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Chapter 1: Introduction

Background

In the last three to four decades, there has been a change in the number of traditional faculty positions. Tenured and tenure-track professors have historically held the faculty roles in United States colleges and universities. These faculty positions were established on the pillars of teaching, research, and service (American Association of University Professors [AAUP], 2003). For many of the tenured and tenure-track faculty members, the research they engage in supports and drives their teaching in the classroom. The level of participation in each pillar may vary based on faculty contract terms, academic area of expertise, and institutional characteristics (AAUP, 2003). One major advantage of being tenured faculty and those in the probationary period of a tenure track is academic freedom (AAUP, 2003). Academic freedom provides some protection from possible retaliation from higher education institutions that may feel faculty research is contentious (Ehrenberg, 2012). In addition, academic freedom is grounded in peer review by faculty in the profession allowing free interactions of intellectual thought (AAUP, 2003).

There is a level of job security afforded by the tenure system in higher education institutions that is enjoyed by tenured and tenure-track professors. Ehrenberg (2012) stated that economists have supported the concept that the tenure system is a sort of “long-term contract” (p. 200). There are faculty who are not eligible for tenure and who have short-term contracts. Non-tenure-track faculty typically have semester, yearly, or in
some cases, multiyear contracts with heavy teaching responsibilities (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). These faculty members are not afforded the same level of academic freedom as tenured and tenure-track faculty (AAUP, 2003).

Since the 1980s, available tenured and tenure-track faculty positions have declined while the positions of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have slowly climbed (Curtis, 2014). The number of tenured and tenure-track positions have decreased (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Ehrenberg, 2012) from 96.8% in 1969 to 85.4% in 1998 (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). The ratio of tenured and tenure-track faculty to non-tenure-track faculty, specifically full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, continues to change, (Curtis, 2014). In 1975, full-time tenured faculty and full-time tenure-track faculty were estimated at 35.9% and 19.9%, respectively, of the faculty in all national degree-granting institutions (Figure 1.1) (Curtis, 2014). By 2011, tenured faculty decreased to 20.6% and tenure-track faculty to 8.6% (Curtis, 2014). In contrast, the numbers of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members increased from 12.8 to 19.4% (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Curtis, 2014; Ehrenberg, 2012; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). While the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty population was growing across the United States, the duties and roles of such faculty varied at higher education institutions.

**Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty compared to tenured/tenure-track faculty.** Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty appointments vary in responsibilities by institutional types and sizes. Some of these faculty members teach more courses than tenured and tenure-track faculty (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Other full-time, non-tenure-track faculty closely resemble their tenured and tenure-track faculty colleagues in teaching load and other department duties (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). After visiting

Various higher institution campuses, Baldwin and Chronister (2001), in some settings, found it difficult to distinguish between the roles of tenured and tenure-track faculty and full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. At times, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were not only involved in instruction, but their research and service was similar to their tenured or tenure-track counterparts (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Hollenshead et al., 2007). Additionally, tenured, tenure-track, and full-time, non-tenure-track faculty had very similar average hours of contact with students (Bland, Center, Finstad, Risbey, & Staples, 2006). In contrast, Bland et al. (2006) found tenured and tenure-track faculty teaching more courses and spending more time teaching during the week than full-time, non-
tenure-track faculty. Simultaneously, non-tenure-track faculty who were working full-time spent more hours getting ready for courses (Umbach, 2007) and providing instructionally related activities (Monks, 2007) than the permanent tenure-track faculty.

Jaeger and Eagan (2011a) found it relevant to examine full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in comparison to their tenured and tenure-eligible colleagues regarding undergraduate education. Both faculty types were found to have similarly structured classes and techniques (Jaeger & Eagan, 2011a), but as Monks (2007) found, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty spent more time preparing for courses than tenured and tenure-track faculty. Umbach (2007) also found similarities in that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, in some ways, resembled tenured and tenure-track faculty in the format and structure of how they taught classes. Tenured, tenure-track, and full-time, non-tenure-track faculty paralleled in work activities by being the most consistent in the teaching strategies employed in conventional (e.g., accounting and systems analysis) and artistic (e.g., music and visual arts) fields; in their learning-centered practice compared to subject-centered practice in diverse academic environments; and in the use of technology (Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011). Even though full-time, non-tenure-track faculty and tenured and tenure-track faculty seem to mirror each other in teaching activities, there seems to be a difference between the two faculty rank systems in the frequency of advising students.

Using the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF), Bland et al. (2006) also found that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty advised undergraduate students more often than tenured and tenure-track faculty at United States research and doctoral institutions, as classified by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching will be referred to throughout this research study as the “Carnegie Foundation.” The comparisons of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to the tenured and tenure-track faculty are not limited to the United States. Rajagopal (2004) noted that Canadian colleges and universities do not officially categorize institutions as teaching and research institutions like the Carnegie Foundation in the United States. Canadian and American higher education structures of institutions and faculty models have a number of parallels (Dobbie & Robinson, 2008; Rajagopal, 2004). In Canada, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty had a heavier workload, where they instructed, tutored, and advised students more hours than tenured and tenure-track faculty (Rajagopal, 2004). Much of the research by Rajagopal referenced non-tenure-track faculty employed in the United States of America, but it also included faculty members working outside of the tenure system within Canada. The academic focus and student enrollment of colleges and universities may determine the needed roles of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty instruct a similar number of courses, but other full-time, non-tenure-track faculty experience teaching more courses.

**Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty.** Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty hold various roles in academia based on the needs of institutions. Baldwin and Chronister (2001) created a classification of work duties or, in other words, the roles full-time, non-tenure-track faculty tend to perform as teachers, researchers, and administrators. One of the primary roles of many full-time, non-tenure-track faculty is teaching. Historically, the hiring of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty was not solely for the purpose of teaching. In 1992, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty at universities were 8% more likely to report
research as their primary duty, and 5% were less prone to state teaching as their employment responsibility (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006).

Only 6 years later, in 1998, there was a major change. Many full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members were more likely to state that most of their time focused on teaching compared to tenured and tenure-track faculty (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006).

During the latter part of the 1980s into the 1990s, colleges and universities experienced a reduction in state and federal governmental financial support while institutional resources became more scarce (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). At the same time, student enrollment increased, creating a need for more faculty in the classroom. In addition, the public’s negative perception of tenured faculty and the faculty’s lack of focus on undergraduate education and graduation compelled institutions to employ more faculty who were focused on this student population (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Full-time, non-tenure track faculty roles have changed over time and some of those faculty have similar credentials as tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty may be perceived as a threat to the traditional tenure system (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). This perceived and potentially real threat may be based on the similar qualifications and workloads of tenure and tenure-track faculty as that of some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. In a national institutional level survey on non-tenure-track faculty, administrators responded that tenured and tenure-track faculty are, to some extent, supportive of positive changes for increasing the numbers and improving the circumstances for non-tenure-track faculty on their campuses (Hollenshead et al., 2007). In contrast, tenured and tenure-track faculty are also one of the highest ranked groups to resist those changes (Hollenshead et al., 2007). The researchers
suggested the resistance to changes may be due to tenured and tenure-track faculty’s viewing their power and influence as diminishing (Hollenshead et al., 2007). The number of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty is growing on various campuses, and they are slowly becoming more empowered by way of unions and institutional policies. Some tenured faculty feel non-tenure-track faculty would more likely support the views of administration regarding governance issues, given that these faculty members are bound by limited term contracts, which are dependent on the administrative contract renewal approval (Wilson, 2013).

Many times, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have appointments focused on research and service similar to tenure-track faculty (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). However, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were found focusing less hours on scholarly work and service to the campus than permanent, full-time faculty (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Bland et al., 2006; Monks, 2007). Less time conducting research by full-time, non-tenure-track faculty is understandable given that most are hired to teach. Although research and service are important to colleges and universities, most full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have little to no time to participate in those activities because of their teaching workload. Like in the U.S., full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in Canada taught as their primary duty (Rajagopal, 2004). However, Canadian full-time, non-tenure-track faculty tended to have high research interests and activities, while having similar average amounts of hours devoted to research as their tenure-track counterparts (Rajagopal, 2004). Most of those faculty had 12-month contracts, unlike the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty who were teaching in the social sciences with 8-month contracts (Rajagopal, 2004). Commonly in the United States, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have 1-year
contracts (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Even though, these 1-year contracts may actually mean 9-10 month contracts, which would include the fall and spring semesters or the fall, winter, and spring quarters. American full-time, non-tenure-track faculty may conduct research on their own time during the summer months. While off contract, these faculty members may possibly pursue scholarly activities with limited resources.

At diverse higher educational institutions, salaries vary among faculty of all appointment types (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Curtis & Thornton, 2014; Ehrenberg, 2012; Hollenshead et al., 2007). Even though the amount of hours for which tenured, tenure-track, and full-time, non-tenure-track faculty are paid is relatively the same (Monks, 2007). Nevertheless, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty earn substantially lower salaries for the baseline institutional salary and salary-per-course section (Monks, 2007). Similarly, Canadian full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, most of them with doctorate degrees and contracts for a full 12 months, earned lower salaries than tenured and tenure-track faculty (Rajagopal, 2004). Responsibilities of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have changed over time, and they vary at different higher education institutions. In some cases, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty’s workload and service duties are like those of tenured and tenure-track faculty although there is a vast difference in pay for the faculty in the two different faculty groups.

**Departmental culture and job performance among non-tenure-track faculty.**

Due to the changes in the faculty proportion of tenured, tenure-track, and full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, intentional and unintentional class systems have developed via actions and policies of the institution at large and within individual departments (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). According to Baldwin and Chronister (2001), disparity in title and
rank, lack of prospects for career upward mobility, career development, compensation, and involvement in institutional governance can contribute to the emergence of two classes of faculty. In a two-level system, some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty are viewed as having a short-term sub-faculty status (Rajagopal, 2004). Some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have twofold roles, as proficient teachers in the classroom, but as subordinates when interacting with their tenured and tenure-track department faculty (Levin & Shaker, 2011).

Kezar (2013a), in his summary of findings (Appendix A), identified destructive cultures within departments where tenured and tenure-track faculty made the non-tenure-track faculty feel inadequate because of their lack of a doctorate degree. Research shows that non-tenure-track faculty members’ negative perception of department culture influenced their work adversely, which affected teaching and student learning (Kezar, 2013a). Many part-time and full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members were reluctant to advise students, avail themselves of office hours without compensation, and be collegial with colleagues and students (Kezar, 2013a). Within both the destructive and neutral cultures, non-tenure-track faculty felt disrespected or disregarded (Kezar, 2013a; Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, & August, 2012). Void of voting rights in governance committees on various campuses), some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have been placed in positions of being the second-class faculty (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Kezar, 2012).

In contrast to some non-tenure-track faculty feeling disrespected, Waltman et al. (2012) found many non-tenure-track faculty members felt included and thought their tenured and tenure-track counterparts respected them. In a study of research universities,
Cross and Goldenberg (2011) identified that some non-tenure-track faculty were highly appreciated and received a higher salary than some tenured faculty. With a postsecondary system similar to the United States, Rajagopal (2004) found Canadian full-time, non-tenure-track faculty with higher ranks, as full and associate professors, and they interacted more positively with their tenured and tenure-track faculty colleagues. One reason for the more positive interactions between the two faculty types may be because most Canadian full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have contracts for a full 12 months (Rajagopal, 2004), allowing full-time, non-tenure-track faculty more time to interact with their tenured and tenure-track colleagues. Some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty felt respected and appreciated, and others spent more time interacting favorably with tenure-line faculty members.

Non-tenure-track faculty reported feeling respected and included within departments that were described as inclusive and had learning cultures by Kezar (2013a) (Appendix A). Non-tenure-track faculty were willing to advise, hold office hours without compensation, and be collegial with colleagues and students to support teaching (Kezar, 2013a). Waltman et al. (2012) found that non-tenure-track faculty who were enduring job-related problems were passionate about teaching, committed to teaching, and committed to working with students. When non-tenure-track faculty were asked about what they liked about their jobs, the most frequent response was having the ability to teach and work with students (Waltman et al., 2012).

The majority of the research on non-tenure-track faculty includes both full-time and part-time non-tenure-track faculty. There are similarities between full-time and part-time non-tenure-track faculty, but, the differences are more pronounced. Full-time and
part-time non-tenure-track faculty have different experiences within the faculty department. Kezar (2013a) found within a faculty department that part-time non-tenure-track faculty tended to have the most difficult experiences in negative cultures. Whereas, long-time, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty protected themselves from the most difficult experiences by working alone or establishing relationships with tenure-track faculty who might protect them from the negative experiences (Kezar, 2013a). Additionally, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were found to be more like tenured and tenure-track faculty in more ways than part-time, non-tenure-track faculty (Umbach, 2007).

Even though many full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members felt satisfied with teaching and mentoring students, at the same time, they desired tenure-track positions, which were decreasing or unavailable (Levin & Shaker, 2011; Rajagopal, 2004). Baldwin and Chronister (2001) called these faculty “tenure-track hopefuls.” Non-tenure-track faculty, most with doctorate degrees, accepted working off a tenure track with the goal of someday being on a tenure track. Simultaneously, there are the same faculty type who reject tenure track or purposefully choose the non-tenure track (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). By being off a tenure track, these full-time faculty members enjoy teaching and interacting with students, but they do not want the intense responsibility of producing scholarly works (Baldwin and Chronister, 2001).

Yet, another career path of a full-time, non-tenure-track faculty is the “trailing” spouse or partner (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). There are situations when both partners and spouses qualify or desire to work in academic settings. One spouse or partner can be hired at a college or university as a tenured or tenure-track faculty while the
“accompanying” spouse or partner can receive a full-time non-tenure-track position. Retired persons or those unfulfilled with their previous careers have become faculty in academia, seeking a “second-career” (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Some of these faculty members previously worked as adjuncts and part-time, non-tenure-track faculty while working in other organizations, then they moved into a full-time faculty role. Individuals accept full-time, non-tenure-track faculty positions for various reasons. Some of these faculty felt disrespected and like second-class faculty members, while other full-time, non-tenure-track faculty experienced inclusion and acceptance by their peers.

**Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty and undergraduate education.** Many full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members engage in a variety of interactions with undergraduate students in colleges and universities. It is highly likely full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, with teaching as their primary responsibility, teach multiple course sections and advise undergraduate students, particularly those in introductory courses (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Baldwin and Chronister’s (2001) institutional survey found that a high percentage of baccalaureate institutions stated they hired full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to teach undergraduate courses. More specifically, research, masters, and doctoral institutions, as identified by Carnegie Foundation, hired full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to teach lower-level courses (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty teaching a large number of introductory courses has advantages and disadvantages for colleges and universities. For example, Umbach (2007) found that some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty did not challenge students academically as well as the tenured and tenure-track faculty.
There are also several advantages to having full-time, non-tenure track faculty teaching undergraduate students and introductory courses. In a study of first-year student retention and student exposure to full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, Jaeger and Eagan (2011a) found that an average student attending a Carnegie Foundation-classified doctoral-extensive university spent 36% of his or her credits being taught by full-time, non-tenure-track faculty with no significant effect on the student’s contact with those faculty members. Over 23 academic terms, students’ evaluations at a research university showed higher ratings for non-tenure-track faculty than for tenure-track faculty (Cross & Goldenberg, 2011). Whereas, at a Master’s I university, undergraduates received instruction from a full-time, non-tenure-track faculty 15.3% of their credit time, and they had a significant positive increase in student persistence into their second year as a college student (Jaeger & Eagan, 2011a).

The faculty job performance of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty affects student learning in various ways. Jaeger and Eagan’s (2011a) results showed at master’s and baccalaureate institutions, there was a negative relationship between freshman students returning for their sophomore year and exposure to the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. In Figlio, Schapiro, and Soter’s (2013) study with Northwestern University freshman students, courses taught by full-time, non-tenure-track faculty influenced the probability that freshman students would enroll in comparable courses, and those courses increased their grades in following academic terms. Another study, though, showed no impact on students’ completion of their first year and persistence to the second year because of the increased use of non-tenure, full-time faculty at public institutions.
(Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005). Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty are not limited to interactions with students in the classroom.

Additionally, some studies have shown that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty socialize, mostly outside of the classroom, with students less than tenured and tenure-track faculty (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006; Umbach, 2007). Compared to the tenured and tenure-track faculty, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, with teaching as their primary activity, worked less hours (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Because of the limited interaction between full-time, non-tenure-track faculty and students, students may view full-time, non-tenure-track faculty as less stable, less secure, and they may be less likely to seek out these individuals as role models and mentors (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Although the number of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty teaching in universities and colleges is increasing, some of these faculty have less contact with students compared to their tenured and tenure-track faculty colleagues (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006; Umbach, 2007).

Teaching effectiveness of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty is often measured in higher education institutions by teaching evaluations from students and faculty appraisals from chairpersons. These performance measurements can play an important part in the contract renewal and promotion of full-time, non-tenure track faculty (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Often times, as part of the appraisal process, chairpersons conduct teaching evaluations of faculty. Kezar (2013c) quoted a full-time, non-tenure-track faculty about the ineffective use of teaching evaluations:

We do have the evaluations, but they are looked at as a hassle and someone comes into my course for about 15 minutes and jots down a few notes. They don’t even
stay for the full course, so it’s not really possible for them to understand what’s going on to give real feedback. Then they turn these in and no one gives me any feedback based on them. (p. 586)

Administrative leaders’ evaluations might not always be effective, yet those evaluations could influence full-time, non-tenure-track faculty contract renewals and promotion. Chairpersons’ evaluations may include assessments of both teaching and service.

While researchers Baldwin and Chronister (2001) found service to the institution as an important factor in determining full-time, non-tenure-track faculty promotion to a higher rank, they also discovered most colleges and universities did not have established policies to address service for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Document analysis by Baldwin and Chronister (2001) of a research university yielded information about evaluations that might factor into the promotion of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. The evaluation called for faculty to display mastery in their respective disciplines, strong teaching expertise, and outstanding service to the university and the community (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty can perform essential department or college roles formerly held by tenured and tenure-track faculty (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Due to increased pressure to produce scholarly works, with no available time and no desire to perform these important department or college roles, may be the reason tenured and tenure-track faculty are no longer engaged in these activities.

The work responsibilities of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty seem to be changing in higher education institutions. This change may lead to challenges for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, such as low compensation and feelings of inequity when compared to tenured and tenure-track faculty (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Kezar,
The changing work responsibilities have also shown to bring more opportunities for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to interact with tenure-line faculty in the areas of research and curriculum development (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Hollenshead et al., 2007; Kezar, 2013a; Rajagopal, 2004; Waltman et al., 2012).

**Problem Statement**

In 2006, Schuster and Finkelstein acknowledged a substantial trend in academia. Different academic appointment types were being remodeled. They noted 30 years (1986-2006) of undeniable growth in the use of part-time non-tenure-track faculty. Although, more subtle between 1996 and 2016, the proportion of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty has steadily grown compared to tenured and tenure-track faculty, which has gradually reduced (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Ehrenberg, 2012; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). From 1993 to 2003, the majority of the full-time new hires in academia were full-time, non-tenure-track faculty (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Various 4-year colleges and universities, both public and private, from all areas of the country had nearly 50% of their faculty on a non-tenure-track (Hollenshead et al., 2007).

The shift in academia for hiring more full-time, non-tenure-track faculty instead of tenure-track positions can lead to problems in higher education institutions. For example, institutions may have less available tenured and tenure-track faculty to serve on vital campus committees for strategic planning, curriculum development, and policies and procedures. Those tenure-eligible faculty members may not have time to serve on committees due to focusing on scholarly activities.
Given that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have no promises of contract renewals, administrators may have to manage high rates of turnover (Curtis & Thornton, 2014), monitor turnover impact on students, and suffer the costs of numerous faculty searches and interviews (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007). When a full-time, non-tenure-track faculty interviewee of Baldwin and Chronister (2001) was asked about full-time, non-tenure-track faculty relationships with students, the lecturer stated, “Students are concerned about faculty turnover. They want faculty to stay” (p. 127).

The decrease of tenure-track faculty and the increase of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty may also result in problems for faculty. In many situations across various colleges and universities, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have similar qualifications and duties compared to tenured and tenure-track faculty (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Tenure-eligible faculty are provided with opportunities for career advancement via promotion upon obtaining tenure and later in their career. Whereas, in some colleges and universities, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty are not provided with pathways for upward career mobility or advancement (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Because of the limited career paths, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, especially those “tenure-track hopefuls,” may be more dissatisfied with their faculty appointments. Baldwin and Chronister (2001) found that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty “complained that not having a career ladder similar to tenure-track faculty was discriminatory, demeaning, and demoralizing” (p. 49). There are other institutions that provide career advancement via the “lecturer rank” system (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001).

Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty tend to have different experiences from tenured and tenure-track faculty regarding job security and upward career mobility.
Generally, tenured faculty do not have to think about job security (Ehrenberg, 2012) via annual contracts and an academic career path. Similarly, tenure-track faculty, as long as they are progressing successfully through the tenure process, do not have to concern themselves with contract renewals and advancement. Unlike tenured and tenure-track faculty, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty may have strong anxiety related to job security and career advancement (Waltman et al., 2012; Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). As previously mentioned, some institutions grant full-time, non-tenure-track faculty contract renewal for multiple years. Depending on the contract terms, full-time non-tenured faculty may be anxious about their career paths and academic work every 1-5 years (Waltman et al., 2012). Other colleges and universities have a promotion system for non-tenure-track faculty that upon promotion, faculty salaries are increased and given multiyear contracts. Promoted faculty may be more likely to remain in academia (Bland et al., 2006). But even with a promotion and multiyear contracts, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty may still experience anxiety and no feeling of permanency in their respective institutions.

Many faculty members work full time teaching in academia, but they are not eligible for tenure positions. Nevertheless, they desire similar aspects of working in a postsecondary setting as their more permanent tenured and tenure-track peers in the areas of job security, career advancement, and equitable working conditions (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Kezar, 2013a; Kezar & Sam, 2013; Rhoades & Maitland, 2008). Job security for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty is not possible in the form of tenure; therefore, it may come in the form of multiyear contracts. Job security is defined by Hollenshead et al., (2007) as “long term contracts, where suitable; transparent and equitable contract terms; and reasonable lengths of time for informing NTTF (non-
tenure-track faculty) of their continued employment and the courses they’ll be teaching” (p. 12).

Literature of non-tenure-track faculty, particularly those full-time faculty, discuss promotion and contract renewal (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Hollenshead et al., 2007; Rhoades & Maitland, 2008). These researchers noted the notice of contracts, contract durations, contract policies, types of promotion, and non-tenure-track rank systems. To the best of the researcher’s knowledge, no studies have addressed how renewed contracts and promotions attribute to the long-lasting careers of a faculty member working full-time off a tenure track. Furthermore, studies have not discussed the possible factors that influence the offering of continuous contracts and advancement to a higher rank. Some scholars (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Kezar, 2013a; Kezar & Sam, 2013; Levin & Shaker, 2011; Waltman et al., 2012) have interviewed full-time, non-tenure-track faculty exclusively, or often combined with part-time non-tenure-track faculty, about various facets of their experiences. They did not capture the voices of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty regarding what they thought aided their effective continuous employment as a teaching faculty off a tenure track. Therefore, the experiences and perceptions of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty who have worked 3 or more years in academia should be studied.

**Theoretical Rationale**

When using organizational socialization, as defined by John Van Maanen and Edgar H. Schein (1979), faculty—both tenure track and full-time non-tenure track—are possibly socialized into organizations in comparable and contrasting ways. There are various definitions of organizational socialization. John Van Maanen and Edgar H.
Schein (1979), who are considered seminal authors, defined organizational socialization as “the process by which an individual acquires the social knowledge and skills necessary to assume an organizational role” (p. 3). Much of the subsequent research notes the “individual” as a newcomer to the organization. Thereby, their research focused on how the organization will socialize the newcomer into the organization.

Although much of the organizational socialization research focused on the newly hired person, Van Maanen and Schein (1979) viewed socialization as a continuous process, similar to the process of learning, but not exclusive to a new employee. Learning is usually ongoing and happens throughout individuals’ lives. Although their theory addresses new employees entering an organization, Van Maanen and Schein noted that socialization happens anytime there is transition for an employee.

At some point in an individual’s career, beyond initial entry into an organization, it is likely that transition from an outsider of a particular group to an insider, in some form, will occur. Individuals transfer from one department to another department and/or move up the academic administrative ladder. Schein (1971) described a model in which an organizational role can be characterized by three dimensions: function, hierarchy, and inclusion. The functional dimension has individuals performing multiple duties within the organization, such as departmental structures. The departments are usually divided by function, such as finance, marketing, management, human resources, and production. The hierarchical dimension refers to the organization’s differentiation of rank (Schein, 1971). Most organizations have clear lines between positions of authority. Schein (1971) noted those positions do not inherently have the power to influence the actions of subordinates. The inclusion dimension, at its core, is interactive (Schein, 1971). The new employee not
only transitions from being the initial outsider to being an insider. Ideally, the employee
will transition several times, becoming more accepted by other members of the
organization, moving from outsider to insider to a fairly accepted novice member to one
who assists with exclusive organizational situations to an intimate member who shares in
the affairs of the group to a central and prominent member of the organization. Just
before and after entering any of the three boundaries, individuals experience a high level
of anxiety (Schein, 1971).

Tuttle (2002) pointed out research on the influential organizational socialization
theory of Schein (1971) and Van Maanen and Schein (1979) only scratched the surface.
Tuttle stated there were no studies conducted testing in a form of boundary passage by
which individuals enter into the hierarchical, function, and/or inclusionary dimensions
mentioned by Van Maanen and Schein (1979). Using the example of a university
affirming tenure to a professor, Van Maanen and Schein (1979) identified this process as
entering the “major inclusionary boundary, as well as the more obvious hierarchical
passage” (p. 21). In an illustration of the inclusionary dimension in Schein’s (1971)
model, he compared an individual’s progressive movement in the dimension, which
inferred there are relationship changes between the individual and the existing members,
to the pre-tenure process of a university professor (Figure 1.2). The pre-tenure professor
may transition several times before becoming more accepted and deemed worthy by other
members of the organization by moving from “accepted but not permanent” to “tenure-
granted permanent membership” to “leader” Van Maanen and Schein (1979, p. 20).

When discussing the negative ways theories have been applied to studies of non-
tenure-track faculty, Kezar and Sam (2011) stated:
Instead of economics and business theories of nonprofessionals, we believe that sociological theories such as professionalization or managed professionals can help to better understand the behavior and experience of non-tenure-track faculty and counter the lens of seeing them only as laborers. (p. 1424)

In a review of assumptions and theories historically used for non-tenure-track faculty, Kezar and Sam (2011) argued against researchers who frame their work with the perception of non-tenure-track faculty as merely contingent workers who are hired to provide services for limited terms. The organizational socialization theory may be a better applicable theory to understanding the experiences of the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty (Kezar & Sam, 2011).

**Statement of Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to examine the experiences and perceptions of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty at a large private doctoral university with moderate research activity. The research focused on identifying possible factors that could influence full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to successful, continued employment for 3 years or more. The work experiences and perceptions of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty are examined.

**Research Question**

The research question for this research was: What are the experiences and perceptions of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty working 3 or more years at a 4-year university that influence career longevity and advancement?

**Potential Significance of the Study**

College and university administrators could benefit from this study by learning more about the experiences of this growing faculty population of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Chairpersons could gain better insight on how to promote collegiality between tenured, tenure-track, and full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to reduce the perception of a two-tiered faculty system. Human resources specialists, deans, provosts,
and chairpersons could obtain knowledge of strategies to support the longevity and success of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty careers. Administrators could better plan for the effective use of the workforce and their working conditions by better understanding how full-time, non-tenure-track faculty interpret their work and interactions with students and colleagues who are tenured, on a tenure track, or are not on a tenure track. As these administrators learn more about full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, they might be in a position to make better decisions about institutional policies and procedures that impact this faculty population.

This study could help full-time, non-tenure-track faculty learn about the experiences of other full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Kezar and Sam (2010b) stated, “Non-tenure-track faculty are more likely to study the experience and working conditions of non-tenure-track faculty in an effort to demonstrate problems that they themselves have experienced.” Most tenured and tenure-track professors are leading the research on non-tenure-track faculty. Most of the literature on non-tenure-track faculty includes both part-time and full-time faculty (Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011; Cross & Goldenberg, 2011; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Figlio et al., 2013; Gappa et al., 2007; Jaeger & Eagan, 2011a; Kezar, 2013a; Kezar & Sam, 2013; Monks, 2007; Umbach, 2007; Waltman et al., 2012). These faculty types may have different experiences, specifically the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Some tenured and tenure-track faculty may view the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty as subordinates, non-professionals, and second-tiered faculty, which may imply there have been alternative motives and a bias for researching this group (Kezar & Sam, 2011). The researcher conducting this study is a full-time, non-tenure-track faculty member at a 4-year private university who addresses the gap in the
literature of a lack of non-tenure-track faculty conducting research on topics related to their position in higher education institutions.

**Chapter Summary**

Since the 1980s, the number of full-time faculty not eligible for tenure have been gradually growing. Simultaneously, the opportunity to obtain a tenured or tenure-track faculty employment has decreased (Curtis, 2014). This change in the composition of the types of faculty appointments can create problems for college and university administrators and faculty. Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have concerns about job security and career advancement opportunities (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Hollenshead et al., 2007; Rhoades & Maitland, 2008). Given the steadily growing number of the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, it is important to understand the how these faculty members navigate and establish a degree of employment longevity.

This research study has five chapters. The first chapter reviews the research problem, the purpose of the study, the research question, and the potential significance of a study examining the experiences and perceptions of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. The chapter concludes with definitions of terms pertinent to this study. A review of the literature on full-time, non-tenure-track faculty is presented in Chapter 2. The research design, methodology, and analysis is discussed in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 presents a detailed analysis of the results and findings, and Chapter 5 discusses the findings, implications, and recommendations for future research and practice.

**Definitions of Terms**

During review of the literature, numerous terms were found to designate faculty working off a tenure track in a full-time capacity: full-time, non-tenure-track faculty;
non-tenure-eligible full-time faculty; full-time, term-appointment faculty; full-time faculty in non-tenure-track positions; full-time faculty in a non-tenure-eligible position; full-time contract faculty; and non-tenure-track, full-time contingent faculty (Jaeger & Eagan, 2011a; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006).

Academic Division – a higher education institutional academic department, school, and/or college faculty devoted to a specific academic discipline.

Full-Time, Non-Tenure-Track Faculty – commonly holding the rank of lecturer or instructor and, at some institutions, the academic instructional staff member holds the same titles as permanent and permanent-track positions (e.g., professor, associate professor and assistant professor). Although these faculty members may function as teachers, researchers, and administrators, a large majority have teaching as their primary responsibility. These academic instructional staff members tend to work at one institution because they hold full-time appointments. Also, clinical and visiting professors are also considered full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, but not for this study.

Lecturer Rank System – an avenue for some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to obtain a promotion to a higher rank (e.g., senior lecturer or principal lecturer).

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty – terms “non-tenure-track faculty” and “contingent” commonly denote both full- and part-time academic instructional staff members who are not on the track to a permanent position or they are not eligible for a permanent position.

Part-Time Faculty – are commonly referred to as adjunct academic instructional staff members. Few part-time academic staff work at only one institution, but they generation have positions at multiple institutions. These staff members can also include graduate students who function as teaching assistants.
*Tenured Faculty* – have the primary duties of teaching, researching, and servicing their respective universities. These academic instructional staff members have successful completed the process to a permanent position. Tenured faculty usually hold the ranks of full, associate, and assistant professors.

*Tenure System* – a process which allows eligible faculty to prove competency in teaching, research, and service, via various activities, to an institution of postsecondary education in exchange for more secure employment (permanent) and freedom from dismissal without due process.

*Tenure-Track Faculty* – have the primary duties of teaching, researching, and servicing their respective universities. These academic instructional staff members are in the process of completing the process toward a permanent position, which can take 6-7 years. Tenure-track faculty usually hold the rank of assistant professors or, in some cases, instructors.

