norms (Chan & Fisher, 2008; Giroux, 2002; Kezar, 2004; Magolda, 2016; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). However, missing from the research are studies that use theory to examine the unintended consequences of policies that have altered the professoriate. Few have applied organizational theories to contextualize contingent faculty work-lives (Kezar & Sam, 2011) or theorized the institutional costs and benefits of said approaches to faculty labor. That contingent faculty remain largely provisional rather than folded into long-term strategies indicates a continued lack of planning for labor and undergraduate instruction, even as administrators repeatedly re-hire the same faculty (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Cross & Goldenberg, 2009). These knowledge gaps suggest a need for research that highlights faculty voices within an institution guided by business-minded policies and dependent on their expertise, low costs, and flexibility. Thus, I offer stakeholders—policymakers, institutional leaders, scholars—empirical insights into the costs and benefits of contingent approaches to faculty labor. Then, I theorize implications for higher education. Such bottom-up perspectives of an institution fills a gap in the literature from a less considered point of view.

The research question driving this inquiry is: How do contingent faculty experience their work-lives within a higher education institution? The answer was derived from a case study of contingent faculty at a public, four-year research institution. Enabling me to consider faculty perspectives in the context of the corporate university, the research took place at Desert University (a pseudonym), a formerly Tier II Carnegie classification institution midway through the implementation of a ten-year plan to redefine itself as a "very high" research institution. The goal to become a major economic engine of the state represents an implicit institutional agenda to secure financial solvency. The purpose of the study is to describe contingent faculty work-lives within this environment. Data for the study came from one-on-one interviews with 15 full-time and part-time non-tenure-track faculty, as well as observations and relevant document analysis. To interpret data, I drew on complexity theory, which frames educational organizations as complex systems, yet supports analysis of faculty perspectives to understand organizational change processes (Mitleton-Kelly, 2003). The theory shifts the focus from an individual's behaviors to her interactions with other agents, organizations, policies, and norms; through those interactions, individuals affect other individuals, systemic elements, and the entire system (Espejo, 2003; Mason, 2008). Complexity theory, therefore, enables us to understand the corporate university from the perspectives of what studies classify as "cost-effective hires" (Hollenshead et al., 2007; Monks, 2007). In preview, the data demonstrate that faculty experienced a double-edged sword of autonomy. Their contingent status provided autonomy that freed them from many responsibilities and oversight of full-time employees. However, as an unintended consequence, autonomy also meant exclusion from meaningful participation in the academy beyond the classroom. The paper divides into four sections as follows: First, I describe relevant literature framing this study. After enumerating out methods, I present contingent

faculty experiences of the corporate university. I subsequently use complexity theory to interpret experiences, framing analysis to consider the data's implications for policy, practice, and future research.

Literature Review

The corporatization literature frames non-tenure-track faculty as expert, yet cost-effective labor who are both integral to institutional missions and the inevitable result of business models in higher education (Donoghue, 2008; Lerner, 2008). Kezar and Sam (2010) suggested widespread consensus among scholars that "economic reasons play a very large role in the hiring of non-tenure-track faculty" with the first reason "connected to cost-effectiveness" (p. 31). The proliferation of contingent faculty, then, is part of a larger policy pattern reshaping higher education institutions into organizations that resemble economically nimble for-profit corporations (Kezar, 2004; Rhoades, 1996; Schell & Stock, 2001; Slaughter, 1993). As Slaughter and Leslie (1997) and Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) explained, institutions "have downsized and essentially outsourced their instructional production workers, replacing full-time faculty" with a contingent workforce to offset costs elsewhere in the academy (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2008, p. 41). If faculty are "academia's key 'stakeholders" (Schrecker, 2010, p. 154) and "the heart" that determines "the health" of institutions (Gappa et al., 2007), then contingent faculty occupy a unique place in the higher education landscape as experts integral to educational missions (U.S. House Committee, 2014) and as cost-effective labor largely unsupported by faculty norms and easily dismissed or reappointed based on managerial needs and consumer demand (Liu & Zhang, 2013; U.S. GAO, 2017).

Corporatization and Student Outcomes

To countermand shrinking budgets and expanding costs, administrations at most institutions have efforted to reduce instructional costs, largely through the use of contingent faculty (Bok, 2003; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Taylor, 2017). Contracted on a per-course or yearly basis, contingent faculty typically earn far less per course tenure-line faculty, receive few, if any, benefits, and have limited access to resources (Monks, 2007; U.S. GAO, 2017; U.S. House Committee, 2014). While part-time and full-time non-tenure-track faculty service an institution's bottom line, research suggested their proliferation negatively impacts student outcomes at the institutional and classroom levels. The implication is that contingent labor policies have contributed to poorer student outcomes.

Institutional Outcomes

Studies indicated contingent faculty—part-time faculty, in particular—negatively impacted student outcomes across institution types. This included graduation (Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Jacoby, 2006; Jaeger & Hinz, 2008), transferring (Eagan & Jaeger, 2009), retention (Jaeger & Eagan, 2011) and persistence (Bettinger & Long, 2004; Jaeger & Hinz, 2008). For example, students who had more contingent faculty-led courses graduated from four-year colleges at lower rates (Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005). Other research quantified the impact on graduation, retention, and progression rates. For example, for every 10% increase in overall exposure to part-time instruction translated into a 1% reduction in the likelihood of earning a degree (Jaeger & Eagan, 2009). Similarly, across institution type, for every 10% increase in students' exposure to part-time faculty, the probability they persisted into the next year dropped by 4% (Jaeger & Eagan, 2011). Likewise, students at doctoral-granting institutions were increasingly less likely to persist into the second year based on identical circumstances (Jaeger &

Hinz, 2008). These findings are consistent with prior research noting contingent faculty lessened overall student persistence (Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005) and, in most cases, decreased the likelihood that students would take subsequent classes in that subject (Bettinger & Long, 2004).

Classroom Outcomes

Findings also indicated less impactful learning (Xiaotao & Di Xu, 2019) and weaker pedagogical practices (Allison-Jones & Hirt, 2004; Bowden & Gonzalez, 2012; Umbach, 2007). Classes taught by contingent faculty, for example, resulted in short-term gains in GPA but long-term losses based on outcomes in subsequent, related courses (Carrell & West, 2010; Ran & Xu, 2018). The implication is that students earned better grades in classes taught by contingent faculty, then suffered the consequences of less demanding learning environments in succeeding classes. In fact, issues of grade inflation appeared across studies, even when controlling for other factors (Cavanaugh, 2006). Poorer outcomes, however, are contextualized by research that examined contingent faculty working conditions. Studies noted substantial differences exist in the support mechanisms provided to contingent faculty (Landrum, 2009). They operated in less defined conditions (Rhoades, 1996) and were less integrated into campus academic cultures (Eagan & Jaeger, 2009). While scholars have proffered solutions intended to improve working environments, little data suggests the efficacy of such policies (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Gehrke & Kezar, 2015).

Corporatization and Faculty Power

Another indicator of corporatization is the emphasis on top-down decision making, defined by expanded managerial supervision and assessment (Magolda, 2016; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Shared decision-making is viewed as inefficient and wedded to the status quo; collegial structures with diffuse power largely have given way to more

rigid bureaucracies with consolidated authority (Lustig, 2010). Instead, the emphasis is on top-down management strategies and accountability measures in service to productivity goals; rewards (and punishments) are meted out based on performance assessed from objective, data-driven outcomes (Deem, 2001; Levin, 2006; Magolda, 2016; Steck, 2003). Decisions priorly negotiated through shared governance are made by small cadres of decision makers removed from those doing the work in the academy (Giroux, 2005; Magolda, 2016).

Concurrently, efforts have been directed toward restructuring faculty work, so administrators can remain agile in response to changes in the marketplace (Slaughter, 1993; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997, 2001; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). This proliferation of contingent faculty positions—which, by definition, are filled, altered, or eliminated in response to demand—is consistent with economic policies and corporate models that emphasize top-down decision making and centralized power (Kezar, 2004; Magolda, 2016; Rhoades, 1996; Schell & Stock, 2001; Slaughter, 1993). They are the fungible labor providing administrators the flexibility to respond to market demands and counterbalance the academic freedoms afforded tenure-line faculty (Benjamin, 2003; Lechuga, 2006). Scholars described contingent labor as less able to resist institutional change or retrenchment, making organizational restructuring easier and faster (Bok, 2003; Fichtenbaum, 2014; Gould, 2003; Muzzin, 2008; Steck, 2003). With limited faculty checks on administrative power (Brown, 2001), programs and educators—especially in disciplines that lack commercial value—are more easily altered or eliminated (Aronowitz & Giroux, 2000).

This is reiterated by studies reporting contingent faculty largely were excluded from shared governance at institution and department levels. Instead, they were left to rely on administrators and influential faculty to affect organizational and departmental change (Gehrke

& Kezar, 2015; Kezar & Gehrke, 2016). Political environments were marked by little socialization, assessment, governance opportunities, and curricular decisions (Baldwin & Chronister 2001; Kezar, 2013b; Schuster & Finkelstein 2006). Even when they have been permitted to contribute, eligibility policies do not facilitate participation. For example, leaders may assume inclusive policies ensure contributions; however, this ignores complications, such as lack of communication, time, or incentives, but also "token" inclusion policies that infer partial or no voting rights (Kezar & Sam, 2013; Kezar & Sam, 2014).

Ultimately, contingent faculty increases indirectly support top-down decision making and expanded managerial control. This has contributed to professional environments of disconnection, isolation, and lack of recognition that intensified over time (Dolan, 2011; Thirolf, 2013). While there were practical, structural, and cultural explanations for their limited influence, the lack of inclusion has constrained their ability to shape institutions through traditional means (Kezar & Sam, 2013). Rather**,** contingent faculty are "managed" academics with limited influence or autonomy (Winter, 2009), leaving all faculty more vulnerable to the vagaries of administrative control. The implication is that contingent labor policies have contributed to political imbalances in higher education institutions, including a lack of agency and self-efficacy for contingent faculty.

Corporatization and Faculty Culture

Beyond political imbalances, corporatization infers shifts in faculty work-lives resulting from performance pressures and an emphasis on business values—efficiency and cost—over academic metrics (Giroux, 2002; Schrecker, 2010; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Research examining corporate culture in higher education, for example, indicated the willingness to sacrifice quality for efficiency (Baltodano, 2012; Rhoads & Rhoades, 2005). Similarly, a study

of ideological tensions found cultural influences, however intangible, have reshaped higher education values and ethics of public service into an ideology of "venture and risk" (Barnett, 2003, p. 65). Collectively, this has contributed to environments that have negatively influenced faculty satisfaction (Olsen & Crawford, 1998; Ponjuan, Conley, & Trower, 2011), commitment (Brown, 2016), motivation (Adams, 2014), and professional identity (Hao, 2015, 2016; Winter, 2009). The implication is that corporate labor policies have altered academic environments and negatively influenced faculty work-lives.

Contingent faculty professional identities were marked by contrasting feelings of inclusion and exclusion. They are impactful fixtures integral to educational missions, but also underserved by academic norms and poorly integrated across campuses (U.S. GAO, 2017; U.S. House Committee, 2014). Regardless of institution type, contingent faculty saw themselves both as experts and as undervalued affiliates lacking status and autonomy. They identified as experts when with students; however, in interactions with tenured faculty or administration, they felt diminished (Levin & Shaker, 2011). Similarly, research described their "double-consciousness" of being viewed by students as professors, yet largely excluded from governance and viewed by colleagues with ambivalence (Schrecker, 2010, p. 211). Struggles with job insecurity, feelings of being undercompensated (Shaker, 2008), and inconsistent department expectations (Hollenshead et al., 2007) further reinforced their ambivalent sense of self-worth. Part-time faculty, in particular, experienced feelings of incompetence and lack of professionalism. Feelings of being specialized professionals with self-efficacy in the classroom were absent in other organizational contexts (Levin & Hernandez, 2014). Other research suggested negative self-perceptions can deepen over time. Thirolf (2013) noted faculty initially developed a positive identity through

teaching and interacting with students. Over time, however, feelings of professional commitment and pride lessened.

These conflicted feelings may be tacitly reiterated by campus leaders and influencers, who expressed ambivalent attitudes and low expectations. Chief academic officers for example, did not expect contingent faculty to engage with campus communities nor did they support them to participate as faculty outside the classroom (Morphew, Ward, & Wolf-Wendel, 2017). Leaders from a range of groups associated with the professoriate (e.g. governing boards, accreditation agencies, state compacts, unions) were aware of how contingent faculty practices and conditions are poorly aligned with student outcomes and faculty professionalism (Maxey & Kezar, 2015). Mid-level administrators (Meyer, 2017) and department chairs (Dolan, 2011; Fjortoft, Winkler, & Mai, 2012; Gappa et al., 2007; Moorehead, 2011; Price et al., 2011) expressed similar attitudes of ambivalence and lower expectations. Ultimately, the collective ambivalence suggests a bifurcated faculty system in which contingents, especially part-timers, operate under less favorable working conditions, with compromised professional identities and diminished commitment and motivation.

Complexity Theory

Corporatization is a process through which higher education institutions gradually have been reshaped into organizations that more closely resemble for-profit corporations. To contextualize the change process, complexity theory emphasizes adaptability and transformation, offering an alternative to the perspective that organizations are mechanistic and predictable (Mason, 2008; Morrison, 2008). An organization is not a hierarchy but a complex system comprised of a variety of "interdependent elements operating at multiple system levels [that] interact and adapt to one another" (Kershner & McQuillan, 2016, p. 6). Within a system, agent

interactions both solidify existing structures or "histories" and create new forms, qualities, and patterns of behavior (Mason, 2008; Mitleton-Kelly, 2003).

Operationalizing Complexity

Complex systems can be understood by agent-level interactions that both reify and reshape an organization; the theory supports analysis of organizational change at the agent level, as the veneer of stable infrastructure and historical memory is sustained alongside shifting social and cultural conditions (Mitleton-Kelly, 2003).

Agents and Interactions. Complexity theory shifts the focus from decontextualized behaviors to interdependent interactions through which individuals affect other individuals, systemic elements, and the entire system (Espejo, 2003; Mason, 2008).

History and Change. Historical memory serves as the stabilizing counterweight to uncertainty (Mitleton-Kelly, 2003; Duncheon & Relles, 2018). This reflects established roles and relationships, power dynamics, and structural elements that reify norms and gradually give way to new, emerging organizational norms, practices, and cultures (Mitleton-Kelly, 2006).

Pressures and Disequilibrium. Pressures disrupt patterns of organizing, creating spaces for adaptation and change (Mitleton-Kelly, 2003). Disequilibrium initiates the need for new solutions when current strategies or structures no longer work (Uhl-Bien & Arena, 2017).

Emergence: Creation of New Order. In response to disequilibrium, agents interact, exchange information, and act, resulting in changes to an organization (Lichtenstein & Plowman, 2009). The knowledge and innovation that emerges from agent-level interactions are not just the sum of existing ideas, but potentially something new and unexpected (Mitleton-Kelly, 2006).

Method

The study used case study methodology of contingent faculty at Desert University, a formerly Tier II Carnegie classification institution midway through the implementation of a ten-year plan to redefine itself as a "very high" research institution. The study is bounded by two site-based parameters (Putney, 2010; Creswell & Poth, 2018)—funding policies that align with tenets of corporatization and institutional type.

Site Selection

This site is representative of current funding policies that are consistent with the corporatization literature. However, a truncated ten-year implementation timeline suggests it is an extreme case of the central phenomenon (Creswell, 2016; Seawright, & Gerring, 2008). The institution is midway through a decade-long initiative to implement policies that establish Desert University as a major economic engine of the state: attracting industries, fostering business startups, creating new patents, bringing in large federal grants and private industry contracts, improving the human infrastructure and health care, producing a highly qualified workforce, and attracting students from around the world (Path to Tier One, 2014; Road to Tier 1, 2013; Tier One Budget, 2014).

Public research institutions, in general, are promising locations to investigate faculty labor and corporatization (McNaughtan, García, & Nehls, 2017). They rely heavily on contingent faculty as a cost strategy to address decreased public funding. Public institutions were more likely to house faculty affected by corporatized elements, such as managerial pressures (Brown, 2016). Like other public universities, Desert University continues to navigate long-term shrinking public investment in higher education (SHEEO, 2018), while relying on contingent faculty, who comprise more than 50% of faculty (NCES, 2018). The initiative, however,

suggests an implicit institutional agenda to secure financial solvency. This tension between budget shortfalls and ambitious, business-minded institutional growth echoed in the literature—and evidenced by policies, goals, achievements, priorities, and public comments by institutional leaders—offers a unique context to examine the influence of corporatization in public higher education.

The site, then, indicates an extreme case. The rapid timeline for implementing Top Tier mission policies to reinvigorate Desert University as a major economic engine of the state infers a prominent corporate climate. Such rapid change also has implications for complexity theory analysis, which suggests complex systems do not change fully or instantaneously, but rather adapt over a long period of time, in part, through agent-level interactions (Morrison, 2008). Also, diversity policies at the institution indicate student demographics at the site reflect historically underrepresented students who may struggle with conventional instruction. This suggests innovative classrooms and approaches to instruction, rather than classrooms led by the least resourced, supported, prestigious faculty.

