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Abstract

This dissertation examines the phenomenon of the growing ranks of contingent faculty in higher education from the perspective of the leaders of five elite adult and continuing education and professional studies institutions in the United States. Existing research reports two-thirds of all post-secondary instructors are now non-tenured or off-tenure track faculty, commonly referred to as contingent faculty. Yet, few colleges and universities have evolved their faculty work environments to respond to the challenges posed by the use of non-tenure track faculty. While there is significant literature about contingent faculty from the perspective of non-tenured faculty and their proponents, little or no literature explores this phenomenon from the perspective of the people most responsible for establishing contingent faculty work environments, the institutional leadership. Therefore, this qualitative research study applied interpretative phenomenological analysis focused on the beliefs of these institutional leaders about contingent faculty at their institutions to increase understanding of this phenomenon and give rise to questions that may help bridge the information gap to make greater meaning of this change. The primary question guiding this study asks what do institutional leaders believe about contingent faculty culture in higher education today? This study uses the theoretical framework of social constructionism to reveal the beliefs, understandings, insights, guidelines, and self-perceptions found in the social discourse of these institutional leaders to reveal how beliefs influence the establishment of contingent faculty identity, relationships, community, and culture at their institutions. Findings from this study suggest that by hiring discipline-specific professionals as scholar practitioners, by establishing relationships that are respectful and rewarding for
faculty, and by embracing a culture that emphasizes teaching, discipline-specific professional relevance, and a community of scholar practitioners, it may possible to avoid the issues causing concern in the existing literature about the use of contingent faculty. These findings indicate that the leaders participating in this study embody a tangible allegiance to the core academic missions of their colleges by creating contingent faculty work environments from the context of what these leaders believe is necessary to meet the unique needs and expectations of their adult learning and professional studies students. Without such evidence, higher education may continue down the path of trial and error without the benefit of the lived experiences and experiential perspectives of expert leaders who have gone before them and are able to shed light on the intended and unintended consequences of the evolving contingent faculty phenomenon.