*The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE)* – a research project hosted by Harvard University that surveys tenure-track faculty to determine their satisfaction with the components of their work and workplace climate. The project has recently included tenured and full-time, non-tenure-track faculty.
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

Introduction

The number of tenured and tenure-track faculty positions have decreased while, at the same time, the number of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty has gradually increased (Curtis, 2014). These changes have resulted in a number of outcomes for colleges and universities. Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty are more visible on postsecondary institution campuses, and they are also working at only one university or college, compared to their part-time, non-tenure-track colleagues (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). While some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have experienced anxiety about job security and career upward mobility (Waltman et al. (2012); Zhou & Volkwein, 2004), other full-time, non-tenure-faculty members have had seemingly satisfying careers. The purpose of this study was to investigate the experiences and perceptions of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty working 3 or more years at a 4-year university that influence career longevity and advancement.

This literature review describes the current condition of the peer-reviewed research regarding full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Empirical research studies from 2004-2013 are reviewed including the germinal works on this topic by Baldwin and Chronister (2001) and Schuster and Finkelstein (2006). Their works are cited in this literature review to support the understanding of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty experiences.
This chapter includes five sections that review empirical studies, analyze methodology in the studies, and identify gaps in the literature. The first section compares full-time, non-tenure-track faculty and tenure-track faculty regarding faculty commitment, productivity, and salaries. The second section shows the studies of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty influences on undergraduate students’ graduation rates, student engagement, and persistence. The third section reviews the literature on the perceptions of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty about their employment. The fourth section presents a methodological review of the literature, and the last section explains the gaps in the literature.

Comparing Full-time, Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and Tenure-Eligible Faculty

Articles in this section of the literature review compare full-time, non-tenure-track faculty with tenured and tenure-track faculty (Bland et al., 2006; Monks, 2007; Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). The database was pulled from the National Center for Education Statistics 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99) (Abraham et al., 2002). The Gallup Organization designed and conducted NSOPF:99 (Abraham et al., 2002). The report is the third of two previous cycles that were conducted in 1988 and 1993. The purpose of the NSOPF:99 was to compare faculty and institutional data over time and gather data to learn more about current faculty and their working conditions in United States higher education (Abraham et al., 2002). The NSOPF:99 has two sections: an institution survey and a faculty survey (Abraham et al., 2002). The sample consisted of 960 degree-granting colleges and universities and 28,576 faculty members. After three stages of sampling, the final eligible institution and faculty sample totaled 959 and 19,213, respectively. Tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty completed the
faculty survey. The faculty survey included questions about employment, background, workload, job satisfaction, compensation, socio-demographic characteristics, and opinions. The institution survey included the number of full- and part-time faculty with instructional and non-instructional responsibilities and tenure status, institutional tenure policies, the impact of tenure policies on new faculty, teaching assessment, and faculty turnover rate (Abraham et al., 2002). The NSOPF:99 served as the database for several studies (Bland et al., 2006; Monks, 2007; Zhou & Volkwein, 2004) that examined faculty commitment, productivity, and salaries among different types of faculty.

Commitment and productivity. Zhou and Volkwein (2004) conducted a quantitative study that examined the factors that directly or indirectly influenced tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty’s intention to leave their jobs, and it examined their job satisfaction at research and doctoral universities (Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). The variables used to determine if there were direct and indirect influences on the faculty’s intention to leave and on their job satisfaction were based on personal characteristics, institutional characteristics, and work experiences. As previously mentioned, Zhou and Volkwein used the NSOPF:99 as the database for collecting information from both the institutional survey data and faculty survey data. The sample population totaled 3,467 faculty members. They focused only on full-time tenured and full-time non-tenured faculty with teaching as their main duty (Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). Zhou & Volkwein defined faculty as tenure-track; full-time, non-tenure-track; and those in colleges with no tenure system. The faculty sample consisted of 56.5% tenured, 21.9% tenure-track, 20.4% full-time non-tenure-track, and 1.2% in colleges with no tenure system (Zhou & Volkwein, 2004).
Zhou and Volkwein (2004) employed a multiple-step analysis that included two kinds of ordinary least squares (OLS) regression analysis to calculate a faculty member’s plans to leave the institute and his or her job satisfaction. The first OLS regression analyzed each job satisfaction measure as a dependent variable using personal characteristics, institutional characteristics, and work experiences as influences (Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). The second OLS regression analysis used all job satisfaction variables and personal characteristics, institutional characteristics, and work experiences variables as influences. With the significant variables found in the first and second OLS regressions analyses, Zhou and Volkwein (2004) used the Analysis of the Moment Structures (AMOS) for the Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) to obtain more accurate results including factor weights and direct and indirect influences.

Using the final AMOS path model, Zhou and Volkwein (2004) found the strongest predictor of plans to leave for tenured faculty were: (a) seniority, (b) satisfaction with compensation, and (c) extrinsic rewards. Comparably, non-tenured faculty also had seniority as the strongest predictor of plans to leave, followed by job security satisfaction, and doctoral degree. The authors suggested the higher ranked tenured or non-tenured-faculty members were less likely to leave employment at their respective institutions. Zhou and Volkwein (2004) concluded that tenured faculty were more likely to stay when satisfied with their compensation, and they regarded extrinsic rewards, like possibilities for career advancement and better pay and benefits, as valuable. At the same time, non-tenured faculty differed by perceiving satisfaction with job security and possessing a doctoral degree as reasons to continue working at their institutions (Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). Overall, when exploring the reasons why faculty
plan to leave, Zhou and Volkwein (2004) found that non-tenured faculty appeared to be 13% more likely to leave their institution, versus tenured faculty at 3%.

Zhou and Volkwein (2004) identified direct influences for tenured and non-tenured faculty’s intentions to leave academia. The direct influences for tenured faculty were seniority, compensation, job security, resources, if the institution had a faculty union, teaching productivity, autonomy, and extrinsic rewards. The non-tenured faculty’s direct influences on plans to leave included seniority, job security satisfaction, and a doctoral degree.

Indirect influences for tenured and non-tenured faculty intentions to leave academia were also identified by Zhou and Volkwein (2004). Influences which indirectly impacted tenured faculty’s intentions to depart from academia were: (a) the diversity of faculty, staff, and students at the institution; (b) if the faculty member held a doctoral degree; (c) if the person was a minority faculty member; and (d) the amount of hours the faculty member worked. Indirect influences on non-tenured faculty’s plans to leave were related to: (a) gender of the faculty member, (b) if the person was a minority faculty member, (c) if the faculty member was involved in committee service, and (d) if the faculty member was engaged in funded research.

While examining the direct and indirect influences of non-tenured faculty’s plans to depart academia, Zhou and Volkwein (2004) found conflicting results. They noted that higher ranked non-tenured faculty seemed to be more satisfied with job security, but at the same time, they were more likely to depart compared to lower ranked non-tenured faculty. Additionally, non-tenured faculty who exhibited high levels of teaching productivity and effective teaching in the classroom were more inclined to remain in the
Zhou and Volkwein (2004) discovered similarities and differences of why tenured and non-tenured faculty decide to leave their academic employment. It might seem logical, but the two faculty types had different reasons to separate from their employer given that these varied faculty types had similar and different roles, duties, and expectations. Researchers Zhou and Volkwein (2004) defined faculty on a tenure-track but who were not tenured as non-tenured faculty. In other studies, some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were found to have similar teaching loads, structured classes, instructional techniques, and duties within the department as tenured and tenure-track faculty (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011; Jaeger & Eagan, 2011). Job security may not be a concern for most tenured faculty (Ehrenberg, 2012). In the same way, tenure-track faculty on pace to obtain tenure might not think about job security as do full-time, non-tenure-track faculty.

Although the Zhou and Volkwein (2004) study included only full-time faculty, limitations of the study were that non-tenured faculty included both tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty, and the no tenure system results were included in the non-tenured faculty results due to small numbers. Also, the study by Zhou and Volkwein (2004) was limited to only research and doctoral institutions. There were no required years of service or employment for the full-time faculty. As a way to better understand the influences of the faculty’s intention to leave, Zhou and Volkwein (2004) suggested that qualitative
studies should be conducted. This study is qualitative in nature to better understand the experiences of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty.

Two years after the Zhou and Volkwein (2004) study, other researchers investigated faculty commitment as well as faculty productivity in teaching and research. A quantitative study by Bland et al. (2006) studied how committed and productive tenured and pre-tenured professors were compared to other faculty appointment types. In this study by Bland et al. (2006), faculty commitment was evaluated by self-reported responses related to the likelihood to depart from the institution, decision to obtain another career in academia again, and total hours worked. When examining faculty teaching productivity, some of the variables Bland et al. (2006) included were the number of classes taught, number of credit courses taught, weekly hours teaching and advising, and the number of committees served and the hours for committee work. The faculty research productivity was assessed by counting the number of peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed media and publications, funded research, number of principal investigator and co-principal investigator grants, and hours of research. Additionally, the Bland et al. (2006) study investigated full-time junior faculty with 6 years or less of service at a college or university. While examining the level of commitment and productivity of tenured and pre-tenured faculty compared to other faculty appointment types, the authors sought to find if there were differences and similarities to those faculty types who were newly hired (Bland et al., 2006).

Like Zhou and Volkwein (2004), the NSOPF:99 supplied the data for the Bland et al. (2006) study. Bland et al. (2006) restricted their study sample in a similar manner as Zhou and Volkwein, which only included full-time faculty at research and doctoral
institutions. But unlike Zhou and Volkwein, who studied faculty focused solely on teaching, Bland et al. (2006) included faculty focused on teaching or research. After Bland et al. restricted the sample population, 5,226 faculty remained: 3,756 tenured and tenure track, 1,460 non-tenure-track, and 10 with no tenure system (Bland et al.).

After conducting a three-way multivariate analysis, Bland et al. (2006) found that 79% of all full-time faculty stated teaching as their primary duty across all institution types. At research and doctoral institutions, 57% of tenured faculty were found to have a higher teaching percentage compared to 41% of non-tenured faculty when stating their primary focus as teaching. Even when the researchers examined only new faculty with 6 years or less at research and doctoral institutions, the findings are consistent between the junior and senior faculty (Bland et al., 2006). The newer tenure-track faculty stated teaching as their main responsibility at 57% (Bland et al., 2006). These faculty members were found to teach at a higher percentage than 40% of the new non-tenured faculty who said that teaching was their primary duty.

In addition, Bland et al. (2006) found that tenured and tenure-track professors completed 2 to 3 times more research than full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, and they committed 4% more time toward research. Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty were, again, found to be more productive by way of indirect teaching than the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty (Bland et al., 2006). Indirect teaching relates to the number of institutional committees that faculty members served on, or served as a chairperson, and the average hours spend on committee work and average weekly contact hours spent with students. Although, non-tenure-track faculty spent about the same average amount of time in contact hours with undergraduate students as tenured and tenure-track faculty,
2.05 hours to 1.86 hours, respectively (Bland et al., 2006). In another comparison, tenured and tenure-track professors taught, in total, more courses than their full-time, non-tenure-track colleagues: 1.74 courses to 1.34 courses, respectively. In addition, tenured and pre-tenured faculty spent 25.02 hours teaching weekly versus their full-time, non-tenure-track colleagues who only spent 20.27 hours. While the same non-tenure-track faculty provided more one-on-one student instructional hours each week and more advising office hours than the tenured and tenure-track faculty, 6.58 hours to 6.41 hours and 6.85 hours to 5.08 hours (Bland et al., 2006).

In addition to the findings for all faculty a college or university, Bland et al. (2006) found data about new junior faculty with 6 or less years of employment. The findings for new faculty were similar to the findings of the previously mentioned findings for all faculty in research and doctoral institutions (Bland et al., 2006). Tenure-track faculty produced more research and taught more hours than non-tenure-track faculty (Bland et al., 2006).

Utilizing specific data responses from the NSOPF:99, Bland et al. (2006) examined the increased likelihood of faculty accepting a job in or out of academia in the following 3 years. Non-tenure-track faculty were found more likely to depart from their teaching position within 3 years. In contrast, tenure and tenure-track faculty were more likely to select employment in academia again (Bland et al., 2006). Bland et al. (2006) questioned the commitment of non-tenure-track instructors.

In the same manner as Zhou and Volkwein (2004), Bland et al. (2006) had limitations in their research. Bland et al. (2006) only studied full-time tenured, tenure-track, non-tenure-track faculty, and those faculty working in a no tenure system. In
addition, both studies were limited to only research and doctoral institutions. However, Bland et al. examined the productivity and commitment of a subgroup, newly hired faculty, with 6 years of service or less. The findings from both studies demonstrate the need to study full-time, non-tenure-track faculty and their decisions as to why they decided to stay beyond 3 or more years in academics and how they successfully continued employment in academics. This study examined the experiences of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty who had been employed for 3 years or more at the same institution.

**Salaries.** Salaries have also been a focus in studies that compare differences between tenure-track faculty and non-tenure-track faculty. Monks (2007) compared the earnings of faculty types across various types of institutions. This quantitative study included a multiple-regression analysis to compare and discuss the incomes of part-time and full-time contingent faculty to full-time, tenure-track faculty. Similarly, as in previous studies by Zhou and Volkwein (2004) and Bland et al. (2006), Monks utilized institutional and faculty data from the NSOPF:99. In Monks’s study, tenure-track faculty referred to both tenured and tenure-track faculty members. Like Zhou and Volkwein, the study only included faculty with teaching as their major role of work. The sample included professors that reported to be on a tenure-track (54%) and full-time, but not on a track (8%) (Monks, 2007).

Monks (2007) employed a variety of analysis methods, including Chow tests, separate regressions, and multinomial logit, for each faculty sample, and Monks used an inverse Mills ratio in the results. Full-time, tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty were very similar in the amount of paid hours per week, 47.9 hours and 46.5 hours,
respectively (Monks, 2007). The results also identified that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty spent 72% of their time engaged in teaching activities compared to 66% of full-time, tenure-track faculty’s time. The Bland et al. (2006) study findings seem to disagree with Monks’s finding. In the Bland et al. study, tenure-track faculty taught more courses and spent more time teaching than non-tenure-track faculty (Bland et al., 2006). Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in the Bland et al. study spent only 6% of their time on research activities, which is less time than the tenure-track faculty who tended to spend 13% of their time doing research in the Monks study. This finding is consistent with Bland et al. (2006). Tenured and tenure-track faculty did more research and spent more time doing research compared to non-tenure-track faculty (Bland et al., 2006). Monks also found that full-time, tenure-track faculty were slightly more involved in campus-wide service-related activities with 14% of their time focused in this area compared to full-time, non-tenure-track faculty who spent 12% of their time performing such service.

Another consistency between the Monks (2007) and Bland et al. (2006) studies is that the tenured and tenure-track faculty tended to spend more time serving and leading campus committees compared to non-tenure-track faculty.

When comparing the earnings of faculty types across different institution types and for basic institutional salary and basic institutional salary by section, as defined by Carnegie Foundation, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty earned significantly lower salaries than the tenure-track faculty, specifically for those faculty members employed at research, doctoral, and comprehensive institutions (Monks, 2007). Monks noted the significant disparity in the salaries of tenure-track faculty compared to full-time, non-tenure-track faculty (2007). Non-tenure-track faculty were paid less by course section and
per hour compared to tenure-track faculty (Monks, 2007). More precisely, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were paid 25.9% less when compared full-time, tenure-track assistant faculty members (Monks, 2007).

Comparing tenured and tenure-track faculty to full-time, non-tenure-track faculty might be unfair. Both faculty groups, although full-time, may have been hired to perform different roles such as teaching, conducting research, or a combination of the two activities. Tenured and tenure-track, full-time faculty focused more hours on research and service to the campus than their full-time, non-tenure-track colleagues (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Bland et al., 2006; Monks, 2007). It may seem apparent that tenured and tenure-track faculty would produce more scholarly works, given that those works are generally a part of faculty’s three core activities: (a) teaching, (b) research, and (c) service. Research and service were important to the respective institutions and communities, but many full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members are typically hired to solely focus on teaching. Research may not be a part of their responsibilities and duties. Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty usually spend more hours preparing for courses (Umbach, 2007) and providing teaching-related activities (Monks, 2007) than the more permanent tenure-track faculty. The time teaching and engaging in teaching-related activities may limit the time that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have to participate in research activities (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Another reason for the difference in production of full-time, non-tenure-track and tenure-track research production may be that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty may choose not to participate in research activities (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty do not have any interest in conducting research, and they prefer to focus only on teaching and service. For
example, those who purposefully chose a non-tenure track had spouses or partners who were simultaneously hired as faculty to work at the same academic institution, and some faculty were second-career individuals who had retired or left previous employment to work in higher education (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001).

**Influence of Full-Time, Non-Tenure-Track Faculty on College Students**

The previous section focused primarily on the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty compared to tenure and tenure-track faculty regarding faculty commitment, productivity, and salaries. Unlike the studies in the former section that all use the same data source, NSOPF:99, the studies described in this section used various data sources, such as the Annual Survey of College Standard Research Compilation, the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement, individual university data sources, and the 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:04). This section includes a review of studies that examined the influence of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty on the graduation rates of undergraduate students, undergraduate student engagement, the instruction of undergraduate students, and student persistence.

**Impact on student graduation rates.** Ehrenberg and Zhang (2005) conducted a quantitative study examining the influence of non-tenure-track faculty, both part time and full time, on student graduation rates at 4-year colleges and universities. The sample size used for data collection of graduation rates totaled 734 postsecondary institutions of two types: public (207) and private (527). The public and private colleges and universities had classifications of doctoral (152), masters (261), and liberal arts (321). When extracting data for faculty, as shown in Table 2.1, samples of public institutions totaling 205, included 87 doctoral, 91 masters, and 27 liberal arts, the private institutions, totaling 521,
included 64 doctoral, 165 masters, and 292 liberal arts faculty (Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005). Ehrenberg and Zhang collected student and faculty data for the years 1986-1987 through 2000-2001, 15 years in total. The student data was retrieved from the Annual Survey of College Standard Research Compilation (College Board, n.d.). The College Entrance Examination Board (College Board) conducts this survey yearly. The Annual Survey of College Standard Research Compilation provided Ehrenberg and Zhang (2005) with the background information of students entering at each institution, individual institutions, and graduation rates of a group of undergraduate students who entered each institution. Many survey questions for the Annual Survey of College Standard Research Compilation were drawn from the Common Data Set. The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) conducts the Faculty Salary Survey, which provided the researchers with faculty statistical information. The survey contained data on the number of full-time and part-time faculty, faculty salaries, and the proportion of full-time faculty who held tenured or tenure-track positions at each institution (Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005).

Table 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Data of Postsecondary Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public (205)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To predict models of full-time students with 5- or 6-year graduation rates, Ehrenberg and Zhang (2005) used a multiple-regression analysis of the data. There was a 10 percentage point increase in the use of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty at a public
higher education institution that related to a decrease of 2.22 percentage points in the institution’s rate of graduation. In addition, at a public, masters-level higher education institution, there was a link to a decrease of 4.44 percentage points (Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005). Given these findings, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty seem to adversely influence the graduation rates of undergraduates and doubly for graduate students. When examining graduation rates, Ehrenberg and Zhang (2005) also researched variables like first-year student completion and second-year retention rates. Knowing student completion and retention rates can provide information about future graduation rates.

Although full-time, non-tenure-track faculty teaching may have negatively influenced graduations rates, Ehrenberg and Zhang (2005) found that faculty members employed at public colleges and universities did not affect freshman student-year completion and student retention to the second year.

Besides the apparent negative impact of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty on the graduation rates of students, Ehrenberg and Zhang (2005) suggested other factors that might have influenced graduations rates. One example was the decrease in the number of courses offered at the institution due to limited financial resources (Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005). Another suggestion was the impact of the increased use of the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty on undergraduate students might have been a beneficial trade-off, as it showed a small positive effect (Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005). As a result of the increase in the use of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, tenured and tenure-track faculty at their respective academic institutions had increased research productivity (Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005). According Ehrenberg and Zhang (2005), this benefit appeared to have the greatest impact at doctoral colleges and universities.
Baldwin and Chronister (2001), Bland et al. (2006), and Monks (2007) seem to support Ehrenberg and Zhang’s (2005) suggestion that more research is produced by tenured and tenure-track faculty. Ehrenberg and Zhang offered another suggestion that the consequences of the decrease in the graduation rates of students might have been offset by the reduced cost of employing full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members. Ehrenberg and Zhang (2005) noted the savings over time by employing a full-time non-tenure-track lecturer instead of a tenure-track assistant professor might have been an acceptable financial substitution for the lower graduation rates due to the significant difference in yearly salaries in favor of the tenure-track assistant professors. The cost of tenure-track faculty increases over the career of the faculty due to them becoming tenured and obtaining promotions (Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005). The rationale for Ehrenberg and Zhang’s (2005) suggestion seems to be supported by Monks’s (2007) findings, which identified the salary disparity in favor of tenured and tenure-track faculty salaries compared to full-time non-tenured track faculty.

**Student engagement.** Some studies examined the influence of the different faculty positions on student engagement. For example, Umbach (2007) conducted a study that focused on the effect of contingent faculty, both full-time and part-time, teaching on the learning and engagement of undergraduate students. Umbach (2007) hypothesized that contingent faculty have less commitment to the colleges, poorer performance, and a higher number of contingent faculty would result in less undergraduate student engagement.

The Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research coordinated the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (Faculty Survey of Student Engagement, n.d.).
The survey is the counterpart to the National Survey of Student Engagement, which questions undergraduate students about their involvement in their educational process and student activities (Faculty Survey of Student Engagement, n.d.). Both surveys are web-based and are distributed across the United States at 4-year degree-granting higher education institutions. The Faculty Survey of Student Engagement involves questions for faculty to answer about how faculty perceive student engagement in activities, organize preparation and instructional time, and how they perceive student interactions with faculty. Umbach (2007) utilized data from this survey, completed in spring 2004, to draw his sample population.

The author identified the final data set for the faculty sample population of 17,914 full-time and part-time faculty members from 130 colleges and universities (Umbach, 2007). Umbach (2007) included academic institutions located in urban, suburban, and rural areas. Using the Carnegie Classification for postsecondary institutions, private doctoral research-extensive institutions, doctoral research-intensive institutions, masters I and II institutions, baccalaureate liberal-arts institutions, baccalaureate general institutions, and minority-serving and other institution types, were examined. Ehrenberg and Zhang (2005) also examined both part- and full-time, non-tenure-track faculty’s influences on students at similar institutional types.

Umbach (2007) used a hierarchical linear model to run the analysis in three steps for multilevel models: (a) a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), (b) a Level 1 model, and (c) a Level 2 model. Umbach created six composites identified in two categories: (a) class structures and time spent preparing for class and (b) faculty interactions with students. The results indicated that class structure and preparation of full-time, non-
tenure-track faculty closely resembled their tenured and tenure-track colleagues (Umbach, 2007). Although, the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty seemed to challenge their students at a significantly lower academic level than their permanently employed colleagues. Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were equally comparable in the use of active and collaborative methods, and they took significantly more time to prepare for courses than tenured and tenure-track faculty (Umbach, 2007). Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty interacted with students less often than the tenure-track faculty (Umbach, 2007). Statistically, in course-related interactions with students, there were no differences found between the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty and tenure-track faculty (Umbach, 2007). However, in non-course-related student interactions, there was a difference. Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty interacted less than the permanent tenure-track faculty.

Umbach’s (2007) study showed mixed results. Full-time, non-tenured track faculty were found to be similar to tenured and tenure-track faculty in some aspects of student learning while they were different in other aspects (Umbach, 2007). Umbach suggested that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty might have lacked commitment and were less effective as faculty members compared to tenured and tenure-track faculty. Bland et al. (2006) also suspected that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty might have a lack of commitment. This lack of commitment could cause full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to leave their academic place of employment. Because full-time, non-tenure-track faculty tend to earn less money, obtain less support for professional development, and are excluded from participating in certain areas of the academic settings, these faculty members might reciprocate the feeling by being less committed to and effective in their respective institutions (Umbach, 2007). Findings of Umbach (2007) show the need for
full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to receive training to promote increased faculty commitment and productivity. In addition, Umbach suggested that academic institutional policies should be developed to support full-time, non-tenure-track faculty’s trust in their colleges and universities. Limitations of the Umbach study involved the use of secondary data, which might not have included controls that influenced the research outcomes. The study examined both full- and part-time non-tenure-track faculty in part and in total for some results, and the impact of compensation of the various faculty types was excluded. This study researched the experiences of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, exclusively, through primary data collection to reveal insight into faculty commitments and productivity.

**Instruction.** Like the previously mentioned studies (Bland et al., 2006; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Monks, 2007; Umbach, 2007; Zhou & Volkwein, 2004), Baldwin and Wawrzynski (2011) examined the differences between faculty groups: tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track. Baldwin and Wawrzynski (2011) examined the likelihood of part-time and full-time contingent instructors’ application of multiple teaching and instructional activities compared to their permanent tenured and tenure-track colleagues. Baldwin and Wawrzynski also studied the diverse academic disciplines to find if pedagogical practices of permanent and temporary faculty differed. The authors examined a two-stage quantitative study that was conducted with across various 4-year public and private colleges and universities, in the same way as Ehrenberg and Zhang (2005) and Umbach (2007).

To identify variables for teaching and learning strategies used by faculty with varying tenure rank and by academic setting, Baldwin and Wawrzynski (2011) used
NSOPF:04. Like the NSOPF:99 added to the two previous cycles conducted in 1988 and 1993, NSOPF:04 added to the last three cycles (Heuer et al., 2005). Research Triangle Park International collected and analyzed the data for the NSOPF:04 during the 2003-2004 academic year (Heuer et al., 2005). NSOPF:04 continued the much needed collection of data about the various aspects of postsecondary faculty, both part-time and full-time, from public and private not-for-profit 2- and 4-year institutions (Heuer et al., 2005). The sample consisted of 1,070 degree-granting colleges and universities, but the final eligible sample of 980 provided the information about their respective faculty (Heuer et al., 2005). After the second sampling stage, the faculty sample totaled 35,630, and 34,330 were eligible (Heuer et al., 2005). Tenured, tenure-track, non-tenure-track faculty, both full-time and part-time, completed the faculty survey. In the same manner as the NSOPF:99, the NSOPF:04 included questions about teaching, background, research duties, workload, job satisfaction, salaries, socio-demographic characteristics, and opinions.

Baldwin and Wawrzynski (2011) wanted a sample population with tenure systems in 4-year colleges and universities and with faculty teaching as their main responsibility. After excluding colleges with non-tenure systems, 2-year colleges, faculty with primarily research and administrative duties, the final sample was 9,783 faculty members. Of the final sample population, 38% were tenured; 20% were on a tenure track; 16% were full-time, non-tenure track faculty; and 20% were part-time, non-tenure track faculty.

Dependent and independent variables were identified by Baldwin and Wawrzynski (2011). The dependent variables included measures of subject-centered teaching using multiple choice or short answers for midterm and final exams and
learning-centered instruction that employed essays for midterms and final exams, term and research papers, and peer work evaluation (Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011). The independent variables included being tenured, on a tenure-track, being on a non-tenured-track, and their academic environment. To determine the use of technology as a teaching strategy and communication with students via e-mail, Baldwin and Wawrzynski (2011) applied the technology index variance (X01Q39) from the NSOPF:04 database.

Multiple stages of analysis occurred in the research of Baldwin and Wawrzynski (2011). The initial stage of data analysis involved the use of descriptive statistics and correlations to conclude the connection of Holland’s (1997) theory of academic environments and the various faculty types to the subject-centered and learning-centered teaching strategies and technology used for teaching. The second stage involved two multiple series of chi-square tests. The first series of chi-square tests for independence were to determine if the use of subject-centered or learning-centered teaching and technology used for teaching are different for different faculty by tenure status and part-time and full-time employment. Baldwin and Wawrzynski (2011) sought to extend the investigation in the second series of chi-square tests for independence. The second series used subject-centered or learning-centered teaching and the technology used for teaching for different faculty types in various academic environments (Holland, 1997).

Baldwin and Wawrzynski’s (2011) first set of tests concluded communication with students using technology by full-time, non-tenure-track faculty was more like the tenured and tenure-track faculty than the part-time, non-tenure-track faculty. The second set of tests found the same likelihood extended to faculty in all academic environments except for the conventional environment, for example, in the disciplines of accounting,
A possible key finding of Baldwin and Wawrzynski (2011) was their discovery that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were more likely to apply similar learning-centered teaching practices as their permanent faculty counterparts, and their teaching practices were most similar to faculty on a tenure-track than the part-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Compared to senior tenured faculty, full-time, non-tenure-track and tenure-track faculty tended to use more subject-centered strategies (Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011). Another similarity found by Baldwin and Wawrzynski (2011) between full-time faculty with other varied appointment types was the application of teaching methods in academic environments defined by Holland (1997), such as artistic, enterprising, investigative, and realistic.

Although Umbach (2007) used a more limited size and representative database, Baldwin and Wawrzynski’s (2011) results resemblances Umbach’s conclusion. Baldwin and Wawrzynski noted that Umbach found full-time, non-tenure-track faculty appeared more like the tenured and tenure-track faculty in the construction of classes, teaching strategies, and the time they prepared for class. The Baldwin and Wawrzynski (2011) findings appear to support the use of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty rather than the use of part-time, non-tenure-track faculty in the way classes are taught more like the tenured and tenure-track faculty. Baldwin and Wawrzynski suggested that comprehensive qualitative research is needed to better compare the differences of the diverse faculty types. The aim of this study was to qualitatively research full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to discover how this faculty possibly differs from other faculty types.

**Student persistence.** In a more recent study examining the teaching of undergraduate students by non-tenure-track faculty, Figlio et al. (2013) conducted a
quantitative study of first-term freshman undergraduate students taking introductory
courses with non-tenure-eligible faculty compared to first-year, tenure-track faculty.
Figlio et al. (2013) examined the likelihood of a freshman student taking a similar course
to a pre-requisite course taught by a tenure-track faculty, compared to a freshman student
who took a similar pre-requisite course taught by a non-tenure track faculty. The study
compared a group of freshman students taking an introductory course taught by a tenure-
track faculty member to another group of freshman students taking the same course
taught by a non-tenure-track faculty member. Figlio et al. examined the impact of tenure-
track faculty compared to non-tenure-track faculty influences on students’ future course
choices, registration, and performance of the grades in those subsequent courses.

The sample population was 15,662 incoming Northwestern University freshman
students who entered college from the fall of 2001 through the fall of 2008. To provide
descriptive characteristics of the sample student population, Figlio et al. (2013) found that
the average Northwestern freshman scholastic assessment test (SAT) score was 1,392,
and 17% of the incoming freshman class were undecided about a major. The university
registrar’s office supplied student transcript data, intended majors, and academic
education, while academic departments and human resources verified faculty tenure
status. Non-tenure-track faculty included lecturers and adjunct faculty while graduate
assistants and visiting professors were excluded (Figlio et al., 2013).

Continuing to describe the Northwestern University freshman sample, Figlio et al.
(2013) noted that entering freshman were rated by the university on a 5-point academic
scale to predict freshman academic performance, where indicator 1 was the strongest and
indicator 5 the weakest (Figlio et al., 2013). Of the 8 years of the sample data for new
freshman classes, 17% had academic indicators of 1, 57% academic indicators of 2, and 26% academic indicators of 3 or higher. During the first fall quarter, 20.1% of the freshman students took a course with only tenured and tenure-track faculty, 3.8% only took a course with non-tenure-track faculty, while most of the freshman students had at least one course with tenured and tenure-track faculty and at least one course with full-time or part-time, non-tenure-track faculty (Figlio et al., 2013).

Figlio et al. (2013) conducted an ordinary least-squares regression. The number of non-tenure-track faculty teaching courses in the freshman first term increased the likelihood of a student taking a similar course by 7.3 percentage points, as well, there was an increase of a little more the one-tenth of a grade point in the following courses. Non-tenure-track faculty teaching introductory courses have probable positive effects despite the course discipline, grading criteria of instructors, and freshman students’ thoughts of content difficulty. The students with the academic indicators of 3 or higher seemed to have the best advantage from taking courses taught by non-tenure-track instructors with the hardest-graded subjects (Figlio et al., 2013). These findings conflict with the findings of Ehrenberg and Zhang (2005) about full-time, non-tenure-track faculty and their negative impact on undergraduate graduation rates.