Sample Selection

To ensure maximal range of experiences, the research sample includes participants from the nine undergraduate colleges and schools across the institution, representing a cross-section of academic backgrounds and appointment types. This was important because contingent faculty are not unique to certain disciplines; almost every field of study has been impacted by their proliferation (Schrecker, 2010). Variation also safeguards against department- and college-level vagaries, ensuring findings are from across the institution, rather than a subset of the institution. Fifteen contingent faculty, 10 part-time and five full-time were chosen. Eight were male and seven were female. Of the part-time sample, five were voluntary (e.g. retirees, outside

professionals), and five were involuntary faculty who desired but had not yet found more stable employment in the academy (Maynard & Joseph, 2008). Appointment type was important because of differences in responsibilities, perks—job security, compensation, participation in governance—and job satisfaction (Levin & Shaker, 2011; Eagan, Jaeger, & Grantham, 2015). Collectively, sample choices support maximum variation (Creswell, 2016).

Data Collection

Consistent with case study protocol, data were collected via multiple sources: interviews with informants, documents, and observations. Primary data were collected via one-on-one interviews with part-time and full-time non-tenure-track faculty as the primary source of data collection. Interviews ranged between 60 to 90 minutes. Interviews followed a semi-structured protocol that included open-ended questions that allowed for probing follow-up questions. Questions focused on the following areas: information about their scholarly background; their roles and responsibilities as faculty; their experiences in the workplace, including views about work conditions, environment, and sense of belonging; their perspective on institution-wide funding policies; open-ended opportunities for them to add narrative experiences and information pertinent to understanding their campus work-lives.

Secondary data were collected via document analysis and observations. I reviewed department and individual faculty websites, departmental postings, faculty handbooks, and policy documents for information related to faculty appointments. I also conducted bi-weekly observations of faculty work spaces over the span of eight weeks. Data were collected in offices and meeting rooms, as well as during institution-wide monthly faculty mentoring meetings. Observations ranged between 60 to 90 minutes. Observation field notes followed a protocol that includes descriptive and reflective notes documenting verbal and non-verbal communication.

Data Analysis

Consistent with case study methodology, I conducted data collection and analysis concurrently using an integrated approach (Bradley, Curry, & Devers, 2007). To analyze data from interviews and observations, I used content analysis techniques, a method for interpreting content through the systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns (Berg, 2001; Creswell & Poth, 2018; Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Data were coded deductively line-by-line using a priori codes based on my research questions and derived from prior empirical research, theoretical constructs, and personal experiences as a contingent faculty. I used deductive codes to label and differentiate work-life elements identified in the literature. For example, my codebook included a priori codes related to professional identities (Boyatzis, 1998; Dolan, 2011; Kezar, 2012; Thirolf, 2013). I coded for experiences that aligned or conflicted with professionalism and academic freedom (Levin & Shaker, 2011; Rhoades, 1998; Schrecker, 2010; Steck, 2003), as well as work-life concerns related to exclusion and isolation. Simultaneously, data were inductively coded line-by-line using open and in vivo techniques. Data were organized into themes based on code types—patterns of repetition, metaphors and analogies, and similarities and differences (Bradley et al., 2007; Mishler 1979; Morehouse & Maykut, 2002)—to reduce redundancy and capture emic perspectives.

Trustworthiness

This study employed several techniques to increase trustworthiness. Careful attention to sample selection helped to ensure the trustworthiness of the data. By interviewing both part-time and full-time non-tenure-track faculty from across the institution, I ensured the data represented various contract types and a full range of disciplines. Interviews, observations, and document analysis, including triangulated data, proceeded until establishing saturation (Creswell & Miller,

2000). Data were reported using thick descriptions and examined for disconfirming evidence (Creswell, 2016). Interview transcripts and research findings were made available to promote member-checking for accuracy (Creswell & Miller, 2000; Carlson, 2010). Also, I employed reflexive journaling immediately after interview and transcription sessions, and when analyzing interview, observational, and document. This supported me to identify and mitigate personal bias based on my experiences as a contingent faculty at various higher education institutions (Creswell & Miller, 2000; Cunliffe, 2004; Watt, 2007). The study had limitations. Findings are context-specific and should not be viewed as comprehensive or generalizable (Lechuga, 2006). Themes reflected individual experiences of interviewees, as well as my interpretations, triangulated by interviews, observations, and document analysis.

Data Presentation

Participants experienced a mixture of benefits and drawbacks to their contingent status in the corporate university. In what follows, I present contingent faculty viewpoints on the advantages and disadvantages of contingent work-life experiences.

Work-Life Autonomy

Contingent faculty enjoyed a great deal of autonomy. As one faculty noted, "We can basically do whatever we want." With few responsibilities outside the classroom and limited oversight, they were not burdened with what another participant described as the "heavy lifting" required to run academic departments or educate students beyond classroom instruction.

"Nobody's Watching."

To begin with, contingent faculty reported work-lives largely independent of accountability and oversight. One participant, who now taught two online classes of 75 students in lieu of in-person classes of 25-30 students he used to teach, said he appreciated the convenient

commute and the option to teach from his cabin in a nearby state. He talked about the pressures of classroom observations and performance evaluations in his department. In his words:

> When I started out, I felt a lot of pressure that people would be watching. But you find out pretty quick that almost nobody's watching. And I suppose that depends on the department [and] who is overseeing. I could not detect anyone was looking at anything that came back from my classes. Of course, I was getting really good [student] evaluations as a teacher. So, maybe someone looked and said, 'everything is great.'"

Instruction was mostly unaccounted for in any administrative sense. No faculty had to bear the stress of peer observations or evaluations of their work. One respondent, who had been observed once in over a decade as a part-time faculty, posited that it was "because there's such turnover" in his department. By his account, observation plans were "cancelled" last year by senior faculty "like, four times. Meeting this, meeting that. Whatever. Don't worry about it." In the absence of formal oversight, many said they relied on positive student evaluations and continued re-hiring as proof enough of teaching prowess. As one part-timer explained, "They keep asking me back. So they know that the class is successful. I don't know this for a fact, but I would guess that they're not worried." Similarly, a visiting full-time faculty operated under the assumption that "no news is good news." In her words: "About the only time I've talked to the department head was when he told me that I had another class this semester, three hours before it started. But I figure if I'm doing something wrong, they're going to let me know." Unless there is a student complaint, classroom instruction went unnoticed and uncommented on.

Participants were not included in department functions and other cultural touchstones. One faculty, for example, described non-tenure promotions and hirings being omitted from college newsletters, "as if we don't matter whether we come work out." Another who had been

interviewed on television about her recent publication said, “We don't get highlighted for any academic accomplishments…I had to send [the interview] to my whole department.” A third puzzled over why his publishing and recently funded research project garnered no attention from administrators, “I think at the end of the day, it all comes down to one thing: Nobody really cares.” A fourth put it more plainly: “I would bet there are members of the [department] who wouldn't know me if they ran me over.”

“I Come In. I Do My Job, and I Go.”

Contingent faculty also described themselves as “contract employees” unobliged to the university. Instead, they were there to service the teaching mission, as bit players in the larger provider-client contract between the university and its students. They come. They teach. They leave. Participants appreciated being able to “fly under the radar screen” and were “not expected to go” to functions outside of classes. As one said, “I just figure, the advantage I have is that I come and do my thing, and I go home.” Another concluded, “I don't personally feel like I need to be that involved. I'm not getting paid enough to. And it's not that I don't care, because I do. I love [teaching], but I don't feel the need to have to integrate.” A third described her position as “a contract employee. I come in. I do my job, and I go. I don't go to the department meetings. I don't get reviewed…I think that's the expectations. I assume. I never have had-, never communicated.” One participant joked when recalling my invitation to conduct our interview in her office, “I don’t have an office. I really don't have space. I don't have a phone number.” Another compared her experience to going to the mall, “I would just come in, do what I needed—purchase my pair of socks—and get out. I just go dump the knowledge in the students, and see you later…It doesn't even matter what campus I'm on.”

Participants also recalled instances when they were able to step up to fill a need, such as teaching classes outside their expertise because “they need instructors so badly” or “they didn't have anyone else to teach”; juggling four different preps “because they needed it”; last-second replacements who “showed up for a class and, “Oh, by the way, here's another [class]” and who consistently are asked to fill in wherever because “they know that I’ll say yes.” One participant compared his role in the department to that of a back-up coming off the bench to plug whatever holes were needed, regardless of credentials. His recent assignments included organizing a lecture series and cobbling together a catalogue: “[We’re] taking the load off of the tenure-track faculty, so they can hopefully win the games, and we're just [supposed to be] on the sidelines helping them achieve it.” In short, contingent faculty heroics were welcome fixes to teaching problems.

“Here’s the Design.”

Contingent faculty were unencumbered by department workloads outside of the classroom. One participant broke down how department leaders assigned contingent faculty their teaching duties: “Here’s the design. This is what you need to do. No ifs, ands, or buts about it. I don’t have any problem with how you do it. But, this is what we need to do.” Participants recognized their role was to implement the university’s teaching mission. As another participant recalled, “When I came here first, they [said], ‘You're going to teach this course.” According to another, “Everybody understands that there's a role and a place for everybody.”

Although it simplified decision making and lightened workloads, the separation of service duties from teaching sometimes created problems because it limited their ability to contribute meaningfully to the mission and the well-being of students outside the classroom. As one participant said, “My responsibilities are mainly to teach these [100-level] classes… Every

lecturer in this place is aware of this." He shared his introduction to curricular decision making for lower division courses in his department. In his words: "You use this syllabus. You have to send the coordinator your exams. He has to approve them. And you have to send him your final grades, and he has to approve it before you can post it for students.'" His sanguine outlook suggested that he had not expected to contribute in those ways. Similarly, another explained, "We can basically do whatever we want, as long as we're following the curricula." One visiting faculty described her contributions to department meetings as "staying out of everybody's hair." In her words: "I smile and nod a lot, because I know my influence is limited. It's a short-term position. So I don't push."

Work-Life Alienation

Others saw the benefits of autonomy as a drawback, noting their alienation from otherwise staple faculty activities. Independence proved disadvantageous for those who sought to do more than be a "cog in the wheel." As long as contingents did not overstep the pre-assigned "role and place," there was amity. Yet, the freedom that gave contingent faculty autonomy left them estranged from research and service in ways that arguably hindered their teaching effectiveness.

"Don't Rock the Boat."

The pre-assigned roles sometimes created tension where teaching and other faculty activities overlapped. While contingent faculty were not burdened by programmatic or administrative expectations, the streamlined system did not support efforts to contribute to department-level processes, such as curricula development or governance-related matters. Participants explained how their contingent status meant they had difficulty accessing the research and service amenities that were a given for their tenure-track and tenured colleagues.

Some participants depicted interactions in which they were overlooked by institutional organizations and administrators. Data revealed work-lives in which participants were unconsidered by policies and norms that would allow them to contribute to the academic community like their tenure-line colleagues. Contingent faculty, especially part-timers, were unconsidered in myriad ways, such as campus spaces, scheduling, representative governance, and access to support staff. While autonomy had its upside, the institution often was not equipped to accommodate contingent faculty. For example, the majority had limited or no curricular responsibilities. One participant described how her chair fielded feedback for changes to the department's bread and butter lower division courses: "I was shut down. I was not even allowed to finish the sentence." More revealing, however, faculty were unaccounted for as contributing members of the academy beyond the classroom. One participant, a longtime contingent faculty who balanced an active research agenda with a full-time teaching load, voiced frustration with policies and structural barriers that impeded non-tenure-track faculty from participating in other facets of the academic community:

> I want to keep getting grants and working on research projects. But IRB is not equipped to deal with non-tenure track faculty. A lot of grants are not equipped to deal, and the Office of Sponsored Programs on campus is not equipped to deal with folks like me. I actually have more hurdles that I have to go through to get my IRB, to get my work out there. I have to apply for status to be a PI on an IRB, which is ridiculous, because I'm doing a lot of research. I shouldn't have to apply and jump through a hoop every single year…All of those are set up to benefit a tenure or tenure-track faculty member, not non-tenured track faculty. I think that they just, in many ways, want us to come, teach, put our head down, don't rock the boat.

Efforts to serve on committees or chair dissertations went against policies and norms. Attempts to initiate professional development opportunities or student certificate programs either were not taken seriously or were discarded once supporting resources were needed. Colleagues had not been socialized (or incentivized) to consult contingent faculty. As one participant explained, "[W]hen the faculty are thinking about who works in our department, they just think about the tenure and tenure-track faculty. They don't even see the other faculty. They don't consider [us] as a colleague or at the same level."

For another participant, not partaking in student admissions processes or faculty search committees, was "a big point of tension" because she was "teaching a lot of those students" and "working as a colleague alongside these new faculty." It also galled her to have no input elsewhere on department rosters, such as selecting the new department chair, "who potentially could have a big impact on me even being retained in the department." Another participant claimed he sought out service to build his CV and support senior faculty said, "I always asked every department chair I had, 'is there anything else I can do,' and I was always told 'no.'"

"They Believed the Students More than Me."

Data also revealed contingent faculty experienced meddling administrators who interfered with professional autonomy. One participant shared his frustration with such practices: "Every time I have to fail a student, I get talked out of it, because 'We need to keep the students' or 'We need to push them up. Can we just curve it?'" Data included several other examples of judgement being questioned or subtle insistences to cater to students, inflating grades, extra revision and re-testing opportunities, or softening attendance policies. The consequences of refusal were not always hidden. For example, another participant shared her experience of being called into the department office after a student complained about a grade "and not so subtly

encouraged to change the grade, which I refused to do. So the next day, I get an email from [an administrator] who wants to visit my class."

One full-time non-tenure track faculty and PhD candidate with a private practice in his field of study, discussed how administrators intervened to arbitrate conflicts with students:

> Every time I would speak to the students about something, god forbid, I would be mad, I would be called into the principal's office. In the beginning, they believed the students more than me. 'There were [multiple] students. How can a few students make something up?' As opposed to saying, "Hey, no. He's a fellow faculty, and we trust that someone with his experience and qualifications would not say that." It continued every term. I tend to have a higher standard, and I expect more. Then students, usually those who were not showing up or not doing work, were always going in and complaining. The school administration has a responsibility to meet with me and review it, and resolve it. But not being a tenure-track, every time I would go to the office, I would be worried that I'm going to lose my job. And it affected my teaching. Then I was like, you know what, it's not worth it.

His fear of being "called into the principal's office," of getting in "trouble" for his classroom conduct, was matched by his frustration with their lack of faith in him. As educated professionals hired for their expertise, he said, such oversight veered into the absurd. This example is extreme but hardly unique.

Another participant described heavy-handed introduction to his department. Despite subject-matter expertise and previous administrative experience, his position in the chain of command was made clear from the get-go:

> "In here, it's very 'You're a lecturer. Your opinion doesn't count at all. And we tell you. We set the course. We're tenured professors. You have no job security.' There's a lot of undercurrents here…Imagine what's going through my mind. It's pure madness! I don't want to talk bad about these people behind their backs, but I have to. I have the obligation to tell you what a mess we're dealing with."

The fallout of autonomy on faculty lives was considerable. Without accountability, high turnover was high. One participant linked the countless fellow part-time faculty he has watched come and go in his eleven years to his department's "cattle call" approach to conflict resolution and scheduling issues. In his words:

> I associate it with cattle calls as a performer: If you complain about something, they fire you and bring one of the other people that came in. Because you were expendable. The PTI situation—at least that I'm exposed to—is the same way. They're like, 'You don't want to teach? Screw you. We'll get somebody else.' As opposed to, 'Well, what's the issue. Maybe there's something we can do, because we'd like to hang onto you.' We had our meeting in the beginning of the year, and I wasn't sure I was going to be able to [teach] because of [a conflicting] opportunity. Instead of my head supervisor saying, 'Let's see if we can work this out,' their immediate response is, 'Oh, okay. Does anybody want to teach those?' So basically I'm a piece of toilet paper? And you don't give a shit.

"Sometimes You Do Feel Like a Graduate Student."

The one notable stream of data complicating this theme was voiced by contingent faculty themselves. Resistance did not come just from senior faculty and administrators. Rather, this tension was amplified by data of contingent faculty sensitive to their own standing in departments. Multiple participants used subordinating language to depict work-lives, especially

if they were long-term contingent faculty. For example, since leaving a tenure-track job at another institution for personal reasons, one faculty had remained in a visiting position for the past four years. He joked about being a "second-class citizen" in his department but quickly offered that no one treated him that way. Still, he was concerned about the implications of his contract status and worried about being "too far out of it at this point" to earn a tenure-line position in the future:

> I think there's only a certain amount of time you can stay at a visiting role before it's like, "well, what's wrong with this person?" If at an event, you always worry about academics being socially awkward. People outside of the school, who don't know my situation, if I apply for another job, they'll look at my CV and say, "Why is this person perpetually [non-tenured]? What's wrong with him?"