Unlike the other previous studies mentioned, the Figlio et al. (2013) study was conducted at a single doctoral research university. Other limitations of the Figlio et al. (2013) study include both part-time and full-time as non-tenure-track faculty, like Ehrenberg and Zhang (2005) and Umbach (2007), without isolating the faculty types separately. The students at Northwestern University were not a reflection of the general U.S. student population because Northwestern is very highly selective in accepting
applicants. Although cited by several authors doing research on varying faculty appointments (Bowen, 2015; Gehrke & Kezar, 2015; Kezar, 2013b; Kezar & Maxey, 2014), a major limitation was that the Figlio et al. (2013) study was a working paper and it was not peer reviewed. Based on the findings that non-tenure-track faculty may have a positive effect on freshman students, Figlio et al. (2013) suggested that research universities hire more research-focused, tenure-track faculty to focus on scholarly activities and hire teaching-focused lecturers to teach introductory courses.

Another quantitative study investigating student persistence was conducted by Jaeger and Eagan (2011). They researched the influence of non-tenure-track faculty interactions with freshman students’ persistence to their second year. The sample selection included six out of 16 state-system, 4-year institutions. With a retention rate above the national average, this state system had an 80% freshman-to-sophomore retention rate. This state system had one of the most expensive state systems (Jaeger & Eagan, 2011). Jaeger and Eagan (2011) stated that the high cost of this college system may have encouraged this state system to hire more non-tenure-track faculty to save money. Each college and university research office supplied data for full-time, freshman who started their academic careers in the fall of 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005, including their transcripts and financial aid files. Institutional characteristic data was collected from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching website (2006). Jaeger and Eagan grouped non-tenure-track faculty into full-time, non-tenure-track; graduate assistants; and “other” part-time faculty.

For the continuing independent predictors, an ANOVA was performed by Jaeger and Eagan (2011). For each college and university, the authors also completed a separate
instrumental variable probit regression. The amount of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty teaching first-year students varied by institutional type: doctoral-extensive (36%), doctoral-intensive (20.46%), masters I (15.35%), and baccalaureate (23.70%) (Jaeger & Eagan, 2011).

Jaeger and Eagan (2011) employed a two-stage analysis and created models based on an ivprobit command in STATA. The researchers found that four incoming freshman classes, totaling 15,566 students, in a doctoral-extensive institution were not significantly influenced by their interactions with full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Ehrenberg and Zhang (2005) found a comparable finding where full-time, non-tenure-track faculty had no influence on students’ first year completion and freshman students continuing into their sophomore year. In contrast, 10% more full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were teaching in two doctoral-intensive universities with eight first-year student cohorts of 19,225 students, which resulted in a significantly positive increase in first-year student retention of 3%. This finding is consistent with the Figlio et al. (2013) findings conducted at a doctoral university where non-tenure-track faculty, including those who were full-time faculty, had a favorable impact on freshman students. Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty teaching freshman students at masters I (seven cohorts, a total of 10,806 students) and baccalaureate institutions (five cohorts, a total of 2,659 students) had a significant negative effect on persistence. Despite these negative effects, Jaeger and Eagan (2011) noted Umbach’s (2007) work showing full-time, non-tenure-track faculty are more similar to tenured and non-tenure-track faculty than part-time on-tenure-track faculty. Recognizing the similarities, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty may affect students in various ways (Jaeger & Eagan, 2011). Baldwin and Wawrzynski (2011) found supportive
findings, as did Umbach, that tenured and tenure-track faculty were similar in some ways to full-time, non-tenure-track faculty.

The strength of the Jaeger and Eagan (2011) study is that non-tenure-track faculty were looked at individually (full-time, non-tenure-track; graduate assistants; and “other” part-time faculty) and not as only one group. While there is a strong part of the study where the authors make suggestions for future research, Jaeger and Eagan (2011) suggested conducting qualitative research, possibly involving desegregation of non-tenure-track faculty, instructor’s length of service, and the length of existing faculty employment at a specific college or university. These findings may warrant further examination of non-tenure-track faculty, specifically full-time, non-tenure-track faculty’s length of continued employment at only one college or university. This study is a qualitative research of solely full-time, non-tenure-track faculty work-related and teaching experiences. The criteria for this study sample population is for the faculty participants to have been involved in several years of employment at a particular university.

Quantitative studies by Baldwin and Wawrzynski (2011), Ehrenberg and Zhang (2005), Figlio et al. (2013), Jaeger and Eagan (2011), and Umbach (2007) were reviewed this recent section. The researchers examined the influence of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty on the graduation rates of undergraduate students, undergraduate student engagement, the instruction of undergraduate students, and student persistence. Qualitative studies that explored the perceptions of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in the workplace is reviewed in the next section.
Full-Time, Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Perceptions on Employment

The research on full-time, non-tenure-track faculty was quantitatively studied by scholars Baldwin and Wawrzynski (2011), Bland et al. (2006), Ehrenberg and Zhang (2005), Figlio et al. (2013), Jaeger and Eagan (2011), Monks (2007), Umbach (2007), and Zhou and Volkwein (2004). They compared full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to tenured and non-tenure-track faculty and examined the influences of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty on undergraduate students. This section includes qualitative studies that focus on how full-time, non-tenure-track faculty think and feel about their employment as a faculty member who is not eligible for tenure.

Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in Canada. One qualitative phenomenological study of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty employed in Canada looked at these faculty member’s workload, feelings about their workplace, and academic rank mobility. Rajagopal (2004) conducted the study at 20 Canadian institutions of higher education. Authors Dobbie and Robinson (2008) and Rajagopal (2004) found several similarities between the Canadian and American colleges and universities in institutional structures and faculty models. Postsecondary institutions in Canada experience the same trends as institutions in the United States. Rajagopal found that the number of Canadian tenure-track faculty had decreased and student enrollment had increased, all while the government reduced major funding to universities.

From 1991 to 1992, Rajagopal (2004) administered institutional and faculty surveys. Using the “handbook of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC)” (p. 261), Rajagopal contacted 87 university administrative departments and invited them to participate in an institutional survey. Of the 87 universities, 61 completed
the surveys, wherein the survey requested information about faculty contracts, faculty workload, compensation, number of faculty members, and university policies. There are specific distinctions for Canadian universities, such as location, primary language group, and student enrollment that reduced the sample to 22 universities with 20 willing to participate.

The faculty survey involving the 20 universities was given to four groups: tenured and tenure-track faculty; full-time, non-tenure-track faculty; part-time contingent faculty; and academic administrators. As noted by Rajagopal (2004), full-time, non-tenure-track faculty tended to have appointments averaging 4 years, even though most only had 1-year contracts. The study found that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, on average, spent 11 hours a week on scholarly work, producing four articles and two to three research grants per year, which was similar to the tenure-track faculty. Other findings by Rajagopal (2004) were that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were on 12-month contracts, and 75% earn $30,000 or more, which is a substantially lower amount than tenured and tenure-track faculty—even though 75% of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have doctorate degrees.

In addition, Rajagopal (2004) found that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty had heavier workloads compared to tenure-track faculty. They also taught between 15 to 21 hours each week and performed 27 to 36 hours each week related to tutoring, advising, and other instructional duties out of the class setting. The most dissatisfied full-time, non-tenure-track faculty had master’s and doctoral degrees, and they were in lower ranked positions.
Rajagopal (2004) surveyed full-time, non-tenure-track faculty about their perceptions of tenured and tenure-track faculty’s thoughts of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Participants felt the more permanent faculty type did not view them as comparable colleagues but rather lower-class faculty with limited roles (Rajagopal, 2004). The study showed that tenured and tenure-track faculty marginalized, did not fully accept, and lacked collegiality with full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Yet, another interesting finding was that higher ranked full-time, non-tenure-track faculty thought the tenured and tenure-track faculty were more collegial toward them than compared to lower ranked full-time, non-tenure-track faculty who felt ostracized (Rajagopal, 2004).

American and Canadian postsecondary institutions and faculty appointments are alike in several ways (Dobbie & Robinson, 2008; Rajagopal, 2004). There are multiple differences and similarities, specifically among Canadian and U.S. full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Baldwin and Chronister (2001), Bland et al. (2006), Monks (2007), and Ehrenberg and Zhang (2005) found that U.S. tenured and tenure-track faculty produced more scholarly works compared to U.S. full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, which differ from those comparable findings in Canada. In addition, Canadian full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have yearly appointments, working all 12 months (Rajagopal, 2004). U.S. full-time, non-tenure-track faculty also have yearly appointments, but they only work 9 to 10 months, following the institutional academic calendars (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). The two countries’ full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, though, were similar in their lower earnings compared to tenured and tenure-track faculty. Rajagopal (2004) found that even Canadian full-time, non-tenure-track faculty with higher ranks earned less money than Canadian tenured faculty. Ehrenberg and Zhang (2005) and Monks (2007) found that
U.S. full-time, non-tenure-track faculty are compensated less than their tenure-track colleagues. When studying U.S. faculty, Bland et al. (2006), Baldwin and Chronister, (2001), Hollenshead et al., (2007), and Schuster and Finkelstein, (2006) documented similar findings of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty performing more work duties than tenured and tenure-track faculty. Like the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in Canada (Rajagopal, 2004), those same faculty types in the US had more prep hours (Umbach, 2007), engaged in more teaching-related activities (Monks, 2007), and provided more advising hours to undergraduate students (Bland et al., 2006). In the same way as lower ranked Canadian full-time, non-tenure-track faculty dissatisfaction, Zhou and Volkwein (2004) found lower ranked U.S. non-tenured faculty less satisfied with their job security, which could lead to a plan to depart from their institutions. Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty both in Canada and the US who hold doctorates, they were more likely to work in academia ((Rajagopal, 2004; Zhou & Volkwein, 2004).

Even though the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in Canada had a full 12-month contract working alongside their tenure-track counterparts, the majority of tenured and tenure-track faculty saw the other full-time, non-tenured faculty not as colleagues but as temporary subordinates (Rajagopal, 2004). Interestingly, Canadian full-time, non-tenure-track faculty holding higher ranks tended to have more experiences that were positive with their tenured and tenure-track colleagues. Of the participants interviewed 78% of the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty wanted to join the tenure-track faculty rank (Rajagopal, 2004).

**Self-perception.** Another study researched how full-time, non-tenure-track faculty perceived their work experiences. Levin and Shaker (2011) conducted a two-part
qualitative study that examined the hybrid and dualistic identities of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. From three public institutions, 18 full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were interviewed within English departments during the 2007-2008 academic year. Interviews, which were conducted up to 3 hours, incorporated structured questions but allowed for natural follow-up questions. In the first stage, the authors read and analyzed all of the transcripts. As a member check to enforce credibility, Levin and Shaker (2011) had participants create narratives to determine how the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty represented themselves, understood their experiences, and they detailed their professional characteristics. Data was examined and classified based on the domains of identity. Collective coded data decreased the amount of research information. The second stage discovered the self-representations and professional and occupational identities. Levin and Shaker (2011) compared and contrasted, numbered, identified variables, and made generalized understanding of the information.

Levin and Shaker (2011) applied the four domains of identity, by Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner, and Cain (1998), to study and categorize the data: figured world, positionality, self-authoring, and agency. In the figured world, the participants explain what is understood in their environment based on their relationships with others, the reflection of behaviors, and other noted results (Holland et al., 1998). A person’s level of influence and rank is related to the positionality domain. Self-authoring is how individuals perceive, act, and feel about themselves and how they respond to the figured world. The agency domain is restricted by the strong influence of the institutional norms (Holland et al., 1998).
The findings of the Levin and Shaker (2011) study identified full-time, non-tenure-track faculty as partially professional and partially worker, but they resembled a worker more than a professional. There were continuing variances in the participants; self-authoring and positionality. The full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were found to doubt themselves and have inconsistent identities (Levin & Shaker, 2011). Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty had somewhat dualistic roles. As educators in the classroom with students, they identified as experts (Levin & Shaker, 2011). Adversely, in the department among tenure-track colleagues, they felt similar to subordinates. This conclusion by Levin and Shaker (2011) parallels what Rajagopal (2004) found—full-time, non-tenure-track faculty felt lesser than and not treated equally as tenured faculty.

Another finding by Levin and Shaker (2011), as hybrids, a finite number of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty seemed satisfied with their place of employment and role as professionals. Most full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were not satisfied with their non-tenure-eligible position and that dissatisfaction limited their agency (Levin & Shaker, 2011). The dualism of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty did not allow them to be viewed as professionals because they lacked the ability to control their future within their respective institutions, while their work as educators went unrecognized and was less merited (Levin & Shaker, 2011). The majority of the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were fulfilled with teaching, while feeling simultaneously unfulfilled with the off-tenure track. Due to the unfulfillment they felt, and the fixed-term contracts offered, there is likely a lack of commitment by full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to the institutions that employ them (Levin & Shaker, 2011). Some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty welcomed the prospect to serve as a professionals and move into a tenure-track positions
This finding is consistent with Rajagopal (2004) in that a large percentage of Canadian full-time, non-tenure-track faculty are similar and different in many ways as their U.S. counterparts in desiring a more permanent tenured faculty.

Two studies seem to support Levin and Shaker’s (2011) conclusion regarding full-time, non-tenure-track faculty member’s lack of commitment. When examining the commitment of non-tenure-track faculty, Bland et al. (2006) found this faculty more likely to depart from their employment within 3 years. Due to the lack of commitment shown to full-time, non-tenure-track faculty by their respective postsecondary institutions, via minimal support professional development, low compensation, exclusion, and limitations in campus governance, Umbach (2007) concluded that the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty would not be committed to the institutions.

Levin and Shaker (2011) suggested that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty do have some level of agency and control to change their experiences. They suggested full-time, non-tenure-track faculty should decide whether to depart from the seeming negative settings or chose to accept the situations, persevere, and excel within their given environments. Like Zhou and Volkwein (2004), Levin and Shaker (2011) stated that non-tenured faculty members might find a niche role within their academic departments. Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty can become online instructional specialists and the “go to” faculty member for necessary departmental services, making these faculty indispensable to the department and to college-wide operations (Levin & Shaker, 2011).

The strength of the Levin and Shaker (2011) study is that it captured the experiences and perceptions of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty through interviews and narrative analysis. On the other hand, a limitation of the study was that it only
investigated one type of discipline, English departments within three university campuses. The study’s findings demonstrate the need to study full-time, non-tenure-track faculty who have been employed at one college or university for an extended period of time to understand their experiences about how and why they persevered. This research focuses on collecting data about the experiences and perceptions of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty who represent various disciplines at a university where they worked for 3 or more years by means of in-depth interviews.

**Job satisfaction.** The Waltman et al. (2012) study, like the previous studies in this section, focused on the views of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty and their work experiences. The qualitative study was done with full-time and part-time, non-tenure-eligible faculty and the influences their positions had on their job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. From 2008-2009, 24 focus groups of 220 full-time and part-time contingent faculty employed at 12 United States research universities were included in the study. Waltman et al. (2012) sampled participants who were “spousal hires,” persons working on their second career, prior graduates or post-doctoral fellows in the same institute, and many who held primary administrative roles. Of the 220 faculty, three fourths were full-time faculty.

The researchers’ method included focus group sessions, each for 90 minutes, where the same open-ended questions were asked of all of the participants. Waltman et al. (2012) prompted the faculty to provide specific examples of the perceptions about their relationships with their peers and managers. Verbatim transcripts of the audio-recorded focus group sessions were created. Faculty participants who could not attend the focus group sessions e-mailed their responses, which were later included in the analysis.
of the data. To perform an analysis of the themes, NVivo software was used. Using a
total of 24 transcripts, two sets of researchers collaborated to find and categorize the
themes.

Waltman et al. (2012) developed four main themes: students and teaching,
importance of personal life and flexibility, terms of employment, and respect and
inclusion. Teaching and working with students and flexibility of personal life contributed
to the job satisfaction of non-tenure-track faculty. Teaching and working with students
gave them significant joy. Waltman et al. (2012) found that the faculty felt excited and
motivated to share knowledge and experience in their discipline, honored to mentor
students, and fulfilled helping students develop into critical thinkers. Many contingent
faculty, primarily women, appreciated the flexibility of their work schedule to take care
of their children and tend to sick family members (Waltman et al., 2012). While other
non-tenure-track faculty were content with not having the stress of undertaking
scholarship, participating on multiple committees, and committing to higher levels of
service as did tenure-track faculty. Non-tenure-track faculty were more satisfied, creative,
and calculative with taking risks (Waltman et al., 2012). Some non-tenure eligible faculty
were not satisfied with the terms of their work and the absence of respect and inclusion.
Not having guaranteed yearly or semester contracts caused non-tenure eligible faculty to
be anxious about their future employment (Waltman et al., 2012). Budgetary issues,
departmental chairpersons’ goals, organizational restructuring, and student enrollment
were risks that influenced non-tenure-track faculty’s contract renewal for the following
academic year. The non-tenure-track faculty felt policies and procedures regarding
promotion and evaluation were unclear and inconsistently applied. Faculty expressed that
opportunities for upward mobility were scarce (Waltman et al., 2012). These findings are consistent with Levin and Shaker’s (2011) results that most of the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were satisfied with teaching, but at the same time, they felt dissatisfied with the lack of career advancement.

The Waltman et al. (2012) study also found faculty perceived themselves and being treated as second-class faculty. Although there were contingent faculty who felt like full faculty members in the department, frequently, contingent faculty felt they were not allowed to express their concerns within the institutions on various levels, and they felt they were at the bottom of a tier system. This result aligns with the Levin and Shaker (2011) and Rajagopal (2004) discoveries of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty thoughts on their unfavorable treatment by tenured faculty.

**Department cultures.** In a qualitative case study, Kezar (2013a) researched both part-time and full-time, non-tenure-track faculty work performance and perceptions of their departmental culture at 4-year universities. The non-tenure-track faculty were employed in 25 departments at the three universities focused in the study (Kezar, 2013a). The 107 sample faculty had experience teaching at a variety of public, private, and technical institutions, collectively. The campuses were located in a suburban, urban, and rural areas—all with a close balanced ratio of non-tenure-track faculty to tenured and tenure-track faculty (Kezar, 2013a). One-on-one interviews for 60-90 minutes were held to derive how the impact of departmental guidelines and procedures on job activities. Before visiting each institution, a review of relevant campus-wide documents and websites was completed (Kezar, 2013a). After arriving on campus, Kezar observed
various college settings and activities to note the interactions of and between faculty and students.

The results of Kezar’s (2013a) study identified four different department cultures: destructive, neutral, inclusive, and learning. Destructive cultures, the most negative cultures, were identified in three departments. Non-tenure-track faculty felt their tenured and tenure-track faculty counterparts did not view them as equals or professionals because they did not have Ph.D. degrees and were disrespectful and hostile (Kezar, 2013a). Levin and Shaker (2011), Rajagopal (2004), and Waltman et al. (2012) also found non-tenure-track faculty felt they were treated undesirably because they were not tenured or on tenure track. As a result of non-tenure-track faculty adverse experiences, they decreased in their willingness to support the department and the students’ ability to learn (Kezar, 2013a).

The most identified culture, 13 out of 25 departments, was the neutral culture (Kezar, 2013a). The non-tenure-track faculty felt invisible, ignored, and they tended to stay out of the way of the chairperson or staff so as not to appear needy or burdensome. Although a better situation than the destructive culture, non-tenure-track faculty in the neutral culture experienced a lack of support from the academic chair and staff, experienced last-minute hiring, and the faculty received low pay (Kezar, 2013a). The feedback provided to some non-tenure-track faculty was a requirement and not purposeful in supporting this temporary faculty group (Kezar, 2013a). Some non-tenure-track faculty received the needed items to be an effective and productive faculty. To a lesser degree than the destructive culture, non-tenure-track faculty in the neutral culture were still less willing to put forth extra effort. In both the destructive and neutral cultures,
non-tenure-track faculty had reduced willingness to be involved department activities (Kezar, 2013a). Bland et al. (2006), Levin and Shaker (2011), and Umbach (2007) also found full-time, non-tenure-track faculty exhibiting lack of commitment to their respective places of employment because of negative experiences. Conversely, Kezar (2013a) found a number of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty who had formed relationships with other faculty that seemed to decrease their negative experiences. These formations of relationships happened more frequently in the destructive and neutral cultures.

The inclusive culture appeared in six departments. Even though non-tenure-track faculty still had lower pay and lesser benefits, they enjoyed their work (Kezar, 2013a). Viewed as a professional by colleagues and supported by chairs via advocacy of professional development and leadership positions, non-tenure-track faculty were much more likely to do more than expected of them by sometimes being willing to work without pay (Kezar, 2013a). With the all of the positive aspects of the inclusive culture, it still lacks the institutional policies and procedural changes to create a sustainable positive culture (Kezar, 2013a).

The learning culture was clearly revealed in three departments (Kezar, 2013a). This culture was highly respectful and inclusive at all levels of the institution. Faculty and chairpersons understood the need to provide non-tenure-track faculty with professional development for teaching and in discipline areas, equitable compensation, and relevant faculty appraisals (Kezar, 2013a). The institutional policies and procedures were established to fully support the non-tenure-track faculty as professional instructors.
The academic chairperson’s role was crucial in the positive development of the departmental culture to promote effective job performance and student learning.

The scholarly works of Kezar (2013a), Levin and Shaker (2011), Rajagopal (2004), and Waltman et al. (2012) were reviewed in this section. The literature included qualitative studies about the perceptions of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty regarding their teaching, job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, work performance, and departmental culture. The next section continues with qualitative studies describing policies and practices that impact full-time, non-tenure-track faculty.

Policies and practices. Kezar and Sam (2013) conducted a qualitative two-part methodological study using institutionalism as a framework. The authors focused on finding the issues and tactics used to advance equitability of the policies and procedures regarding full-time, non-tenure-track faculty (Kezar & Sam, 2013). Institutionalization has three phases: mobilization, where a system is ripe for reform; implementation, where a system has begun to change; and institutionalization, where the reformation has become constant. The Higher Education Contract Analyses System, which is a database open to researchers upon request, aided in the identification of faculty sample populations (Kezar & Sam, 2013).

Part 1 of the study included 60 to 90-minute-long telephone interviews with 45 faculty members, many who held leadership roles in the institutions with a goal to positively or progressively work toward positive policies for contingent faculty (Kezar & Sam, 2013). Of the faculty interviewed, 40 were non-tenure-track faculty and five were tenure-track faculty. At eight institutions, interviews were conducted in group settings, while 22 other institutions held one-on-one interviews (Kezar & Sam, 2013). Part 2 of the
study included a year-long document analysis of 424 employee contracts and contingent policies. Meeting minutes, web pages, and contingent faculty listservs provided more data after the selection of the institutions were made for the study. Kezar and Sam (2013) used the Boyatzis (1998) thematic analysis to analyze the various documents and to interview data. During the data analysis, Kezar and Sam (2013) identified both deductive and inductive codes. The criteria for categorizing the themes were: (a) amount of people who spoke about the same theme, (b) the length of time an individual spoke about a theme, and (c) the participants expressed the importance of a theme.

Kezar and Sam (2013) classified 12 campuses in the mobilization phase. They found it was important to make faculty aware of the issues concerning contingent faculty, establish a method of collecting information and communicating concerns of contingent faculty, and bring contingent faculty out of isolation and have them more visible on campuses. Kezar and Sam (2013) categorized 13 institutions in the implementation phase. For effective implementation, faculty needed to create a clear reason for advocating contract and policy and practice changes; use of documents including data, goals, and exemplary institutions to push forward policies; be allowed to participate in campus governance; rally and capitalize on advocates both internal and external; and develop a plan to act (Kezar & Sam, 2013). Only five colleges and universities were identified in the institutionalization phase. Those in governance and policymaking roles, like tenure-track faculty and administrators, often affect this stage (Kezar & Sam, 2013). Campus climate has to be discussed openly at the institute level. A focus on values instead of policies is needed to provide effective change and non-tenure-track faculty
should take on more responsibility, especially on important topics influencing the institutions.

**Methodological Review**

In reviewing the literature of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty at 4-year colleges and universities, quantitative methodological studies were often conducted within a positivist paradigm (Kezar & Sam, 2011). Several quantitative studies utilized multiple regression analysis, confirmatory factor analysis, ANOVA, predictor models, and descriptors statistics (Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011; Bland et al., 2006; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Figlio et al., 2013; Jaeger & Eagan, 2011; Monks, 2007; Umbach, 2007; Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). The studies employed various analyses that determined dependent and independent variables for graduation rates, influence of faculty teaching on undergraduate learning, influence of contingent faculty experiences on freshman persistence, likelihood of teaching strategies of various faculty appointment types, and likelihood of freshman taking subsequent courses taught by instructors of different faculty status. These quantitative studies compared tenured and tenure-track faculty to non-tenure-track faculty regarding plans to leave their employment, job satisfaction, commitment, and faculty salaries. The research also presented the effect of non-tenure-track faculty teaching on student graduation rates, undergraduate students learning and engagement, and student persistence.

Seeking to understand full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members’ perceptions toward their workplace, researchers conducted a number of qualitative methodological studies. Several qualitative studies employed surveys, case studies, phenomenological methods, semi-structured and open-ended interview questions, transcripts, narrative
analyses, and written and recorded interviews via telephone and in person, group and one-on-one meetings (Kezar, 2013a; Kezar & Sam, 2013; Levin & Shaker, 2011; Rajagopal, 2004; Waltman et al., 2012). Themes were coded with Boyatzis’s (1998) thematic analysis and NVivo software. To check for credibility, researchers used triangulation of observations and document analyses (Kezar, 2013a; Kezar & Sam, 2013). Overall, the qualitative studies described full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members’ experiences and the perceptions and the environments and cultures in which they worked.

Gaps in the Literature

Several gaps emerged from the literature review for this study. First, no study addressed factors that could aid in the successful career longevity and advancement of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Although Baldwin and Chronister (2001) mentioned contract renewal and promotion, which might aid in extending the careers of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, no studies about full-time, non-tenure-track faculty member’s continuous employment and career mobility were conducted in depth. Second, it appears that tenured and tenure-track professors and researchers are leading the research on non-tenure-track faculty, specifically full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. This research by tenured and tenure-track faculty could be biased in favor of themselves and against non-tenured faculty (Kezar & Sam, 2011).

Third, although full-time, non-tenure-track faculty are slowly but steadily growing in numbers, most studies do not exclusively study full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Research involving non-tenure-track faculty have included comparisons to tenured and tenure-track faculty. In the studies of non-tenure-track faculty, some have primarily focused on part-time, non-tenure-track faculty (Antony & Valadez, 2002;
Bettinger & Long, 2005; Eagan & Jaeger, 2008; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Jaeger & Eagan, 2011b; Jaeger & Hinz, 2008). Other studies related to non-tenure-track faculty have included both full-time and part-time faculty (Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011; Cross & Goldenberg, 2011; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Figlio et al., 2013; Gappa et al., 2007; Jaeger & Eagan, 2011a; Kezar, 2013a; Kezar & Sam, 2013; Monks, 2007; Umbach, 2007; Waltman et al., 2012). A few studies have focused solely on full-time, non-tenure-track faculty (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Levin & Shaker, 2011; Rajagopal, 2004). Both part-time and full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have similar term appointments that have no guarantee for contract renewal (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Part-time, non-tenure-track faculty contracts can range from one-semester to a one full year with varying numbers of courses taught during a term (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). In comparison, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty receive 1-year to multiyear contracts (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Many full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members are interacting more frequently with students and faculty than part-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Because full-time, non-tenure-track faculty teach a full load of courses, they spend more time in the physical space of the department (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Kezar, 2013a). Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, also, have offices to themselves or they share with another faculty member (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Part-time, non-tenured faculty might teach online courses, have limited courses each term, have lack of office space and supplies, and have limited departmental support (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kezar, 2013a).

While some full-time, non-tenure-track appointments have multiple-year contracts, some of these temporary faculty members are eligible for contract renewal
while others are not (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Waltman et al. (2012) showed that non-tenure-track faculty, both part-time and full-time, were concerned and uneasy about employment for the upcoming year. Despite the fact that some non-tenure-track faculty might have had multiyear contracts in the past and felt a greater sense of job security, they, too, felt anxious about contract renewal (Waltman et al., 2012). Non-tenure-track faculty who performed well can still worry about the effects of budget issues, rising costs of student tuition for postsecondary education, departmental and institutional needs, low student enrollment, and changes in the renewal of their contracts (Waltman et al., 2012). When examining the reasons why faculty leave academia, researchers, Zhou and Volkwein (2004), found job security as the second strongest predictor of faculty intention to depart. They also found higher ranked non-tenured faculty were less satisfied (Rajagopal, 2004) with job security. Job security is a concern for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty.

This study addresses these gaps in the literature by qualitatively studying full-time, non-tenure-track faculty who taught at the same university for 3 or more years. As the primary data collection, in-depth interviews were conducted with the use of supplementary data from document analysis, field notes, and a demographic survey. Attention was given to discovering how these faculty members possibly differed from other faculty types and to uncover faculty members’ commitment and productivity. The most noticeable gap is the lack of literature involving full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in 4-year higher education institutions with successful careers or years of service.
Chapter Summary

This selective literature review discussed various perspectives and effects of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty on undergraduate education, their workplace experiences, comparisons to tenured and tenure-track faculty, and institutional policies and procedures. After searches of the databases, reviews of empirical studies within the last 10 years, and analysis of the methodology in the studies, the identified gaps in full-time, non-tenure eligible faculty literature were discussed. Chapter 3 presents and discusses the research design, research context, data collection, and analysis.
Chapter 3: Research Design Methodology

Introduction

Studies have shown slow but steady growth of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty compared to their tenured and tenure-track faculty counterparts (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Ehrenberg, 2012; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Of newly hired full-time faculty, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty are the most hired in colleges and universities (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty who have limited term contracts experience higher anxiety levels related to job security and career advancement than their tenured and tenure-track faculty colleagues who may have more job security and career advancement (Waltman et al., 2012; Zhou & Volkwein, 2004).

The purpose of this study is to better understand the experiences and perceptions of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty working 3 or more years teaching in a 4-year university.

The first section of this chapter describes the phenomenological study of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty at a large private university. The following portion of the chapter provides a description of the research design, which includes the rationale for choosing this design and the benefits and limitations of this design. The remaining sections address the research context and participants, highlighting the participant criteria, and the research methodology that involved data collection, analysis, and procedures. The chapter concludes with a summary.
Research Design

The purpose of qualitative research study is to interpret and find understanding of a phenomenon (Glesne, 1999). To find understanding of the lived experiences of individuals, it is best for the researcher to have a personal interaction with participants in their natural setting (Creswell, 2013). In a qualitative study, the researcher is the instrument that collects and interprets the data (Creswell, 2013).

A phenomenological research design was used in this study to allow the researcher to explore the shared experiences of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty working and teaching in a 4-year university. Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were interviewed in order to document their descriptive experiences of those full-time, non-tenure-track faculty (Marshall & Rossman, 1995). The individual interviews were semi-structured to allow for main, probing, and follow-up questions.

From the onset of the data analysis, the researcher set aside his own experiences to be open to new and different viewpoints from other fellow full-time, non-tenure-track faculty who had various experiences in the same setting. In the data analysis, the researcher proceeded in a systematic manner to record detailed full-time, non-tenure-track faculty statements and derive a wide-ranging collection of meanings. Afterwards, the researcher formulated specific descriptions of what full-time, non-tenure-track faculty experiences were and how the non-tenure-track faculty members were experiencing them (Creswell, 2013).

Research Context

The university. This study took place at a large suburban, private, not-for-profit university in the United States, which is referenced throughout the dissertation as the
University. The University’s Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching classification is presently Doctoral University with Moderate Research Activity. This University is a coeducational institution that confers associate, baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral degrees across nine colleges and other university units granting degrees.

At the beginning of the fall 2015 semester, the University had an undergraduate student population of 15,401 and graduate student population of 3,205. The faculty totaled 1,544 including both full-time (tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track) and part-time faculty (tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track). Faculty with instructional, research, and administrative duties were included in the 1,544 total. The number of instructional full-time, non-tenure-track faculty at the University has increased over the years. In the fall of 2008, this population was 177 and by the fall of 2015, it had grown to 301. The University’s chief academic officer set a goal to obtain a more balanced faculty ratio between tenured and tenure-track faculty and full-time and part-time non-tenure-track faculty based on the number of sections or credit hours taught.

At the start of each academic year, the University hosts a faculty orientation event. Since 2008, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have participated in the University 2.5-day faculty orientation alongside their tenure-track colleagues. All new faculty have an opportunity to engage with faculty and administrators, campus wide, and within their academic divisions. Time is allocated for both formal and informal interactions among the new faculty and campus leaders.

In 2011, the University established and modified the lecturer rank system for full-time, non-tenure track faculty; instituted teaching awards for non-tenure track faculty, started giving lecturer professional development grants, and the University’s Chief
Academic Officer appointed a Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Administrator. Higher ranked lecturers, called senior and principal lecturers, are allowed to serve on and share in governance of the University by way of the Academic Faculty Senate. Lecturers have the opportunity to receive promotions after a specified numbers of years in rank and demonstration of outstanding teaching. At least one of the colleges at the University provides professional development support for the lecturers by supplying full or partial payment of conference fees and the associated travel, lodging, and meal costs. After reviewing institutional demographics and policies, it appears the University has some supportive procedures in place for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Having positive policies and procedures for the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty could influence the faculty members’ experiences and perceptions.

The researcher. This research study is personal. Employed as a full-time, non-tenure-track faculty member for 8 years at a 4-year postsecondary institution, the researcher has been engaged in multiple annual contracts. In addition to teaching, 3 of the 8 years of employment involved service by volunteering in the University’s internship program and making field visits with interns at their assigned organization. The researcher also served in a position to support the University’s diversity initiatives by working directly with the dean of the college.

Research Participants

Creating a sample in a purposeful manner is vital and most effective in capturing the common experiences of participants (Creswell, 2013). During the fall 2015 academic semester, the University employed a total of 1,544 faculty members, but only 1,015 were full-time instructional faculty. The population for this study consisted of 301 full-time,
non-tenure-track faculty members with teaching as their primary duty. A sample of these faculty were selected from the colleges and the University departments that granted degrees.

The sampling of the participants was a combination of a homogeneous and criterion sampling. Homogeneous sampling has very specific criteria and involves the selection of all similar types of circumstances to understand and describe a subsection of participants more thoroughly (Glesne, 1999). Comparably, criterion sampling consists of all cases satisfying a specific criterion and all of the participants who have experienced the phenomenon (Creswell, 2013; Miles & Huberman, 1994). For this study, the sample was homogeneous and criterion by selecting participants who were full-time, non-tenure-track faculty who spent 70% or more of their time teaching at least three courses a quarter or semester for 3 years or more. Selecting full-time, non-tenure-track faculty with 3 or more years of teaching at the University helped to ensure that the faculty chosen for the study had either obtained numerous contract renewals, possible multiyear contracts, or possibly they had advanced within the lecturer rank system. Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty can be lecturers, senior lecturers, and principal lecturers. A small number of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty hold traditional ranks such as instructor, assistant professor, and associate professor. An additional inclusion was full-time, non-tenure-track faculty who had experienced promotion in the lecturer or traditional rank system without going through a promotion process. In other words, those faculty members were “grandfathered in” to their positions. The following faculty positions do not fit the inclusion criteria and they were excluded from the study: tenured or tenure-track faculty, former tenured or tenure-track faculty from the University or another postsecondary
institution, non-tenure-track research faculty, visiting faculty, part-time or adjunct instructors, emeritus faculty, clinical faculty, or faculty with primary administrative duties.

The full-time, non-tenure-track faculty numbers are increasing nationally as a subgroup (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Curtis, 2014; Ehrenberg, 2012; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). According to University’s website, the faculty members employed at the study site share similar experiences because they were employed for more than 3 years and the majority of their time was concerned with teaching responsibilities. The University allows some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to have multiyear contracts, no limit on full-time, non-tenure-track faculty contract renewals, and has a full-time, non-tenure-track faculty rank system for lecturers.

The researcher accessed the participants through the office of the University’s Chief Academic Officer. The Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Administrator used the University’s preset listserv to send e-mails to full-time, non-tenure-track faculty on behalf of the researcher. The listserv consisted of more than 300 full-time, non-tenure-track faculty including those faculty members who had teaching, research, or administrative activities as their primary responsibilities, but the study sample was draw from 301 full-time, non-tenure-track faculty who focused on at least 70% of their workload toward instruction.

Data Collection

This section explains how the data was collected for the study. There were five forms of data collection used in this study. Those five sources allowed the researcher to validate the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty qualifying criterion and obtain additional
demographic participant information while triangulating the data. The data collection sources were a demographic survey, interview transcripts, field notes, and University documents.

Prior to inviting the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members to participant in the study, permission to solicit these faculty members, along with the researcher’s plan to conduct the study (Appendix B), was approved by the University’s Chief Academic Officer. The Chief Academic Officer agreed to have the Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Administrator send an e-mail to inform full-time, non-tenure-track faculty about participation in this study. The Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Administrator contacted 301 full-time, non-tenure-track faculty by way of the campus-wide e-mail listserv. Embedded in the e-mail was the formal invitation to full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to participate in the study (Appendix C). The invitation that provided an introduction and the purpose of the study and the interview. It also included a website link to Qualtrics, which is an online survey software, where the interested participant could consent to participate (Appendix D) and a demographic data survey for the interested participant to complete (Appendix E). Given the significant presence of deaf and hard-of-hearing faculty members on the University’s campus, the collected data about hearing status aided in the representative selection of all faculty to participate in the study.

**Demographic data survey.** The first form of data collection was the demographic data survey (Appendix E), which gathered basic participant information and obtained participant confirmation for him or her to be included in the study. Demographic data questions addressed were gender, hearing status, tenure-track status, faculty title and rank, years of employment at the University, percentage of time teaching in each
previous quarter or semester, postsecondary education, college name, and department’s name. The survey also served as a screening mechanism by providing information about delimitations to the participant criteria.

Creswell (2013) recommended 5-25 participants should be included in a phenomenological study. A desired sample of 8 to 12 participants who met the criteria was not achieved after the initial e-mail; therefore, a reminder e-mail was sent 1 week after the initial e-mail by the Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Administrator (Appendix F). To ensure that information about the study was shared across the campus, flyers (Appendix G) were posted on academic and campus bulletin boards following the first e-mail. After the second e-mail, the sample population exceeded 12 participants. The researcher then proceeded to start the participant selection process.

The first selection of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty was based on those with the most years of employment at the University. The second selection was based on the differences of colleges and/or departments in which the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty worked. With faculty representation from various colleges and departments, the participants had diverse experiences and perceptions about their respective department and college cultures. Equally important were the differing roles that the participants performed and how others viewed them in their department. Consideration was given to have an equal number of male and female possible participants.

**Interviews.** Once the participants were selected, semi-structured, 1-hour in-depth interviews were scheduled at the University with full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. The interviews were conducted in a non-distractive location, with good acoustics and lighting, where the individual participants would feel comfortable to discuss their experiences.
Interviewing is used in phenomenological studies to collect data because in-depth interviewing allows participants who share similar experiences to speak about their experiences. The interview questions for this study were predetermined and were created in a meaningful and logical order. The research question, literature review, and the theoretical framework guided the development of the interview questions. The interview protocol (Appendix H) consisted of 11 open-ended interview questions that allowed the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members to express their experiences. Specific questions meant to probe for robust interview responses were asked as needed.

For all of the interviews with hearing, not deaf, or hard-of-hearing faculty, a digital audio device was used to record the interview. Digital audio devices captured the clear voices of both the interviewer and interviewee. For interview(s) with deaf or hard-of-hearing faculty, digital video equipment was used to document the interview. The camera was positioned to capture the communications of the researcher and the participant. As an assurance, a digital tablet with both audio and video capabilities served as a secondary recording device for all interviews. Due to the researcher being fluent in American Sign Language with an Advanced Plus to Superior Plus Level Range on the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview, a certified sign language interpreter was not needed for the interview(s) with deaf and hard-of-hearing faculty members. Upon completion of all of the interviews, the audio recordings were transcribed into written text by an independent transcriptionist. The video recordings were interpreted and transcribed by a certified Registry Interpreter for the Deaf (RID) sign language interpreter.
**Field notes.** During the interviews, the researcher had a preprinted interview protocol form with ample space for writing field notes before, during, and after each interview to collect additional data. Field notes can be descriptive and reflective (Creswell, 2013). Notes are not limited to what the interviewee said, but they can also reflect how the interviewee responded or appeared when responding. The descriptive notes can provide insightful information about the interview process and activities. Reflective notes can help in the coding process and eventually the development of themes (Creswell, 2013).

**Institutional documents.** Several documents from the University served as the fourth form of data collection for the study. Documentation provides written evidence and data to the researcher about participants’ environments (Creswell, 2014). Institutional documents and surveys were examined to gain a more comprehensive perspective about the policies and practices of the organization regarding its full-time, non-tenure track faculty. These institutional documents and surveys were accessed through the University’s website. Data pre-collected by a national faculty survey, internal faculty survey, and an institutional climate survey were all included in the document analysis and retrieved from the University’s website.

**Researcher.** The fifth form of data collection utilized the researcher as the instrument (Glesne, 1999). The forms of data, how the data was collected, and examination of documents and the interviewing of participants were conducted and then interpreted by the researcher (Creswell, 2014). In the data analysis, the researcher explored relationships and patterns within the data to determine broad and applicable
themes (Glesne, 1999). The researcher interpreted the shared experiences and described the meaning of those shared experiences.

**Procedures Used in Data Analysis**

**Demographic data survey.** The demographic survey served as a tool to ensure that participants satisfied the criteria and assisted in the selection process. The demographic survey was made available to the participants through the Qualtrics online questionnaire software. Utilizing the features of the Qualtrics software, the researcher created reports based on the study’s participant criteria. Created reports were filtered by all of the participants surveyed, all lecturers, lecturers with 5 or more years, only lecturers, and only senior lecturers. The reports aided the researcher in determining the eligible population. Data related to gender, rank, highest degree earned, years working at the University in the lecturer rank, and academic disciplines was analyzed for the selection process. The selection of participants was based on most years employed at the University as a lecturer, the diverse academic divisions represented, and the gender of the possible participants.

**Interviews and field notes.** In a phenomenological qualitative study, data analysis involves a step-by-step process. The process begins by examining participants’ interview statements through audio or text to find sentences that will assist in understanding how the participants experienced the phenomenon (Creswell, 2013). The next step necessitates moving from individual statements to expansive units of meaning (Creswell, 2013). A detailed description of the essence of the participants’ experiences concludes the analysis. In the process of the research:
1. To the best of the researcher’s ability, he bracketed and set aside personal experiences to keep the participants’ paramount (Creswell, 2013).

2. To ensure the development of relevant codes and themes, the researcher continued to refer to the research question to serve as a guide.

3. The researcher listened to interview audio recordings, reviewed the video recordings, and read the interview transcriptions and interview notes. The process was repeated to gain a holistic context of the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty experiences.

4. As a direct content analysis strategy, transcriptions were read while highlighting predetermined codes. These predetermined codes were based on the literature review of experiences associated with full-time, non-tenure-track faculty and the anticipation of participants’ responses (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005).

5. For the data that could not be identified as a predetermined code, it was noted and analyzed at a different time than the predetermined codes (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005).

6. While reviewing the data, care was taken to write additional notes in the margins of the transcription texts to identify phrases and key concepts (Creswell, 2013). Attention was given to conflicting or matching data from the demographic data survey with the interview notes.

7. For the data that was not deemed under the predetermined codes, the researcher categorized it. The larger categories of data were reduced to
smaller groups of analyzed information, resulting in new codes or subcodes. Codes emerging from the analysis was included by the researcher.

8. Relevant phrases and sentences linked to the codes were identified. Interpreted meanings of those phrases and sentences were grouped into themes, which capture the essence of the full-time, non-tenure-track shared experiences (Creswell, 2013).

9. After deriving themes from the information, the researcher reflected and interpreted the meaning of the information collected (Creswell, 2013).

10. When a saturation of themes was determined, redundant units of meaning were eliminated.

11. Themes were grouped together in several groups by relevant meaning.

12. The participants were asked to member check, review, make modifications, and add any additional information, as needed, to their respective transcripts to ensure the transcript reflected the true context of their interview responses (Creswell, 2014).

13. Based on the feedback from the member checking and as needed, modifications to the themes were modified for accuracy.

14. Overarching commonalities were sought across all or the majority of the interviews.

University documents. The University documents consisted of varied and multiple surveys, websites, reports, polices, and practices. The documents were organized and critically inspected to identify patterns and trends across the documents about full-time, non-tenure-track faculty that met this study’s criteria. Also, official documents of
the University were studied to gather faculty and student demographic data. The researcher reviewed the University’s national faculty, internal faculty, and climate surveys for specific concepts and characteristics relative to full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. The purpose of examining the documents was to obtain possible a priori or predetermined codes that would emerge and to find data that would support or contradict this study’s participants’ responses. Academic policies and practices were examined to discover which policies addressed full-time, non-tenure-track faculty workload; their involvement in governance; the promotion process; faculty orientations; and professional development funding.

Confidentiality. All audio-, video-, and text-based files collected for the study were secured under lock and key during the research study, and will be for 5 years after publication of the study. The researcher did not request any participant information that was not germane to the focus and purpose of this study. Identification numbers were assigned to each interviewed participant. All participant information was confidential and stored in a password-protected external hard drive and locked in the office of the researcher. Only the researcher has access to the anonymized recorded and transcribed data. In the case of a deaf or hard-of-hearing faculty member who participated, a certified sign language interpreter interpreted and then transcribed the interview into text. The certified sign language interpreter is bound by the professional organization’s conduct of ethics which ranks confidentiality as paramount ethical behavior (Appendix I). The storage of the digital demographic survey (Appendix E) data (which contains the name(s) and identifying data) remained in the Qualtrics software, which is an online survey
software, and the interview protocol (which contains the Participant ID number) is stored separately in printed text.

The researcher is fluent in American Sign Language (ASL) and was able to communicate directly with deaf or hard-of-hearing individuals. At the start of the interview, the researcher used the primary language of the deaf or hard-of-hearing faculty member(s), whether spoken language or sign language, to briefly review his/her consent to participate, ask interview questions, and respond to the participants’ questions or comments.

**Summary**

This chapter explained the rationale and methodology for this phenomenological study. The data collection and data analysis was selected to best understand the work and teaching experiences of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. The data was collected by the researcher in a variety of ways using in-depth individual interviews, a demographic data survey, field notes, and document analysis.
Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

A literature review of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty revealed a consistent increase in this faculty type compared to tenured and tenure-track faculty (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Ehrenberg, 2012; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). When higher education institutions are hiring full-time faculty, most of the faculty are non-tenure-track faculty (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, who have limited term contracts, experience higher anxiety levels related to job security and career advancement than their tenured and tenure-track faculty colleagues who may have more job security and career advancement (Waltman et al., 2012; Zhou & Volkwein, 2004).

The purpose of the study was to obtain an increased understanding of the experiences and perceptions of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty at a large private doctoral university. The study was guided by the following research question: What are the experiences and perceptions of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty working 3 or more years at a 4-year university that influence career longevity and advancement?

Chapter 4 reports the findings of the study, which are arranged into five major themes that were formulated through cross-data analysis. Each theme is related to the experiences and perceptions that influence the career advancement and longevity of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty who have worked 3 or more years at a 4-year university. The following five themes were identified upon completion of data analysis:

1. Socialization is support, trust, and acceptance.
2. It’s like being a second-class citizen.
3. The workhorse carries a heavy load, but it’s worth it.
4. What’s your niche? To make myself needed.
5. Moving forward with an unclear path.

The themes emerged from the analysis of the data collected from the five different sources with emphasis on the semi-structured interviews with 12 full-time, non-tenure-track faculty who were employed for 3 or more years at the University. The analysis of data was supplemented by a demographic survey (Appendix E), field notes, and University documents and surveys.

Demographic survey. As a screening tool for participant criteria and a form of data collection for this study, a demographic survey (Appendix E) was sent to 301 full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members on the University’s campus-wide e-mail listserv. Of those 301 full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, 47 faculty members started the survey, and 37 faculty members completed the survey. From the faculty who completed the survey, 17 were lecturers and senior lecturers who met the criteria of being employed as a full-time, non-tenure-track faculty member for 3 or more years at the University. All 17 full-time, non-tenure-track faculty responded that they worked 70-100% of their time during the 2014-2015 academic year focused on teaching responsibilities. The researcher’s goal was to obtain 8-12 participants. Following the study’s methodology, the initial selection of participants was based on faculty with the most years employed at the University. The next selection considered the faculty chosen from various colleges and departments. The final selection focused on an equitable representation of female and male participants. Of the potential participants reviewed, 13 were selected by the criteria.
After all of the 13 interviews were completed, it was determined that one of the participants did not satisfy the study’s eligibility by teaching less than 70% of the time during the 2014-2015 academic year, and the participant was eliminated from the study sample. This researcher conducted primary data analysis based on the interviews of the final 12 participants.

A summary of the participants’ demographics is displayed in Table 4.1. The demographic variables were obtained from the semi-structured interviews and the demographic survey (Appendix E). Of the nine participants, six were male and three were female. Of the 12 participants, nine full-time, non-tenure-track faculty participants had been promoted to the rank of senior lecturer and had been employees at the University at least 5 years or more. The remaining three participants were lecturers. No principal lecturers participated in this study. There were several faculty members employed at the University prior to being hired as lecturers. Many of the participants had industry experience.

**University documents.** Some of the data included in this study were from the University national faculty, internal faculty, and climate surveys. The national faculty survey (2012) had 96 respondents of the total 207 full-time, non-tenure-track faculty who were lecturers and senior lecturers employed on campus. There were two specific questions asked in the national survey that were used in this study. Those questions asked respondents to select “the best aspects about working at your institution” and “the worst aspects about working at your institution.” Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were told to select 2 of the 29 options provided for each question. Of the 136 internal faculty
Summary Demographic of Full-Time, Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Lecturer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree Earned*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTNTTF** Working at the University at Lecturer Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 9 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTNTTF with Previous Employment at the University (some FTNTTF had more than one position)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a Previous Employee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplines***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA, MDS, and Business</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Alumni</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTNTTF with Previous or Current Industry Experience</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Percentages do not add to 100% due to rounding; **Full-Time, Non-Tenure-Track Faculty; ***Disciplines: STEM – Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematic; LA – Liberal Arts; MDS – Multidisciplinary Studies
survey (2015) respondents, there were approximately 61 lecturers, 26 senior lecturers, and no principal lecturers. During analysis of the internal faculty survey documents, the researcher ignored and eliminated all comments that specifically mentioned non-tenure-track faculty working primarily as a researcher or administrator, adjunct professor, visiting professor, or any other faculty appointment type that did not meet the criteria for participation in this study. The climate survey (2012) included both the University’s staff and faculty. Although, the survey results were aggregated by staff and faculty (tenured and tenure-track faculty, and full-time, non-tenure-track faculty), the researcher could not obtain the response rate for the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty for the climate survey.

**Interviews.** To enforce creditability, interview transcriptions were e-mailed to each of the participants for member checking. The participants were asked to review the transcripts to make sure the documents accurately represented their individual interview responses. Seven of the 12 participants completed a member check.

**Theme 1: Socialization is support, trust, and acceptance.** Socialization in the context of Theme 1 indicates the level of department, college, and university acceptance that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty feel they had achieved. Their roles, interactions, and relationships appeared to influence their socialization. Understanding socialization as a perpetual process of learning the skills and information of an organization, Van Maanen and Schein (1979) stated that the process does not happen only for new employees. When discussing the inclusionary dimension, Schein’s (1971) model shows, for example, an employee’s ability to advance through the dimension. While going through the dimension, relationships change between the employee and the existing employees (Schein, 1971). In this study, the participants recalled feeling accepted, trusted, valued,
and supported by the administrators, traditional tenured and tenure-track faculty, and other full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. The participants were employed from 3 to more than 9 years at the University and they had received various levels of support from different faculty types.

The participants in the study were given a figure, which was included in the interview protocol (Appendix H), and they were asked to circle their perceived level of membership or acceptance into their departments as full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members, and then they were asked to explain why they chose that level of membership or acceptance. Figure 4.1 shows a plot of the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty participants’ responses to the interview questions and they are represented by various shapes on the Central Figure side (left side of the figure). The questions were: “What do you think your level of membership (or acceptance) is in your department as a full-time, non-tenure-track faculty member?” and “Can you explain why you chose this level of membership (or acceptance)?”

Based on the organizational socialization theory by John Van Maanen and Edgar H. Schein (1979), the levels of membership or acceptance are: (a) Central Figure, as one who is essential to the operations of the department/college; (b) Confidant, as a trusted member of the department or college, or fully shares in all the affairs of the group; (c) Confederate, as one who assist other members on certain selected matters and somewhat trusted member in department; (d) Provisional Member, as one not officially an outsider or newcomer, but adopted tentatively, conditionally, and probationary; (e) Newcomer, as one “on the edge” of organizational affairs, and may not yet be deemed trustworthy by other members; and (f) Outsider, as a marginally accepted novice group member.
**Figure Key**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Membership or Acceptance</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Figure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Employed ≥8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Employed ≥9 years; 4 participants approaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Employed 4-8 years; 3 participants approaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Employed 3-4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaching the next level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4.1. Inclusionary Domains of Organizations – Membership. Adapted from “Toward a Theory of Organizational Socialization,” by J. Van Maanen and E. H. Schein, 1979, Research in Organizational Behavior, 1, p. 209. Copyright 1979 by Elsevier.*
The figure key in Figure 4.1 displays the name and level of membership or acceptance in an organization, and the shaped object represents the participants’ selecting that level, and the number of participants responding to that level of membership. Of the 12 participants, seven stated or implied they were in between two levels of acceptance. Those participants are displayed as shaped objects with extended arrows, indicating that the participants were “approaching” the next level of membership. Figure 4.1 also includes the demographic information of the participants at each level of membership or acceptance. Overall, the participants reported feeling accepted as an equal departmental peer, being trusted in many department matters to make decisions, and valued for what they brought to the department.

As noted by Participant 3, a senior lecturer employed for more than 5 years at the University and approaching the highest level of acceptance in the department:

Well, [I’m] probably somewhere in between Confidant and Central Figure. I’m not the Central Figure in my department . . . I don’t want to overstate my role, but I think the definition that you gave of Central Figure [as one who is] central to the operations of the department, and Confidant [as one who is a] trusted member of the department that fully shares in all the affairs of the group . . . yeah, I’d feel confident with [choosing] Confidant . . . I think people trust me, and I get along well with everybody, and because I’ve been there for a while now, and there aren’t a lot of tenure-track people there who feel that their role is above my role.

(p. 30, ln. 718)
Participant 8, a lecturer, who expressed having a very supportive chairperson, may be approaching a more accepted level of socialization in the department, if supported by peers for promotion.

Well, without the possibility of going in between [Confederate and Confidant], I would select Confederate at this point. Based on your categorization to me, I would be a Confidant by your description if the department shows support for my promotion to senior lecturer [in the future]. To me, that [show of support from the faculty members] would demonstrate that level of inclusion. So, while I have not attained [Confidant level] yet, I think I would place myself just below that level. (p. 24, ln. 587)

Similar to Participant 8, Participant 7 reported collaborating with tenured and tenure-track faculty in various capacities, but shared that the chairperson was not supportive. Therefore, Participant 7 reported feeling like a Confederate and possibly approaching the level of Confidant.

I would say I am a Confederate. . . . Well, I was stuck between Confidant and Confederate, but on [the description of] Confidant, you said, [one who] fully shares in all the affairs [of the organization]. I don’t really think [I am fully included in] all the affairs. I had to go with the one step down, because I do think [I am included in] most affairs . . . . Like there’s a lot of good ole’ boys and girl stuff that [lecturers] are not included in . . . . I don’t think everybody is included in everything. (p. 34, ln. 791)

A senior lecturer, Participant 11, received a great deal of support from the department chairperson in the form of increased compensation and promotion. Before the
researcher completed reading the interview question and describing each level of membership or acceptance to the participant, Participant 11 assuredly stated,

I’m reasonably confident that I know what those terms [you have] written mean. I’m at least a Confidant, but I think if you ask my colleagues this question, I think most of them would say [I’m a] Central Figure. Fortunately, I’m in a work group where differentiation between tenure-track and non-tenure track only happens when the University policy requires that it happen. In all other cases, there’s no differentiation. When it comes to discussing, when it comes to voting, when it comes to nominating students for awards, when it comes to opportunities for professional development, [tenured, tenure track, and lecturers] are all treated the same . . . . So, I’m at least a Confidant, but I think I am a Central Figure, based on my interpretation of how the terms are described. (p. 4, ln. 91)

Because the participants generally said they felt accepted as a colleague in the department and trusted to make decisions and to lead departmental programs, many of the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty participants had the freedom to modify courses they taught. “I have ownership of the courses I teach. I talk with the department chair if I want to change [course structure, format, and materials] or the books we’re using. I have the freedom to do that” (Participant 6, p. 6, ln. 139). Modification of the courses involved full-time, non-tenure-track faculty varying the time allocated to lectures and labs and restructuring the course format and delivery of course materials.

Participant 5 suggested that introduction courses in the department were primarily assigned to lecturers. Teaching introduction courses seemed advantageous for Participant
5 because of the level of autonomy and flexibility with the presentation and structure of the courses. Participant 5 described,

   The introductory courses are being left to the lecturers to manage, which is a good and bad thing. It’s sort of nice being able to do what I want to do [with the courses]. I teach one course . . . and, pretty much, it is exactly what I wanted it to be . . . . In some respect, not having the tenured faculty [teach introduction courses], they basically defaulted to whatever [lecturers] want. I am doing whatever I want, what I think is best for the students. (p. 11, ln. 99)

   Based on the department leaders’ level of acceptance of the participants, there seemed to be flexibility in the choice of courses the participants taught or had some influence in when the days and times of the courses would be offered. Participant 10 taught various courses at both the bachelor and master’s level. Having extensive experience in teaching this repertoire of courses, “I got to say that I’ve been given pretty much any [course to teach] that I’ve asked for . . . it’s an advantage, definitely an advantage” (Participant 10, p. 14, ln. 333). The participants mentioned that they have some input as to the courses they are assigned. Of the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, four stated they socialized and established relationships with the individuals responsible for assigning courses to faculty in their departments. Because of family obligations, schedulers generally accommodated the faculty requests and parameters for days and times of assigned courses.

   Participant 3 noted that the department course coordinator allowed for occasional course assignment reduction and input into which courses were offered and what days and times courses were available:
The [scheduling person] who actually handled most of [my course assignments] would really try to not break my back . . . . There were times when I was developing a brand new class [the scheduling person] would reduce the course load. [That has happened] a few times. If the course already existed, I wouldn’t really get a [course] release, but I’d still have to do all that prep for [the course] . . . . I have some [influence] in what courses [the department] is going to offer and what times of the day [the courses will be offered] . . . . I’m not sure [other faculty] have quite as much freedom as [I] have. (p. 21, ln.489)

Participant 3 felt accepted by the lower level department administrator, the department course coordinator, which in turn allowed for the possible advantage of course reduction while teaching a new course and various courses in a semester.

To continue to learn more about the socialization of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, the participants were asked to circle and indicate their perceived permanency or job security in their departments as full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Using the Leader Permanent side (right side) of the same figure in the interview protocol (Appendix H), they were asked to explain why they chose that level of permanency. In Figure 4.2, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty participants’ responses to the interview questions about their level of permanency or job security are plotted and represented by various shapes on the Leader Permanent side (right side) of figure. The questions were based on an adaptation of the organizational socialization theory by John Van Maanen and Edgar H. Schein (1979). The levels of permanency or job security are: (a) leader and permanent member; (b) promotion and/or received a multiyear contract and is a more permanent member; (c) accepted, but not a permanent member; and (d) outsider. Those questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure Key</th>
<th>Level of Permanency or Job Security</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feels Permanent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Employed for 8 to &gt;9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels More Permanent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Employed for 4 to &gt;9 years; 3 participants approaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels Accepted, Not Permanent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Employed 3 to 4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaching the next level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were: “What do you think your level of permanency (or job security) is in the department as a full-time, non-tenure-track faculty member?” and “Can you explain why you chose this level of permanency (or job security)?” The figure key in Figure 4.2 displays the name and level of the permanency or job security in the organization, and the shaped objects represent the participant selection at that level and the number of participants that responded to that level of permanency. Of the 12 participants, three stated or implied that they were between two levels of permanency. Similar to Figure 4.1, those participants are displayed as shaped objects with extended arrows, indicating that the participants were “approaching” the next level of permanency. Figure 4.2 illustrates that most full-time, non-tenure-track faculty felt “more permanent” in the department after being asked the question about their perceived level of permanency or job security. Figure 4.2 also includes the participants’ demographic information at each level of permanency or job security. Of the 12 participants, 9 expressed feeling “more permanent” for the following reasons: the number of years they were employed in the department, and at first, if they were certain their faculty appointment was not permanent, they then chose “more permanent” or associated being “more permanent” with having a multiyear contract and obtaining a promotion. Of the nine participants who felt “more permanent,” three appeared to be approaching the Leader Permanent level.

Participant 10, who reported to be approaching the permanent level of departmental membership, had been in the department for a number of years and reported being able to comfortably teach almost any course in the department.

I guess I’d put myself up here somewhere around permanent leader, but I can’t go all the way. [I’m] very close to permanent leader. I think [that’s] the perception of
most people in the department including the chairperson . . . is that they see me as a permanent member . . . [My administrator] likes having me around, because there’s a lot of courses I can teach. I’ve taught basically [every course] with the exception of [one course] . . . I’ve taught every course in the graduate or undergraduate levels. I’ve taught just about everything. I’m pretty versatile. So, [I don’t think I’m] going away anytime soon. (p. 27, ln. 654)

While deciding on which level of permanency to choose, Participant 2 made a clarifying point,

A senior lecturer best describes me. The word permanent, though, does not. I guess I would circle “more permanent,” but I would say the [problem is with the] word permanent . . . I think you either have [permanency] or you don’t. (p. 29, ln. 724)

Like Participant 2, Participant 4 understood a lecturer is not a permanent faculty member. Nevertheless, Participant 4 chose the Permanent Leader level of membership based on seniority in the department and leadership role. Participant 4 explained,

[It’s] tough [to choose a level of permanency] because I know I’m not permanent; I know I’m not. Well, my position is called “permanent,” but I’m on a contract. But I feel like I’m going to select leader permanent because I’m considering the worst case scenario if [administration], basically, the university has to get rid of everybody. I think all the lecturers have to go and [the department is] down to tenure-track faculty. I would hope that I’m one of the last people [to be fired]. So, with that in mind, I don’t ever see that situation happening, so that’s why I would select leader permanent. (p. 31, ln. 800)
Having felt supported by tenure eligible faculty and accepted by peers, Participant 5 mentioned being reliable and an important member of the department. Participant 5 explained, “My department has accepted me as part of the faculty. I mean, that’s always good in the fact that I don’t feel left out . . . . But in my department, it’s never been a question [about me being accepted]” (p. 3, ln. 61).