Faculty used pejoratives such as "second-class," "bench players," a "hired gun," and a "cog in a wheel" to describe their place in the academy. One part-time faculty described her and her fellow contingent faculty as outsiders who are "like some shady part that comes and goes." Another was more blunt: "we don't really belong here." In particular, participants saw ongoing contingent status in myriad negative ways, as if it suggested incompetence, subordination, aberrance, even irrationality. One faculty analogized her status in the department to that of a student, despite a prolific record of scholarship. In her words: "Sometimes you do feel like a graduate student still. I would say in my first year, I had a real hard time with that. I feel like a grad student again, yet I've published. And some of these new hires haven't published." Now, in his eleventh year, another participant referred to himself as "the anomaly" for having remained in a department that so many former colleagues have left. Reflecting on the revolving door of colleagues who quickly moved on for "better" opportunities, often outside of academia, a third

faculty said, “Any rational person would [leave], right? I'm fucking nuts to be here, right? To have been here twelve years? The reasonable guy is the smart guy. The ones who are competent, they're here a short time and then go somewhere else.”

Discussion

Contingent faculty in this study described the double-edged sword of autonomy. They reported few responsibilities outside the classroom and enjoyed limited, if any, oversight. On the one hand, they were free from most responsibilities, unbeholden to the university, and unaccountable to anyone but their students and themselves. They contributed valuable expertise and timely solutions to teaching problems. Yet, they could come and go as they pleased, getting to work with students while avoiding the time-intensive intellectual and political rigors of running a department. On the other hand, autonomy also meant they were alienated from other faculty activities, such as research and service. Their work-lives were assumed to support the academy’s needs, not their own aspirations. Hired to teach, they often met with resistance when pursuing their ambitions. The data demonstrate how their efforts to participate were undercut by a mix of department-level mandates, managerial incursions, policies and academic norms, and administrative indifference. Whether resistance from faculty was personal or practical, data suggest contingent faculty internalized their experience as negative self-perceptions and feelings of disconnection. The data also indicate contingent faculty had few opportunities to be recognized for their work or to exercise the full range of their capabilities. Confining contingent faculty to the teaching mission meant they could not contribute beyond instruction even when they wanted to. Without recognition, a sense of accomplishment, or institutional belonging, they were mostly relegated to the outer ring of the academy. In what follows, I analyzed the autonomy and alienation contingent faculty encountered when interacting with senior colleagues,

administrators, and institutional organizations. First, I used complexity theory to analyze key findings from the study. Then, I concluded with implications for faculty policies, educational missions, and future research.

Contingent Faculty in Complex Systems

Complexity theory frames organizations such as universities as complex systems. Systemic behavior is defined by numerous intersecting elements that interact and adapt to each other, rather than by individual agents themselves (Kershner & McQuillan, 2016; O'Day, 2002). Within a system, agent interactions both reify existing structures or histories and create new forms, qualities, and patterns of behavior (Mason, 2008; Mitleton-Kelly, 2003). Since complex systems do not change quickly, but rather evolve over time (Morrison, 2008), agent-level interactions both reflect traditional norms and perpetuate systemic change. Complexity theory, then, provides a point of view to conceptualize how ongoing changes to faculty labor that date back decades have gradually altered the professoriate and, by implication, higher education institutions. Two prior findings support this inference:

- Although contingent faculty, by definition, are provisional, their work-lives are inextricably linked with educational outcomes in public institutions dependent on their expertise, low costs, and flexibility.
- Based on the number of contingent faculty appointments at American postsecondary institutions, their work-lives are representative of the majority of the professoriate (U.S. GAO, 2017; U.S. House Committee, 2014).

In other words, contingent faculty work-lives are indivisible from the health and productivity of public institutions. Accordingly, in my data, work-lives were fraught with faculty and administrators interactions that often excluded them from the academy. Based on this insight, I

framed the remainder of discussion according to relevant theoretical constructs of complex systems: agent-level interactions and history and change.

Agent-level Interactions

To understand what drives systemic change, complexity theory shifts attention away from individual behaviors and toward the interactions between agents (Cilliers, 2000). This invites analysis of contingent faculty interactions with colleagues. Recall, for example, faculty descriptions of intra-departmental relations. In one participant's words: "In here, it's very 'You're a lecturer. Your opinion doesn't count at all. And we tell you…Imagine what's going through my mind. It's pure madness!" Another, who tried to give feedback for changes to lower division courses, "was not even allowed to finish the sentence." A third described interactions with administrators as "getting called into the principal's office." Or, consider the frustration one faculty voiced about efforts to get involved in faculty work beyond the classroom. As she said, "They don't even see the other faculty. They don't consider [us] as a colleague or at the same level." Similarly, remember the respondent who received almost no oversight or professional feedback in almost two decades as an instructor, admitting "you find out pretty quick that almost nobody's watching." And, recollect the faculty whose observation was cancelled four times by senior faculty before shrugging off the opportunity, "Whatever. Don't worry about it." Indeed, findings across the dataset depicted asymmetries in which more powerful decision makers dictated the quality and quantity of interactions and, by proxy, their inclusion.

From a complexity theory perspective, the primary question, then, is how these interactions shaped contingent faculty work-lives. Hired to teach, they were unencumbered by pressures and responsibilities. However, the cost of autonomy was lack of recognition, inclusion, and respect. In the above exemplars, contingent faculty were subordinate to more powerful

colleagues by virtue of appointment status. They either were invisible to senior colleagues and administrators or were subject to micro-management. What they did contribute—in the classroom, often as fill-in faculty—was met by indifference or roundly ignored. Interactions merely reinforced their exclusion from departmental workings; the absence of interactions (or supportive policies and norms) signaled their lack of priority and were, by some accounts, tinged with undercurrents of passive aggression and subtle hostilities. Underlying all of this was the tenuousness of yearly or semester-long appointments, which left little recourse in the face of top-down controls. Essentially, interactions revealed the twin indignities of being beholden to more powerful colleagues, yet lacking the power to do much about it. Despite being educated, accomplished professionals and scholars, respondents were not afforded the range of benefits and responsibilities consistent with their faculty status. As such, interactions were consistent with prior descriptions of contingent faculty as "managed" academics (Winter, 2009) often barred from department processes and vulnerable to the vagaries of top-down control. Contingent faculty were not considered in the institutional or departmental calculus beyond the classroom (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Landrum, 2009; Leslie & Gappa, 2002). Such experiences also track with studies describing how prior departmental models—in which contingent faculty were treated as respected, contributing professionals—have given way to management styles that discriminate and exclude (Kezar, 2013c).

Interestingly, data also contained numerous instances of participants disparaging their contingent status. They struggled to develop a sense of community, eroding sense of belonging, which infers implications for productivity. This is consistent with prior studies that reported faculty self-efficacy and feelings of professionalism were absent in organizational contexts outside the classroom (Levin & Hernandez, 2014). This was especially true when interacting

with tenured faculty and administration (Levin & Shaker, 2011). Findings also compliment prior research that identified external work-life influences on productivity (Kezar, 2013b) and sense of self (Kezar, 2013c). However, this particular data infer contingent faculty have internalized their lower status, and so participate in defining their own subordinate position in the academic hierarchy. The temptation to blame institutional policies, academic norms, and departmental power brokers, while inviting, even obvious, may be reductive. The theory indicates exclusion is the result of interactions with more powerful colleagues, but also the lack of interactions with supportive organizations and administrators. If, as the theory suggests, agents also impact the system in which they participate (Mason, 2008), then contingent faculty exclusion must be mediated, in part, by how they see themselves in the academy.

History and Change

From a complexity theory perspective, the secondary question, then, is how these interactions potentially intersect with the traditional professoriate theorized by scholars and, by implication, higher education institutions. Whereas agent-level interactions affect individuals, systemic elements, and the entire system (Espejo, 2003; Mason, 2008), history serves as a counterbalance to uncertainty (Mitleton-Kelly, 2003; Duncheon & Relles, 2018). As a result, policies and norms that align with the history of a system are more readily accommodated; those that do not align cause more friction (Liebowitz & Margolis, 1995).

From a systems perspective, contingent faculty remained in the liminal spaces of the institution—charged with servicing the teaching mission, yet unaccommodated by policies, norms, or relationships that support professionalism and assimilation. As Schrecker (2010) previously noted, they have a “double-consciousness” of being seen by students as professors, yet largely excluded from other parts of the academy and viewed by colleagues with

ambivalence (p. 211). This implies a hybrid identity: They are elevated in the classroom, yet diminished in the hierarchy when interacting with senior colleagues (Levin & Shaker, 2011). Given the increasing numbers of non-tenure-track faculty (Kezar, 2013b) and decreasing numbers of tenured and tenure-track faculty (Donoghue, 2008; Geiger, 2004; Lerner, 2008; Taylor, 2017), current policies and norms are misaligned with the realities of faculty appointments or the needs of institutions who heavily rely on their labor. Non-tenure-track policies, for example, are still grounded in casual, now-antiquated notions of visiting or retired intellectuals, artists-in-residence, technical workers, and professionals adding prestige or unique expertise (Schibik & Harrington, 2004). Those policies were designed to accommodate a small subset of a mostly tenured professoriate. As a result, they are misaligned with current faculty hiring practices and length of service.

From a complexity perspective, the reason for this is self-evident: The historical memory of higher education faculty, in fact, is not in conflict with the business-minded logic of corporatization. In either paradigm, stakeholders—faculty, administrators, even contingent faculty—view non-tenure-track as casual labor. There is no impetus to change, even though neither captures the nuances of contingent work-lives or accounts for their full palette of potential contributions. This was brought to the fore in this study *because* participants have been in their positions for a minimum of three years. Nearly half have remained for more than a decade. They are contingent in name only. By implication, policies and norms have not evolved to accommodate them and so remain in conflict with faculty work-lives. That contingent faculty continue to be viewed as provisional rather than folded into long-term strategies infers an ongoing lack of strategic vision for faculty labor and instruction beyond the current semester or

school year, even as they return year after year (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Cross & Goldenberg, 2009).

Fiscal Policy and Faculty Exclusion

Complexity theory suggests agent-level interactions (or the lack thereof) actively and passive-aggressively excluded contingent faculty. Faculty policies and academic norms tacitly reified their outsider status. Thus, interactions, policies, and norms that allowed autonomy had the unintended consequence of excluding and alienating. The theory also indicates faculty policies and norms are grounded in prior conceptions of the instructor-scholar. Contingent faculty work-lives (and current faculty hiring practices) are in conflict with the historical memory of non-tenure-track faculty as casual labor. This is consistent with the business-minded logic of corporatization that views them as a source of cheap labor (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2008). Both exclude contingent faculty, limiting contributions—even those in support of current policy goals—and impeding professional development.

Implications

This study highlighted the challenges of faculty policymaking within a system that prioritizes cheap, flexible labor yet is dependent on highly educated, trained scholars and professionals. As evidenced by faculty studies (e.g. U.S. GAO, 2017; U.S. House Committee, 2014), the traditional professoriate theorized by scholars is belied by the realities of faculty rosters. Cheap labor policies, as a response to funding cuts, have provided public institutions with immediate cost savings and flexibility, but at a cost to student success (Bettinger & Long, 2004; Jacoby, 2006; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Jaeger & Eagan, 2011; Jaeger & Hinz, 2008), academic environments (Baltodano, 2012; Rhoads & Rhoades, 2005; Schrecker, 2010; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006), and faculty work-lives (Adams, 2014; Brown, 2016; Hao, 2015, 2016;

Winter, 2009). In accordance with this study's theoretical perspective, I argue agent-level and systemic implications for cheap labor policies and practices, then propose future research studies.

Productivity Implications

Contingent work-lives were marked by a lack of collegiality and growth opportunities, potentially undermining productivity (Webber, 2011). Interactions with colleagues mostly reinforced their exclusion. Rather than depicting contingents as underserved (U.S. GAO, 2017; U.S. House Committee, 2014), findings showed them as left to their own devices, having few, if any, interactions that might support professional development or promote sense of belonging. Given the links between professional development and opportunities to discuss and reflect (Kezar, 2013b), the lack of constructive interactions has repercussions for professional growth. Fallback strategies—student evaluations and faculty retention—also revealed flawed self-reflection practices that may lead to false appraisals of classroom success. The former, student evaluations, does not correlate with student learning (Uttl, White, & Gonzalez, 2017); the latter, faculty reappointments, is far more indicative of departmental needs and budgetary demand (Liu & Zhang, 2013). Furthermore, data depicting administrative interference with faculty-student dynamics were notably consistent with corporatization literature framing students as satisfied customers being catered to by the academy (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Given contingent faculty, particularly part-timers, were reportedly more hesitant to address academic integrity issues, report violations, or sanction students for even basic transgressions (Hudd et al., 2009), there may be additional explanations beyond campus ties and time constraints posited in prior literature. It is also worth considering that poor student outcomes may stem not from unprepared, unqualified instructors but rather from other contexts that hamstring professional work-lives.

Improving outcomes invites rethinking contingent labor policies, as the long-term costs may outweigh any immediate cost-savings.

Systemic Implications

Consistent, widespread, long-term reliance on contingent faculty labor infers a now-institutionalized approach to hiring practices across higher education. While universities have effectively decreased instructional costs (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004), cheap labor strategies have affected stakeholders in all areas. For example, contingent faculty increases correspond with increased pressures for ever-decreasing numbers of tenured and tenure-track faculty left to carry the academic load (Donoghue, 2008; Geiger, 2004; Lerner, 2008; Taylor, 2017). By extension, current faculty policies have not been sufficiently revised—or, rather, contingent faculty have not been suitably reimagined—to allow them to carry more of the load. This is not in anyone's best interest. Data in this study suggest the institution and departments were not leveraging a plentiful resource—contingent faculty—that can support bottom-line productivity. Two-thirds of study participants (10 of 15) efforted to engage in scholarly pursuits beyond the scope of their contracts—research, grants, committees, curricular design, more comprehensive teaching loads—but were met with resistance. That they had appropriate credentials, expertise, and interest begs an alternative explanation for why they were unqualified to do so. It appears that faculty policies have not yet been suitably amended—and academic norms have not been sufficiently challenged—to accommodate those off the tenure-track. If anything, they exacerbated the chasm between haves and have-nots. The resultant faculty bifurcation, then, is not just an issue of inclusion. Rather, it is indicative of a structural inefficiency—a poorly run business—that overlooks or underestimates alternative sources of productivity. For institutions to realize their potential, leaders should consider revising cheap labor policies—and, by

implication, academic norms—so motivated faculty can reap more of the benefits and shoulder more of the responsibilities automatically granted tenure-line colleagues.

Educational Implications. On the other hand, business-as-usual policies mask a more cynical reality—one in which cheap labor policies have led to haphazard, stop-gap solutions in response to chronic funding shortages (Kezar, 2012). If prior research is any indication, undergraduate instruction is left to take the hit (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Contingent faculty exemplify a public educational system caught between traditional educational values and economic mandates. Their work-lives lay bare the contradiction inherent in recasting public institutions as for-profit corporations: highly educated, trained scholars and professionals largely unsupported by academic norms, policies, expectations, and accommodations; instructors integral to educational missions, yet poorly integrated across campuses; the least involved, supported faculty often asked to educate the least prepared students; a cost-savings measure that, research suggests, may beget financial repercussions (Jacoby, 2006). Collectively, these incongruities suggest contingent faculty occupy a very different institution than their tenure-line colleagues. By implication, cheap labor policies have bifurcated faculties, resulting in the majority of faculty hirings (U.S. GAO, 2017; U.S. House Committee, 2014) being excluded from most institutional workings. Continued public divestment suggests institutions will continue to rely heavily on contingent faculty for instruction. This is so, despite studies indicating this arrangement—as currently conceived—is problematic. Student tuitions will continue to keep the lights on, despite the outcomes. As a compromise to rethinking cheap labor policies, institutions should consider revisiting educational missions. Claims of commitment to educational excellence are belied by ever-dwindling investments in instruction "relative to the tuition monies that come to [institutions] as a result of enrollments" (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2008, p. 41).

Complexity theory eschews the logic of immediate or unilateral fixes, arguing instead for long-term visions to systemic change. Accordingly, I am far too cynical to propose productivity studies for what are ostensibly systemic issues. As state budgets continue to shrink, universities will continue to pursue cheap labor policies that lean heavily on non-tenure-track faculty. Thus, scholars should continue to examine the implications of corporatization and faculty labor. Universities are being inexorably altered in ways that no one really understands. Yet, little is known about how shifts in faculty appointments impact other areas of the academy or the long-term implications of majority contingent faculties. Studies exploring the parallel work-lives of tenure-track and non-tenure-track, for example, might yield insights into the changing landscape of the professoriate and shed light on instructional, scholarly, political, and cultural changes. Conversely, data in this study infer universities are not leveraging a plentiful resource—contingent faculty—that can support bottom-line productivity. Researchers should be asking how to best create opportunities for all faculty to participate in the academy to the fullest of their abilities and interests.