Participant 8 reported that the chairperson supported him/her, which seemed to provide the participant with a feeling of being more permanent in the department:

I do feel more permanent in the sense that my department [chairperson] has shown me the level of support by being the one that nominated me for the promotion . . . . So this is something [the chairperson and I] discussed in my annual review. [The chairperson] says . . . “basically [I] will only start this promotion process for people who [I] believe are going to finish the process.” I don’t look at it as a done deal, but certainly, I feel like I have the strong support of my department [chairperson]. (p. 25, ln. 609)

Of the 12 full-time, non-tenure-track faculty participants across the represented disciplines, 11 noted that they received administrative support. A department chairperson generally provided direct administrative support. Chairpersons that nominated and supported full-time, non-tenure-track faculty for promotions in the lecturer rank system, provided mentoring, acknowledged and adapted faculty workload, and recognized the multiple career goals for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Participant 8 reported how the department administrator was aware of, and accommodated, the varied professional needs full-time, non-tenure-track faculty possess. Participant 8 stated, “my department
chair has been very supportive of the lecturers. [The chair] understands that each lecturer comes in with different goals in mind” (p. 2, ln. 48).

While the participants shared receiving administrative support from their chairpersons, other participants mentioned receiving administrative support for scholarship from their respective college deans. Several deans permitted full-time, non-tenure-track faculty who desired to be involved in scholarly activities to do so with their chairpersons’ approval. Given that University documents regarding faculty in the lecturer rank system state that research is not a requirement, scholarship would most likely not be included in their annual work plan. All faculty members submit an annual work plan to their department chairs. The work plan at the University includes anticipated goals and outcomes, with detailed expected results relating to teaching and service for the upcoming academic year. If full-time, non-tenure-track faculty participated in research, it was expected to be conducted on the faculty member’s own time, for example, during the summer or intersessions. Of the eight participants who stated their deans allowed full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to conduct research, six stated they engaged in research and wished to continue to do so. In one college, a dean provided funding for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to conduct research and further their knowledge and training through professional development.

Participant 1 explained how the college dean was proactively supportive of research and provided funding,

Our current dean said, “I’m not going to penalize you [for doing research]. I may not be able to reward you, but I’m not going to penalize you.” [The dean is] now actually even moving to subsidizing such an effort. [The dean has] really become
pro-scholarship [for lecturers]. I think the ball is moving in that direction. (p. 19, ln. 502).

Of the 12 full-time non-tenure-track participants, three said they received support from their deans in specific, individual ways. Participant 6 spoke about an example of administrative support and reported, “[the dean] meets every semester, individually, with lecturers” in the college (p. 2, ln. 47). Participant 2 appreciated the dean’s acknowledgement of his service to the department and college,

My annual reviews are always [rated] outstanding. The department chair or the dean always comments on how much service I do and that’s great . . . . My annual evaluations are always somewhat glowing. Usually there is a nice note from the dean. I don’t downplay it. I mean, it’s important. It’s nice the dean even knows who [I am]. (p. 8, ln. 191).

Participant 2 reported support from the dean and also having a relationship with and support from the chairperson. During the first 2 years as a newcomer, Participant 2 started becoming socialized in the department by learning the skills and gaining the knowledge needed to accept the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty member position. Participant 2 recalled, “I really felt the love” (p. 35, ln. 878) from the previous department chairperson and mentioned having a “very good on-boarding experience” (p. 3, ln. 72). He also realized socialization in the department might have occurred differently in other departments across the University campus. Participant 2 went on to state:

I got lots of good mentoring from my department chair. I know that’s not always common, but I was very lucky to have a department chair who really took an
interest in what I needed to know, answered [my] questions, and helped and
visited a couple of my classes to give me feedback. I greatly appreciated [that].
But I have heard [my] experience is not always typical. I’ve heard stories about
people that get thrown in the deep end kind of thing. You know, here are your
three classes, here are the textbooks, here are syllabi [which] previous faculty
have used, and good luck. (Participant 2, p. 3, ln. 62)

In general, the participants described their careers as full-time, non-tenure-track
faculty as being good experiences with a few participants noting very good experiences.
When reporting why their experiences and perceptions as full-time, non-tenure-track
faculty were mostly pleasant, the faculty recounted that they worked easily with, and
were treated well by, tenured, tenure-track, and other non-tenure-track faculty.
Participant 4, speaking about his department, said, “I would say the other lecturers and
the tenure-track professors have been very positive [toward me]. They’ve been very
helpful, even though everybody is kind of doing their own thing” (Participant 4, p. 5,
ln. 126). Within the participants’ departments, there were several opportunities for full-
time, non-tenure-track faculty to work with other faculty through collaboration on
projects and coordinating student programs and campus events. “I like collaborating with
other teachers” (p. 3, ln. 69) explained Participant 4, and “I [had the opportunity] to work
with tenured faculty on [a project] for an introductory [course]” (p. 10, ln. 240). Four
participants co-created courses with departmental colleagues, and four of the faculty
interviewed, co-taught, or team-taught courses with their peers. Co-teaching and team-
teaching was explained as more than one section of a course being offered and faculty
working together to align the course assignments, labs, and tests, or when faculty taught one course together to the same set of students.

Participant 2 collaborated with a tenure-track faculty colleague, similar to Participant 4. Participant 2 stated,

I [co-created] and co-taught a course last fall with a tenure-track faculty member. Now, we alternate teaching [the course]. [The faculty member] brought some very good theory to that class, I brought a lot of practical application and real-world examples both from my [industry experience] and all the work I’ve done. (p. 14, ln. 361)

A senior lecturer, Participant 7, cooperated with a fellow full-time, non-tenure-track faculty member to create and teach a course and planned to do the same type of cooperation with a tenure-eligible faculty member. “I co-created and co-taught a class with another lecturer. I’m in the process of co-creating a course, right now, with a tenure-track faculty member. I will co-teach it with the tenure-track [faculty member]” (Participant 7, p. 14, ln. 323).

It appeared that Participant 8 and his lecturer colleagues were very included in departmental governance activities by the senior tenure-track faculty, and they were respected and allowed to communicate their thoughts regarding departmental manners. Participant 8 remarked,

[Lecturers] participate in the faculty meetings where [we can] vote on anything that’s brought to a vote during these meetings . . . . For the most part, I feel like my opinion is valued at these meetings. The lecturers are not afraid to speak their minds and provide their professional opinion. We [faculty in the department] all
earn the same degree, and we’re all [working] in different capacities. Some of us are teaching all of the time; some of us are doing more research; I feel like it’s a pretty good mix. (p. 7, ln. 177)

The participants reported that they worked well alongside their department colleagues and engaged in collaborative activities like co-teaching and co-creating courses; therefore, it appeared the participants were accepted, trusted, and supported by the other faculty members.

The participants reported receiving support from their department, college leadership, and from the chairperson and college deans. There were deans who allowed full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to participant in research, and in some cases, deans provided funding for the research. The lecturers and senior lecturers in this study shared that they had positive experiences with their department chairpersons and faculty members, both tenure-track faculty and non-tenure-track faculty. Most full-time, non-tenure-track faculty felt accepted and trusted, and they worked well with their colleagues on multiple projects and courses. Some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty enjoyed the freedom to change course presentation, structure, and materials, and they had the flexibility to choose the courses they wanted to teach and the days and times the courses were offered.

In addition to the interviews with the participants, the document analysis found that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty rated their satisfaction of departmental collegiality and department leadership high (National Faculty Survey, 2012). Interactions with departmental faculty were described as how well full-time, non-tenure-track faculty “fit” into the University and how collegial the departments were as a whole (National Faculty
Departmental leadership was defined as full-time, non-tenure-track faculty’s satisfaction or dissatisfaction, department chairpersons’ decision making, communications, and appropriateness in evaluation of work (National Faculty Survey, 2012). In the same survey, faculty responded to the question, “What are the best aspects about working at your institution?” The highest rated response from this question was: my feeling of a sense of “fit” (National Faculty Survey, 2012).

In a survey addressing the University’s climate, the Climate Survey (2012) found that 80% of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty reported favorable ratings about their collegiality with co-workers. The theme of faculty collegiality and interactions with faculty appeared over 45 times in the Internal Faculty Survey (2015) of non-tenure-track faculty for the question, “What do you like about teaching at the University?”

Theme 2: It’s like being a second-class citizen. Of the 12 participants, seven experienced a situation or multiple situations that made them feel as though they were not “real” faculty members, or they felt below the level of the tenure-track and tenured faculty. Even though full-time, non-tenure-track faculty felt largely socialized and accepted into academia, they also expressed feelings about how the University does not recognize full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in the same manner as faculty on the traditional tenure track. When asked if there were disadvantages of working as a full-time non-tenure-track faculty member, many of the participants articulated their concerns about the unfair disparity in pay between themselves and tenure-track and tenured faculty; inequity in the representation and participation of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in the University’s faculty governance; lack of job security; absence of administration’s acknowledgement of the full breath of their workload; and their
perceived second-class treatment. There were two full-time, non-tenure-track faculty participants who had been assigned course days before the start of the semester. Some other faculty had been excluded from certain departmental- and university-wide meetings, committees, access to funding, and departmental decisions.

Of the 12 participants, six noticed their faculty appointment was similar to former tenured and tenure-track positions, and some current tenured faculty positions involved primarily teaching duties and little to no research responsibilities. Participant 12 observed some of the senior tenured faculty in the department having “teaching portfolios.” Participant 12 commented that those faculty “teach a lot [of courses] . . . . They teach as much as the lecturers do” (p. 22, ln. 488). When recounting the amount of teaching and service activities performed, Participant 7 shared,

If [you] were looking into [the department] from [outside the department], you would not be able to tell the difference between myself or any tenure-track professor . . . . All those things [I do] are exactly what any tenure-track professor is doing. (p. 27, ln. 634)

Participant 3, a senior lecturer, described how the teaching loads and service work responsibilities resemble those responsibilities required for by some tenured and former tenured and tenure-track faculty. Participant 3 conveyed,

As [the department] started to lose tenure-track positions, I started to do a lot of the duties that [tenured] faculty used to do. A lot of what I do, now, probably looks like what the older [tenured] faculty used to look like. I’m not doing formal research scholarship, but I do everything else. I’m on all kinds of committees and running programs. I was supposed to have four classes a semester, [but] one class
didn’t have enough students [to keep the class open for the semester], so, I’m 
doing three [classes], but then I took on some more [departmental] duties . . . . I 
think my role has changed and almost looks a little bit more like a [former] 
tenure-track faculty member who’s not doing scholarship. (p. 23, ln. 551)

Participant 3 also recognized that tenure-track positions were decreasing and 
Participant 3 was taking on the responsibilities once held by the now senior tenured 
faculty. In like manner, similarities between lecturers and current tenured faculty were 
acknowledged by another senior lecturer, Participant 5, who does not conduct research. 
Participant 5 stated,

[I’m] teaching three or four [courses] . . . I think there are some [tenured] faculty 
who are teaching eight [courses per year] . . . . [Some tenured faculty in my 
department] are teaching four [courses in the fall semester] and four [courses in 
the spring semester], because they’re not doing any research . . . . They’re doing 
the same basic workload. [It seems to me] the University is [indirectly] telling 
[tenured] faculty who teach [more courses] that we don’t want you here anymore. 
I mean, they want [tenured and] tenure-track faculty to be bringing in research 
grants. [The University] doesn’t want them to be [teaching] in the classroom. 
They can hire cheaper labor, lecturers, to [teach in] the classroom. (p. 8, ln. 177)

Out of the 12 participants, 11 directly mentioned or alluded to salary as a 
disadvantage to being a full-time, non-tenure-track faculty member. A few faculty 
members mentioned specifically needing additional employment to maintain financial 
stability. They had to work a job outside of the University or take on teaching overloads 
during the fall and spring semesters, summer, and intersession to earn more money. Of
the six participants who have business experience, two identified that their salaries do not account for their years of industry work. Among those with doctorate degrees, one of the four faculty members reported that his salary was not based on his educational background. Of the 12 full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members, four stated that they noticed the salary difference between the two faculty types, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty and tenure-track and tenured faculty.

Participant 2 had a great experience working at the University but expressed some displeasure with the amount of pay received, especially when compared to the salary of a tenure-track department member. Participant 2 articulated,

In my situation the [low] salary situation means I really have to plan to do other work to pay the bills. I know, for a fact, when I started [working here some years] ago, a tenure-track person started at the same time in the same department. [That faculty member received] tenure. [The faculty member is] an associate professor [and] literally makes twice as much as I do . . . . I do not resent that [the faculty member] makes that money. [The faculty member] worked hard [to obtain tenure], . . . [the person] got [a] Ph.D. and has many bills to pay off. I completely understand that. But other than that, should [there] be such disparity between someone who has [decades] of professional experience and a master’s degree, . . . and gets outstanding reviews from the department chairperson [compared to that of someone recently obtaining tenure?]. Frankly, because of the pay scale [for lecturers], [I have] to work a chunk of the summer to pay bills. (p. 12, ln. 306)

Because of the perceived low salary compensation, three of the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members in this study had to seek additional means of obtaining
extra income. Two of these faculty members accepted overload courses to instruct because the department needed to provide more courses, and the participants needed the money to sufficiently take care of their financial obligations. Fall and spring semesters are traditional teaching sessions for faculty, but three participants worked during the summer and winter breaks to earn extra money to compensate for the regular low salary.

Participant 12 responded to the question about the disadvantages of working as a full-time, non-tenure-track faculty member in the same way as many other participants regarding low salary. Participant 12 shared,

I think the University, as a whole, does not appreciate how much [work] lecturers put into their classes. I think [lecturers] have large teaching loads and, yet, we get paid less than tenure-track faculty. [Tenured and tenure-track faculty] are doing less teaching and doing research. But quite often, I think . . . the non-tenure-track faculty are taking the [classes with large numbers of students] . . . . Yet, in general, it’s true to say [lecturers] get paid a lot less [than tenured and tenure-track faculty], when really [lecturers] are the University’s bread and butter. I don’t know about [lecturers in other] departments, but it certainly seems to be the case in my college that lecturers get the classes [with large numbers of students]. We do work incredibly hard, and yet, I don’t think we’re recognized financially [for the work lecturers do]. (p. 21, ln. 456)

Participant 12 identified that lecturers in the department had to teach more students than tenured and tenure-track faculty. Some of the participants in this study reported tenure-track faculty taught fewer classes and students while doing research, and they were getting greater compensation than lecturers.
On the university and department level, some of the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty described their voting rights as not equal to those of tenured and tenure-track faculty. Three participants noted that they had limited to no voting rights on the university level. Of those three participants who identified voting inequalities in academic governance, two faculty members, from different departments, reported participating in the departmental voting process. The votes of the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty and those of the traditional faculty were considered differently.

Participant 2 communicated the perception of a tier system in the University’s faculty.

“Yeah, you [lecturers] are great. We [tenured faculty will be] here forever . . . . We’re valuable because we’ve been given tenure. The University obviously needs us [tenured faculty]. You [lecturers] are replaceable.” That’s [appears to be] the implication, and it comes out in unintentional ways during a faculty meeting [during the voting process]. (Participant 2, p. 5, ln. 112)

Even though, Participant 6 expressed feeling of being treated very well, overall, by both tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the department, Participant 6 described equity issues with lecturers in the University’s academic governing process and recognition of lecturers as “real” faculty. Participant 6 said,

To be honest, the biggest negative here at [University] . . . [is] the culture of a real faculty member as a tenure-track or tenured faculty member [not a full-time, non-tenure-track faculty member]. Even the [faculty] senate, if I remember correctly, doesn’t have any non-tenure-track faculty members who are part of [the faculty senate]. (p. 2, ln. 33)
Participant 6 thought that non-tenure-track faculty were not included in University governance. It seems Participant 6 was unaware that the University’s faculty senate permits full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, promoted into the lecturer rank, to be elected to represent their respective colleges (Document Analysis). Presently, there is one senior lecturer representing a college in the University in the faculty senate.

Two of participants stated that they perceived teaching, which has become the primary role of lecturers, has been moved aside. They explained that the University now seems to focus more on research and scholarship. Participant 10 presented how full-time, non-tenure-track faculty are treated unfairly compared to their tenured and tenure-track counterparts.

I think the non-tenure-track lecturer position is sort of a second-class position. Nobody says that [it’s second class], and if you would ask [administrators], they would deny it. They would say that the two tracks are on par, but that’s just nonsense. [That’s] just not the case. (Participant 10, p. 24, ln. 554)

Participant 10 further clarified the perception of a second-class citizen based on the new direction and attention of the University.

Because teaching is seen as less important than scholarship. [With] teaching you’re dispensing information, scholarship you’re creating information, you’re creating new knowledge. There was an article in one of the online publications [from the University] that said something about the [transition was] going to happen and help move [the University] from being a teaching [focused] university to a research [focused] university. It [didn’t state the University] was to become a
teaching/research university. It was moving away from [a teaching University] to become [a research University]. (Participant 10, p. 24, ln. 561)

Of the 12 participants, 10 acknowledged they have no job security. Of the senior lecturers, five articulated that the multiyear contracts they were offered still do not guarantee their continued employment. Even though the several of the participants reported feeling they didn’t have job security, three recounted their contracts were always renewed.

Participant 1 described the experience of being laid off from a corporate job and realizing there was no job security. Participant 1 recalled,

I came here after having been downsized from industry, and I think that sticks with you a little bit . . . [I knew] there were multiple layoffs coming, and [I] dodged a bunch of them. [But] after a while [I], begin to feel like [my] number is going to come up [to be laid off]. But on the other hand, [I] always wanted to believe [that I was] so important they couldn’t get rid of [me], but [I] know the day they show up and say sorry we don’t need [me] anymore, [I] realized, no one is irreplaceable. (p. 27, ln. 705)

Even with a multiyear contract, Participant 1 reported not feeling like there was job security. For many of the participants in this study, tenure was considered the highest level of job security. Participant 1’s feelings of no job security seemed to be supported by Participant 2’s comments of, “a 3-year contract is no kind of permanency; it’s a [just] 3-year contract” (p. 29, ln. 730).

Despite the fact Participant 3, a senior lecturer, said “they always bring me back” (33, ln. 783), when speaking about each of the department chairperson’s renewing the
annual contracts, Participant 3 was still concerned about getting offered yearly contracts. Participant 3 recalled,

You never knew, at the end of the year, whether you had a job. There were times I was told, “I don’t know if we’re going to have enough money for you next year.” I know I have a 3-year contract as a senior [lecturer], which is kind of nice, but I don’t know if at the end of [my contract], I will get another 3-year contract. [My chairperson could say], “I’m sorry, we had to bring in a tenure-track person, we don’t need you anymore.” (p. 18, ln. 420)

Of the 12 participants, five perceived job security as not promised by a multiyear contract. When the interview question about hindrances to contract renewals was asked, eight of the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty participants stated their contracts might not be renewed based on decreased student enrollment and budgetary constraints. Seven of the participants shared that a change in administration, dean, or chairperson could result in changes of the evaluation ratings for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty and possibly contract renewals. While Participant 2 “felt the love” during the first 2 years of employment from the former chairperson, he further stated, “things have been different [with my current chairperson] . . . I guess that’s the only tactful way I can put it.”

While many of the participants appreciated the support from their administrators, as mentioned in Theme 1, six of the participants stated that their chairpersons did not acknowledge the full amount of work they were performing. Most of the full-time, non-tenure track faculty participants explained they taught between 8-10 courses each year depending on their college, discipline, and rank. Senior lecturer, Participant 4, who teaches several courses a semester with large student enrollment, cannot limit the work
week to 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, because of the teaching and service responsibilities. Participant 4 explained,

I don’t think [the chairperson] understands the amount of work that [lecturers are] doing. It never was a 40 hour a week job. But for me, I tend to be a workaholic, and I’ll work every day. My typical work week, when school is in session, is no less than 60 hours a week. I’m a probably 60 to 80 hour [a week] person. (p. 12, ln. 306)

The other participants further expressed that their respective chairpersons were unaware of the amount of time full-time, non-tenure-track faculty spent with students, teaching, and on service-related activities. Even though Participant 9 documented the amount of teaching, advising, and service activities in the annual appraisal, he stated, “I don’t think the chairperson fully realizes how much work lecturers actually do (p. 28, ln. 728). Remembering a situation when the chairperson asked a full-time, non-tenure-track faculty member to take on hosting a campus event, Participant 2 was taken back by as to how the chairperson was unaware of the faculty member’s current responsibilities while attempting to add to the large workload. Participant 2 noted,

I already have a very full plate of service I’m doing. If I were to take on [coordinating the event], [then I would] have to stop doing other things. I was astounded by [the chairperson’s] reaction of “Oh,” and it made me think [the chairperson did not] really understand my workload. During the semester, from week 3 through final exam week, I am literally [working] 60 to 70 hour weeks. [I have] many students’ [assignments] to grade and give them feedback. (p. 9, ln. 212)
Many of the participants expressed feeling as though they were not treated like a real faculty member, or they were treated at a lower level than tenured and tenure-track faculty. The lower salary earnings, compared to tenure-track faculty’s salaries, and the participants’ perceived increased University focus on research and decreased attention on teaching added to the feeling of second-class citizenship. Six of the participants in this study thought they had similar duties as tenure-track faculty, and some of them had taken on departmental responsibilities that were formerly performed by tenure-track faculty. Even with multiyear contracts, many of the participants did not perceive they had job security. The full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in this study reported that administration changes could affect their evaluations. The large amounts of work completed by the participants went unnoticed by the several of the chairperson or the deans at the University.

Document analysis supplemented the primary data of the semi-structured interviews. Upon analyzing various institutional documents, the researcher found that full-time, non-tenure track faculty replied at a rate of 20% to a faculty survey question regarding “the worst aspects about working at your institution.” The full-time, non-tenure-track faculty’s top response in the National Faculty Survey was that compensation was the worst aspect of working at the University.

The theme of feeling like a second-class citizen seemed to be supported by of the comments in the Internal Faculty Survey. Comments about low pay, inequity between tenure-track faculty and non-tenure-track faculty, and no job security appeared 64 times in the survey by non-tenure-track faculty respondents who answered the survey question, “What concerns and issues do you have about teaching at the University?” As a note to
the theme of feeling like a second-class citizen due to low salary, the results from the
survey revealed that many full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members received at least
two pay increases while employed at the University.

**Theme 3: The workhorse carries a heavy load, but it’s worth it.** When asked
the very first question of the interview regarding the overall experience as a full-time,
non-tenure track, Participant 12 replied, “It’s hard work” (p. 2, ln. 39) then proceeded to
smile and laugh. Seven of the 12 participants said they worked with a large to very large
number of students, creating numerous long hours of work in and out of the classroom.
Participant 2 recounted his classroom, which has 24 seats, and the course is “always
oversubscribed by 12 to 24 students” (p. 15, ln. 366) and observed “Lecturers do a lot of
heavy lifting and [teach] a lot of courses at a lower cost” (p. 6, ln. 153). Additionally,
most of the participants reported that heavy teaching loads included instruction of newly
created courses taught for the first time, fully modified courses from a single piece of
paper, preparation to create new courses, and a number of varied courses needing
multiple course preparation times in one semester. In addition to the developed courses,
some participants mentioned they had to frequently and continuously update and receive
training for new software and technology regarding the coursework.

Because of the number of number of students in the classroom and the expected
level of service for lecturers and senior lecturers, a few participants mentioned they had
less time to interact with students, and the timeliness of grading assignments and tests
were impacted. Participant 5 appreciated the flexibility to work certain hours of the day
and on weekends, if desired, but described how having a large number of students limits
interactions with students. Examples of large and very large classes were described by
full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in this study as teaching 30-40 students in a liberal studies course and 100 students in a STEM course. Participant 5 remarked,

I do grading and [other teaching and service activities]. In a typical week, I work more than 40 hours a lot of times. So it’s not like that’s the end of the work week for me; but on the flip side, it’s my own hours for almost all of it . . . . I’m teaching a massive number of students a year. I mean, this semester alone, I have [over 100] students in three classes . . . . I could have 38 to 40 students per class load. It’s insane . . . if [some lecturers] are teaching four [courses per semester], they could have close to 200 students that they’re working with. So, in some respect, we have so many students that it’s hard to really get to know them, and that’s sort of a shame, because we don’t have enough faculty. We don’t have enough classes being offered, and it’s just sort of crazy. (p. 39, ln. 949)

The full-time, non-tenure-track faculty participants reported teaching numerous and various courses in face-to-face classroom or in an online setting or doing both. The courses covered multiple academic levels: introductory general education, upper level major, and graduate and honors courses. In addition to teaching, these faculty members shared that they advised students with independent studies, senior theses, and capstone projects. The full-time faculty in this study mentioned that introduction courses tended to have large numbers of students.

Participant 3 discussed trying to reduce the amount of time involved in teaching and supporting students in both online and in-classroom environments.

I’m trying to work a little more humane number of hours these days. But [it’s difficult to do with] online classes. [I’m] always checking in [with students] over
the weekend [and at the same time] developing new classes, [teaching] three or four other classes, and doing capstone projects . . . . I try not to work as much on the weekends now, but I still do it. (p. 23, ln. 533)

Participant 4 noted that the introductory courses taught by full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have a higher number of enrolled students compared to the advanced courses taught by tenured and tenure-track faculty. Participant 4 presented,

[Lecturers] are teaching pretty much all the intro courses and wherever else [the chairperson] needs [me to teach]. Lecturers understand that. We’re under a lot of pressure to teach and cover all these courses. The intro courses are typically 50 students, but that tapers down [to around] 30 to 35 students in the upper level courses. We just have to deal with a lot more students. We teach a lot more students than the tenure-track people. That’s just reality. (p. 24, ln. 605)

In the same way, Participant 4 spoke about lecturers teaching the introductory courses. Participant 12 articulated how lecturers and senior lecturers teach first-year students who usually need more faculty support and reported that the administrator does not seem to comprehend the large student population enrolled in the courses. Participant 12 shared,

I think my [chairperson and other departmental faculty] expect a lot from its lecturers and senior lecturers. We are given pretty heavy teaching loads. Lecturers, most exclusively, teach the first-year classes and, as you probably know, first-year students are a lot of work, particularly [in the fall] semester. I think my department does appreciate the amount of work that the lecturers do . . . . [Well], I think they do. Lecturers have to do 15 hours in the classroom each
semester. I think one thing the [chairperson and other faculty] don’t seem to take heed to is the number of students lecturers teach and the fact that the first-year [students], [in the] first semester need a lot of work and a lot of attention . . . . Sometimes it’s [the amount of time with students] outside of the classroom . . . . [There’s] a lot of grading, a lot of preparation; there’s a big push towards more active learning, which takes a fair amount of time to prepare. I [meet with] students outside of class [to provide assistance with assignments]. (p. 2, ln. 39)

In addition to the work full-time, non-tenure-track faculty do, they have, at the time of the research or formerly, taken on official or unofficial leadership roles in their departments. Even more time was needed for the faculty participants to plan and prepare for co-teaching and co-creating of courses and collaboration for student group programs and campus activities. Even with the substantial workload of the participants, six faculty found the time to undertake involvement in scholarship.

Most of the participants reported having heavy teaching loads of six to eight courses a year and devoting large amounts of time in service to the campus. Yet other participants mentioned teaching a total of eight courses in the fall and spring semesters of the academic year with the expectation to teach 10 courses in the year if needed. Since 9 of the 12 participants were senior lecturers, many of them provided considerable amounts of service to the University through serving on various committees as well as coordinating and hosting campus-wide events. University documents state there is an expectation for senior lecturers to engage in service activities at the department or college level. These senior lecturers could be asked to be involved in service at the university
level. In addition, faculty teaching four courses in a semester may have to prepare for three different courses.

In spite of the heavy workload of teaching numerous courses with many students and providing countless hours of service, the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty seemed willing to endure it all for the benefit of their students and the love of teaching. Responding to the interview question asking participants, “What do you enjoy about being a full-time, non-tenure-track faculty?” most participants responded that they enjoyed teaching and the encounters with students. Participant 2 “loves helping students and meeting new students” (18, ln. 453). While working “60 to 70 hours” (p. 9, ln. 217) a week, Participant 2 did not mind the workload. Participant 2 explained further:

The rewards come at the end of the semester when students individually thank you. That’s why I teach—for those moments, because I literally have students come to me hug me and say, “You know what, at the start of this class, I didn’t think I would get it and my [work won’t] get better. Thank you so much.” I absolutely live for those moments. I wish I could put them in a bottle on the shelf. (p. 9, ln. 220)

Participant 10 seemed to cherish the art and act of teaching and its impact on students and heartily explained:

I think teaching is sort of an addictive thing. It’s coming from somebody who didn’t really enjoy high school all that much. I was surprised to see myself in college and then graduating with a 4-year degree and then involved in teaching. I think part of what’s sort of driven [my teaching] is I didn’t really enjoy the experience as a high school student. [My experience in high school] sort of
informs my teaching. I try to keep [my teaching] worthwhile and relevant for the students. Also, while teaching is not a really great way to make a living, the teaching, itself, is addictive, and I really enjoy that. (p. 3, ln. 57)

Based on experiences as a student, Participant 10 tailored teaching to best benefit the students learning. While Participant 7 had similar workloads as a senior lecturer to Participant 10, she, too, appeared to have a passion to assist students by availing herself—even if it was not part of the annual work plan. Participant 7 recalled,

I just had a faculty [member come to] my office the other day. [I said,] “Why am I doing [all of this service work] and I’m not getting any credit for it?” Students come in, and they want help, but I can’t get course releases [for doing all of the advising]. I asked my colleague what to do and [my colleague said] direct [the students] back to [the faculty members who are] supposed to be working with [the students]. Again, it’s not officially [what I am supposed to be doing], but this is what it is when you’re a lecturer . . . . The students don’t know. I can’t say, “Sorry that’s outside of my job description.” (p. 27, ln. 640)

To provide the best possible education for, and the enjoyment of, working with “great” students, Participant 3 continually modified courses for currency and relevancy, created several new courses, and taught during the summer semesters. Participant 3 commented,

Sometimes [I] end up working long hours and [I’m] tired. I try not to take shortcuts for the students . . . . People pay a lot of money to be here. [I] owe them [my] best effort. Do I always come through with shining colors? Probably not, but it’s never for a lack of trying. (p. 9, ln. 208)
When specifically asked about the teaching and interactions with students, four of the participants commented that they enjoyed the diversity of the students. The national faculty survey results showed full-time, non-tenure-track faculty rated their satisfaction with aspects of teaching fairly high. Of the 12 participants, 11 stated they enjoyed interacting with students. The full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in this study described the characteristics of the students as: traditional students enrolling directly from high school into college, while other older students were those currently serving or who served in the military, who were employees affiliated with local companies, and who were non-traditional students. Familiarity between students and their instructors developed because a couple of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty had the opportunity to spend an entire year with a set of students.

Participant 3 described positive experiences teaching older non-traditional students. Participant 3 recounted,

A lot of them are just wonderful kids and adults too. I was working with the [students] who are all professionals getting their degrees. They have very busy lives, full-time jobs, families, and mortgages [to pay]. They’re [from] all over the country. They were quality students. I got a little spoiled by working with them so much in the first four years [I worked at the University] . . . when you’d say the [assignment] paper is due on a certain date, almost all of them would hand it in on time. (p. 10, ln. 221)

Participant 6 valued developing relationships with students and their diverse perspectives, especially from the international students. Delightedly, Participant 6 shared,
I tend to have the same students with for about a [few semesters] . . . . So, I really get to know them. I think there’s probably two elements I enjoy the most. One [element] would be that the relationships you develop with students. [I tended to teach smaller size classes], it’s a different thing if you’re teaching a class of, like, 60 students, and I only [taught] them once ever. In a way, [I won’t] really get to connect with them as individuals. But I have the benefit that I’m able to get to know my students really quite well. The other thing I really love about teaching is I love the fresh perspective that the students bring with them. I will have subject content that I’ve taught many, many times. You can go in right now and just lecture on it. It’s still amazing to me, in discussions with students, [that] they’ll have insights or make connections or stimulate [something new] in me with material that I already know very, very well . . . . I really love discussing the ideas and concepts and how would they apply with the students and getting different perspectives. (p. 5, ln. 106)

Because full-time, non-tenure-track faculty are hired for primarily teaching duties, they have a high frequency of contact with students. Since seven of the participants taught introductory courses, and many of those courses had large numbers of students, the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty participants were in frequent contact with numerous students. To add to the student contact hours, six faculty participants advised students with their senior research and capstone projects, and they coordinated the students’ teaching-assistant programs. Four of the participants shared how they loved it when students experienced “ah-hah” moments and really understood the course content.
Progress and success of students were also highlights for the faculty in this study. All of the participants reported receiving very good student evaluation ratings.

Lecturer, Participant 9, enjoyed seeing students who arrived as freshmen and then graduated, knowing he was involved in the students’ successful processes. Participant 9 remembered helping students scaffold information to obtain a better understanding of course concepts.

I like the in-class interaction with the students. In a way, it gives me the feeling of where the students stand [and what they know]. So, it’s like a regular conversation. If you were talking about bank loans . . . . Okay, “What does interest rate mean?” I can use that as an example [as a] starting point for discussion. I can explain a little more and lead the students to the point where I wanted them to learn the concepts. And then, “Yeah, you’ve got it!” That’s the part I enjoy. (p. 7, ln. 168)

Participant 7 treasured moments when students transferred and applied knowledge from the classroom to other aspects of their lives. Participant 7 reported,

I love when there’s little connections being made like, “Oh, that’s like when we talked about whatever,” or my favorite is when [we talked about] fresh produce. Or “This happened at dinner, and I told my mom she’s [acting like the character we discussed in class]” and I’m like, “Oh, you [remembered something from class]. You get a gold star.” I’m, like, you know something because we talked about the difference between regurgitating and comprehending. Those [moments] are why we, lecturers, stay here and teach. So, that definitely happens, occasionally, enough to get excited about it. (p. 13, ln. 298)
Several full-time, non-tenure-track faculty participants in this study spent large amounts of time and energy teaching large numbers of students. Much time was spent by the participants involved in teaching-related activities such as the creation of new courses, full or partial modification of courses, preparation for various courses taught in one semester, and the coordination of team and co-teaching of courses. In addition to heavy teaching loads, the participants spend a generous number of hours supporting students and contributing service to the University. In service to the University, some of the participants have assumed leadership roles in their departments, served on various and multiple committees, and have become involved in planning and leading of college- and campus-wide events. The majority of the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty participants explained that they most enjoyed teaching because of the variety of students and the meaningful interactions with those students.

Findings from the national faculty survey indicate that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were concerned about the aspects and the levels of service they were performing. Also, in answering a faculty survey question, “What are the worst aspects about working at your institution?” the second highest survey response was teaching load. The third highest response was “too much service and too many assignments.” When asked about the kind of appreciation and recognition received from colleagues and administrators in the national faculty survey, the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty rated appreciation and recognition with a mean of 3.23 of 5.00. In response to another national faculty survey question that focused on “the best aspects about working at your institution,” the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty responses for the fourth and fifth highest top responses were: “support for teaching and quality of undergraduate students.”
The theme of heavy workload and aspects of workload emerged 39 times in the internal faculty survey of non-tenure-track faculty for the question, “What concerns and issues do you have about teaching at the University?” Over 45% of the non-tenure-track faculty had been a primary author for the official curriculum for courses at the University with many other faculty submitting multiple proposals. The theme of faculty interactions with students and student characteristics emerged 73 times in the internal faculty survey of non-tenure-track faculty for the question, “What do you like about teaching at the University?”

**Theme 4: What’s your niche? To make myself needed.** One way for the participants to teach the courses they wanted to teach was for them to develop and create those exact courses. Of the 12 participants, eight stated that they created, co-created, or fully modified courses they instructed in the past or were currently teaching. Participant 3 stated “[I] make [myself] valuable” (Participant 3, p. 28, ln. 670). This senior lecturer seemed to intentionally create a niche by continually creating new courses and fully modifying other courses, which led to “[the administration] keep giving me contracts” (Participant 3, 28, ln. 666). Five faculty participants acknowledged that they were the “go to” person for teaching specific courses, or they claimed ownership of the courses they taught. Participant 1, perceived as a trusted leader in the department, stated “I [found] a niche. Faculty [in the department] come to rely on you to fulfill a job function. So, I made myself necessary . . . I’m the “go to” guy for [science courses]” (Participant 1, p. 28, ln. 723). Interestingly, six of the participants are alumni of the University and had opportunities to teach the courses they took as former students. Participant 5, an alumnus of the University, shared how a former instructor is now his colleague: “I’m teaching one
of the classes that a faculty member, who’s still at the University, used to teach” (Participant 5, p. 15, ln. 367). Participant 12 explained the introductory STEM courses are kind of “my thing” and “I don’t mind teaching [lecture and the labs]. If I can do both, I’m happy” (Participant 12, p. 18, ln. 383).

It appeared that many full-time, non-tenure-track faculty participants had taken on formal and informal leadership roles in their departments. The participants trained students to become learning assistants, coordinated those student assistant groups’ activities, hosted and planned college-wide events, mentored other faculty, and preformed core duties in their departments. Participant 4, who feels he is a Central Figure in the department because of seniority and leadership roles, stated,

I coordinate the [student] Teaching Assistants. We meet for two hours a week . . . I basically do everything with the TAs, their timecards, co-develop material for labs, and deal with all of the issues that they [encounter]. (p. 6, ln. 152)

The participants were involved in extensive amounts of service and some faculty members led committees. Senior lecturer, Participant 2, described, “[I provide a] very high level of service to the department, the college, and University. [I have the] willingness to be a team player and to contribute wherever [needed]. I [have developed] a few new classes” (Participant 2, p. 35, ln. 870).

Of the faculty participants, eight had industry experience. Those faculty members became engaged in academia in various ways. Some of the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were laid off from their industry positions when their employers downsized the companies. A few participants had continued to maintain their small businesses while teaching, or they had retired from corporate positions, and they only wanted to teach.
Recognizing the significance of industry knowledge, Participant 2 readily shared that knowledge to benefit students beyond their academic careers and into their professional careers.

I’ve had students who have graduated tell me they thought [sharing my professional experiences] was a wonderful contribution to their education. Students felt like they’d had a taste of what the expectations would be in the work world . . . . I think [lecturers] bring practical skill sets that complement the tenure track. (Participant 2, p. 4, ln. 87)

All of the participants directly stated or indirectly expressed their willingness to teach and serve whenever and wherever possible. Participant 1 remembered, “for most of my [employment at the University], I never said no to either courses or [recommended] committee assignments or whatever. So, they know I’ll do it, . . .” (Participant 1, p. 28, ln. 729). Three faculty participants perceived that the courses they taught were those that tenure-track and tenured faculty did not want to teach. When discussing students with low motivation in general-education science courses, Participant 1 stated, “I teach courses that the tenure-track people don’t want to teach. Who wants a class of [over 150] freshmen who don’t like a [STEM course]?” (Participant 1, p. 28, ln. 722). Further elaboration about tenure-track faculty not wanting to teach introductory courses was stated by Participant 4, who identified, “[An introductory course] doesn’t entice a lot of them [tenured and tenure-track faculty] to teach it, because they are more research focused now. These first-year students aren’t going to be able to advance their research” (Participant 4, p. 4, ln. 99).
Participant 3 believed in bringing value to the workplace by creating a number of courses. While also noting the importance of being open to changes as needed, Participant 3 positively stated,

Lecturers have to be flexible. I actually think that’s a good thing that employees should be flexible. We should be trying to help our employer, and ultimately the students, have a better experience. So, I try to do [be flexible] and help the University and students . . . . One of the people who wrote a letter of support for me [is] a tenure track [faculty member]. When I went up for [promotion to] senior lecturer, [the faculty member] always felt [the department chairperson] plugged me in wherever [the department] needed somebody. (p. 24, ln. 561)

Demonstration of willingness to do what is best for the students and the University seemed to be a virtue Participant 6 sought to display in the department.

Participant 6 assuredly stated,

I’m very active in, and willing to be active in, the department. I would never, for example, say, “It’s not my job. It doesn’t involve me. I’m just going to be quiet.” I really have the welfare of our students, our program, and our department at heart. I think [when] you want to be active and work towards that goal, then that’s appreciated. (p. 32, ln. 735)

It seemed that the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were active in creating, co-creating, and fully modifying courses that they teach or will be teaching. These faculty members have seemly become the “go-to” persons for specific courses, programs, or projects. They also became formal and informal leaders in their respective departments and throughout the campus. Half of the participants were University alumni, and some
participants had corporate business experience. Overall, the participants were willing to be flexible and do whatever was needed, whenever it was needed, for the benefit and success of the students.

Up to this point, the previous themes included additional data by way of University documents. While conducting the document analysis to find emerging themes and supporting and contrasting data to supplement the primary data analysis of the participant interviews, no data was found to support the theme of *What’s my niche? To make myself needed*. It appears the questions asked in the national faculty survey, internal faculty survey, and climate survey did not focus on or address the aspects of this fourth theme.

**Theme 5: Moving forward with an unclear path.** What did the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty participants think about the next steps in their academic profession? In general, the participants in this study expressed interest in applying for the next level within the lecturer rank, senior or principal lecturer. Participant 5 seemed pleased to have an opportunity for career advancement. “I was expecting the lecturer [position] was going to be my last job title, and [then] all of a sudden, [I] have two new job titles I can apply for” (Participant 5, p. 39, ln. 963). Looking toward a future promotion opportunity, Participant 1 stated,

> At some point, I would be eligible to apply for principal [lecturer] . . . . Frankly, it’s not [much of] a salary difference [from senior lecturer], but there’s also no downside to applying. As a principal [lecturer], I [would] have my 5-year contract. (p. 24, ln. 629)

Participant 4 also spoke about the principal lecturer position.
[The principal lecturer] position is kind of similar [to a senior lecturer], and the only difference with principal [lecturer and senior lecturer] is [administration] expects principal [lecturer’s] service to [contribute] more outside of the department level, to the college, or university wide. (p. 8, ln. 207)

The following are quotes from the lecturers who all have a desire to take advantage of the promotional opportunity through the lecturer promotional ladder.

Participant 6 replied, “absolutely,” wanting to advance in the lecturer rank system. “I [have] a need for achievement. I think I’m that way. I’m always thinking, how can I move to the next level? [I think about] what are the ways I can [advance in my career]” (Participant 6, p. 28, ln. 630).

Participant 8 commented,

In the near term, I’d like to progress up through the lecturer ranks at [the University]. I think I’ve demonstrated my commitment to the institution. I’m not looking in the immediate future to go somewhere else to [take on] a bigger role. So, for me, the near term is moving up maybe to principal lecturer in the future, and then, long term, it’s just sort of up in the air. I might look towards a tenure track somewhere in the region. (p. 22, ln. 535)

In the same manner as Participant 8, Participant 9 would have liked to be promoted into the lecturer rank, although, both participants were open to other employee opportunities outside of the University. Participant 9 identified,

My short-term [goal] is to become a senior lecturer. The long term is to become principal lecturer. I do have to admit the [academic career] goals have been starting to change. Because I saw an impact. Ever since the [University] released
salary amounts for faculty positions across the various colleges on campus] has put a damper on my goals. Maybe [I will] start to look outside academia to [return to] industry. (p. 32, ln. 931)

Even though both Participant 8 and Participant 9 had goals of becoming principal lecturers, they both had other aspirations based on their educational background and corporate work experience. Both expressed they were aware of the salary differences between full-time, non-tenure-track faculty and tenured and tenure-track faculty at the University.

Of the nine senior lecturers, four of them recalled that the promotion process was unclear. During the promotion process from lecturer to senior lecturer, Participant 1 recalled, “When I went through the [promotion process], it was not as well defined as it is now” (Participant 1, p. 35, ln. 920). Participant 1 continued describing the process,

It was a very messy process at the time. It’s [improved] a little [bit] since then. [Administration] still writes the policies in flexible terms . . . . How many committees [do I need to be involved in]? How many hours is the right number [to satisfy the promotion criteria]? [Administrators and promotion committees] sometimes argue lecturers need to show diversity in your teaching . . . . What constitutes diversity? What is enough diversity? [What’s] “excellence in teaching?” On our current scale, is it a [rating of] 3, 4, or a 5 on the student evaluation scale. What am I being judged against? I mean, my students, being lower in motivation, are never going to love me quite as much as somebody teaching courses in their major. So, I’m never sure what the criteria are. (p. 36, ln. 942)
There were eight participants who came from outside academia with “real-world” business skill sets. Participant 3 detailed the differences in the promotion process in industry and in an academic environment and how the process was a completely new and different process. It seemed Participant 3 had a difficult experience learning what was needed to be submitted and completed in preparation for promotion.

[Administration] formed a [lecturer promotion] committee and your [chairperson] isn’t on the committee. I thought, how can [my] boss not be on the [lecturer promotion] committee? The [chairperson] is the person who knows the most about [me and] should know the most about [me], and people I never met were on the committee . . . . I didn’t have a lot of formal evaluations from my [chairperson] over the years because [the chairperson] didn’t think [it was needed] for lecturers. All of a sudden, the senior lecturer [position was made available], and part of the criterion was submitting all your evaluations from your chairperson, and I didn’t have them. For example, people in academia write down all the workshops they attended and if you presented [at a conference] or someplace. I didn’t write down any of that for the first 3 years, and I did all kinds of things, but because, in the private sector, nobody really did [wrote down all the workshops and presentations information] . . . to get promoted. (Participant 3, p. 35, ln. 828)

Participant 3 went on and recounted,

So, when I went through my [lecturer promotion] committee [process], there was a gap in the middle of it from when I started. I [just] happened to remember a few [workshops and presentations] I went to, but I had to explain [the gaps in
information] to the committee. Nobody ever told [lecturers] how to [document activities for evaluations and promotions], [because] there was no promotional ladder [at the time], and we didn’t know anything. (p. 18, ln. 413)

The ages of the participants, their work/life balance situations, and the level of involvement in research seemed to influence the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty’s career goals and desire for tenure-track faculty positions. While 10 of the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty participants perceived they did not have job security in their current position, when asked about their future professional aspirations, there were varied responses. When the participants were asked if they wanted a tenure-track faculty position, eight faculty members in this study stated they previously wanted a tenure-track position, but they no longer desired a tenure-track position because of the increased requirements for research and publications, or they would accept tenure-track positions without scholarship as a primary responsibility. One participant would accept a position on the tenure track with a research expectation, if offered. Two other participants would be willing to work as tenure-track faculty members either now in their career or in the future, but that tenure-track position might be at another college or university. Yet, another faculty member never wanted a tenure-track position. Seven of the 12 participants explained they would not be able to apply for a tenure-track position or obtain tenure without a doctoral degree, current research production, or the ability to obtain grant funding for research. They also perceived there was no clear pathway for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to become a tenure-track faculty member.

If offered a tenure-track position, Participant 1 contemplated the pros and cons of accepting, thinking of professional and personal life. Participant 1 articulated,
I mean, if the day I walked in here [my administrator], said, “Okay look. you can go non-tenure track or tenure track,” I would have picked tenure track. [I would have picked tenure track] just because there is a greater sense of security once you get over the hurdle . . . . At my age, I’ve given up on the transition to tenure track, and I’m just trying to do the best I can within the [lecturer rank system]. (p. 12, ln. 309)

Participant 1 went on to explain,

To some extent, now [after] years [of working at the University], if [administration] offered me a tenure-track position, I’m not sure I’d take it. Because that’s asking me to spend 6 years or so trying real hard to get tenure just in time to start looking at the sunset of my career. So, I’m not sure, at this point [in my life if] I would accept a tenure-track position with the increased [scholarship] expectations. (p. 7, ln. 184)

Without a Ph.D. and research background, Participant 3 thought it would be very difficult to get a tenure-track position at the University. The research requirements for tenure-track faculty could be problematic, especially at this point in one’s career. But Participant 3 would consider obtaining a tenure-track position because “I would think it would be more money” (Participant 3, 27, ln. 643). Participant 3 also stated:

I thought about [a tenure-track position], but [the University has] gone to that more hard and fast [rule]. [I] need a doctorate degree [to get tenure] . . . I don’t think [me getting tenure is] ever going to happen. I’m not sure I want to get caught up in all the things that they have to do at this point in my life . . . . [Although], it would be nice to have a real research agenda, but I don’t want to be
[like] some of the tenure-track faculty . . . . Some of them are getting pounded and [have a lot of responsibility to publish articles and get grants] for scholarship, that’s what I mean . . . . If [administrator] came to me and said, “Would you like to do this?” [I would need the administrator] to explain why it would work and how it would work. If it were the right circumstances, I would [take a tenure-track position]. (p. 26, ln. 627)

Participant 9 openly disclosed no desire for a tenure-track position if it required a Ph.D. and requirements for scholarship and publications.

I have a strong desire not wanting to get a tenure-track position, because of the research [expectations]. Well, a second reason I do not want a tenure-track position is the [current] Ph.D. requirement. I will be [happy] and willing to receive a tenure-track position, if [the University] waived the Ph.D. requirement and they waive the requirement of the research. (p. 32, ln. 922)

Participant 4, a senior lecturer, has seemly learned to accept the role of a full-time, non-tenure-track faculty member. There is an interest in obtaining a tenure-track position, but not if the current requirements for the position are to have a Ph.D., show evidence and history of scholarly publications, and have expectations of future research publication.

I would love to be a tenure-track faculty member . . . . [The department] has a lot of older [senior] professors that don’t have PhDs. They have master’s [degrees same as me], and they’re slowly being phased out. What’s happening is [administration] is bringing in all these new [tenure-track] faculty with ridiculously high research expectations. So, teaching is really not their [main] focus . . . . At this point [in my career], most of my work is in introductory
[courses], and [I have done some] research. But, to me, it’s been made clear that [a tenure-track position] is unattainable [given the requirements] . . . . But my [lecturer] position is less permanent than a tenure [track faculty member]. As you get older, your options get less as a lecturer . . . the environment now would have been pushing me [to do] far more to research . . . . It’s like publish or perish. That seems like a stressful environment. That’s not something that interests me at all. Maybe that’s why I won’t ever be a tenure-track faculty because of the [high level of research] expectation. Where I like teaching, the research stuff, I don’t want that to be my primary responsibility. (Participant 4, p. 13, ln. 324)

Wanting to be in a tenure-track position and conduct research, Participant 6 wanted to continue to teach and interact with students in the same current capacity.

It’s bit of a mixed blessing. I always wanted to do the research. I [did not earn a] doctorate [degree] just to have a doctorate [degree]. I really enjoy [doing] research, but I know I [would] miss not teaching the load that I teach now [if I took a tenure-track position]. I look forward to [doing the scholarly work] because I always enjoy doing research. And it’s better if [research] is part of your job, and it’s not something you’re doing on your own in addition to your job. Definitely, I think there would be [job] security even though there’s definitely perils with a tenure track. But as long as you’re successful, [you should obtain tenure] . . . I mean, there definitely is a difference in compensation [between full-time, non-tenure-track faculty and tenured and tenure-track faculty]. I find [it] ironic that, in a way, what’s valued least is teaching. But from a salary perspective, that seems
to be the case . . . I link a higher salary to [being a tenure-track faculty]. I link more opportunities to [being a tenure-track faculty]. (p. 19, ln. 432)

Participant 6 seemed to believe that teaching and rich interactions with students, which is very enjoyable as a lecturer, would decrease if Participant 6 became a tenure-track faculty member.

Another senior lecturer would not mind receiving a tenure-track faculty position because it might provide more compensation and allow for more influence in the academic governance process. Before accepting a tenure-track position, Participant 10 would need to clarify definitions and expectations for scholarship and, like Participant 6, would still want to be actively teaching and being in contact with students. Participant 10 stated:

I’d have to have a discussion with [administration] as to what would count as scholarship. I would also have to have conversations with [administration] about the whole course release [and less teaching]. I think I would take the title [of a tenure-track faculty member], take the pay raise, and I’m speculating on the pay raise. I don’t know how that works. It’s all this big mysterious thing. The general perception that the teaching isn’t as critical or important or as valued [as research and scholarship]. But I would probably keep everything as it is [with my teaching schedule]. I wouldn’t necessarily want to take a course release. I guess what I’d like to see is the tenure-track faculty [position involve] more teaching. (p. 25, ln. 602)

In the past, Participant 8 wanted to become a tenure-track faculty member, but not in the present due to family commitments. Participant 8 said,
Tenured and tenure-track positions provide a kind of career stability and a more appropriate salary for my level of education. I would prefer to be compensated a little better than I am, but I also recognize that higher compensation comes with a higher workload. Not in the sense of your teaching workload, but just the total number of hours that you spend pursuing tenure. To me, I can’t imagine fitting that into 40 hours a week . . . . For me, [a tenure-track position] is sort of a deferred thing. I would pursue a tenure-track position in the future once [some of my family responsibilities have decreased or have been completed]. I don’t know what that means in terms of how old [I would be], but at this stage in my life, I think this [lecturer] position is appropriate for [me].

Of the 12 participants, eight thought they would retire or possibly retire from the University. Participant 3 stated, speaking of retiring from the University, “As long as they keep giving me contracts” (Participant 3, p. 28, ln. 666). Participant 1 stated, “My current plan is to ride it [until] retirement, if I can” (Participant 1, p. 25, ln. 666). When asked, “Would you see yourself retiring from the University?” Participant 6 responded, “Yeah [I see myself retiring from the University], I’d be very happy to be [at the University] for many more years” (Participant 6, p. 28, ln. 636).

While confidently stating that plans to retire from the University would happen in the future, Participant 4 explored the job market by searching for teaching positions at other colleges and universities. Participant 4 reflected:

At this point, it’s going to take something pretty severe for me to even want to look [for other employment]. I realize I have to sometimes accept things [about being a lecturer] that I don’t like. If I don’t like my current chairperson, it’s not
going to be a perfect world. But, right now, I don’t see any reason [to search for work at another college]. Once in a while, I’ll look at [faculty positions] at other universities. They’ll send e-mails [to me] about employment positions. If I was to go [to another university] to become a lecturer, [there is] such an unknown quality. Would I succeed or fail? Is what [I am] doing at [the University] [equal] to what [I would be doing at another college]? So, yeah, I do definitely see myself, at this point, retiring from here. (p. 29, ln. 725)

In Theme 5, many of the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty intended to take advantage of the promotion opportunity through the lecturer rank system. They planned to apply for the senior lecturer or principal lecturer positions. A few faculty members explained their experiences with the lecturer promotion process. The process seemed unclear, confusing, and loosely constructed. Of the 12 participants, 11 mentioned or expressed that their current age, work/life balance situations, and their measure of research agenda that influenced their decisions to accept or reject if offered a tenure-track position. The majority of the participants felt they would continue in their present career track until retirement from the University.

The full-time, non-tenure-track faculty rated the promotion process (clarity of process, criteria, standards, body of evidence for promotion, and whether will faculty will be promoted) very low with a mean average of approximately 2.60 out of 5.00 (National Faculty Survey, 2012). When asked about mentoring (its importance, effectiveness, and support from faculty), full-time, non-tenure-track faculty rated mentoring with a low mean of 2.99 out of 5.00 (National Faculty Survey, 2012).
In response to a faculty survey question, “If you were to choose to leave your institution, what would be your primary reason?” full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were asked to choose from a list of 14 responses. One of the two highest responses were “There is no reason why I would choose to leave this institution” as one of the top responses (National Faculty Survey, 2012). When asked if full-time, non-tenure-track faculty would choose to work at the University again, they responded they would decide to work at the University again with a mean of 3.87 out of 5.00. (National Faculty Survey, 2012).

**Unanticipated Findings**

Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty are making long-term careers from continuous annual contracts. The study also revealed two unanticipated findings. Full-time, non-tenured track faculty in this study reported apprehension and anxiety relating to their annual administrative evaluations and they were concerned about increasing student enrollment and the potential impact that it might have on their overall workload.

**Summary of Results**

This study focused on experiences and perceptions of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty employed at a 4-year university. According to the lecturers and senior lecturers in this study, they expressed feeling generally accepted and trusted in their departments, which aided in their socialization into the departments. The participants also felt they had a supportive environment. The full-time, non-tenure-track faculty seemed to experience varying degrees of socialization. Regarding acceptance or membership in the department, no full-time, non-tenure-track faculty participant felt like a Newcomer or Outsider. Similarly, no participant felt like an Outsider when asked about permanency. Despite the
support from administrators, the participants reported feeling unequal to tenure-track faculty because of the lack of job security, lack of access to governance, and low pay for the amount of work they performed compared to the tenure-track counterparts. Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in this study reported having heavy teaching loads with large numbers of students, numerous and varied courses, and multiple service-work commitments. The participants had seemingly found various ways to make themselves needed within their departments by creating courses, leading student programs, hosting events, and taking on duties formerly done by tenured and tenure-track faculty. Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty are making long-term careers from continuous annual contracts.

This chapter presented the results of data analysis from multiple data sources. The primary data source was the interview texts, with additional data collected and analyzed from institutional documents consisting of surveys, policies, and meeting minutes. The analysis resulted in the following five themes:

1. Socialization is support, trust, and acceptance.
2. It’s like being a second-class citizen.
3. The workhorse carries a heavy load, but it’s worth it.
4. What’s your niche? To make myself needed.
5. Moving forward with an unclear path.

There were two surprises in the findings: participants’ anxiousness about receiving the chairpersons’ evaluations, and the continuous increase in the student population and how it might impact the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty workload.

Chapter 5 discusses the results of the research and the implications for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty literature, higher education policies, and academic leadership.
Chapter 5 also includes a discussion of the research limitations, the possibility of a postsecondary policy creation or changes, recommendations for further research, and recommendations for collegiate administrations. The chapter ends with a conclusion.
Chapter 5: Discussion

Introduction

Over the past 36 years, full-time, non-tenure-track college and university faculty have been increasing in numbers while the traditional tenured and tenure-track faculty populations have declined (Curtis, 2014). This shift in hiring more full-time non-tenure-track faculty might cause problems for postsecondary institutions and faculty because colleges and universities could have less tenured and tenure-track faculty members to serve in the operations of academic divisions and on university-wide committees or initiatives. Additionally, there might be less tenure-eligible faculty to support strategic planning, curriculum development, and revisions to policies and procedures. There are no guarantees of annual contract renewals for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, which might lead to faculty members’ anxiety about job security (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Additionally, some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty might feel worried because they lack opportunities for career advancement (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001).

This study was conducted to examine full-time, non-tenure-track faculty experiences teaching in a private doctoral university and their perceptions regarding their work in the academic setting. The goal was to discover possible factors of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty’s work environment that could impact contract renewal or advancement. The research question asked was, What are the experiences and perceptions of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty working 3 or more years at a 4-year university that influence career longevity and advancement? The major sections of this...
chapter discuss the implications, recommendations, and limitations of the study, and the chapter concludes with a summary of the study.

**Implications of Findings**

The results from this study provide several implications related to the experiences and perceptions of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in higher education institutions. The implications for research are discussed in the first section. The second section includes the implications for policy in colleges and universities. The last section is focused on the findings of the study and the implications for higher education academic leaders and for those full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in the profession.

**Implications for research.** Kezar and Sam (2010a) examined various studies about non-tenure-track faculty. Those studies reported lower levels of commitment by non-tenure-track faculty. Kezar and Sam (2010a) noted that those low levels of commitment may transpire if non-tenure-track faculty do not completely socialize into the academic environment in comparison to those who are accepted and socialized into academia. The results of this study indicate that the participants at the University were socialized into the organization at varying degrees with most of the participants being accepted, trusted, and supported by colleagues and administrators. The full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in this study reported being very dedicated to supporting students and doing whatever was needed for their department to be effective. Some participants reported they loved the moments when struggling students finally understood a course concept or when the “light bulb went on” in students’ heads. In addition, many of the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty stated they planned to retire from the University and had no reason to leave the institution. These findings are supported by the studies of
Waltman et al. (2012) who found full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were committed to both teaching and working with students, which gave them enjoyment. The authors also found that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were eager to share their knowledge with students. The findings of this present study and Waltman et al. (2012) appear to demonstrate that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty love teaching, supporting, and interacting with their students.

From the results in this study, it appears several full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members transitioned through several levels of socialization into the organization. Over time, working in the organization, it appears that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty may have become more accepted by their departmental peers. While undergoing socialization, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty appeared to have established relationships with colleagues. Some participants in this study mentioned having developed relationships with their respective department’s scheduling course coordinators, which may be an advantage in influencing flexibility into their work schedule, the courses taught, number of courses taught, and the days and times of the courses that were taught. These findings are supported by the studies of Schein (1971) and Van Maanen and Schein (1979) who inferred that a faculty member can make continuous movement throughout an organization, and relationships with other organizational members can change. In a similar way full-time, non-tenure-track faculty can have evolving relationships with organizational members. There are several transitions and individual experiences to becoming an accepted member in an organization (Schein, 1971; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Waltman et al. (2012) found that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty appreciated the flexibility of their work-life
balance schedule to care for their children and sick family members. As full-time, non-tenure-track faculty transition through levels of acceptance in an organization and become more socialized, they might cultivate relationships with their existing organizational members, which may lead to advantageous outcomes. These favorable outcomes might transpire in the form of more collaborative opportunities with tenured, tenure-track, and other full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to co-create and team teach courses and to conduct research and present scholarly works.

Kezar and Sam (2013) conducted a study to find the topics and strategies used to improve the equity of policies and procedures regarding full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. The concept of institutionalization is a specific form of change that happens in institutions (Kezar & Sam, 2013). The changes are long-term and rooted in the institutional environment. There are three phases of institutionalization (Kezar & Sam, 2013). In the first phase, mobilization, a college or university system is ready and prepared for reform (Kezar & Sam, 2013). The second phase, implementation, is where a system has taken the initial steps and begun to change. A college or university consistently engaged with the community in discussions of campus climate and policies affecting non-tenure-track faculty, such as compensation, teaching workload, and career advancement, would be in the third phase, institutionalization (Kezar & Sam, 2013). The University in this study could be considered operating in the institutionalization phase because the University’s institutional documents and websites state that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty are invited to participate in faculty orientation with other colleagues. Also, there is a full-time, non-tenure-track faculty rank promotion system; a non-tenure-track faculty teaching award; access to professional development grants especially for
full-time, non-tenure-track faculty; an appointed Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Administrator; and promoted full-time, non-tenure-track faculty are allowed to serve on and share in governance at the University. It appears the University in this study is attempting to make the working environment more equitable for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty via positive and supportive policies and practices. The United States higher education policymakers, both administrators and faculty, could benefit from the examination of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Tenured, tenure-track, and a small number of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty serve on academic faculty-governing boards. The faculty members have a strong influence on the policies set on college and university campuses. They might be empowered to implement and vote for favorable institution policies and practices supporting full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Supportive policies related to career advancement, participation in institutional governance, job security, compensation, and academic freedom for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty might result in more favorable employment satisfaction of these faculty, which may lead to a positive effect on student learning, retention, and graduation rates.

The results from this study suggest that the age of the participant, balance between work and home life activities, and involvement level in scholarly work influenced the desire for tenure-track positions. Although, there were a few participants in this study who desired to have a tenure-track position, most of the faculty members stated their desire to be on a tenure track had dissipated over the course of their career. The increased emphasis on research expectations was the main reason the participants no longer desired to pursue a tenure-track position in their career path. These results seem to contradict the findings of Rajagopal (2004) who found that 78% of the Canadian full-
time, non-tenure-track faculty interviewed wanted tenure-track faculty positions. Rajagopal (2004), who noted that Canadian colleges and universities have similar higher education systems as those in the United States, stated that the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty tended to have employment terms of approximately 4 years. Even though a large number of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in Canada desired tenure-track positions, the number of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in United States wanting tenure-track positions might be different based on job expectations and requirements. It is unclear whether the participants in Rajagopal’s study were reappointed and were employed for more than 4 years. In this current study, most of the participants were employed for more than 4 years at the University. It appears full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in this study who were further along in their career did not want the responsibilities and pressure of tenure-track positions due to the impact on their work-life situations. There are some faculty, described by Baldwin and Chronister (2001) as “tenure-track hopefuls,” that desire to have tenure-track positions. If academic leaders understand the aspirations of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty where some desire tenure-track positions and some do not, these faculty members might feel more supported by their administrators, which could lead to them to feeling more socialized. Adversely, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty with diverse career goals might seek other employment opportunities if higher education administrators do not acknowledge and support them regarding different career goals.