References

Adams, C. G. (2014). *Faculty perception of autonomous motivation in higher education: An exploratory qualitative inquiry* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation) Capella University, Minneapolis, MN.

Allison-Jones, L. L., & Hirt, J. B. (2004). Comparing the teaching effectiveness of part-time & full-time clinical nurse faculty. *Nursing education perspectives, 25*(5), 238-243.

Aronowitz, S. (2000). *The knowledge factory: Dismantling the corporate university and creating true higher learning.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Aronowitz, S., & Giroux, H. (2000). The corporate university and the politics of education. *The Educational Forum, 64*(4), 332–339.

Baldwin, R. G., & Chronister, J. L. (2001). *Teaching without tenure: Policies and practices for a new era*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Baltodano, M. (2012). Neoliberalism and the demise of public education: The corporatization of schools of education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 25*(4), 487-507.

Banasik, M. D., & Dean, J. L. (2016). Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Learning Communities: Bridging the Divide to Enhance Teaching Quality. *Innovative Higher Education*, *41*(4), 333-342.

Barnett, R. (2003). *Beyond all reason: Living with ideology in the university*. Buckingham, UK: Routledge.

Benjamin, E. (2003). Editor’s notes. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *123*, 1-13.

Berg, B.L. (2001). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bettinger, E., & Long, B. T. (2004). Do college instructors matter? The effects of adjuncts and graduate assistants on students' interests and success (No. w10370). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bowden, R., & Gonzalez, L. P. (2012). The rise of contingent faculty: its impact on the professoriate and higher education. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, *4*(1), 5-22.

Bradley, E. H., Curry, L. A., & Devers, K. J. (2007). Qualitative data analysis for health services research: developing taxonomy, themes, and theory. *Health services research*, *42*(4), 1758-1772.

Brown Jr., W. O. (2001). Faculty participation in university governance and the effects on university performance. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, 44*(2), 129-143.

Brown, A. D. (2016). *Corporatized higher education: A quantitative study examining faculty motivation using self-determination theory* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Burk, N. M. (2000). *The invisible professor at-risk: How departmental disconfirmation disempower adjunct faculty*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association (86th, Seattle, WA, November 9-12, 2000)

Carlson, J. A. (2010). Avoiding traps in member checking. *The Qualitative Report, 15*(5), 1102-1113.

Carrell, S. E., & West, J. E. (2010). Does professor quality matter? Evidence from random assignment of students to professors. *Journal of Political Economy, 118*(3), 409-432.

Cavanaugh, J. K. (2006). What did you get? A faculty grade comparison. *Quality Assurance in Education, 14*(2), 179-186.

Cilliers, P. (2000). What can we learn from a theory of complexity?. *Emergence, 2*(1), 23-33.

Creswell, J. W. (2016). *30 essential skills for the qualitative researcher.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into* P*ractice, 39*(3), 124-130.

Creswell, J. W. & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among* five approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cross, J. G., & Goldenberg, E. N. (2009). *Off-track profs.* Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Cunliffe, A. L. (2004). On becoming a critically reflexive practitioner. *Journal of Management* E*ducation, 28*(4), 407-426.

Curtis, J. W., & Thornton, S. (2013). The annual report on the economic status of the profession, 2012–2013. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors. Retrieved from www.aaup.org/report/heres-news-annual-report-economic-status-profession-2012-13.

Danley-Scott, J., & Tompsett-Makin, D. (2013). Balancing optimal assessment with part-time faculty participation: A discipline's dilemma. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *37*(1), 64-67.

Deem, R. (2001). Globalisation, new managerialism, academic capitalism and entrepreneurialism in universities. *The Routledge Falmer reader in higher education, 37*(1), 287.

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.

Donoghue, F. (2008). *The last professors: The corporate university and the fate of the humanities*. New York, NY: Fordham University Press.

Duncheon, J. C. & Relles, S. R. (2018). *"We're caught in between two systems": Exploring new accountability challenges of dual credit implementation.* CERPS Working Paper 2018-2. University of Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX.

Eagan, M. K., & Jaeger, A. J. (2009). Effects of exposure to part-time faculty on community college transfer. *Research in Higher Education*, *50*(2), 168.

Eagan Jr, 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.

Ehrenberg, R. G., & Zhang, L. (2005). Do tenured and tenure-track faculty matter?. *Journal of Human Resources*, *40*(3), 647-659.

Espejo, R. (2003). Social systems and the embodiment of organisational learning. In E. Mitleton-Kelly (Ed.), *Complex systems and evolutionary perspectives on organisations*: *The application of complexity theory to organisations*, (p. 53-70). Oxford, UK: Pergamon.

Fichtenbaum, R. (September-October, 2014). From the president: Inequality, corporatization, and the casualization of academic labor. *Academe Online.* Retrieved from www.aaup.org/article/president-inequality-corporatization-and-casualization-academic-labor#.XRphant7mwA.

Fjortoft, N., Winkler, S. R., & Mai, T. (2012). Pharmacy practice department chairs' perspectives on part-time faculty members. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 76*(4), 59.

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

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.

Geiger, R. (2004). *Knowledge and money: Research universities and the paradox of the marketplace*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Giroux, H. (2002). Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a democratic public sphere. *Harvard educational review, 72*(4), 425-464.

Giroux, H. A. (2005). Academic entrepreneurs: The corporate takeover of higher education. *Tikkun, 20*(2), 18-28.

Gould, E. (2003). *The university in a corporate culture.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Green, J., Franquiz, M., & Dixon, C. (1997). The myth of the objective transcript: Transcribing as a situated act. *Tesol Quarterly, 31*(1), 172-176.

Hao, Z. (2015). Commercialization and corporatization versus professorial roles and academic freedom in the United States and Greater China. *Chinese Sociological Review, 47*(2), 103-127.

Hao, Z. (2016). In search of a professional identity: higher education in Macau and the academic role of faculty. *Higher Education, 72*(1), 101-113.

Hollenshead, C., Waltman, J., August, L., Miller, J., Smith, G., & Bell, A. (2007). *Making the*

best of both worlds: Findings from a national institution-level survey on non-tenure-track faculty. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for the Education of Women.

Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 15*(9), 1277-1288.

Hudd, S. S., Apgar, C., Bronson, E. F., & Lee, R. G. (2009). Creating a campus culture of integrity: Comparing the perspectives of full-and part-time faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education, 80*(2), 146-177.

Jacoby, D. (2006). Effects of part-time faculty employment on community college graduation rates. *Journal of Higher Education*, *77*(6), 1081-1103.

Jaeger, A. J., & Eagan Jr, M. K. (2009). Unintended consequences: Examining the effect of part-time faculty members on associate's degree completion. *Community College Review, 36*(3), 167-194.

Jaeger, A. J., & Eagan, M. K. (2011). Examining retention and contingent faculty use in a state system of public higher education. *Educational Policy*, *25*(3), 507-537.

Jaeger, A. J., & Hinz, D. (2008). The effects of part-time faculty on first semester freshmen retention: A predictive model using logistic regression. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 10*(3), 265-286.

Jones, W. A., Hutchens, N. H., Hulbert, A., Lewis, W. D., & Brown, D. M. (2017). Shared governance among the new majority: Non-tenure track faculty eligibility for election to university faculty senates. *Innovative Higher Education, 42*(5-6), 505-519.

Kershner, B., & McQuillan, P. J. (2016). Complex adaptive schools: Educational leadership and school change. *Complicity: An International Journal of Complexity and Education, 13*(1).

Kezar, A. J. (2004). Obtaining integrity? Reviewing and examining the charter between higher education and society. *The Review of Higher Education, 27*(4), 429-459.

Kezar, A. (Ed.). (2012). *Embracing non-tenure track faculty: Changing campuses for the new faculty majority*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Kezar, A. (2013a). Departmental cultures and non-tenure-track faculty: Willingness, capacity, and opportunity to perform at four-year institutions. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *84*(2), 153-188.

Kezar, A. (2013b). 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.

Kezar, A. (2013c). Non-Tenure-Track Faculty's Social Construction of a Supportive Work Environment. *Teachers College Record*, *115*(12), n12.

Kezar, A., & Gehrke, S. (2016). Faculty composition in four-year institutions: The role of pressures, values, and organizational processes in academic decision-making. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *87*(3), 390-419.

Kezar, A., & Lester, J. (2009). Supporting faculty grassroots leadership. *Research in Higher Education, 50*(7), 715-740.

Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (2012). The changing faculty and student success: Report on the project working meeting. Los Angeles: The Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success. Retrieved May 11, 2017 from http://www.uscrossier.org/pullias/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/Delphi-Project_Report-on-Working-Meeting_Web-Version-2.pdf

Kezar, A., Maxey, D., & Holcombe, E. (2015). *The professoriate reconsidered: A study of new faculty models*. Pullias Center for Higher Education, University of Southern California.

Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2010). Understanding the new majority of non-tenure-track faculty in higher education: Demographics, experiences, and plans of action. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 36*(4). https://doi.org/10.1002/aehe.3604

Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2011). Understanding non-tenure track faculty: New assumptions and theories for conceptualizing behavior. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *55*(11), 1419-1442

Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2013). Institutionalizing equitable policies and practices for contingent faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *84*(1), 56-87.

Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2014). Governance as a catalyst for policy change: Creating a contingent faculty friendly academy. *Educational Policy*, *28*(3), 425-462.

Labaree, D. F. (1997). Public goods, private goods: The American struggle over educational goals. *American Educational Research Journal, 34*(1), 39-81.

Landrum, R. E. (2009). Are there instructional differences between full-time and part-time faculty?. *College Teaching, 57*(1), 23-26.

Langen, J. M. (2011). Evaluation of adjunct faculty in higher education institutions. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 36(2), 185-196.

Lechuga, V. M. (2006). *The changing landscape of the academic profession: Faculty culture at for-profit colleges and universities*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Lerner, G. (2008). Corporatizing higher education. *The History Teacher, 41*(2), 219-227.

Leslie, D.W., & Gappa, J.M. (2002). Part-time faculty: Competent and committed. In C. Outcalt (Ed.), *Community college faculty: Characteristics, practices, and challenges* (p. 59-67). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levin, J. S. (2006). Faculty work: Tensions between educational and economic values. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(1), 62-88.

Levin, J. S., & Hernandez, V. M. (2014). Divided identity: Part-time faculty in public colleges and universities. *The Review of Higher Education*, *37*(4), 531-557.

Levin, J. S., & Shaker, G. G. (2011). The hybrid and dualistic identity of full-time non-tenure-track faculty. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *55*(11), 1461-1484.

Lichtenstein, B. B., & Plowman, D. A. (2009). The leadership of emergence: A complex systems leadership theory of emergence at successive organizational levels. *The Leadership Quarterly, 20*, 617–630.

Liebowitz, S. J., & Margolis, S. E. (1995). Path dependence, lock-in, and history. *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization*, 205-226.

Liu, X., & Zhang, L. (2013). Flexibility at the core: What determines employment of part-time faculty in academia. *Relations Industrielles/Industrial Relations, 68*(2), 312-339.

Lustig, J. (2005). The university revisioned: An alternative to corporate mis-education. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 27*(1), 17-52.

Magolda, P. M. (2016). *The lives of campus custodians: Insights into corporatization and civic disengagement in the academy*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Marsh, F. K. (2010). High performance team: Building a business program with part-and full-time faculty. *Journal of Education for Business, 85*(4), 187-194.

Mason, M. (2008). Complexity theory and the philosophy of education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 40*(1), 4-18.

Maxey, D., & Kezar, A. (2015). Revealing opportunities and obstacles for changing non-tenure-track faculty practices: An examination of stakeholders' awareness of institutional contradictions. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *86*(4), 564-594.

Maynard, D. C., & Joseph, T. A. (2008). Are all part-time faculty underemployed? The influence of faculty status preference on satisfaction and commitment. *Higher Education, 55*(2), 139.

McArthur, R. C. (1999). A comparison of grading patterns between full-and part-time humanities faculty: A preliminary study. *Community College Review, 27*(3), 65-76.

McNaughtan, J., García, H. A., & Nehls, K. (2017). Understanding the growth of contingent faculty. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 2017*(176), 9-26.

Meyer, J. R. (2017). Administrator perspectives of advantages and challenges of employing part-time faculty in nursing education programs: Two sides of the same coin. *Nursing education perspectives, 38*(2), 80-84.

Mitleton-Kelly, E. (2003). Ten principles of complexity and enabling infrastructures. In E. Mitleton-Kelly (Ed.), *Complex systems and evolutionary perspectives on organisations: The application of complexity theory to organisations*, (p. 23-50). Oxford, UK: Pergamon.

Mitleton-Kelly, E. (2006). A complexity approach to co-creating an innovative environment. *World Futures, 62*(3), 223-239.

Monks, J. (2007). The relative earnings of contingent faculty in higher education. *Journal of Labor Research, 28*(3), 487-501.

Moorehead, D. (2011). Department chairs' perceptions of part-time faculty status in Maryland public and private higher education institutions. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV.

Morphew, C., Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2017). Contingent faculty composition and utilization: Perspectives from independent colleges and universities. *New Directions for*

Institutional Research, 2017(176), 67-81.

Morrison, K. (2008). Educational philosophy and the challenge of complexity theory. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 40*(1), 19-34.

Muzzin, L. (2008). How fares equity in an era of academic capitalism? The role of contingent faculty. In Chan, A. S., & Fisher, D. (Eds.). *The exchange university: Corporatization of academic culture*, (p. 105-124). Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

National Center for Educational Statistics. (2018). *University of Nevada-Las Vegas Characteristics of Postsecondary Faculty*. Retrieved from nces.ed.gov/ programs/coe/indicator_csc.asp.

Olsen, D., & Crawford, L. A. (1998). A five-year study of junior faculty expectations about their work. *The Review of Higher Education, 22*(1), 39-54.

Path to Tier One. (2014). *The path to tier one.* Retrieved from www.unlv.edu/sites/ default/files/page_files/121/PathtoTierOne_17Sept2014FINAL.pdf.

Ponjuan, L., Conley, V. M., & Trower, C. (2011). Career stage differences in pre-tenure track faculty perceptions of professional and personal relationships with colleagues. *The Journal of Higher Education, 82*(3), 319-346.

Price, J. H., Braun, R. E., McKinney, M. A., & Thompson, A. (2011). Perceptions of part-time faculty by chairpersons of undergraduate health education programs. *Health promotion practice, 12*(6), 923-931.

Putney, L. (2010). Case Study. In Salkind, N. J. (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of research design* (p. 116-120). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ran, F. X., & Xu, D. (2018). Does contractual form matter? The impact of different types of non-tenure track faculty on college students' academic outcomes. Journal of Human

Resources, 0117-8505R.

Rhoades, G. (1996). Reorganizing the faculty workforce for flexibility: Part-time professional labor. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *67*(6), 626-659.

Rhoads, R. A., & Rhoades, G. (2005). Graduate employee unionization as symbol of and challenge to the corporatization of US research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education, 76*(3), 243-275.

Road to Tier 1 (2013). Our road to tier 1. *UNLV Magazine, 21*(2) Retrieved from www.unlv.edu/news/article/our-road-tier-1.

Schell, E. E., & Stock, P. L. (2001). *Moving a mountain: Transforming the role of contingent faculty in composition studies and higher education*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Schibik, T. J., & Harrington, C. F. (2004). The outsourcing of classroom instruction in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 26*(3), 393-400.

Schmidt, P. (2008). Use of Part-Time Instructors Tied to Lower Students Success. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 55(12).

Schneider, M., & Yin, L. (2011, August 22). The High Cost of Low Graduation Rates: How Much Does Dropping Out of College Really Cost? Retrieved from www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report AIR_High_Cost_of_Low_Graduation_Aug2011_0.pdf.

Schrecker, E. (2010). *The lost soul of higher education: Corporatization, the assault on academic freedom, and the end of the American university*. New York, NY: The New Press.

Schuster, J. H., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore, MD: JHU Press.

Seawright, J., & Gerring, J. (2008). Case selection techniques in case study research: A menu of qualitative and quantitative options. *Political research quarterly, 61*(2), 294-308.

Shaker, G. (2008). *Off the track: The full-time nontenure-track faculty experience in English* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

Slaughter, S. A. (1993). Retrenchment in the 1980s: The politics of prestige and gender. *Journal of Higher Education, 64*(3), 250–282.

Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (1997). Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the *entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (2001). Expanding and elaborating the concept of academic capitalism. *Organization, 8*(2), 154-161.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2008). The academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime. In Chan, A. S., & Fisher, D. (Eds.). *The exchange university: Corporatization of academic culture*, (p. 19-48). Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Sonner, B.S. (2000). A is for 'adjunct': Examining grade inflation in higher education. *Journal of Education for Business, 76*(1), 5-9.

State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO). (2018). *State Higher Education Finance (SHEF) Fiscal Year 2018.* Retrieved from www.sheeo.org/projects/shef-%E2%80%94-state-higher-education-finance.

Steck, H. (2003). Corporatization of the university: Seeking conceptual clarity. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 585*(1), 66-83.

Taylor, A. (2017). Perspectives on the university as a business: The corporate management

structure, neoliberalism and higher education. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 15*(1), 117.

Thirolf, K. Q. (2013). How faculty identity discourses of community college part-time faculty change over time. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *37*(3), 177-184.

Tier One Budget. (2014). UNLV tier 1 initiative budget narrative. Retrieved from www.unlv.edu/sites/default/files/UNLV%20Tier%201%20Initiative%20Budget%20 narrative%20REVISED%204.25.2014.pdf.

Uhl-Bien, M., & Arena, M. (2017). Complexity leadership: Enabling people and organizations for adaptability. *Organizational Dynamics, 46*, 9-20.

Umbach, P. D. (2007). How effective are they? Exploring the impact of contingent faculty on undergraduate education. *The Review of Higher Education*, *30*(2), 91-123.

U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2017). *Contingent workforce: Size, characteristics, compensation, and work experience of adjunct and other non-tenure-track faculty*. Retrieved from www.gao.gov/assets/690/687871.pdf.

U.S. House Committee on Education and the Workforce. (2014). *The just-in-time professor: A staff report summarizing eForum responses on the working conditions of contingent faculty in higher education*. Retrieved from https://edlabor.house.gov/imo/media/doc/ 1.24.14-AdjunctEforumReport.pdf.

Uttl, B., White, C. A., & Gonzalez, D. W. (2017). Meta-analysis of faculty's teaching effectiveness: Student evaluation of teaching ratings and student learning are not related. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 54*, 22-42.

Valadez, J. R., & Anthony, J. S. (2001). Job satisfaction and commitment of two-year college part-time faculty. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 25*(2), 97-108.

Webber, K. L. (2011). Factors related to faculty research productivity and implications for academic planners. *Planning for Higher Education, 39*(4), 32.

Winter, R. (2009). Academic manager or managed academic? Academic identity schisms in higher education. *Journal of higher education policy and management*, *31*(2), 121-131.

Xiaotao, F., & Di Xu, R. (2019). Does contractual form matter? The impact of different types of non-tenure-track faculty on college students' academic outcomes. *Journal of Human Resources, 54*(4), 1081-1120.

Zusman, A. (2005). Challenges facing higher education in the twenty-first century. Retrieved from www.educationanddemocracy.org/Resources/Zusman.pdf.

Losing Our Faculties: Tenure-Track Faculty in the Corporate Academy

In response to unprecedented financial challenges, public higher education institutions have appropriated policies and practices that more closely resemble for-profit corporations than social institutions traditionally charged with creating knowledge (Bok, 2003; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). For decades, public institutions have grappled with declining state funding (Archibald & Feldman, 2006), uncertain federal research monies, and changing attitudes towards labor and the marketplace (Magolda, 2016; Zusman, 1999). As a result, universities and colleges have faced considerable pressure to make up the difference, whose real costs typically increase 3-4% annually (Armstrong, 2016). Thus, the "corporate academy" is not an allusion to for-profit institutions. Rather, the term calls attention to pervasive fiscal pressures that mediate institutional decision-making, often at the expense of public missions. In the corporate academy, practices and norms associated with the public good have been subsumed by those that minimize non-financial goals and prioritize cost-effective labor in service to the bottom line (Magolda, 2016; Taylor, 2017).

While institutions offset funding reductions in many ways, research extensive universities commonly have turned to research as a source of revenue (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Business-minded labor policies incentivize tenure-line faculty to pursue research agendas linked to financial remuneration (Chan & Fisher, 2008; Mendoza, Kuntz, & Berger, 2012; Price & Cotten, 2006; Neumann & Guthrie, 2002) and public-private partnerships that bring the corporate sector inside the university (Rudy et al., 2007). The problem, however, is that faculty are expected to navigate "all-in" time and productivity demands to publish and pursue external funding (Solomon, 2011), even as teaching and service duties compete for their time and attention (Aronowitz, 2000; Mohanty, 2003). Concurrently, policies encourage faculty away

from classrooms, ceding instruction to a majority contingent workforce (NCES, 2018; U.S. GAO, 2017; U.S. House Committee, 2014). Essentially, policies to address budget shortcomings have led to makeshift efforts to solve what are effectively interdependent issues—separating the once singular, "mutually reinforcing" role of the teacher-scholar (Fairweather, 1996, p. 100)—that traditionally served the public good (Baum, Ma, & Payea, 2010).

Further complicating labor policies, numerous studies indicate production dips after achieving tenure (e.g. Bess, 1998; Estes & Polnick, 2012; Faria & McAdam, 2015; Holley, 1977; Way et al., 2017). Studies attribute post-tenure dips to a host of explanations such as institutional neglect (Beauboeuf-Lafontant, Erickson, & Thomas, 2019), increased service responsibilities (Neumann & Terosky, 2007), post-tenure ennui after achieving a milestone (Blanchard, 2012). However, the budgetary implications of decreased research output invites inquiry into what other elements might contribute to "post-tenure malaise." Prior research suggests it has roots, in part, in pre-tenure work-lives. However, empirical research supporting policymakers and institutional leaders to reflect on policies that prioritize research activities and bifurcate educational missions is thin. What little we know about tenure-track faculty suggests they are particularly burdened by policies and expectations and more vulnerable to the stress of work-life imbalances (Mendoza, Kuntz, & Berger, 2012; Solomon, 2011). However, missing from the research are studies that use theory to examine the unintended consequences of policies that affect the professoriate, and, by implication, institutions. Few have theorized the hidden costs of cost-effective approach to faculty labor. These knowledge gaps suggest a need for research that highlights faculty voices within an institution guided by such policies and dependent on their entrepreneurial prowess as well as academic expertise.

The research question driving this inquiry is: How do tenure-track faculty experience their work-lives within a higher education institution? The answer is derived from a case study of tenure-track faculty at a public, four-year research institution. To explore faculty perspectives in the context of the corporate university, the research took place at Desert University (a pseudonym), a formerly Tier II Carnegie classification institution midway through the implementation of a ten-year plan to redefine itself as a "very high" research institution. The goal to become a major economic engine of the state implies an institutional agenda to secure financial stability. The purpose of the study is to describe how tenure-track faculty experience their work-lives within this environment. Data for the study came from one-on-one interviews with 15 full-time and part-time non-tenure-track faculty, as well as observations and relevant document analysis. To interpret data, I drew on the theory of academic capitalism, which frames educational organizations as quasi-for-profit corporations and tenure-line faculty as entrepreneurs incentivized to conduct research and pursue funding that connects institutions to the economy (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Academic capitalism enables us to understand the corporate academy from the perspective of those classified as junior "entrepreneurs" (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004) being groomed as future leaders. In preview, the data demonstrated that tenure-track faculty experienced considerable pressures to publish and pursue external funding. The paper divides into four sections as follows: First, I outline the literature pertinent to this study. After detailing methods, I present faculty experiences in the corporate university. I subsequently use academic capitalism to interpret those experiences, framing my analysis to consider the data's implications for policy, practice, and future research.

Literature Review

The corporatization literature frames tenure-track faculty as cost-efficient revenue generators, even while they are being groomed as future leaders of higher education. Labor policies have incentivized tenure-line faculty to prioritize remunerative research activities (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997), largely to the exclusion of other professional responsibilities (Aronowitz, 2000; Fairweather, 2005). However, this shift in priorities suggests stressful environments that negatively affect faculty work-lives.

Corporatization: Research as Revenue

Corporatization is reflected in changing attitudes towards the purpose of research and expectations for faculty productivity. While research has long been considered "the most 'cosmopolitan' academic function" for scholars, and held in the highest esteem (Fairweather, 2002, p. 26), the implication was that it had social as well as economic importance. Administrations at research institutions, however, have looked increasingly to scholarship as a potential source of revenue to countermand shrinking budgets and expanding costs in other areas of academia (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). As a result, tenure-line faculty have been incentivized to pursue potentially financially rewarding agendas. This shift from public intellectuals creating and disseminating knowledge (Kezar, 2004) to productive "entrepreneurs" incentivized to pursue grant dollars and remunerative research (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004) is consistent with faculty studies. For example, tenure-track faculty faced ever-growing time and research-related demands (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2005), even as national survey data suggested they allocate less time to other facets of the professoriate (Fairweather & Beach, 2002). Similarly, studies of tenure requirements and policy incentives indicated faculty pursue external funding and publish at increasingly high rates, despite teaching and service duties ostensibly competing for their time

and energy (Aronowitz, 2000; Diamond, 1999; Fairweather, 2005; Mohanty, 2003). Prior tenure-track work-life balance studies offered a similarly singular picture of tenure-track priorities. For example, Solomon (2011) found pre-tenured faculty at research universities either organized their lives around professional responsibilities to publish and pursue grants or felt they risked jeopardizing their careers. Findings, she noted, were consistent with scholarship that showed faculty pursue external funding and publish at increasingly high rates (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997) and with theory suggesting policies communicate "an abstract model employee who has no personal life responsibilities or has someone else who tends to them" (p. 341).

Revenue-Generating Labor

The implication is that focus on research and related tasks have assumed an increasingly large piece of ever-expanding faculty work-lives. So, while faculty responsibilities remain complex and multifaceted (Johnsrud & Rosser, 2003), reward systems and time allocation appear to be based on narrow criteria that align with economic values (Gonzales, Martinez, & Ordu, 2014). However, this shift to productive "entrepreneurialism" infers several potential complications. Research-first priorities, for example, may discourage risk-taking or the pursuit of innovative inquiries that have social value but lacks commercial potential (Foster, Rzhetsky, & Evans, 2015). Business-minded policies can limit the types of research inquiries and methodologies, implicitly favoring more measurable and easily monetized research (Neumann & Guthrie, 2002), as well as disciplinary support across an institution (Mendoza, Kuntz, & Berger, 2012). Another policy tenet—private-public partnerships—yielded mixed results. Material and financial gains and more fluid pathways into the public domain may be offset by predominantly private-sector benefits and potential ethical compromises (Rudy et al., 2007), as well as conflicts of interest. Such concerns are not without merit. Aronowitz and Giroux (2000) cited studies (e.g.

Cho, 1997; Cho & Bero, 1996; Press & Washburn, 2000) in which results were compromised: corporations censored or altered unfavorable results at odds with commercial interests; industry-sponsored research was far more likely to reflect favorably on those items being examined. Collectively, the literature invites debate as to the costs and benefits of corporatized influences on research outputs. Meanwhile, the traditional professoriate theorized by scholars—shielded from external forces, publicly funded, free to pursue relevant lines of inquiry—has given way to the academic entrepreneur implored to be more productive activities that will produce additional funding (Mendoza et al., 2012). The net result infers less autonomous, innovative researchers.

Corporatization: Work Environments

Corporatization also is reflected in changing faculty work environments. Work-lives are marked by performance pressures; policies incentivize business values, such as efficiency and cost, over academic metrics (Brown, 2016; Giroux, 2002; Schrecker, 2010; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). This also infers the willingness to forgo quality for efficiency (Baltodano, 2012; Rhoads & Rhoades, 2005). Those cultural influences have reshaped academic values and ethics of public service into an ideology of "venture and risk" (Barnett, 2003, p. 65). Work environments are facilitated by, and reflected in, an administrative class that has grown in numbers and in control (Bowen & Buck, 2004; Brenner, 2006; Matthews, 1997; Schrecker, 2010). Managerial supervision and assessment are in service to productivity goals; rewards and punishment are meted out based on performance gleaned from objective, data-driven outcomes (Deem, 2001; Levin, 2006; Magolda, 2016; Steck, 2003). Collectively, this has introduced and reified corporatized values by shifting decision-making criteria from "mission and quality to competitiveness, efficiency, and cost effectiveness" (Kezar, 2004, p. 440). The implication is that

faculty work-lives are shaped by top-down decisions and performance incentives and pressures that reflect corporate values (Giroux, 2002; Schrecker, 2010; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006).

This, however, comes at a cost. Resultant pressures contribute to environments that adversely affect professional identity, commitment, motivation. Faculty reported stress and anxiety, leading to low sense of belonging, feelings of isolation, and exclusion. Overly regulated environments, for example, altered (Hao, 2015) or impeded the development of faculty professional identities (Hao, 2016; Winter, 2009). Summarizing data from a survey conducted by more than a hundred scholars from eighteen countries, Hao (2015) reported performance pressures have transitioned faculty from a "community of scholars in a knowledge community" to "a community of workers in a knowledge enterprise" (p. 113-114). Further, faculty who recounted significantly higher levels of external controls and performance pressures also reported being less satisfied with academia and more likely to leave the academy (Brown, 2016). They also expressed decreased motivation to work in regulated environments with little control over rules and policies and minimal involvement in campus management (Adams, 2014). This is consistent with prior research describing tenure-track faculty as more burdened by labor policies and expectations (Mendoza et al., 2012) and more vulnerable to work-life imbalances (Solomon, 2011) and tenure ambiguities (Price & Cotten, 2006; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Such professional demands contribute to feelings of stress and anxiety, which have implications for productivity, commitment, motivation, and morale (Brown, 2016; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002; Mendoza et al., 2012; Olsen & Crawford, 1998; Ponjuan, Conley, & Trower, 2011; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). The implication is that corporatized labor policies negatively influence faculty work-lives. This is a troubling portent, in light of research connecting high stress levels to lower

outputs (Eagan & Garvey, 2015; Imtiaz & Ahmad, 2009) and junior faculty willingness leave their positions if and when other opportunities appear (Smart, 1990).

Academic Capitalism

Corporatization is a process through which higher education institutions have been reshaped into organizations that more closely resemble for-profit corporations. To contextualize this change process, Slaughter and Rhoades' (2004) theory of academic capitalism proposes changes to higher education are a result of cultural and political shifts in educational priorities from knowledge and learning as a public good to a "knowledge/learning regime" in service to economic logic(p. 1). The theory describes how higher education institutions have actively integrated into the new, information-driven economy. Whereas knowledge was once created and funded primarily as a public good, it is now a raw material to be sought out, mined, extracted, and leveraged for fiscal ends. In turn, stakeholders—faculty, students, administrators, academic professionals—are incentivized to use resources and interstitial organizations to create "new circuits of knowledge" that connect institutions to the economy (p. 1). The study, however, focused only on theoretical elements related to faculty research.

Research Entrepreneurism

The prior tenets of academic freedom respected faculty members to follow research where it led and supported them to dispose of research as they saw fit. From the lens of academic capitalism, the "knowledge/learning regime" values privatization and profits. Knowledge is produced as a private good, valued for profit potential, eminence, and connections to the global market. Thus, tenure-line faculty are incentivized to research and pursue external funding, whether through public monies, or private enterprise, and market-related research. Research agendas are shaped by efforts to procure research grants and to generate research-related

intellectual property, patents, copyrights, trademarks, or products, processes, and services that can be licensed and sold in the marketplace.

Walker (2009) contributed temporal elements to the theory, which gave context for how academic capitalism penetrated faculty work-lives on the individual level (Gonzalez et al., 2014). Ever-looming demands leave faculty feeling pressured and "with little or no time" (p. 496). Since time is a limited resource best used to procure grants and publish, those demands leak into other facets of their lives. This is further evidenced by the need to manage time efficiently and perform quickly and cheaply. Walker (2009) described this as the "cult of efficiency" that reflects the values of capitalism and drives agendas, outcomes, and evaluative measures (p. 498). Lastly, time elements are evidenced by the moral imperative to use time wisely, suggesting faculty have internalized capitalist value of efficiency and production (p. 499). Collectively, economic and temporal components form a conceptual latticework to support an institutional analysis of tenure-track faculty work-lives.

Method

The study used case study methodology of tenure-track faculty at Desert University, a public institution mid-way through a 10-year plan to achieve "very high" research status and establish it as a major economic engine of the state. The study is bounded by two site-based parameters (Putney, 2010; Creswell & Poth, 2018)— funding policies that align with tenets of corporatization and institutional type.

Site Selection

This site is representative of current funding policies consistent with the corporatization literature. Yet, the ten-year implementation timeline suggests it is an extreme case of the central phenomenon (Creswell, 2016; Seawright, & Gerring, 2008). The institution is midway through a

decade-long plan to implement policies that will establish Desert University as a major economic engine of the state: attracting industries, fostering business startups, creating new patents, bringing in large federal grants and private industry contracts, improving the human infrastructure and health care, producing a highly qualified workforce, and attracting students from around the world (Path to Tier One, 2014; Road to Tier 1, 2013; Tier One Budget, 2014).

Public research institutions, in general, are promising locations to investigate faculty labor and corporatization. Because their missions include research mandates, they are able to employ cheap labor strategies to deal with decreased public funding. Also, faculty at public institutions are more affected by corporatized elements, such as pressures to produce (Brown, 2016). Like other public universities, Desert University continues to navigate long-term shrinking public investment in higher education (SHEEO, 2018). The initiative, then, suggests an implicit institutional agenda to secure financial solvency. This tension between budget shortfalls and ambitious, business-minded institutional growth echoed in the literature—and evidenced by the funding policies, goals, priorities, and public comments by institutional leaders—offers a unique context to examine the influence of corporatization in public higher education.