Based on the results of this study, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty taught more courses than most of the tenured and tenure-track faculty in their respective departments. Prior to determining the study’s results, the researcher examined a workload policy.
document for one academic division in the University. The document described the varied expected workloads for tenured, tenure-track, and full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. The document showed that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in that college or school were expected to teach more than tenured and tenure-track faculty. The workload document seems to concur with the responses from the participants in this study.

Workload policies for other academic divisions in the University were not accessible by the researcher. Some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in this study articulated that they had similar workloads, number of courses taught, and service to the department as some existing tenured faculty and former tenured and tenure-track faculty colleagues.

The study of Baldwin and Chronister (2001) found that some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members taught more courses than tenured and tenure-track faculty, while other full-time, non-tenure-track faculty appeared more like their tenured and tenure-track faculty counterparts with respect to the number of courses they taught and other department responsibilities. Baldwin and Chronister (2001) results support this present study’s findings. The results of both this current study and Baldwin and Chronister (2001) study seem to contradict the Bland et al. (2006) findings. Bland et al. found that during one week, tenured and tenure-track faculty taught more courses and spent more time teaching compared to full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. It seems more likely that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty would teach more classes than tenured and tenure-track faculty because full-time, non-tenure-track faculty are hired for and expected to perform primarily teaching responsibilities. Although it is not fully clear if full-time, non-tenure-track faculty duties are routinely becoming more like their tenure-eligible counterparts, scholars have found that the role of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty has
been changing (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Hollenshead et al., 2007; Rhoades & Maitland, 2008). More full-time, non-tenure-track faculty may be more often performing activities other than their teaching, which might cause confusion and uncertainty about the actual role of those faculty. Baldwin and Chronister (2001) found that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were given duties to perform in the department, but they were not assessed based on the role they were assigned. If full-time, non-tenure-track faculty lack clarity in their roles, those faculty members might experience difficulty in receiving contract renewals and promotions due to not meeting the required criteria.

This present study yields that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty had yearly or multiyear contracts and primary teaching responsibilities, but they performed various levels of service and research activities. Most of the participants were heavily involved in some kind of service, while some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty conducted research. These findings seem to be supported by the AAUP (2003) documentation that states the level to which a faculty member is engaged in teaching, research, and service depends on terms of the contract, academic discipline, and the characteristics of the college or university. For the participants in this study who engaged in research, the research was voluntary and completed on their own time. Some of the participants stated that they did not have time for scholarly activities because of their teaching load. These findings were also supported by the study of Baldwin and Chronister (2001) who found that full-time, non-tenure-track teaching workloads may restrict the amount of time those faculty members have to participate in scholarly activities. Several of the participants in this study had administrators who permitted and supported full-time, non-tenure-track faculty’s participation in research. Even if full-time, non-tenure-track faculty had the
opportunity to engage in research and had a desire to do research, they might not have
had the time due to their heavy workload.

Kezar and Sam (2011) emphasized the importance of non-tenure-track faculty
conducting research on other non-tenure-track faculty subjects. But previous research
studies on full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were conducted by tenured and tenure-track
professors and researchers (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011;
Cross & Goldenberg, 2011; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Figlio et al., 2013; Gappa et al.,
Monks, 2007; Rajagopal, 2004; Umbach, 2007; Waltman et al., 2012). Research
conducted by tenured and tenure-track faculty might be biased and focused on full-time,
non-tenure-track faculty as merely temporary employees and non-professionals (Kezar &
Sam, 2011). The researcher for this study is a full-time, non-tenure-track faculty member
who is studying the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty population at the University. This
study may be one of the only studies where a full-time, non-tenure-track member
examined and studied full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. A qualitative study was
specifically chosen by the researcher to give voice to the full-time, non-tenure-track
faculty population that has not often been given a voice (Kezar & Sam, 2010b). As a full-
time, non-tenure-track faculty member, the researcher aimed to focus on the experiences
of other full-time, non-tenure-track faculty through the lens of organizational
socialization recommended by Kezar and Sam (2011). Also, the researcher has lived
experiences similar to those of the participants in the study. Those lived experiences
provided a context from which to base this study. Kezar and Sam (2010b) suggested
studies for non-tenure-track faculty based on this context to address the concerns and problems of that population.

**Implications for policy.** The findings in this study suggest that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty roles in the higher education sector are changing from merely teaching to involving more service and possibly scholarship responsibilities. These changes could have several policy implications for colleges and universities. The faculty in this study shared that some of them participate in minimal scholarship, and most of them are more heavily involved with service to the campus community. For many of the participants in this study, it was becoming more difficult to identify the difference between some tenured faculty and their full-time, non-tenure-track counterparts. The only noticeable difference might have been the doctorate degrees earned, amount of research published, or the level of research the tenure-track and tenured faculty was conducting. In this study, some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty had similar teaching and service responsibilities as several senior tenured faculty members in their departments. While there might be provosts and deans who provided research opportunities to full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, these faculty members might not have been able to take advantage of those opportunities for several reasons. The full-time, non-tenure-track faculty might not have had the time to conduct research, experienced a heavy teaching load, or there was no course release to allow time to for the participant to conduct research.

As some higher education institutions continue to employ more full-time, non-tenure-track faculty and less tenured and tenure-track faculty, as in the case of the University in this study, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty might have to accept more service work in order to assist in the operations of the department and the college.
Tenure-eligible faculty might have less time to perform service activities and spend more
time involved in research. University policies that state the primary teaching role of full-
time, non-tenure-track faculty might not match the growing trends of how higher
educational institutions are utilizing this faculty population. If research opportunities are
not made available to full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, those faculty members might
not continue to be proficient within their disciplines. Without currency in their respective
areas of expertise, they could lack the insight to direct and guide instruction in the
classroom. Furthermore, some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty might want and need to
do research in order to remain qualified to apply for tenure-track positions, if desired,
both internally or externally, to their respective colleges and universities. With full-time,
non-tenure-track faculty performing and taking on responsibilities other than teaching,
their job descriptions and expectations regarding teaching, research, and service can
become unclear.

If full-time, non-tenure-track faculty continue to be assigned workloads that
resemble tenured faculty, those full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members may become
less willing to build relationships and support students as a result of inequitable salaries
between the positions. Monk (2007) documented the differences between the salary of
full-time, non-tenure-track faculty and tenure-track and tenured faculty. Full-time, non-
tenure-track faculty’s salaries were substantially lower than the tenured and tenure-track
faculty’s salaries. Based on Theme 2 in this study, the participants found their
compensation as a disadvantage to being a full-time, non-tenure-track faculty member.
The participants noted the vast difference between the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty
pay and the more favorable pay of tenured and tenure-track faculty. If the salary
differences continue between the different types of faculty for similar job descriptions, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty may become dissatisfied with their positions, feel undervalued by their employers, lower their level of effort for teaching and working with students, and leave the institution for other employment. The lower pay of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty might contribute to these faculty members not feeling like “real” faculty, which might, in turn, hinder their favorable socialization process into the organization. In addition, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty may be less willing to be the “workhorse” and accept a greater teaching and service workload by always responding, “yes” when asked by their chairperson to do extra work. In situations where the salary is a major shortcoming for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, collective bargaining using unions may occur. Faculty colleagues, chairpersons, and students who perceive full-time, non-tenure-track faculty as having lower standards for teaching could result in lower scores on peer evaluations, appraisals, and student ratings of the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Faculty who receive less-than-favorable assessments may not be provided with contract renewals or career advancement opportunities, which could then limit the faculty’s continued employment.

When examining participants’ level of membership in the organization and level of permanency in Chapter 4 (Figures 4.1 and 4.2, respectively), the initial analysis may seem that the longer the length of time full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in this study were employed in the organization, the more socialized they became. Upon deeper analysis, the socialization process involved full-time, non-tenure-track faculty becoming accepted, trusted, and supported by their tenured, tenure-track, and full-time, non-tenure-track colleagues and administrators. These results could imply that in order for full-time,
non-tenure-track faculty to experience career longevity and feel socialized into the organization, they would need continuous contracts to be renewed and possibly multiyear reappointments without restrictions on the number of faculty reappointments. Without significant time for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to collaborate and build relationships with their colleagues through co-teaching and co-creating of courses, these faculty members may not have a sense of “fit” within their departments nor feelings of satisfaction toward their administrators and colleagues. Based on the results of this study, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty’s success in higher education may be possible through satisfaction with their employment and socialization in which all full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in the organization are accepted as equal peers and colleagues.

Several full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members at the University who had been promoted mentioned their promotion processes were unclear. The promotion process was relatively new at the University, and it was established after 2008. If there is a lack of mentoring and advising by chairpersons on how to interpret the promotion policy and the criteria for evaluations, the promotion processes may become confusing and frustrating for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, and they may be unsuccessful in obtaining a higher rank, which would hinder their career advancement. Recommendations and approvals of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty for promotions tend to come from chairpersons, promotion committee members, and deans. Moreover, if the expectations of all of the groups involved in recommending and approving full-time, non-tenure-track faculty for promotion are not clearly understood by full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, those faculty members may fail to acquire multiyear contracts. Without multiyear contracts, career longevity and socialization into the organization may
be negatively impacted. Based on the findings of this study, most of the participants wanted to be promoted to the next level in the rank system. In postsecondary institutions where there is no full-time, non-tenure-track faculty rank system, some of these faculty might feel their careers are professionally stagnated and see no possible way to advance in their current positions. If full-time, non-tenure-track faculty are denied promotions in the rank system due to lack of guidance and transparency by the chairpersons, it may create an uncomfortable work environment with several full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members who may feel they have less job security, are immobile in their professional growth, and dissatisfied with their salaries.

**Implications for leadership and professional practice.** There were full-time, non-tenure track faculty in this study who taught introductory courses with large student class sizes. Some of those faculty participants mentioned other full-time, non-tenure-track peers in their academic division who taught introductory courses. This practice is often seen at colleges and universities to allow tenure-track faculty more time to conduct research (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). The participants in this study stated that tenured and tenure-track faculty have taught less introductory courses at the University. This suggests there could be an imbalance in mostly full-time, non-tenure-track faculty taking on introductory classes, which may prompt some accreditation boards to make recommendations for more appropriate ratios of non-tenure-track faculty to tenured and tenure-track positions. Participant 5 stated “almost all of our freshmen classes are being taught by non-tenure-track faculty, and there’s very little buy-in from the tenured track on the [teaching of introductory courses]” (Participant 5, p. 11, ln. 256). This situation of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty teaching mostly introductory courses should be of
concern to higher education administrators as full-time, non-tenure-track faculty may become weary of teaching the same courses each year with no variation in the types of courses they teach. Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty may also miss opportunities to build relationships with students due to the large student course enrollment. In addition, students may be concerned if full-time, non-tenure-track faculty are teaching all or a majority of the introductory courses. Students may be less likely to view full-time, non-tenure-track faculty as role models and mentors due to their short-term employment status.

The full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in this study tended to teach introduction courses with large numbers of students, which could lead to heavy workloads and less meaningful interactions with students. Most of the introduction courses have freshman and sophomore students who are adjusting to college life. Additionally, these students might be still maturing and discovering social, cultural, emotional, and spiritual aspects about themselves (Clydesdale, 2007; Upcraft, Gardner, & Barefoot, 2005). Some freshman and sophomore students may be less motivated to take general education courses that are seemingly unrelated to their desired majors (Clydesdale, 2007; Upcraft et al., 2005). These students could have different needs and present different challenges than older students who have matriculated in colleges and universities for longer periods (Clydesdale, 2007; Upcraft et al., 2005). Due to these challenges, freshman and sophomore students might need more faculty support compared to junior and senior students who have experienced some level of success. This additional support may impact the workload of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty who are teaching a majority of introductory courses.
The full-time, non-tenure-track faculty at the University in this study taught mostly lower-level courses. In the study by Baldwin and Chronister (2001), they also found that some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were restricted to teaching introductory courses. Freshmen students were positively influenced by the teaching of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to persist into their sophomore year (Jaeger & Eagan, 2011a). These faculty members may play an important role in the academic careers of students. Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty may help freshman and sophomore students establish a strong foundation and set those students up for success in more advanced subsequent courses. If full-time, non-tenure-track faculty can positively impact student grades and persistence, student enrollment, and graduation rates may increase. Consequently, renewable annual contracts or multiyear contracts could be offered to full-time, non-tenure-track faculty thus providing employment longevity.

Deans and chairpersons may decide to limit full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to teaching mostly or only introductory courses. By limiting these faculty members to teaching introductory sequence courses, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty may be unaware of how the courses within the department or major relate and connect across the curriculum. Additionally, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty may be limited in how well they can advise students to the relevancy of courses and the rationale of the sequence of courses.

Academic officials might not be aware of and appreciate the differences in the workloads between full-time, non-tenure-track faculty and their tenured and tenure-track faculty colleagues. Furthermore, these administrators may not be completely aware of the unique characteristics of the students who are at various levels of academic performance.
and emotional and social capabilities in their personal lives. It may not have been acknowledged and recognized by those in academic leadership which faculty types, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty or tenured and tenure-track faculty, are primarily teaching large numbers of students with possible extra and specific needs. It is important that administrators understand and appreciate the additional challenges full-time, non-tenure-track faculty experience. If administrators do not recognize these challenges as part of the full-time, non-tenure track workload, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty might get burned out, and the educational experience of the students could also suffer. Based on this study’s findings, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have heavy workloads that were not always acknowledged by their chairpersons. Continued lack of attention to the teaching and service workload of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty by administration might be perceived by others that this group of faculty is less important or second-class to the institution than the tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Based on the results of this study, all of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty felt socialized into the organization and had positive experiences in an environment that was accepting, trusting, and supportive. Academic leaders need to have an understanding of the organizational socialization process of this group of faculty. When full-time, non-tenure-track faculty become more socialized into the organization, there might be an increase in faculty retention and less faculty turnover. Senior faculty’s acceptance and support of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty might influence these full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members to be more willing to do what is needed in the departments, and have a sense of “fit.”
Many academic leadership roles in colleges and universities are typically held by tenure-track and tenured faculty, yet with a growing population of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, this expectation may be changing. Some of the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in this study took on leadership roles in their departments and at the college level. Those participants who took on leadership roles were trusted and supported to make decisions on behalf of their academic division. Regardless of faculty tenure status and rank, most faculty are not generally orientated into being trained in leadership, which may be especially true for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty (Kezar, Lester, Carducci, Gallant, & McGavin, 2007). If full-time, non-tenure-track faculty are not trusted to make decisions and supported with leadership training, their feelings and perceptions of being second-class citizens might be reinforced.

The results from this study imply that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have heavy teaching and service loads. They may accept the heavy workload because they enjoy teaching and working with students. The participants in this study might have always said yes when given courses assignments and service work in order to secure their jobs. Some of the participants may have felt that if they did not accept new or different responsibilities, it could have jeopardized their chances of receiving contract renewals and advancement within the rank system. Chairpersons may continue to give full-time, non-tenure-track more teaching and service work, because those faculty always say yes and chairpersons are not truly aware of the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty workload. The continuous acceptance of heavy workloads without recognition and reward from administrators may cause full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to be reluctant to say yes when asked to perform departmental duties. Those faculty members may develop feelings
of resentment and become contentious toward the chairpersons or other faculty members who may be perceived by the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty as having lighter workloads and yet are receiving more pay.

The findings of this study suggest that administrators may not fully understand the workload of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Deans and chairpersons who are unaware of the unique role full-time, non-tenure-track faculty play in the department or college and the amount of workload they complete, may leave this group of faculty feeling unappreciated and unrecognized. This suggested lack of awareness by academic leaders might influence how full-time, non-tenure-track faculty feel toward performing their work duties, collaborating with other department colleagues, and instructing and advising students.

Limitations

This study was limited to a large private doctoral university. The findings for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty at colleges and universities with other Carnegie Classifications may have different findings from this study. The University has established positive policies in support of full-time, non-tenure track faculty. These policies are in the form of: lecturer rank system, teaching awards for non-tenure-track faculty, professional development grants, a Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Administrator, and senior and principal lecturers can be voted onto governance committees at the University level. These policies may have provided the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty at the University with more positive settings compared to other institutions, which may have added to their perceptions and experiences.
Since the majority of the participants had been employed by the University in another capacity prior to becoming a lecturer, their responses to the questions about socialization and acceptance may have been influenced by previous employment as an adjunct, a visiting professor, or part-time faculty. This study was limited to lecturers’ and senior lecturers’ self-reported perceptions of their descriptive experiences as full-time, non-tenure-track faculty.

The researcher is conscious of the possible bias, due to his experiences as a full-time, non-tenure-track faculty member, brought to this study. Still, this study has value and adds to the overall literature on this population in the field of higher education. It is important that non-tenure-track faculty study the experiences of non-tenure-track faculty (Kezar & Sam, 2010b).

**Recommendations**

The results from this study provide several recommendations related to the experiences and perceptions of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in higher education institutions. The recommendations for future research and higher education institutional policies are discussed in the first two sections. The last section includes recommendations for academic leaders and full-time, non-tenure-track faculty.

**Recommendations for future research.** The University in this study had a full-time, non-tenure-track rank system. The system had three rank levels. There were no full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in this promoted to the highest rank, because there were no responses to the invitation to the study by that level of faculty. Therefore, a study that examines the perceptions and experiences of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty who have been promoted to the highest rank would be valuable. This type of study would add to the
body of knowledge on the socialization process of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty into an institution of higher education. This recommended study would also provide more insight on the transitions full-time, non-tenure-track faculty make when becoming more accepted and trusted in a college or university.

This study included full-time, non-tenure-track faculty who had worked 3 or more years. All of the participants interviewed reported feeling various degrees of socialization into their departments. A future study may consider understanding the experiences of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty who have been employed for less than 3 years. A study of this kind would contribute to the understanding of how new full-time, non-tenure-track faculty socialize into the culture of academia.

This study was conducted at a large doctoral university. Replicating this research at other similar research and doctoral universities with comparable student and faculty populations may prove to be very informative. The examination might reveal the results of this study are unique only to the University or that the five themes are applicable and can be generalizable to similar colleges or universities. Conducting research about full-time, non-tenure-track faculty at other types of universities would assist in understanding the diverse faculty titles and roles of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty services on campuses. A study of other types of Carnegie Classified colleges and universities, including comprehensive colleges or liberal arts focused universities, would give more insight into the variety of roles performed.

Recommendations for policy. Most of the participants in this study reported receiving multiyear contracts after being promoted within the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty rank system and feeling accepted by their other department faculty members,
valued as a peer, and supported by both the administrators and faculty in their
department. If full-time, non-tenure-track faculty receive multiyear contracts, their
dissatisfaction toward their employment might improve, and their perceptions of
themselves, as well as, how others perceive them might result in a more positive
workplace experience (Levin & Shaker, 2011; Waltman et al., 2012). Based on the
findings of this study, Baldwin and Chronister (2001) and Hollenshead et al. (2007),
many full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members perceived they have little to no job
security. A way to provide more job security might be by providing longer contracts. For
example, the University of Denver recently developed a new ranking system for full-
time, non-tenure-track faculty members that allows them to be eligible for a 3-year, then
a 5-year, and finally a 7-year contract (Flaherty, 2015). The University of Denver sought
to show its appreciation for its full-time, non-tenure-track faculty by providing equitable
policies to support full-time, non-tenure-track faculty with long-term contracts and
professional career pathways.

Several reasons full-time, non-tenure-track faculty may not be offered a contract
renewal is because of budgetary restraints, reduction in student enrollment, or a major
departmental change (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Yet, these reasons may not always
be communicated to faculty upon being hired. Some of the participants in this study
seemed to be aware of the reasons that affected contract renewals because they
experienced losing employment due to corporate downsizing. Institutions that do not
have clear contract renewal processes for faculty could impact the anxiety level of full-
time, non-tenure-track faculty. It is important that there are terms in full-time, non-
tenure-track faculty’s contracts that clearly state the factors for which contracts will be or
will not be renewed. Also, academic leaders should provide transparency in the process of renewing contracts.

Scholars (American Federation of Teachers Higher Education, 2005; Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Hollenshead et al., 2007; Rhoades & Maitland, 2008) suggest providing full-time, non-tenure-track faculty with multiyear contracts after a trial period. Although a few of the participants in this study reported that multiyear contracts do not equate to job security, most of the participants stated they felt permanent or more permanent in their full-time, non-tenure-track faculty positions. There were nine senior lecturers in this study who had previously received multiyear contracts. Of the three lecturers, only one lecturer felt “not permanent.” Policymakers should be mindful of how extended contracts might provide more job security for some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty than others.

Theme 2, *It’s like being a second-class citizen*, revealed that full-time, non-tenure-track-faculty expressed a difference in how they were treated by others on campus compared to the treatment of tenured and tenure-track faculty. These differences led some of the participants in this study to report feeling like second-class citizens. One way for deans and chief academic officers to help change the perception of a second-tiered system is to eliminate the use of the terms, “non-tenure-track” faculty. All faculty, tenured and tenure-track and full-time, non-tenure track, should have the same type of titles, such as, assistant professor of practice or assistant teaching professor, which are currently used at the University of Denver (Flaherty, 2015). Although, the University of Denver did not provide initial salary increases, it did demonstrate more commitment and support toward full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Baldwin and Chronister (2001) found
that various colleges and universities provided full-time, non-tenure-track faculty with career advancement opportunities. The advancement opportunities were provided to full-time, non-tenure-track faculty through a rank system similar to tenured and tenure-track faculty. Titles such as Assistant Professor and Associate Professor seemed to give more creditability and respect to the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in contrast to the Instructor title (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Many full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members have similar educational backgrounds as some tenured and tenure-track faculty, and they perform similar work duties. Kezar (2013a) identified settings where full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have positive connections with tenure-eligible faculty and favorable institutional policies as the learning culture (Appendix A). By providing an equitable policy of creating job titles that reflect the traditional tenure-line faculty, it might provide full-time, non-tenure-track faculty with a sense of recognition and appreciation where the interactions with tenured and tenure-track faculty are fair and equal.

Changing the titles of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty might not be enough to make those faculty members feel less like second-class citizens and more on the level with tenured and tenure-track faculty. Academic division administrators should strive to build work environments of trust. Covey (2006) recommended leaders who build organizations with high levels of trust produce trust dividends (Covey, 2006). When employees trust their peers and leaders, the value of the product they offer is increased, and loyalty among stakeholders is strengthened (Covey, 2006).

The findings for this study showed that the participants were confused about the promotion process. According to Theme 5, Moving forward with an unclear path, almost
all of the full-time, non-tenure-track-faculty in this study stated they desired a promotion to the next level in the rank system. Colleges and universities with a promotion rank system could have promotion committees that make recommendations for or against the promotion of eligible full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Those committees could include tenured, tenure-track, and full-time, non-tenure-track faculty (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). The promotion process should be clear at all higher education institutions. For postsecondary institutions contemplating the establishment of a full-time, non-tenure-track system, they should be careful to create fair and equitable criteria and expectations for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. To ensure equity in the promotion process, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty should be involved in the development of policies and procedures. By having those faculty members engaged in the process of policy development, it ensures full-time, non-tenure-track faculty’s voices are recognized and heard. Promotion workshops should be provided to all full-time, non-tenure-track faculty; eligible faculty for the promotion committee, and deans as well as chairpersons. The workshops should provide information about the expectations and criteria for the promotion process. The procedures and policies should be clearly understood by all persons involved with the promotion process.

For colleges and universities who have already created a full-time, non-tenure-track faculty rank system, there should be periodical reviews and evaluations of the promotion criteria and previous promotion processes. If the institutions do not have any full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in the highest rank yet, policy makers should have clear procedures as to the initial promotion process. Institutions that have a well-defined
promotion and contract-renewal process could lead full-time, non-tenure track faculty to feeling less anxious over job security and more socialized into the organization.

In this study, the participants reported having similar workloads to the existing tenured faculty and former tenure-track faculty that included teaching a similar number of courses, advising students, creating and modifying courses, conducting research, serving on multiple committees, leading programs, and coordinating events. While performing duties like tenure-line faculty, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty were receiving compensation noticeably different from the tenured and tenure-track faculty. Institutions of higher education should pay close attention to the workload and pay scale differences between the full-time, non-tenure-track and tenure-track or tenured faculty positions. Furthermore, by focusing on the salary disparities, those institutions help to ensure an equitable pay structure and prevent the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty from feeling as though they are not “real” faculty members, and they would not feel underappreciated for continuously carrying a heavy load.

**Recommendations for professional leadership and professional practice.**

Theme 1, *Socialization is support, trust, and acceptance*, indicated that the support of administrators in this study was a key part in the socialization process. The participants stated that chairpersons and deans provided them with support in various ways. In addition, many of the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in this study were in departments that were accepting, trusting, and allowed for collaboration with colleagues. It is important for department chairpersons to establish departments with cultures of respect and collegiality to promote a positive and inclusive working environment for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty (Cipriano, 2011; Kezar, 2013a). Chairpersons should encourage
non-tenure-track faculty to positively socialize with colleagues and students and they should promote non-tenure-track faculty job performance and student learning (Kezar, 2013c). Administrators should create opportunities for faculty to collaborate with one another on curriculum development, department service, and possible research. In departmental meetings, all faculty could share their teaching experiences, research interests, and personal hobbies to allow other faculty members to find commonalities with other faculty. Leadership scholars, Kouzes and Posner (2012), suggested that leaders should encourage collaborative work to help develop trusting relationships between individuals. Genuine relationships can also be created through establishing symbolic ceremonies and events in order to develop cohesiveness in the organization (Bolman & Deal, 2013). For example, for institutions that provide new faculty orientation, academic administrators should not depend solely on a 1- to 2-day orientation as the main driver of the socialization process. Academic division leaders should provide at least a year-long new faculty orientation and continued socialization opportunities that would involve workshops about teaching and student learning and work-life balance panel discussions. The year-long orientation should involve tenure-track and full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty issues and concerns need to be specifically addressed during these orientations as well.

Opportunities for socialization do not have to be only professionally focused. Departmental retreats that include all faculty would provide time for faculty to know get to know each other. Faculty need to know how to trust one another in order to accomplish the mission and objectives of colleges and universities (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty need to be in the presence of other faculty, administrators,
and students to foster honest relationships (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). Some of the academic division events with faculty should also include students in order to foster and strengthen relationships with students. Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty with high commitment levels to teaching and strong collegial relationships with their tenured and tenure-track faculty might be more likely to receive a renewed contract and a promotion to a higher faculty rank.

Based on the results, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in this study appeared to have equity in their academic divisions, but they had concerns about the inequity in governance at the university level. In order to avoid any perceptions of inequity, academic leaders at higher education institutions should evaluate how all faculty groups are represented in committees, governing boards, and faculty leadership positions. A recommended policy to help guide equal representation could include a fixed and designated number of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty memberships at the university faculty governance level. Bolman and Deal (2013) stated that within any organization, there are groups competing for resources. Leaders should be conscience of the differences in values, experiences, and perceptions of those in the group in order to make equitable and fair decisions regarding the distribution and use of the resources (Bolman & Deal, 2013). Administrative and academic leaders who formally support the involvement of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in governance at the academic division and institution levels, may simultaneously provide these faculty members with an equitable investment in the operations of the institution and a voice in the affairs of the college or university.
Based on the findings of this study, some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have taken on leadership roles and service activities previously performed by tenured and tenure-track faculty. Since full-time, non-tenure-track faculty are assuming more leadership responsibilities, it seems logical that higher education administrators should provide more training in leadership for these faculty. Kezar et al. (2007) recognized the lower number of tenure-track faculty positions available in colleges and universities and the tenure-track faculty being highly engaged in scholarly activities with less time for academic leadership activities. Role models with service and leadership expertise should be offered to non-tenure-track faculty as part of the socialization process into the organization (Kezar et al., 2007). Selected role models from among tenured, tenure-track, and possibly full-time, non-tenure-track faculty should be paired with full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members who have displayed interest in leadership positions within the department. One way to achieve this recommendation is for college and university administrators to create a formal system of coaching and mentoring for all faculty to better prepare them to be successful academic leaders.

Kezar et al. (2007) suggested that non-tenure-track faculty work collaboratively with other non-tenure-track faculty to develop leaders who could serve on committees and could impact changes to institutional policies. Opportunities for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to work together and acquire leadership roles may be available within the establishment of a Full-Time, Non-Tenure-Track Advisory Group. In addition, members of the group could provide acceptance and support to one another and contribute to a positive socialization process. The group could focus on issues pertinent to full-time, non-tenure-track faculty and work with academic leaders and faculty governing
boards to create equitable policies for those faculty. Colleges and universities that support full-time, non-tenure-track faculty accepting leadership roles may better utilize the expertise of this group of faculty and also provide them with a wider understanding of their academic division and the institution.

Leadership expert, Maxwell (2011), said great leaders replicate themselves and do not simply energize those who follow them. Chairpersons should be working with deans and provosts in order to create a leadership succession plan in order to ensure operation of the departments flow seamlessly from incumbent leaders to successive leaders. Leadership training and succession planning could also build and sustain confidence in the continued success and ongoing development of department faculty.

Based on the results in this study and all of the five themes, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty who want to receive contract renewals and promotion or those thinking of accepting employment as a full-time, non-tenure-track faculty member should consider the following recommendation:

- find a niche by utilizing their unique skills and expertise that are needed but not currently present in their academic division;
- volunteer to perform duties other faculty do not do;
- say yes when asked to coordinate programs and lead activities;
- realize and accept that a heavy workload is likely for a full-time, non-tenure-track faculty member;
- offer to create and develop new courses (which may lead to socialization into the organization and acceptance by colleagues and administrators);
be observant of the various levels of the institutional faculty and professional staff support activities. Take notice of what is needed or not presently being supported and proactively ask what needs to be done within the department, college, or university level;

- conduct a self-assessment of their skill set:
  - If full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have the skills needed to make positive contributions to campus initiatives, those faculty members should volunteer to become more involved in those activities.
  - If full-time, non-tenure-track faculty do not have the skills needed, those faculty members should start to develop specific skill sets that will be most useful to their department and college (e.g., course design and development for online or in-class, discipline-based assessment, and mentoring and advising of students for the purpose of student persistence.)

- take advantage of the workshops, presentations, and training seminars.

If training for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty is not provided, those faculty members should convey their concerns about equity to their administrators and point out the policies that do not support full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. The full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members should discuss with their respective chairpersons how their professional development training would be an overall benefit to the department. The training could provide existing or future contributions to the academic division. The administrator might need to be reminded of the importance of the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to stay proficient in various aspects of their disciplines and/or instructional methodology. If other faculty, such as tenured and tenure-track faculty, are provided with
funding and access to training, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty could gently remind their administrative leaders that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty need and deserve the same level of training as their counterparts to provide the best education to the students.

Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty should communicate with their administrators and colleagues what they want and need regarding their career longevity and career advancement. Higher education institutions may provide its full-time, non-tenure-track faculty with performance feedback through annual chairperson evaluations. During the meetings to discuss the evaluations with their chairpersons, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty might proactively discuss career goals, specifically goals that will aid in career longevity and advancement. It is important to connect the goals of the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to the mission and vision of the academic division. Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty need to be familiar with the communication style of their respective chairpersons to effectively relay all of the relevant information relative to their career aspirations. Useem (2001) suggested that when communicating with a supervisor, it is important for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to be prepared to provide a convincing rationale for their requests and what they believe. Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty can develop rationales by providing their administrator with examples of how they bring value to the organization (Useem, 2001).

Where socialization aided the good and positive experiences of the participants in this study, collegiality may also assist the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Silverman (2004) provided recommendations for being collegial in academic settings. He put forth possible benefits of tenure-track faculty engaging in collegial activities as a positive influence on becoming tenured and/or receiving contract renewals. Furthermore, a benefit
for tenured faculty working in a collegial department may be a favorable effect in promotion to Associate or Full Professor rank (Silverman, 2004). Some colleges and universities with full-time, non-tenure-track rank systems have promotion committees. These promotion committees can consist of tenured, tenure-track, and full-time non-tenure track faculty of higher rank (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Like the collegiality of their tenured and tenure-track colleagues, it is possible for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to build favorable networks through socialization with their more permanent peers that will positively affect extending employment in their respective departments and colleges. These collegial relationships established by full-time, non-tenure-track faculty could also attribute to contract renewals and promotions thereby extending their employment.