The sample, however, indicates an extreme case. The rapid timeline for implementing Top Tier mission policies to reinvigorate Desert University as a major economic engine of the state indicates a prominent corporate climate. Also, diversity policies at the institution suggest student demographics at the site reflect historically underrepresented students who may struggle with conventional instruction. This implies innovative classrooms and approaches to instruction, rather than classrooms led by a contingent faculty, while tenure-track faculty navigate "all-in" time and productivity demands to publish and pursue external funding.

Sample Selection

To ensure maximal range of experiences, the research sample includes participants from the nine undergraduate colleges and schools across the institution, representing a cross-section of academic backgrounds. Variation safeguards against disciplinary or department- and college-level vagaries, ensuring findings are from across the institution, rather than a subset of the institution. Fifteen tenure-track faculty—eight male and seven female—were chosen because, as studies suggested, they are more burdened by labor policies than tenured colleagues (Mendoza et al., 2012) and more vulnerable to work-life imbalances (Solomon, 2011)

Data Collection

Consistent with case study protocol, data were collected via multiple sources: interviews with informants, documents, and observations. Primary data were collected via one-on-one interviews with tenure-track faculty. Interviews ranged between 60 to 90 minutes and followed a semi-structured protocol that included open-ended questions that allowed for probing follow-up questions. Questions focused on the following areas: information about scholarly backgrounds and research; their roles and responsibilities as faculty; their experiences in the workplace, including performance pressures, external controls, and sense of belonging; their perspective on institution-wide funding policies; open-ended opportunities for them to add narrative experiences and information pertinent to understanding campus work-lives.

Secondary data were collected via document analysis and observations. I reviewed department and individual faculty websites, departmental postings, faculty handbooks, and tenure and policy documents for information related to faculty work-lives. I also conducted bi-weekly observations of common work spaces over the span of eight weeks. Data were collected in shared faculty work spaces and monthly meetings when access was permitted. Observations

ranged between 30 to 90 minutes. Field notes followed a protocol that included descriptive and reflective notes documenting verbal and non-verbal communications.

Data Analysis

Consistent with case study methodology, I conducted data collection and analysis concurrently using an integrated approach (Bradley, Curry, & Devers, 2007). To analyze data from interviews, documentation, and observations, I used content analysis techniques, a method for interpreting content through the systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns (Berg, 2001; Creswell & Poth, 2018; Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Data were coded deductively line-by-line using a priori codes derived from prior empirical research and theoretical constructs. I used deductive codes to label and differentiate business-minded elements identified in the literature. For example, my codebook included a priori codes related to research remuneration such as funding and publishing, as well as work-life concerns related to feelings of stress and anxiety. Simultaneously, data were inductively coded line-by-line using open and in vivo techniques. Data were organized into themes based on code types—patterns of repetition, metaphors and analogies, and similarities and differences (Bradley et al., 2007; Mishler 1979; Morehouse & Maykut, 2002)—to reduce redundancy, capture emic perspectives, and contribute to understanding the central phenomenon.

Trustworthiness

This study employed several techniques to increase trustworthiness. Careful attention to sample selection helped to ensure data trustworthiness. By interviewing tenure-track faculty from across the institution, I ensured the data represented a full range of academic disciplines. Interviews, observations and document analysis, including triangulated data, proceeded until establishing saturation (Creswell & Miller, 2000). Data were reported using thick descriptions

and examined for disconfirming evidence (Creswell, 2016). Research findings were made available to promote member-checking for accuracy (Creswell & Miller, 2000; Carlson, 2010). Also, I employed reflexive journaling immediately after interview and transcription sessions, and when analyzing interview, observational, and document. This supported me to identify and mitigate personal bias based on my experiences as a faculty at various four-year higher education institutions (Creswell & Miller, 2000; Cunliffe, 2004; Watt, 2007). The study had limitations. Findings are context-specific and should not be viewed as comprehensive or generalizable (Lechuga, 2006). Themes reflected individual experiences of interviewees, as well as my interpretations, triangulated by observational and document analysis.

Data Presentation

Participants were under constant pressure to publish research and pursue external funding, which they described as a blend of physical and psychological stresses. In what follows, I present faculty viewpoints on the physical and psychosocial pressures of tenure-track at a research extensive institution.

Physical Pressures

Physical pressures convey how respondents described work-lives of external discord, metaphorized as physically taxing. As one participant explained, “If they hire you for a tenure-track position, you know what the weight of expectation is—to be more productive.” The need to generate research, to “operate at this hyper-productive level” while constantly having to answer for “why aren't you being more productive,” suggested the physical toll of nonstop work.

“You Just Get Up and Sprint All Day.”

To begin with, participants depicted work-lives beset by pressure to remain in constant motion. They were “a wheel that's spinning,” “constantly running the rat race,” “chasing the

money," and needing "to let the research snowball." In one participant's words: "You just get up and sprint all day. Seven days a week. And don't have very much time to look around. Sprinting around and not eating basically describes my experience of being a pre-tenured faculty." Another compared his lifestyle to a "shark who has to keep swimming." Like several other participants, he also likened a fast-approaching academic milestone to a race, in this case a ceaseless obstacle course:

> "There's no such thing as feeling calm when it comes to this. That's the funny thing: 'Oh, if I can just get through this process, then everything will be—.' No! There's still hurdle after hurdle and wall to run through."

Conversely, the "hurried" pace of research, the need to "keep moving forward," even if it's only "a tiny little shuffle forward," also was evidenced by the inability to slow down, even though it undermined more deliberative processes and compromised quality. For example, one participant said, "It doesn't give me time to sit back and think and reflect and really plan, to keep planning, significant research. Because it's always like, 'okay what's the next thing? What do I need to do to IRB?' You get some data? Let's just spit out something." As a consequence, he was left to "spit out whatever comes my way, fast, from the data, and move onto the next thing. It's too fast." Others were similarly compelled towards "get-rich quick publications" and "low-hanging fruit." As one participant admitted: "I have some really good ideas, if I could find the time. Considering how long it takes to publish stuff, there's not really an incentive."

"It's Like Pregnancy"

Participants also associated tenure-track work with transformation—both literal and figurative—that burgeoned scholarly, but not physical, fitness. As faculty advanced towards tenure, they described escalating expectations. "The solution is self-evident," one participant

said: “Work harder.” So, when “skyrocketed” demands “accelerated…more rapidly” and “scream[ed] to me ‘just publish more,’” they adapted to—or were co-opted by—the pressure to “operate at this hyper-productive level.” As one participant explained, “It’s like pregnancy; it's like researching for two. I can't get the senior faculty to do more, so you have to do the output for like one and a half.” Most respondents intimated that tenure-track faculty are more easily leaned on by department and college administrators, as opposed to their senior colleagues who must shoulder other responsibilities and are less vulnerable to pressure. Expectations, then, fell to them to be more research active. As a result, participant were pushed to transform. Several regarded the ever-increasing pace with incredulity, remarking that demands felt “physically impossible” and “an impossible task.” One deadpanned, “My job was described to me as 80% research, 40% teaching, and 10% service.” Like other respondents from research-extensive institutions, she had an “eyes-wide-open view about what it might be like to start a tenure-track position.” Going forward that first year meant, “If nobody dies, we'll be doing really, really good.”

For some respondents, the combined “pressure [of] hustling money” and constant need to “focus your energy on research” provoked frank concerns for deteriorating physical health. Participants reportedly were “exhausted,” “very nervous,” and filled with “a lot of stress.” One participant was particularly forthright in depicting how pressures have transformed his health. In his words: “Well—at the sake of sounding disgusting–it shows up as hair in the sink and blood in the toilet.” He fancied his lifestyle eventually getting the best of him, likening his pending demise to that of a warrior going out on his shield: “I'll have a heart attack. Somebody will walk into class. I'll pass out. They'll wheel me out. I've already told them that on my headstone I want them to put, ‘This changes nothing. Your assignment is still due on Tuesday.’”

Conversely, unrelenting, transformative pressure was further evidenced by faculty unable to slow down or turn it off, even in the waning weeks of the tenure process. By the end of the process, the transformation into indefatigably productive scholar was complete. For example, one participant described his drive to continue to produce, even knowing tenure was just a matter of paperwork. Having exceeded publishing expectations and recently earned a sizeable grant, he shared his “guilt” over having “made it” and momentarily easing off the gas. In his words:

> “I'll tell you, it feels weird. It's the longest I've ever gone since I've been here, since I've been a faculty member, without working on one or multiple grants. So there's a part of me that internally feels guilty…the internal pressure is still there. So, that doesn't really get better.”

“Caught Up in the Machine”

Participants likened ever-growing pressures to feelings of confinement. One respondent referred to this as “the vise that the institution got put in” related to current research and funding policies. Another called it “get[ting] caught up in the machine.” A third framed tenure-track work-lives as bound by responsibilities to bring resources to bear. In her words: “They're milking people in my position, who are carrying the burden of bringing in money, bringing in resources, bringing in people and equipment.” The constant, thrumming “low-level of anxiety all the time, right, about doing *something*,” left a fourth participant feeling beset by time management concerns. He relayed a story, perhaps apocryphal, of a department at another institution where the office walls were on movable tracks that were adjusted based on grant money earnings: “The more money you brought in, the larger your office would expand, relative to someone else. Talk about anxiety. The walls are literally closing in on you, if you're not generating funding.”

Confinement was amplified by depictions of isolation and physical separation. Multiple participants described empty office halls with closed doors and few interactions with colleagues outside of meetings. As one said, “Many times, I come into work and I'm the only one here. Sometimes, it's like, what am I doing here? That’s a little frustrating.” Another reasoned there was no culture of collaboration in the department “because everybody’s in their own cave, and they’re just trying to print out all the publications that [align with] the bylaws.” Other participants, however, offered different context for this. Isolation was an inevitability of work-lives subsumed by research demands. As one faculty put it: “Just the fact everyone is swamped in things that need to be done.” And those demands, another participant explained, may not intersect. In his words: “There isn't a huge amount of interaction from one faculty to another. And it’s not because of people being standoffish. They're not working on the things that I'm working on.” A third participant related her physical isolation to underlying anxieties over earning tenure. As she explained, “I don't think there's a sense of dis-belonging at the department, at the university. I think that there's fear, and there's stress.” Along those same lines, isolation was depicted as a self-preservation strategy to protect time and separate oneself from non-research activities viewed as less important. As one participant explained, “I've been a little bit more protective of my time. I used to have my door open all the time. Now it's getting slowly closer to close.” Another was more succinct: “You just get caught up with your own need to survive.” Physical isolation even extended beyond the institution, as well, bleeding into family lives. One participant described her holiday season holed up in a different room in the house to finish writing a grant, while her family celebrated without her: “I was there for Thanksgiving dinner, but I was absent.”

Psychosocial Pressures

Psychosocial pressures convey how respondents depicted work-lives of internal discord marked by mental and emotional challenges. As one faculty noted, “For all of the benefits that come along with [tenure-track], I do think that there is a serious mental health crisis among faculty.” The need to produce, to “increase your numbers” while constantly “being told that you need to be doing more research,” suggested the psychological and social toll that work-lives took on them.

“We’re All Unwell”

To begin with, participants described work-lives beset by psychosocial malaise in environments of competition and stress. In one participant’s words: “Everyone I know is sick. I'm sick. I'm not ‘cold’ sick. We're all unwell. We're all depressed. Anxious. Everybody just seems to be miserable.” When I asked for a supporting example, she directed me to an online social media platform geared toward academics, which she called a marriage between “the culture of perfectionism in the university combined with the culture of curated online selves pretending to be perfect.” In her words:

> A “culture of reinforcing ‘you have to be busy; you have to be submitting all this stuff.’ In the language, somebody just saying to you, ‘Oh, how many pubs did *you* get this semester?’ As though it's just an assumption that you got pubs. And that it's going to be a lot of them. Just a norm that is completely off.”

Participants were “mentally drained” by workloads, “saddened” by peers who might not survive tenure demands, and “guilty” or “morally weird” for prioritizing research over other responsibilities. Yet, the underlying message was consistent. Produce. Interactions between faculty or with administrators, one participant explained, were driven by the same question:

“Not, how are your students? How's your teaching? It’s where are you in your research? How's your research? What are you working on?”

Similar exchanges appeared across the data, yet participants were divided as to what undergirded workplace competition and stress. Several claimed their intrinsic drive to produce outpaced external expectations. As one participant teased, “We're all A type personalities. We’re here because we are inherently motivated for our whole lives in how to succeed.” Another explained, “There's a certain standard in my head of what is a good researcher at any institution.” Others, however, described environments of competition instigated by peers and reinforced by department leaders. One participant, for example, explained top-down pressure to get grants “is becoming beyond competitive, where it’s not even collaborative.” This, he said, has created an atmosphere of competition, “It's kind of like, ‘I see you as a threat, so I'm going to cut you down.’” Similarly, another said, “I look at my peers. I'm still in that very competitive mindset.” A third described a “numbers-driven” department chair, who “uses the word ‘productivity’ regularly, saying ‘if we're investing so much in our faculty, we need to have the productivity to match,’” and who foments competition between colleagues by pitting them against each other. In his words: “And, so, every other second, he’d be like, ‘[unnamed colleague] published six things this year.’ Cool. Well, I'm in my first year here, and you've given me four new preps.”

“Am I Not That Good?”

Participants also depicted how competition and stress filled them with doubt and fear that affected self-confidence. Several respondents seemed to condone, even embrace, the pressure. One even suggested increased external pressure “would be beneficial for a lot of faculty.” Others, however, were more candid about internal crises of confidence. They shared work-lives marked by feelings of uncertainty and dread. For example, several depicted “scary” early

adjustment periods, as one participant explained, "when you don't even know what questions to ask [or] who do I even talk to." In one participant's words: "[T]here's just this dark period where you're like, 'What the hell am I doing here?' There's the fear that you are expected to do something, but you haven't been told what they are." Another admitted, "A lot of times I just don't know what the hell I'm doing."

Feelings of dread grew, as participants advanced towards tenure and the stakes grew higher. This was compounded by ambiguous expectations that put them on uncertain footing. They were "frustrated with," "unnerved by," even "freaked out about" vague, shifting expectations. In the absence of knowing, they relied on the same strategy. Produce. All the time, as quickly as possible. As a result, participants expressed doubt and fear, particularly in moments when they were not actively productive. One participant, for example, grappled with in-between moments after finishing a project and submitting a paper for review but "not knowing where you want to go next." The "constant pressure" to remain productive was contrasted by—even preferable to—analysis paralysis and compounded by the long wait for reviewer feedback. In his words: "You're caught in that stasis of, 'Should I wait for this; do I have time to start another project?'" For another, the "[a]mbiguity and fear" of not meeting expectations was unmollified even by a prior history of success. She described her uncertainty about an approaching academic milestone, despite a record of publishing nearly two dozen articles, "I think I'm good, but now you've got me so convinced. It's the gaslighting. Am I not that good?"

Conversely, self-doubt was allayed when tenure-track faculty received some form of tangible recognition that put them on firmer ground. For example, one described the connection between recent, outsized production and her emotional well-being: "It ebbs and flows, depending upon how many publications are getting accepted. I got four publications accepted in this past

year, so I'm feeling good.” Another participant had the confidence to voice contrarian views in department works *because* of his robust academic track record:

> “If I was having problems—I was not being able to get publications out, things were not working, I was not getting funding—I think I would definitely feel more dour. And my concentration would be on what's right in front my plate, as opposed to thinking about what's shaping the department.”

A third found renewed confidence to reframe aggressive top-down pressure after several recent hits, including first-author acceptance on an article in a top journal: “I feel like they recruited me to be insane or something. And I was like, ‘Whoa. This isn’t what I signed up for, so I’m going to calm down a little bit.’”

“Playing the Game”

One notable amplification of psychosocial outcomes was the consistent usage of “playing the game” as a rationale for work-life behaviors. The pressure to publish and seek funding, for example, were alternately “the publication game,” “a numbers game,” a “young man’s game,” and “the same game.” Participants needed to “come up with a game plan” to land funding. They worked harder to implement research agendas as “part of the game.” At a research extensive institution, after all, it is “a whole different ballgame.”

However, participants framed “the game” differently, alternately embracing, capitulating to, or, in one case, resisting it. For example, participants who embraced the game were poised to maximize their wins. They were conversant in how policies and practices were “corporatizing the structure of education.” Research agendas were broken down by “dollars-per-square-foot**.**” Cuts to public monies were attenuated by the “grant model of funding.” As one participant explained, “When I think about research, I cannot separate it from the money aspect.” A second

framed research pressures as the “need to be able to produce something that is notable and quantifiable. It doesn't have to be dollars, for instance, but that's typically the way it’s thought about—especially for research space. People that are bringing in money get to do it…it's the game that we all play.”