If provosts, deans, and chairpersons desire full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to be satisfied with their employment and remain with the institution for many years, they need to be aware of the amount of work, the specific nature of the work, and the challenges of the work that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty perform. The participants in this study reported that some deans and chairpersons recognized and supported the varied career goals of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. It is important for academic leaders to recognize the heavy teaching and service loads of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Chairpersons should inquire about the career goals of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty and try to accommodate those goals by providing training and funding to encourage the career longevity and advancement of those faculty. If administrators acknowledged and rewarded full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, this recognition of their contributions to the department and college may demonstrate to the full-time, non-tenure-
track faculty that they are not merely “cheap laborers” but professionals who should be acknowledged and nurtured (Kezar & Sam, 2011). Hall (2008) suggested that new human resource departments support the goals of the organization by collaborating with managers to develop employees as value added assets. As a reward, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty would be given the freedom to develop their own courses and be given the flexibility to choose the days and times courses are available and which courses are offered in a given semester.

In this study, the University provided full-time, non-tenure-track faculty with positive policies and practices, which might have favorably influenced the lived experiences of those faculty. Administrative leaders who employ full-time, non-tenure-track faculty should provide those faculty members with equitable policies and procedures. After interviewing numerous companies, Ton (2014) found that businesses that recognized their employees as assets, not merely expenditures in need of continuous investments, had happy employees with good jobs. Offering professional development funds, equitable salary and benefits, recognition awards, full inclusion in academic division and university governance, and new faculty orientation to full-time, non-tenure-track faculty may aid in the socialization of those faculty. When speaking about full-time, non-tenure-track faculty participating in an academic orientation program, Baldwin & Chronister (2001) stated, “Orientation is no less important for non-tenure-track faculty than for tenure-track faculty” (p. 165). In essence, all faculty appointment types should be allowed to participate in institutional faculty orientation training. One aspect of promoting an environment for supporting successful socialization of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty is to assimilate full-time, non-tenure-track faculty and tenure-track
faculty at the same level (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). In addition, engaging in discussions with full-time, non-tenure-track faculty about department and university-wide norms, such as grading policies, teaching philosophy, co-curricular activities, and other campus community processes, are vital to those faculty members’ successful transition into the culture (Kezar, 2012).

Conclusion

The number of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have gradually increased while the numbers of tenured and tenure-track faculty have declined (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Ehrenberg, 2012; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). This decline of available tenured and tenure-track faculty positions may cause problems for administrators and full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Job security, opportunities for upward career mobility, and equity in the workplace were possible problems for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Higher education administrators might obtain more understanding about those full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members in order to help them feel accepted, trusted, and supported by colleagues and administrators. Despite full-time, non-tenure-track faculty having unclear job responsibilities and perceived less job security, they may become more knowledgeable about how to successfully navigate and advance in their careers. The purpose of this study was to examine full-time, non-tenure-track faculty at a large private doctoral university. This phenomenological study examined the perceptions and experiences of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Specifically, the career longevity and career advancement was explored for this faculty type.

This qualitative research study allowed the researcher to explore and find meaning in the shared experiences of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Twelve
participants in this study worked more than 70% of their employment teaching for 3 years at the University. Data was collected with a demographic data survey, in-depth semi-structured interviews, field notes, document analysis, and the researcher as an instrument to validate the criteria and to triangulate the data. All five forms of data were analyzed to identify emerging themes and connect patterns or relationships across all of the data.

The study’s findings added to the concept of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty as second-class citizens and these faculty finding their niche (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011; Bland et al., 2006; Ehrenberg and Zhang, 2005; Jaeger & Eagan, 2011a; Kezar, 2013a; Levin & Shaker, 2011; Monks, 2007; Rajagopal, 2004; Umbach, 2007; Waltman et al., 2012; Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). The results from this study also support and expand research in the field of higher education by focusing on full-time, non-tenure-track faculty: workloads, salary earnings, and time engaged in teaching activities, compared to tenured and tenure-track faculty. The five themes make a strong argument for academic leaders in higher education institutions to create accepting, trusting, and supportive work environments that offer full-time, non-tenure-track faculty opportunities to have long successful careers. These work environments would establish settings for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to experience favorable organizational socialization processes where these faculty members feel equal to other academic division faculty.

The results also indicate that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have unique or “niche” roles in their academic divisions while performing heavy amounts of teaching and service. Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have varied and individual career goals that may or may not include desires for tenure-track positions.
Recommendations were described to assist colleges and universities in developing policies that would provide a better sense of job security for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Improved job security for those faculty may result from providing longer employment contracts and increasing equity for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Designating a specific number of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty for representation on the academic governing board at the university level may create more equity and provide full-time, non-tenure-track faculty with a voice across the campus. The findings and recommendations in this study provide knowledge, tools, and processes that may be helpful in understanding the factors that might affect full-time, non-tenure-track faculty’s successful continued employment and career advancement for those faculty members employed for 3 years or more.

Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty seem to have a career pathway, but it is unclear. To navigate their careers successfully, full-time, non-tenure track faculty will need to communicate with their academic division leaders about career aspirations and their experiences as full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members. Going beyond communication, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty should be active participants in their socialization process within their departments and colleges. They should bring value to their departments while taking on roles that will show themselves as trusted members of those departments. It is necessary for those faculty members to make themselves needed by finding or creating their niche.

Provosts, deans, and academic division leader should acknowledge the unique roles that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty perform within their institutions. Understanding full-time, non-tenure-track faculty’s unique roles will assist with the
implementation of appropriate organizational socialization processes. It is critical that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty have positive experiences through the organizational socialization process. It is imperative that higher education institutional leaders establish work environments that are accepting, trusting, and supportive for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to address the successful adoption of this increasing faculty role in colleges and universities.
References


## Appendix A

### Summary of Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departmental Culture</th>
<th>Destructive Culture</th>
<th>Neutral or Invisible Culture</th>
<th>Inclusive Culture</th>
<th>Learning Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to perform – respect, collegiality, employment equity, and flexibility</td>
<td>Perceived disrespect (shut out of and intimidated if they show up at meetings, events, or governance); hostile faculty and staff; not listed I departmental faculty listings; role is not considered a professional one; salary and benefits grossly inequitable; do not follow any existing institutional practices that might be positive for NTTs (from union contract or faulty handbook).</td>
<td>No perceived respect and inclusion (not invited to meetings, events, or governance); no relationship with tenure-track faculty and staff – just ignored; not listed in departmental faculty listings; role is seen as temporary teacher; salary and benefits inequitable; chair may not be familiar with campus policies or union contract.</td>
<td>Perceived respect and inclusion (invited to meetings, events, or governance); positive and equal relationship with tenure-track faculty and staff; importance acknowledged; listed in departmental faculty listings; role is considered a profession/career; attempts to make salary and benefits closer to equitable; chair aware of campus policies or union contract.</td>
<td>Perceived respect and inclusion (invited to meetings, events, or governance); positive and equal relationship with tenure-track faculty and staff; importance acknowledged; listed in departmental faculty listings; role is considered a profession/career; attempts to make salary and benefits closer to equitable; chair aware of and is enhancing campus policies or union contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to learning</td>
<td>Unwilling to advise; unwilling to conduct office hours unless paid; unwilling to build connections and networks to support teaching and advising; unable to talk to colleagues about teaching – so negatively impacts efficacy.</td>
<td>Unwilling to advise; unwilling to conduct office hours unless paid; unwilling to build connections and networks to support teaching and advising; unable to talk to colleagues about teaching – so negatively impacts efficacy.</td>
<td>Willing to advise; willing to conduct some unpaid office hours willing to build connections and networks to support teaching and advising; able to talk to colleagues about teaching – so positively impacts efficacy.</td>
<td>Willing to advise; willing to conduct some unpaid office hours willing to build connections and networks to support teaching and advising; able to talk to colleagues about teaching – so positively impacts efficacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity to perform – hiring practices and capabilities, professional development, knowledge</td>
<td>Hiring practices are illegal and unprincipled; constantly hiring as environment is so bad; no professional development; no knowledge to support advising role.</td>
<td>Hiring practices are sometimes intentional and other times not; lots of turnover – ongoing hiring mode; usually no professional development opportunities; no knowledge to support advising role.</td>
<td>Intentional hiring practices; less turnover and minimal hiring; professional development often limited to on-campus opportunities; no knowledge to support advising role.</td>
<td>Intentional hiring practices; less turnover and minimal hiring; professional development not limited to on-campus opportunities; knowledge to support advising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to learning</td>
<td>May hire people without best expertise; lack needed professional development; lack information and knowledge to be successful.</td>
<td>May hire people without best expertise; lack needed professional development; lack information and knowledge to be successful.</td>
<td>Hire people with best expertise; have teaching-oriented professional development and sometimes key info about advising to support students.</td>
<td>Hire people with best expertise; have both teaching expertise developed and connection to professional association – so can keep up with advances in knowledge and key info about advising to support students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of Findings – Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departmental Culture</th>
<th>Destructive Culture</th>
<th>Neutral or Invisible Culture</th>
<th>Inclusive Culture</th>
<th>Learning Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to perform – equipment, materials, policies, leader behavior, academic freedom, autonomy, etc.</td>
<td>Lack basic office, supplies, and equipment; no orientation; no mentoring; chair and staff do not respond to requests; no materials available (e.g., sample syllabi); no input into curriculum; cannot choose textbooks; schedule courses within days or weeks routinely; schedule courses without thought of faculty and other obligations; attempt to schedule as few classes as possible so not able to get benefits; provide no evaluation; excluded from any leadership.</td>
<td>Have basic office, supplies, and equipment; no orientation or mentoring; chair and staff sometimes respond to requests; some materials available (e.g., sample syllabi); sometimes have input into curriculum; sometimes can choose textbooks; schedule courses within weeks or months routinely; schedule courses without thought of faculty and other obligations; provide no evaluation or evaluation is not taken seriously; leadership not encouraged.</td>
<td>Have basic office, supplies, and equipment; no orientation or mentoring; chair and staff respond to requests; some materials available (e.g., sample syllabi); sometimes have input into curriculum; sometimes can choose textbooks; schedule courses a semester or more in advance; consolidate part-time to full-time so can teach at as few places as possible and collaboratively schedule; provide no evaluation or evaluation not taken seriously; leadership not encouraged.</td>
<td>Custom design office to pair with faculty who teach same courses; proactively acquire supplies and equipment; orientation and mentoring provided (faculty members who teach same sources are paired with NTTs; chair and staff respond to requests; all materials available (e.g., sample syllabi); always input into curriculum; always choose textbooks; schedule courses a semester or more in advance; consolidate part-time to full-time so can teach at as few places as possible and collaboratively schedule; provided evaluation and feedback; asked to play a leadership role on campus committees and in curriculum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Findings – Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departmental Culture</th>
<th>Destructive Culture</th>
<th>Neutral or Invisible Culture</th>
<th>Inclusive Culture</th>
<th>Learning Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship to learning</strong></td>
<td>Lack basic office, supplies, and equipment to perform; misinformation to set up courses and advise; lack of orientation leads to wasted time away from teaching to do logistics; lack of mentoring often leads to poorly run courses that do not cover learning goals and are not aligned with curriculum; last-minute scheduling leads to no or poor preparation; no input on curriculum and textbooks and lack of sample syllabi lead to classes that do not draw on NTTF expertise or strengths and lack of alignment with learning goals; lack of sample materials leads to poorly prepared courses or ones that may not meet departmental goals; without collaborative scheduling, NTTF are commuting with little time between courses – and are consequently late, have to cancel class, and are poorly prepared; lack of peer feedback leads to ongoing poor student evaluations; lack of leadership means NTTF expertise, particularly related to the field and practice, is excluded from curriculum.</td>
<td>Office space, materials, and equipment allow for basic teaching functions; lack of orientation leads to wasted time away from teaching to do logistics; lack of mentoring often leads to poorly run courses that do not cover learning goals and are not aligned with curriculum; last-minute scheduling leads to no or poor preparation; minimum input on curriculum and textbooks and lack of sample syllabi lead to classes that do not draw on NTTF expertise or strengths and lack of alignment with learning goals; collaborative scheduling leads to no tight commutes and faculty are well prepared and have time to advise students after course; lack of peer feedback leads to ongoing poor student evaluations; lack of leadership means NTTF expertise, particularly related to the field and practice, is excluded from curriculum.</td>
<td>Office space, materials, and equipment allow for basic teaching functions; scheduling allows for course preparation and quality; when offered, input into curriculum, textbooks, and sample syllabi leads to drawing on NTTF expertise and strengths and alignment with learning goals; collaborative scheduling leads to no tight commutes and faculty are well prepared and have time to advise students after course; consolidation of teaching to one campus means NTTF are less exhausted and have more time for preparation and students; peer evaluation leads to more immediate and strong courses and positive student evaluations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Approval by University Chief Academic Officer

The University

Chief Academic Officer
0000 Street Name
City, ST 00000

June 3, 2015

Re: “Experiences and Perceptions of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty Who Have Navigated Three or More Years Working and Teaching at a Four-year University”

Dear St. John Fisher Institutional Review Board:

I, University Chief Academic Officer, support Alvin Boyd, Sr. to conduct the above mentioned research study at St. John Fisher College doctoral requirements. I understand that the researcher will contact full-time non-tenure track faculty through e-mails sent via the Office of the Chief Academic Officer.

Upon the completion of Mr. Boyd’s dissertation, he will be encouraged to disseminate his findings to the community as found appropriate.

Sincerely,

Chief Academic Officer
E-mail Invitation to Full-Time, Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Subject: Research Interview Invitation
To: University Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty
From: Alvin C. Boyd, Sr., St. John Fisher College (SJFC) doctoral student

My name is Alvin Boyd and I am a doctoral student in the Executive Leadership program in the Ralph C. Wilson Jr. School of Education at St. John Fisher College of Rochester, NY. I am conducting research to gain a better understanding of the working experiences of full-time non-tenure track faculty that may lead to employment longevity and career advancement. The Institutional Review Boards at St. John Fisher College and the University have reviewed and approved the study. Additionally, I have the support of my St. John Fisher College faculty research sponsor and dissertation chairperson, Dr. Shannon Cleverley-Thompson.

If you are willing to be considered as a participant in this study, you need to consent to participate and respond to a brief demographic survey to determine your eligibility to participate. The survey should take about 5 minutes to complete. If you are eligible, you will be contacted to arrange a one-on-one 60-minute interview. The interview will be conducted in a location on the University’s campus that is comfortable and private for both the interviewee and the interviewer. To complete the consent form and demographic survey, please open the link below.

__________________________________________

I sincerely appreciate your consideration of my request to participate in an interview. Please contact me _____________________________ if you have any questions.

Thank you.

Alvin C. Boyd, Sr.
St. John Fisher College
Ralph C. Wilson Jr. School of Education
Doctorate of Executive Leadership Student
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Informed Consent For Full-Time, Non-Tenure Track Faculty

St. John Fisher College
Education Doctorate in Executive Leadership
3690 East Avenue
Rochester, NY 14618

Title of Study: Experiences and Perceptions of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty at a Four-year University

Name of Researcher: Alvin C. Boyd, Sr. ____________________________

Faculty Supervisor: Dr. Shannon Cleverley-Thompson _______________________

Description of the Research Project: The purpose of this research project is to gain a better understanding of the working experiences of full-time non-tenure track faculty that may lead to employment longevity and career advancement. The work experiences and perceptions of full-time non-tenure track faculty will be examined. The demographic survey will take about five minutes and will include five questions related to personal and professional characteristics. In addition to the demographic data being used to assure participants meet criteria, it will be used as descriptors when reporting the results of the study. The informal, open-ended interview will be approximately 60 minutes in length. It will take place in a location at a date and time that is convenient for you and the researcher. I will be conducting the interview.

Place of Study: The interview will be conducted at the University in a location that is comfortable and private for the interviewee and the interviewer.

Potential Risks or Discomforts: As a participant, there is minimal risk to you. It is possible that participants will feel awkward speaking with the researcher, whom the participant has never met before, about their personal work experiences. In addition, there is a one-hour time commitment for the interview. The interview will be scheduled at a
convenient time for participants to reduce the interruption to their schedules. At any time during the interview or immediately after, the participant may choose to withdraw from the study and all recordings will be erased.

**Potential Benefits:** Participation in this study will add the opportunity to discuss feelings, perceptions, and concerns related to full-time non-tenure track faculty. Learning about the experiences of full-time non-tenure track faculty may help Provosts, Deans, Chairpersons, and Human Resource Specialists 1) promote collegiality between tenured/tenure track faculty and full-time non-tenure track faculty to reduce the perception of two tiered faculty system, 2) develop strategies to support longevity and success of full-time non-tenure track faculty careers, and 3) make better decisions about institutional policies and procedures supporting and including full-time non-tenure track faculty.

**Protecting Confidentiality and Privacy:** This research is confidential. The information gathered for this project will not be published or presented in a way that would allow participants to be identified. All audio, video, and text based files collected for the proposed study will be secured under lock and key during the research study and for five years after the study. All participant information will be stored in a password-protected external hard drive. The researcher will not request any participant information that is not germane to the focus and purpose of this study. Identification numbers will be assigned to each interviewed participant. Only the researcher will have access to the anonymized recorded and transcribed data. The storage of the digital demographic survey data will remain in the Qualtrics, an online questionnaire software and the Interview Protocol will be stored separately in printed text.

**Your Rights:** As a research participant, you have the right to:

1. Have the purpose of the study, and the expected risks and benefits fully explained to you before you choose to participate.
2. Withdraw from participation at any time without penalty.
3. Refuse to answer a particular question without penalty.
4. Be informed of appropriate alternative procedures or courses of treatment, if any, that might be advantageous to you.

5. Be informed of the results of the study.

**Audio or Video Recording and Transcription:** This study involves the audio (or video, for deaf or hard-of-hearing faculty participants) recording of each interview. Neither the participants’ names nor any other identifying information will be associated with the audio or video recording or the transcript. In the case of a deaf or hard-of-hearing faculty participating, a certified sign language interpreter will interpret from sign-to-voice before transcription from audio to text. The certified sign language interpreter is bound by the professional organization’s conduct of ethics which ranks confidentiality as paramount ethical behavior.

At any time during the interview or immediately after, the participant may choose to withdraw from the study and all recordings will be erased.

**By checking the box in front of each item, you are consenting to participate in that procedure.**

- ☐ participating in a 60-minute interview;
- ☐ having your interview recorded;
- ☐ having the recording transcribed;
- ☐ willing to review the transcript and identify any inconsistencies as recalled from the interview;
- ☐ use of the written transcript in presentations and written products.

**Signatures:** Please sign and date the following page.

I HAVE READ THE CONSENT FORM. MY QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ANSWERED. MY SIGNATURE ON THIS FORM MEANS THAT I UNDERSTAND
THE INFORMATION AND I CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY. I ALSO CERTIFY THAT I AM 18 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER.

__________________________________________  _____________________
Signature (Participant)     Date

__________________________________________
Printed name (Participant)

__________________________________________  _____________________
Signature (Researcher)      Date

__________________________________________
Printed name (Researcher)

If you have any further questions regarding this study, please contact the researcher listed above.

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) of St. John Fisher College has reviewed this project. For any concerns regarding confidentiality, please call Jill Rathbun __________________. She will direct your call to a member of the IRB at St. John Fisher College.
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Demographic Data Survey for the Participants

Name: ____________________________________________

College, Center or Program: ____________________________________________

Department: ____________________________________________

E-mail Address: ____________________________________________

Please mark your responses below and respond in text when appropriate.

Gender:  Male___  Female___  Other ___  Prefer not to disclose ___

Hearing Status:  Hearing___  Deaf___  Hard of Hearing___

1. What is your current faculty status?
   □ Full-time Non-Tenure Track
   □ Part-time Non-Tenure Track
   □ Tenure Track
   □ Tenured

2. What is your current faculty title or rank?
   □ Lecturer
   □ Senior Lecturer
   □ Principal Lecturer
   □ Visiting Professor (Lecturer, Assistant, or Associate)
3. Have you ever been employed as a tenured or tenure track faculty member at this university or another university?
   □ Yes       □ No

4. How many years have you been employed as a full-time non-tenure track faculty at the current university?
   □ More than 9 years
   □ 5 – 9 years
   □ 3 – 4 years
   □ 1 – 2 years
   □ Less than 1 year

5. During the last academic year (2014 – 2015), what was your approximate percentage of time dedicated to teaching?
   □ 70% – 100%
   □ 40% – 69%
   □ 10% – 39%
   □ 0% – 9%

6. What postsecondary, graduate, and/or professional degrees (certifications) have you obtained? (Check all that apply)
✎ Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)
✎ Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)
✎ Juris Doctor (J.D.)
✎ Doctor of Medicine (M.D.)
✎ Master of Fine Arts (M.F.A.)
✎ Master of Business Administration (M.B.A.)
✎ Master of Public Administration (M.P.A.)
✎ Master of Science or Master of Arts (M.S. or M.A.)
✎ Bachelor of Science or Bachelor of Arts (B.S. or B.A.)
✎ Bachelor of Applied Arts and Science (B.A.A.S.)
✎ Other

________________________________________________________

✎ Professional Certifications

________________________________________________________

Thank You.

If you are eligible to participate in this study, you will be contacted to arrange a one-to-one interview.

Alvin C. Boyd, Sr.
St. John Fisher College
Educational Doctoral Program in Executive Leadership
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Reminder E-mail Invitation to Full-Time, Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Subject: Research Interview Invitation  
To: University Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty  
From: Alvin C. Boyd, Sr., St. John Fisher College (SJFC) doctoral student

My name is Alvin Boyd and I am a doctoral student in the Executive Leadership program in the Ralph C. Wilson Jr. School of Education at St. John Fisher College of Rochester, NY. This e-mail is a reminder, requesting your participation in a research study. I am conducting research to gain a better understanding of the working experiences of full-time non-tenure track faculty that may lead to employment longevity and career advancement. The Institutional Review Boards at St. John Fisher College and the University have reviewed and approved the study. Additionally, I have the support of my St. John Fisher College faculty research sponsor and dissertation chairperson, Dr. Shannon Cleverley-Thompson.

If you are willing to be considered as a participant in this study, you need to consent to participate and respond to a brief demographic survey to determine your eligibility to participate. The survey should take about 5 minutes to complete. If you are eligible, you will be contacted to arrange a one-on-one 60-minute interview. The interview will be conducted in a location on the University’s campus that is comfortable and private for both the interviewee and the interviewer. To complete the consent form and demographic survey, please open the link below.

I sincerely appreciate your consideration of my request to participate in an interview. Please contact me (acb01964@sjfc.edu) or (504-920-2681 – cell) if you have any questions.

Thank you.

Alvin C. Boyd, Sr.  
St. John Fisher College  
Ralph C. Wilson Jr. School of Education  
Doctorate of Executive Leadership Student
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Flyer

Seeking Full-Time, Non-Tenure Track Faculty with Primary Teaching Duties for a Research Study

What is the Study?
Full-time Non-Tenure Track Faculty are wanted for a study to understand the working experiences of full-time non-tenure track faculty that may lead to employment longevity and career advancement.

What Will You Have to Do?
- Consent to participate in the study
- Respond to a brief demographic survey to determine your eligibility to participate
- If you are eligible, participate in a one-on-one 60-minute interview

To complete the consent form and demographic survey, please use the link (http://tinyurl.com/qycehob) or the QR Code to the right (mobile-friendly survey)

This study is being conducted as part of a doctoral dissertation requirement for the Executive Leadership program in the School of Education at St. John Fisher College of Rochester, NY.

Institutional Review Boards from both the University and St. John Fisher College have reviewed and approved this research study.

Please contact Alvin Boyd at (______________) or (_____________ – cell) if you have any questions.
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Interview Protocol: Full-Time, Tenure-Track Faculty Interview Questions

Note. Extra writing lines removed from this copy.

Date: ____________________________

Interview UD#: ____________________

Start Time: _______________________

End Time: _________________________

Location: _________________________

Years of service at the university: ________

Rank: ____________________________

(SCRIPT)

Before we begin, I would like to briefly review the informed consent form you signed.

(Briefly review form for the description of the research project, potential risks and benefits, the extent of protecting confidentiality and privacy, participants’ rights, and conditions of participation)

I want to thank you for your time. I will be asking you questions that are related to your experiences as a full-time non-tenure track faculty member. The information gained from this interview will be included in my dissertation as requirement for earning my doctorate degree at St. John Fisher College. In my study, I will use an ID number rather than your given name. If you are uncomfortable with any question and prefer not to answer, just tell me and we will move to the next question. If at any point you do not want to be recorded, please let me know and I will stop the recording and take detailed notes. I will resume
recording when you are ready. I will transcribe the interview and within three weeks, I will send you a copy of the transcript to review, make modifications, and add any additional information as needed. I want to confirm the transcript reflects the true context of your interview responses. The purpose of the recorder is to capture your responses as accurately as possible. Do you have any questions or concerns? (Pause for response).

Should you have questions during the interview, I will be pleased to answer them. If you need a break, please let me know and we will take one. Your participation enables me to pursue the present research question and address the research problem:

If you are ready, let us begin.

Question | Interview Questions
---|---
Number

1.How would you describe your experience as a full-time non-tenure track faculty member?

**Probing Questions**
- Have there been particularly positive or favorable experiences?
  - If yes, what were those experiences?
  - How did you handle or deal with those experiences?
- Have there been specific negative or unfavorable experiences?
  - If yes, what were those experiences?
  - How did you handle or deal with those experiences?
2. What do you enjoy about being a full-time non-tenure track faculty?

Probing Questions

- Are there aspects of teaching and interacting with students that you enjoy?
  - If yes, please describe those aspects of teaching and interacting with students.
  - Why do you enjoy these aspects of teaching and interacting with students?

- Are there aspects of working with other faculty that you enjoy? (e.g. working with tenured, tenure track, full-time non-tenure track faculty, and/or other colleagues)
  - If yes, please describe those aspects of working with other faculty.

3. Are there advantages of being a full-time non-tenure track faculty member? If yes, what are the advantages?

Probing Questions

- Do you engage in research as a full-time non-tenure track faculty member?
  - If yes, would you consider engaging in research as an advantage?
  - If no, would you consider not engaging in research as an advantage?
  - Why would you consider this an advantage to you?

- Do you get to choose which courses you will teach?
  - If yes, would you consider choosing which courses you will teach an advantage?
  - If yes, why would you consider this an advantage to you?

- Do you get to choose the dates and times the courses you will teach?
- If yes, would you consider choosing the dates and times the courses you will teach an advantage?
- If yes, why would you consider this an advantage to you?
  - Does your educational or professional background align with the discipline and courses you teach?
    - Would you consider choosing this alignment of your background and the courses you teach an advantage?
    - If yes, why would you consider this an advantage to you?

4. Are there disadvantages of being a full-time non-tenure track faculty member? If yes, what are the disadvantages?

Probing Questions
- What type of contract do you have? (e.g. semester, annual, or multiyear contract)
  - Would you consider this type of contract a disadvantage?
  - Why would you consider this type of contract a disadvantage?
- Do you get to choose which courses you will teach?
  - If yes, would you consider choosing which courses you will teach a disadvantage?
  - If yes, why would you consider this a disadvantage to you?
- Do you get to choose the dates and times the courses you will teach?
  - If yes, would you consider choosing the dates and times the courses you will teach a disadvantage?
  - If yes, why would you consider this a disadvantage to you?
- Does your educational or professional background align with the discipline and courses you teach?
  - Would you consider choosing this alignment of your background and the courses you teach a disadvantage?
  - If yes, why would you consider this a disadvantage to you?
5. Do you see differences between your full-time non-tenure track faculty member role and that of tenured or tenure track faculty? If yes, how is your role as a full-time non-tenure track faculty member different from tenured or tenure track faculty? (e.g. teach a course you developed, teach courses outside of your specialization, advising a large number of undergraduates, program or lab coordinator)

Probing Questions
- Would the role you have be traditionally viewed as a tenure track responsibility?
  - If yes, explain how is your role would be traditionally viewed as a tenure track responsibility?
- Do other tenure track faculty perform this role?
  - If yes, explain how do other tenure track faculty perform this role as compared to your role?
- Are there differences in the number of courses you teach as a full-time non-tenure track faculty member to those taught by tenured or tenure track faculty in your department?
  - If yes, what are the differences in the number of courses you teach as a full-time non-tenure track faculty member to those taught by tenured or tenure track faculty in your department?

6. When you think about other full-time non-tenure track faculty colleagues in your department and/or college, do you have similar roles?
  - If yes, explain how other full-time non-tenure track faculty colleagues have similar roles?
• Are there differences in roles from other full-time non-tenure track faculty colleagues?
  • If yes, explain how other full-time non-tenure track faculty colleagues have different roles?
• Are those other full-time non-tenure track faculty colleagues in your department? College? Or other parts of the University?

7. Have you ever desired to be in a tenure track faculty position?
   If yes, why? If no, why not?
   
   Probing Questions
   o What are your career goals?
     • Is this full-time non-tenure track faculty position aiding you in obtaining those goal/s?
       • If yes, how is it aiding you to accomplish the goal/s?
       • If no, is it hindering you from accomplishing the goal/s?
         ➢ If yes, in which ways is it hindering you from your goal/s?

8. Looking at the figure (see handout), the full-time non-tenure track process is compared to a level of membership and permanency in an organization through the process of orienting an employee to an organization.

   Based on the left side of the figure, what do you think your level of membership (or acceptance) is in your department as a full-time non-tenure track faculty member? Circle your response. Can you explain why you chose this level of membership (or acceptance)? (see handout)
   □ Central Figure (Essential to the operations of the department/college)
☐ Confidant (Trusted member of the department or college or fully shares in all
the affairs of the group)

☐ Confederate (One who assists other members on certain selected matters;
somewhat trusted member in department)

☐ Provisional Member (not officially an outsider/newcomer; adopted tentatively;
conditionally; probationary.)

☐ Newcomer ("on the edge" of organizational affairs. May not yet be deemed
trustworthy by other members)

☐ Outsider (marginally accepted novice group member)

Based on the right side of the figure, what do you think your level of permanency
(or job security) is in the department as a full-time non-tenure track faculty
member?   Circle your response. Can you explain why you chose this level of
permanency (or job security)? (See next page or on back)

☐ Leader (Permanent)

☐ Promotion and/or Multiyear Contract (More Permanent)

☐ Accepted (But Not Permanent)

☐ Outsider
Inclusionary Domains of Organizations
(Organization Socialization Theory)
9. What do you perceive are the reasons for your continuous contract renewals or contract offers?

   **Probing Questions**

   o Has anyone given you a reason why you received a renewed contract?
     - If yes, who told a reason why you received a renewed contract?
     - What was the reason the person told you?

   o Besides the possibility of negative teaching evaluations by your chairperson or administrator and unfavorable student ratings, what are reasons which may hinder you from getting a contract renewal?

   o What role do you think student enrollment plays in contract renewals?

   o Are there other factors which your contract may be dependent upon (e.g. department budget and program closure or restructure)?
     - If yes, what are the other factors?

   o Have you felt worried about those factors which may influence contract renewal?
     - If yes, why did you feel worried?
     - If no, why did you not feel worried?

10. What do you perceive are the reasons for your successful promotion process? (See Rank)
Probing Questions

○ If you applied for the promotion process more than one time, what do you think influenced your success in the promotion process the most recent time?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Study    Possible Prompts
Topic

General  Can you give me an example of that ________?

          Please tell me more about ________________?

          Could you share a story related to ____________?

          Do you have further examples of ____________?


11. We are near the end of this interview, is there anything else you would like to share with me?

________________________________________________________________________

I mentioned earlier, I will be e-mailing you a copy of the transcript of this interview within three weeks and respectfully ask that you review, make modifications, and add any information to make certain you believe that it accurately reflects your responses. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you for participating in this interview
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