For other participants, the game meant capitulating to pressures in service to tenure. For example, a participant who was “instructed to do fundable research” put potentially more impactful passion projects on hold until after tenure. In her words: “I have not changed but molded my research agenda to fit what is quote unquote fundable. I think it's playing the game. I don't know if I would have changed and molded in those ways if it wasn't the game.” Another participant talked about the need to stay in his lane, pursuing a narrow research agenda that he knew would keep him in good standing with tenure reviewers: “I cannot just go outside of my comfort zone in terms of research. I cannot just do anything.” In contrast, a third participant countermanded pressures to “play that game the first couple years” by also taking “the time to do the work that I would find the most fulfilling…even if I collect five hours of data a month.” She oscillated between “get-rich-quick publications” and cultivating other research interests to “do something that feels like I’m making the research connection.” In her words: “It’s ‘how can I play the game’ with the pressures, but I also know it’s not good for anyone if I don’t want to be here in three years.” It was a game, even for the lone participant voicing her aversion to playing it. She viewed advice from a colleague to leverage other work-life obligations in support of publishing as “artificial; square peg round hole.” As she explained, “I would have to put aside my actual ambitions for myself in my work and change them to be what the school needs from me for tenure. Not necessarily anything that's good or helps anybody.”

Discussion

The data indicated tenure-track faculty encountered significant pressure to produce publishable, fundable research while striving for tenure at a research extensive institution. They described their work-lives as a mix of physical and psychosocial pressures that gave dimension to their experiences. In what follows, I review key takeaways from the data—grounding them in relevant literature. Then, I use the theory of academic capitalism to further unpack the findings. I conclude with implications for faculty labor policies and practices, and future research.

Physical Pressures

Tenure-track faculty either organized their lives around professional responsibilities to publish and pursue grants or felt they risked their futures (Solomon, 2011). They described their work-lives in perpetual motion. This was, by inference, necessary to meet research expectations. Recall, depictions of non-stop sprinting, a shark needing to move in order to survive, and the endless series of hurdles, races to run, or money to chase. This pressure to stay in motion is consistent with studies reporting tenure-track faculty face ever-increasing research-related activities (Gappa et al., 2005). But also recall the pressure to "spit out" findings and move onto the next project, putting more innovative ideas on the post-tenure backburner. This tracks with studies suggesting tenure incentives promote "get-rich-quick publications," as one participant said, even if it means sacrificing quality for efficiency (Baltodano, 2012; Rhoads & Rhoades, 2005). Tenure-track faculty also described work-lives that transformed them, both figuratively and literally. Recall, depictions of pregnancy and being worked to near-death, but also reports of exhaustion, stress, and deteriorating health. That the pace intensified as faculty advanced towards tenure deadlines suggests a process that demands continual sacrifice and ever-deepening compliance, even as it grooms them to be "independent" scholars. If they wanted to keep their jobs, they adapted to—or were co-opted by—research pressures. As the literature suggests,

tenure-track faculty either devoted themselves to research activities or jeopardized their careers (Solomon, 2011). Work-life pressures also were analogized using images of confinement. As walls closed in, for example, participants found themselves in the vice grip of escalating expectations. They were yoked to their responsibilities, while being "milked" by the institution in its quest for resources. But also recall the isolation, especially those who strategically isolated to ward off non-research interactions and activities, even during family time. These are the demands of tenure-track. Faculty are merely responding to a reward system that is based on increasingly narrow criteria (Gonzales, 2012; Gonzales et al., 2014), even as expectations communicate an abstract ideal of an academician who has no personal responsibilities outside of the academy.

Psychosocial Pressures

Tenure-track faculty also experienced work as an onslaught of psychosocial pressures. The cumulative malaise, doubt, and rationalization suggests unpleasant, if not untenable, work lives. Mental stress left them emotionally fraught, lacking confidence, even filled with fear, and guilty about neglecting other elements of academe. Recall, they depicted themselves as "mentally drained" and made "miserable" by work pressures. They were "freaked out" by expectations and filled with doubt and fear in environments of competition and stress. Playing the game, then, was a way participants framed productivity demands and justified how pressure informed research agenda or time priorities. Findings build on prior research that suggested tenure-track faculty were vulnerable to the stress and anxiety of work-life imbalances (Mendoza et al, 2012; Solomon, 2011). Although the data indicate work-life satisfaction in terms of professional achievements and research proliferation, the data raise questions about the extent to which the tenure process, and tenure itself, is sustainable, much less humane. This description

runs counter to that of the traditional professoriate theorized by scholars—independent, shielded from economic and political pressures, free to follow research where it led and dispose of research as they saw fit (Mendoza et al., 2012). The data, thus, are inconsistent with the literature that discusses faculty work-lives as professionally fulfilling, highly autonomous, and intellectually original (O'Meara, Terosky, & Neumann, 2008). To make sense of this disconnect between the data and prior studies, I turn to academic capitalization as an interpretive framework to make sense of tenure-track faculty experiences from an organization perspective.

Academic Capitalism

As a reminder, academic capitalism reframes public universities as institutions that resemble for-profit corporations in the business of knowledge production. Knowledge is valued less as a social good than for profit potential, prestige, and connections to the global market (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). The theory reframes tenure-line faculty as entrepreneurs incentivized by labor policies to pursue research and external funding, whether through public monies or relationships with private enterprise (Gonzales et al., 2014). Concurrently, time is both a limited resource to be efficiently used to service research (and funding) missions and a lens through which to interpret work-lives (Walker, 2009). From an academic capitalism perspective, for example, tenure-line faculty are assets expected to generate scholarship and procure resources quickly, cheaply, and continually. As such, when analyzed in the context of market values, the work-lives of tenure-track faculty suggest an unsparing, zero-sum, free market ethos as a workplace environment in which only the fittest survive.

Research entrepreneurialism

When faculty are cast as entrepreneurs, the notion of tenure-track faculty as a start-up enterprise is appropriate. Research suggests the early careers of business entrepreneurs are time

and labor intensive, chaotic, and vulnerable to market variables (Shane, 2008). Work-life balance is eschewed in light of necessary sacrifices required of a successful venture with huge potential upsides but huge risks (Ezzedeen & Zikic, 2017). This matches participant experiences in the study. From an academic capitalism perspective, it appear that research-first mandates guided tenure-track faculty agendas, mostly to the exclusion of other labor outputs. Rather than being protected and free to pursue inquiries in service to the public good, they were entrepreneurs responding to pressures that compelled their pursuit of external funding, market connections, and prestige (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Walker, 2009). As the theory infers, research production was paramount. As one participant summarized: "First in that priority should be grants. Second is publications. Everything else is somewhere below." Respondents were acquainted with "the grant model of funding." It meant shaping (or reshaping) research according to funding opportunities. They framed tenure policies as imperatives to produce "notable and quantifiable" research typically measured and valued according to dollar amounts. For others, funding imperatives were less clear—looked upon favorably, though not always explicitly part of tenure requirements. Yet, publishing quickly and continually—"sprinting around" and "researching for two"—drove work-lives, even at the expense of other responsibilities and well-being.

However, participant experiences also suggest research outputs were inconsistent with entrepreneurial values. Business entrepreneurialism commonly infers risk taking, creativity, and innovation (Palich & Bagby, 1995). Yet, from an academic capitalism perspective, it appears tenure-track faculty were risk averse. They responded to tenure policies by prioritizing research done "quickly and cheaply" (Walker, 2009). They "spit out" findings from the data and quickly moved onto the next project. They molded research agendas based on fundability. They reported not having the time or incentive to take risks or pursue novel ideas, instead shelving potential

innovations until after tenure in favor of “low-hanging fruit.” Understandably, participants were responding to tenure incentives that reward outputs separate from risk. In that way, research productivity demands they conform to tenure requirements (and peer reviewer expectations). Entrepreneurialism, however, demands risk. Through the lens of academic capitalism, this contradiction translates into work-lives filled with chaos and sacrifice, but without the creative payoff associated with risk or the catharsis of innovation.

Faculty as Fiscal Resources

Academic capitalism recasts the professoriate—once-autonomous, protected scholars in pursuit of socially beneficial knowledge—as “managed” labor (Winter, 2009) in service to the bottom-line. In turn, labor policies frame tenure-line faculty as fiscal resources rather than knowledge producers. Such policies motivate faculty to bridge the funding gap via research-first mandates in exchange for eventual protected status in the academy. This view is consistent with data in this study describing tenure-track work-lives. Early careers were characterized by intense pressures, to the exclusion of other professional considerations. Agendas were defined by the need to constantly produce viable research to the exclusion of other considerations. Case by individual case, short-term gains—funding, prestige—outweighed potential long-term costs, even as those immediate gains exacted a significant toll on faculty wellness, collegiality, and personal lives. Furthermore, academic capitalism prioritizes remunerative outputs, not innovative ones. Correspondingly, academic culture conflicts with entrepreneurial fundamentals such as risk. If anything, data suggested faculty were rewarded by *conforming* to tenure guidelines and peer reviewers—the antithesis of risk. Taken together, faculty are being groomed for the unforgiving, winner-take-all marketplace of ideas, yet there is no payoff for innovating or upside that warrants risk. The only reward is getting to keep their jobs at terrific cost to physical and

psychosocial well-being. Even if institutions wanted to develop faculty into innovative risk takers, the tenure processes disincentivized them from doing anything outside of the box. Essentially, the system demands constant production, yet tacitly discourages risk, innovative, or inquiries that have social value but lack commercial potential.

Implications

Although not generalizable, this study suggests the human costs of a public system that views its labor force as a revenue source. As a proxy, faculty work-lives suggest higher education institutions have digressed from the public mandate. The traditional academic-researcher serving the public is in conflict with the realities of faculty committed to "all-in" time and productivity demands, even as other roles and relationships compete for their time and energy. Inclusion in the system, then, comes at the expense of everything else in their lives. It inferred a host of physical and psychosocial ills. This is ingestion, not inclusion. That tenure-track faculty may have embraced or capitulated to the tenets of academic capitalism indicates those values have become increasingly synonymous with academic ones. The willingness to be devoured by the system—to adapt to or be co-opted by pressure—suggests the tenure process mostly serves to replicate capital values but without the payoff associated with business entrepreneurialism. Their compliance does not indicate policies are an effective way for institutions to organize labor. It merely suggests junior faculty participate in their own commoditization. In accordance with this study's theoretical perspective, my study asserts two organizational implications for cheap labor policies and practices.

First, cheap labor policies train junior faculty away from prior iterations of the professoriate as teacher-scholars. Instead, they invest their early careers in producing value for the academy, either directly through funded research or indirectly via publications. This is the

going rate for a permanent seat in the academy, to the exclusion of other professional functions, relationships, outside interests, and personal well-being. In order to "keep the job I have," as one participant explained, faculty must produce scholarship that contributes to solving what are, in fact, organizational resource dependence problems. Except that is not what is supposed to happen. Rather than service the public research mission, junior faculty are indoctrinated into a system that views them as fiscal resources. Incentives to pursue diverse, innovative agendas must yield ground to financially viable ones, especially while striving for tenure. The tenure process, then, is not for developing independent-minded scholars willing to take risks and pursue diversified knowledge agendas to the public's betterment. Rather, it guides junior faculty towards actions that serve the narrow interests of the corporate academy. Inclusion via earned tenure suggests little more than the reproduction of capital values, further eroding higher education's public mandate to produce knowledge for the public good. As universities continues to induct faculty in this manner, the academy further abdicates its primary role in society, while prior iterations of public service cede to private interests and individual rewards.

Second, outcomes in this study invite critique of the long-term utility of cheap labor policies, which function to maximally extract output while institutions still have leverage. In theory, the tenure process grooms faculty to assume the mantle of leadership in the academy. The idea that they might need protection or guidance is decidedly against the cutthroat, free-market perspective of academic capitalism. Rather, only the strong should survive. In reality, faculty were being "milked" for their value with little regard for professional growth that supports long-term viability (O'Meara et al., 2008). Data in this study demonstrated how faculty work-lives were backdropped by physical and psychosocial distress. Participants consistently reported exhaustion, anxiety, depression, nervousness, and other related ailments. Rather than

being mentored to succeed, they were being devoured by a system willing to eat its young in service to its bottom line. If so, we are ceding the future of the academy to faculty that are getting driven into the ground by the tenure process. This has implications for productivity, commitment, motivation, and morale (Adams, 2014; Brown, 2016; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002; Olsen & Crawford, 1998; Ponjuan et al., 2011; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). If faculty are a proxy for institutional health (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007), then the theory of academic capitalism calls into question the long-term vision for public institutions that leverage their most valuable resources for immediate fiscal gain.

Academic capitalism offers a compelling context to analyze faculty labor policies as they are currently imagined. The theory infers the tenure process transforms junior faculty into entrepreneurs. However, more research is necessary to better understand the true costs of cheap labor policies that train scholars to prioritize remunerative research agendas. By incentivizing productivity and efficiency, for example, policies limit research agendas, methods, and motivations (Neumann & Guthrie, 2002). In turn, they seemly dissuade scholars from answering pertinent, socially impactful research questions that lack commercial applications (Foster et al., 2015). Tenure-track faculty, in particular, are vulnerable. As one participant commented, "there's not really an incentive to do groundbreaking research until you get tenure. And once you get tenure, what's the incentive anyway?" As such, researchers should examine how policy incentives can affect research innovation both in the short- and long-term. Academic capitalism also infers all-in productivity demands that exact a toll on junior faculty. However, more research is needed to understand the lasting effects of arduous pre-tenure work-lives. For example, researcher should examine the immediate repercussions of cheap labor policies on post-tenure productivity. Dips in post-tenure research production are problematic for institutions

that look to faculty productivity, in part, to address funding shortages. It may be that those dips stem from the very same policies that infer unrealistic expectations on junior faculty in the first place. Concurrently, we lack conclusive evidence that cheap labor policies are effectively remunerative. Researchers should weigh the real costs to faculty commitment, motivation, morale, and academic culture against the potential financial benefits for public institutions. It may be that institutions are throwing good money after bad.

References

Adams, C. G. (2014). *Faculty perception of autonomous motivation in higher education: An exploratory qualitative inquiry* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation) Capella University, Minneapolis, MN.

Anfara Jr, V. A., Brown, K. M., & Mangione, T. L. (2002). Qualitative analysis on stage: Making the research process more public. *Educational Researcher, 31*(7), 28-38.

Archibald, R. B., & Feldman, D. H. (2006). State higher education spending and the tax revolt. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(4), 618-644.

Armstrong, L. (2016). Barriers to innovation and change in higher education. *TIAA-CREF Institute*.

Aronowitz, S. (2000). *The knowledge factory: Dismantling the corporate university and creating true higher learning.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Aronowitz, S., & Giroux, H. (2000). The corporate university and the politics of education. *The Educational Forum, 64*(4), 332–339.

Baldridge, J. V., Curtis, D. V., Ecker, G. P., & Riley, G. L. (1977). Alternative models of governance in higher education. *Governing academic organizations,* 2-25.

Baltodano, M. (2012). Neoliberalism and the demise of public education: The corporatization of schools of education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 25*(4), 487-507.

Barnett, R. (2003). *Beyond all reason: Living with ideology in the university*. Buckingham, UK: Routledge.

Baum, S., Ma, J., & Payea, K. (2010). Education pays, 2010: The benefits of higher education

for individuals and society. Trends in higher education series. College Board Advocacy & Policy Center.

Benjamin, E. (2003). Editor's notes. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *123*, 1-13.

Beauboeuf-Lafontant, T., Erickson, K. A., & Thomas, J. E. (2019). Rethinking post-tenure malaise: An interactional, pathways approach to understanding the post-tenure period. *The Journal of Higher Education, 90*(4), 644-664.

Berg, B.L. (2001). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bess, J. L. (1998). Contract systems, bureaucracies, and faculty motivation: The probable effects of a no-tenure policy. *The Journal of Higher Education, 69*(1), 1-22.

Blanchard, K. D. (2012, January 31). I've got tenure. How depressing. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved from www.chronicle.com/article/Ive-Got-Tenure-How/130490

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S.K. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods (4th ed.).* New York: Pearson Educational Press.

Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bowen, R. W. & Buck, J. L. (2004). College presidents are hard-working, talented, and vastly overpaid. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *50*(35).

Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bradley, E. H., Curry, L. A., & Devers, K. J. (2007). Qualitative data analysis for health services research: developing taxonomy, themes, and theory. *Health Services Research*, *42*(4), 1758-1772.

Brenner, D. (2006). Performative pedagogy: Resignifying teaching in the corporatized university. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 28*(1), 3-24.

Brown, A. D. (2016). *Corporatized higher education: A quantitative study examining faculty motivation using self-determination theory* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Carlson, J. A. (2010). Avoiding traps in member checking. *The Qualitative Report, 15*(5), 1102-1113.

Carlson, J. S. (2015). Factors Influencing Retention Among Part-Time Clinical Nursing Faculty. *Nursing Education Perspectives, 36*(1), 42-45.

Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. (2019, February 15). *News & announcements: 2018 classification update*. https://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/.

Chan A. S. & Fisher, D. (2008). Academic culture and the research-intensive university: The impact of commercialism and scientism. In Chan, A. S., & Fisher, D. (Eds.). *The exchange university: Corporatization of academic culture*, (p. 49-69). Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Creswell, J. W. (2016). *30 essential skills for the qualitative researcher.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into* P*ractice, 39*(3), 124-130.

Creswell, J. W. & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among* five approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cunliffe, A. L. (2004). On becoming a critically reflexive practitioner. *Journal of Management* E*ducation, 28*(4), 407-426.

Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2008). *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Deem, R. (2001). Globalisation, new managerialism, academic capitalism and entrepreneurialism in universities. *The Routledge Falmer reader in higher education, 37*(1), 287.

Diamond, R. (1999). *Aligning faculty rewards with institutional mission: Statements, policies, and guidelines*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.

Eagan Jr, M. K., & Garvey, J. C. (2015). Stressing out: Connecting race, gender, and stress with faculty productivity. *The Journal of Higher Education, 86(*6), 923-954.

Estes, B., & Polnick, B. (2012). Examining motivation theory in higher education: An expectancy theory analysis of tenured faculty productivity. *International Journal of Management, Business, and Administration, 15*(1), 1-7.

Etzkowitz, H. (1998). The norms of entrepreneurial science: cognitive effects of the new university–industry linkages. *Research Policy, 27*(8), 823-833.

Ezzedeen, S. R., & Zikic, J. (2017). Finding balance amid boundarylessness: An interpretive study of entrepreneurial work–life balance and boundary management. *Journal of Family Issues, 38*(11), 1546-1576.

Fairweather, J. S. (1996). *Faculty work and public trust: Restoring the value of teaching and public service in American academic life*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Fairweather, J.S. (2005). Beyond the rhetoric: Trends in the relative value of teaching and research in faculty salaries. *The Journal of Higher Education 76*(4), 401–422.

Fairweather, J. S., & Beach, A. L. (2002). Variations in faculty work at research universities: Implications for state and institutional policy. *Review of Higher Education, 26*(1), 97-115.

Faria, J. R., & McAdam, P. (2015). Academic productivity before and after tenure: the case of the 'specialist'. *Oxford Economic Papers, 67*(2), 291-309.

Foster, J. G., Rzhetsky, A., & Evans, J. A. (2015). Tradition and innovation in scientists' research strategies. *American Sociological Review, 80*(5), 875-908.

Fylan, F. (2005). Semi-structured interviewing. *A handbook of research methods for clinical and health psychology*, *5*(2), 65-78.

Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E., & Trice, A. G. (2005). Rethinking academic work and workplaces. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 37*(6), 32-39.

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

Giroux, H. (2002). Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a democratic public sphere. *Harvard Educational Review, 72*(4), 425-464.

Giroux, H. A. (2005). Academic entrepreneurs: The corporate takeover of higher education. *Tikkun, 20*(2), 18-28.

Giroux, H. A. (2013). Neoliberalism's war against teachers in dark times. *Cultural Studies? Critical Methodologies, 13*(6), 458-468.

Gonzales, L. D. (2012). Responding to mission creep: Faculty members as cosmopolitan agents. *Higher Education, 64*(3), 337-353.

Gonzales, L. D., Martinez, E., & Ordu, C. (2014). Exploring faculty experiences in a striving university through the lens of academic capitalism. *Studies in Higher Education, 39*(7), 1097-1115.

Hao, Z. (2015). Commercialization and corporatization versus professorial roles and academic freedom in the United States and Greater China. *Chinese Sociological Review, 47*(2),

103-127.

Hao, Z. (2016). In search of a professional identity: higher education in Macau and the academic role of faculty. *Higher Education, 72*(1), 101-113.

Heijstra, T. M., & Rafnsdottir, G. L. (2010). The Internet and academics' workload and work–family balance. *The Internet and Higher Education, 13*(3), 158-163.

Holley, J. W. (1977). Tenure and research productivity. *Research in Higher Education, 6*(2), 181-192.

Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 15*(9), 1277-1288.

Imtiaz, S., & Ahmad, S. (2009). Impact of stress on employee productivity, performance and turnover; an important managerial issue. *International Review of Business Research Papers, 5*(4), 468-477.

Johnsrud, L. K., & Rosser, V. J. (2002). Faculty members' morale and their intention to leave: A multilevel explanation. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*(4), 518-542.

Kezar, A. J. (2004). Obtaining integrity? Reviewing and examining the charter between higher education and society. *The Review of Higher Education, 27*(4), 429-459.

Lechuga, V. M. (2006). *The changing landscape of the academic profession: Faculty culture at for-profit colleges and universities*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Lerner, G. (2008). Corporatizing higher education. *The History Teacher, 41*(2), 219-227.

Levin, J. S. (2006). Faculty work: Tensions between educational and economic values. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(1), 62-88.

Lustig, J. (2005). The university revisioned: An alternative to corporate mis-education. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 27*(1), 17-52.

Magolda, P. M. (2016). *The lives of campus custodians: Insights into corporatization and civic disengagement in the academy*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

McPherson, M., & Schapiro, M. (1999). Tenure issues in higher education. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 13*(1), 85-98.

Mendoza, P., Kuntz, A. M., & Berger, J. B. (2012). Bourdieu and academic capitalism: Faculty “habitus” in materials science and engineering. *The Journal of Higher Education, 83*(4), 558-581.

Mohanty, C. (2003). *Feminism without borders: Decolonizing theory, practicing solidarity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

National Center for Educational Statistics. (2018). *University of Nevada-Las Vegas Characteristics of Postsecondary Faculty*. Retrieved from nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/ indicator_csc.asp.

Neumann, R., & Guthrie, J. (2002). The corporatization of research in Australian higher education. *Critical perspectives on accounting, 13*(5-6), 721-741.

Neumann, A., & Terosky, A. L. (2007). To give and to receive: Recently tenured professors' experiences of service in major research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education, 78*(3), 282-310.

Olson, G. A. (2009). Exactly what is ‘shared governance’. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *24*. Retrieved from www.chronicle.com/article/Exactly-What-Is-Shared/47065.

Olsen, D., & Crawford, L. A. (1998). A five-year study of junior faculty expectations about their work. *The Review of Higher Education, 22*(1), 39-54.

O'Meara, K., Terosky, A. L., & Neumann, A. (2008). Faculty careers and work lives: A professional growth perspective. *ASHE higher education report, 34*(3), 1-221.

Palich, L. E., & Bagby, D. R. (1995). Using cognitive theory to explain entrepreneurial risk-taking: Challenging conventional wisdom. *Journal of Business Venturing, 10*(6), 425-438.

Path to Tier One. (2014). *The path to tier one.* Retrieved from www.unlv.edu/sites/default/files/page_files/121/PathtoTierOne_17Sept2014FINAL.pdf.

Ponjuan, L., Conley, V. M., & Trower, C. (2011). Career stage differences in pre-tenure track faculty perceptions of professional and personal relationships with colleagues. *The Journal of Higher Education, 82*(3), 319-346.

Price, J., & Cotten, S. R. (2006). Teaching, research, and service: Expectations of assistant professors. *The American Sociologist, 37*(1), 5-21.

Putney, L. (2010). Case Study. In Salkind, N. J. (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of research design* (p. 116-120). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rabionet, S. E. (2011). How I Learned to Design and Conduct Semi-Structured Interviews: An Ongoing and Continuous Journey. *Qualitative Report, 16*(2), 563-566.

Rhoades, G. (1998). *Managed professionals: Unionized faculty and restructuring academic labor*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Rhoads, R. A., & Rhoades, G. (2005). Graduate employee unionization as symbol of and challenge to the corporatization of US research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education, 76*(3), 243-275.

Road to Tier 1 (2013). Our road to tier 1. *UNLV Magazine, 21*(2) Retrieved from www.unlv.edu/news/article/our-road-tier-1.

Rudy, A. P., Coppin, D., Konefal, J., Shaw, B. T, Ten Eyck, T. A., Harris, C., Busch, L. (2007). *Universities in the age of corporate science: The UC Berkeley-Novartis controversy*.

Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Ryan, G. W., & Bernard, H. R. (2003). Techniques to identify themes. *Field Methods, 15*(1), 85-109.

Schell, E. E., & Stock, P. L. (2001). *Moving a mountain: Transforming the role of contingent faculty in composition studies and higher education*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Schrecker, E. (2010). *The lost soul of higher education: Corporatization, the assault on academic freedom, and the end of the American university*. New York, NY: The New Press.

Schuster, J. H., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore, MD: JHU Press.

Seawright, J., & Gerring, J. (2008). Case selection techniques in case study research: A menu of qualitative and quantitative options. *Political Research Quarterly, 61*(2), 294-308.

Shaker, G. (2008). *Off the track: The full-time nontenure-track faculty experience in English* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

Shane, S. A. (2008). *The illusions of entrepreneurship: The costly myths that entrepreneurs, investors, and policy makers live by*. Yale University Press.

Slaughter, S. A. (1993). Retrenchment in the 1980s: The politics of prestige and gender. *Journal of Higher Education, 64*(3), 250–282.

Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (1997). Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the *entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (2001). Expanding and elaborating the concept of academic capitalism. *Organization, 8*(2), 154-161.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2008). The academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime. In Chan, A. S., & Fisher, D. (Eds.). *The exchange university: Corporatization of academic culture*, (p. 19-48). Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Smart, J. C. (1990). A causal model of faculty turnover intentions. *Research in Higher Education, 31*(5), 405-424.

Solomon, C. R. (2011). "Sacrificing at the altar of tenure": Assistant professors' work/life management. *The Social Science Journal, 48*(2), 335-344.

State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO). (2018). *State Higher Education Finance (SHEF) Fiscal Year 2018.* Retrieved from www.sheeo.org/projects/shef-%E2%80%94-state-higher-education-finance.

Steck, H. (2003). Corporatization of the university: Seeking conceptual clarity. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 585*(1), 66-83.

Taylor, A. (2017). Perspectives on the university as a business: The corporate management structure, neoliberalism and higher education. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 15*(1), 117.

Tier One Budget. (2014). Tier 1 initiative budget narrative. Retrieved from www.unlv.edu/sites/default/files/UNLV%20Tier%201%20Initiative%20Budget%20narrative%20REVISED%204.25.2014.pdf.

Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Turner III, D. W. (2010). Qualitative interview design: A practical guide for novice investigators.

The Qualitative Report, 15(3), 754.

U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2017). *Contingent workforce: Size, characteristics, compensation, and work experience of adjunct and other non-tenure-track faculty*. Retrieved from www.gao.gov/assets/690/687871.pdf.

U.S. House Committee on Education and the Workforce. (2014). *The just-in-time professor: A staff report summarizing eForum responses on the working conditions of contingent faculty in higher education*. Retrieved from house.gov/imo/media/doc/1.24.14-AdjunctEforumReport.pdf.

Walker, J. (2009). Time as the fourth dimension in the globalization of higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 80*(5), 483-509.

Watt, D. (2007). On becoming a qualitative researcher: the value of reflexivity. The *Qualitative Report, 12*(1), 82-101.

Way, S. F., Morgan, A. C., Clauset, A., & Larremore, D. B. (2017). The misleading narrative of the canonical faculty productivity trajectory. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 114*(44), E9216-E9223.

Winter, R. (2009). Academic manager or managed academic? Academic identity schisms in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *31*(2), 121-131.

Zusman, A. (2005). Challenges facing higher education in the twenty-first century. Retrieved from www.educationanddemocracy.org/Resources/Zusman.pdf.

Curriculum Vitae
Mark L. Spinrad

Education

University of Nevada, Las Vegas (Las Vegas, NV) PhD August 2020
Higher Education

San Francisco State University (San Francisco, CA) M.A. December 2005
Postsecondary English Education, Concentration in Composition
Certificate in Teaching Post-Secondary Reading May 2004

University of California, Santa Cruz (Santa Cruz, CA), B.A. December 1995
Modern Literature

Qualifications Summary

Experienced faculty leader, qualitative researcher, and post-secondary instructor with excellent interpersonal communication and leadership skills. Areas of expertise include non-tenure track faculty policy design, resource development, professional development. Responsible for mentoring new faculty and coordinating professional development and community building workshops. Demonstrated expertise in designing and implementing student-centered curricula for students with diverse needs, backgrounds, ages, and learning styles.

Administrative Experience (Selected)

Consultant, Office of Faculty Affairs, UNLV 2019-2020

- Policy design: Faculty credential policy
- Resource development: Faculty manual; web-based resources for part-time faculty
- Professional development: Organize and facilitate part-time instructor mentoring group

Consultant, **Office of the President**, UNLV 2019-2020
Institution-wide initiative to improve campus climate for part-time instructors under the direction of the Executive Director of Strategy and Strategic Initiatives.

Lead Graduate Assistant, College of Education, UNLV 2019—2020

- Learning and program assessment design, implementation, analysis
- Curriculum development
- Professional development: Observe and mentor graduate assistants and part-time instructors for First- and Second-Year Seminar courses.

Administrative Intern, **Office of Faculty Affairs**, UNLV Spring 2018
Conducted study on department chair perceptions of contingent faculty in support of creating web-based content and resources for the UNLV Faculty Affairs website.

Publications

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles

Spinrad, M.L. & Relles, S.R. (in review). Penny unwise and pound foolish: Understanding student financial literacy and college access.

Presentations

American Educational Research Association San Francisco, CA, April 19, 2020.
The Challenges of Digital Innovation: Lessons from Innovating Research Methods to Support Educational Transformation. https://convention2.allacademic.com/one/aera/aera20/ (Conference canceled).

University of Nevada, Las Vegas New Faculty Orientation Las Vegas, NV, August 20, 2019.
NFO student panel.

Association for the Study of Higher Education Tampa, FL, November 16, 2018.
Penny Unwise and Pound Foolish: Understanding Student Financial Literacy and College Access.

Nevada State University, Henderson, NV., October 20, 2018.
Looking for Trouble: *At the intersection of research interests and academic scholarship.*

Ethnographic & Qualitative Research Conference Las Vegas, NV, February 26, 2018.
The Business of International Students at a Community College.

University of Nevada, Las Vegas, First-Year Seminar Slam Las Vegas, NV, April 15, 2016.
Creating a Student-Centered Learning Environment—Expert Group Projects.

San Francisco State University, Pedagogy and Practice Conference San Francisco, CA, December 7, 2005. *Student Perceptions of Freshman Composition.*

Conference on College Composition and Communication, San Francisco, CA, March 16, 2005, *Models for Student Success: Learning from Award-Winning Basic Writing Programs: Integrative Reading/Writing Strategies: PPC and Peer Review.*

California Reading Association, San Jose, CA, November 4, 2004, *Effective Discussion and Questioning Strategies in the Integrated Reading and Writing Classroom.*

Academic Service

Outstanding Teaching by Part-time Faculty Selection Committee, UNLV 2020
Reviewed, evaluated application materials, discussing them with committee. Analyzed, critiqued scoring methods and evaluation criteria, identifying examples for best teaching practices that can be shared with UNLV's teaching community.

Part-time Instructor Mentoring Group, UNLV 2019-current
Facilitating monthly, university-wide PTI mentoring group focused on building community, developing student-centered pedagogies and classroom management strategies, and identifying on-campus instructional resources.

Part-time Instructor Brown Bag Coordinator, UNLV 2016-2017
Coordinated monthly professional development and community building workshops for part-time faculty and graduate assistants in the Educational Psychology & Higher Education.

Reading Program Committee, College of Southern Nevada 2015-2016
Served on committee responsible for founding, organizing, designing, and implementing institution-wide reading program. Contributed to faculty learning community largely unfamiliar with postsecondary reading environment and curricula.

Communications Coordinator, Composition and Reading Association of Future Teachers (CRAFT), San Francisco State University 2004-2005
Coordinated events and activities for graduate student-led organization founded to advance the interests of and provide informational and peer support for current and future literacy teachers.

Teaching Experience

Instructor, **Graduate Assistant** EPHE, University of Nevada, Las Vegas 01/16-05/20
College of Education 103—First-Year Seminar
College of Education 202—Second-Year Seminar
EPY 718 Introduction to Qualitative Methods (T.A.)

Instructor, English Department, College of Southern Nevada 08/15-05/16
English 092: Preparatory Composition I
English 098: Preparatory Composition II

Instructor, *Metropolitan Heath Academy*, San Francisco State University 01/08-01/10

Instructor, English Department, San Francisco State University 08/04-01/10
English 104-105: Intro to College Writing/Effective College Reading I
English 106: Intro to College Writing/Effective College Reading II
English 114: First-year English Composition
English 214: Second Year English Composition
English 414: Elements of Writing

Instructor, English Department, Diablo Valley College 08/06-12/07
English 116: College Reading Development

Awards

Nominee, Outstanding Graduate Student Teaching Award, 2019

Professional Associations

American Educational Research Association (AERA)
Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE)

Other Professional Skills

SEO, SEM, Google Analytics, Google Adwords, PPC, Social Media strategy, HTML, CSS, Microsoft Word, Excel, PowerPoint

Contact information: mspinrad@hotmail.com