Keywords: contingent faculty, casualization, faculty compensation, faculty equity, leadership, non-tenure track faculty, shared governance
# Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.................................................................................................................. 3  
Dedication.................................................................................................................................. 5  
Abstract ..................................................................................................................................... 6  
Chapter 1 – Research Problem.................................................................................................... 12  
  Justification ............................................................................................................................... 15  
  Lack of Evidence ..................................................................................................................... 16  
  Audience ................................................................................................................................... 17  
  Significance of the Research Problem ..................................................................................... 17  
  Positionality Statement ........................................................................................................... 19  
  Research Question .................................................................................................................. 19  
  Theoretical Framework ........................................................................................................... 21  
Chapter 2 - Literature Review ................................................................................................... 26  
  Challenges and Opportunities for the New Faculty Majority .................................................... 27  
  The Value Proposition of the New Faculty Majority in the Era of the New Consumerism ....... 33  
  The New Faculty Majority and Emergent Trends for Roles, Responsibilities, and Rights ..... 37  
  Leadership and the Path Forward for the New Faculty Majority ............................................ 48  
Chapter 3 - Methodology .......................................................................................................... 52  
  Research Tradition .................................................................................................................. 56  
  Research Design ...................................................................................................................... 57  
  Participants ............................................................................................................................... 58  
  Data Collection ....................................................................................................................... 58  
  Data Storage ........................................................................................................................... 60  
  Data Analysis ........................................................................................................................... 61  
  Trustworthiness ...................................................................................................................... 61  
  Conclusion ............................................................................................................................... 63  
Chapter 4 – Research Findings ................................................................................................... 65  
  Participant Profiles .................................................................................................................. 65  
  Themes ..................................................................................................................................... 67  
  Identity for Non-tenure Track (NTT) Faculty ........................................................................... 69  
    Beliefs about recruiting discipline-specific professionals for NTT teaching roles............... 71  
    Beliefs about degree requirements for NTT faculty ............................................................. 75
Beliefs about needs and motivations for NTT faculty ........................................... 80
Relationship Building for Institutions and NTT Faculty ........................................... 86
  Beliefs about the value of NTT faculty ............................................................. 86
  Beliefs about alignment of NTT faculty ............................................................ 89
  Beliefs About shared governance and academic freedom .................................... 93
  Beliefs about evaluation processes for NTT faculty ........................................... 97
  Beliefs about faculty organizing and unionism ................................................... 99
Culture and Community for NTT Faculty ............................................................. 102
  Beliefs about respect for NTT faculty .............................................................. 103
  Beliefs about empowering NTT faculty ............................................................ 107
  Beliefs about care and support for NTT faculty ................................................ 111
Conclusion .................................................................................................................. 117
Chapter 5 – Discussion of Research Findings ......................................................... 121
  Interpretation of Themes ...................................................................................... 128
  Establishing Identity for NTT Faculty ................................................................. 129
    Beliefs about faculty context ............................................................................. 130
    Beliefs about faculty recruitment ..................................................................... 132
    Beliefs about faculty expectations and satisfaction ......................................... 135
  Building Relationships between Institutions and Faculty .................................... 137
    Beliefs about faculty compensation ................................................................. 140
    Beliefs about faculty evaluation ....................................................................... 141
    Beliefs about shared governance ..................................................................... 142
    Beliefs about unionism ..................................................................................... 144
  Creating an Academic Community or Culture for NTT faculty ......................... 145
    Beliefs about NTT faculty performance ........................................................... 146
    Beliefs about NTT faculty support ................................................................... 147
    Beliefs about NTT faculty empowerment ......................................................... 148
    Beliefs about NTT faculty positionality ........................................................... 149
Conclusion .................................................................................................................. 150
Implications for Further Research ........................................................................... 151
  Need for Research Disaggregated by Faculty Type ............................................ 151
  Need to Disaggregate Research by Institution Type .......................................... 152
Limitations of This Study .......................................................................................... 153
Personal Reflection ................................................................................................... 155
Implications for Other Colleges and Universities.......................................................... 157
Conclusions.................................................................................................................. 159
References................................................................................................................... 162
Appendix A.................................................................................................................. 173
Appendix B.................................................................................................................. 174
Appendix C.................................................................................................................. 175
Appendix D.................................................................................................................. 176
Appendix E.................................................................................................................. 178
List of Tables

Table 1. Theoretical Framework and Methodology ........................................... 22
Table 2. Evidence of the Superordinate and Subordinate Themes in the Study .... 68

List of Figures

Figure 1. Superordinate Themes in Scholar Practitioner Environments.............. 123
Figure 2. Essentials for Scholar Practitioner Model.......................................... 126
Chapter 1 – Research Problem

Existing literature indicates two-thirds of all instructors in U.S. higher education are now non-tenured or off-tenure track faculty, commonly referred to as contingent faculty (Bradley, 2004; Campaign for the Future of Higher Education, 2013; Gappa, 2000; Gappa & Leslie, 2002; Kezar, 2004; Kezar & Sam, 2013). The growth of contingent faculty in higher education began decades ago as a temporary solution to contain the cost of instruction with economical, flexible part-time adjunct faculty; however, over time, contingent faculty have become a permanent fixture with potentially long-term harmful, repercussions in terms of faculty satisfaction, student outcomes, and academic quality. Nonetheless, few colleges and universities seem to have evolved their administrative processes and policies to respond to the many challenges posed by the growing use of non-tenure track full-time and part-time faculty. The lack of strategy regarding this change in faculty culture has given rise to the need for additional research to better understand this phenomenon in terms of what it means for modern higher education. One way to make greater meaning of this phenomenon is to explore institutional leaders’ beliefs about the emerging culture of this new faculty majority at select institutions to obtain their perspective on the nature of this phenomenon.

By exploring leaders’ beliefs about contingent faculty, it may be possible to better understand its impact on higher education, how it has shaped faculty culture, and how leadership behaves in response to this challenge. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine higher education leaders’ beliefs about contingent faculty culture at elite post-secondary institutions focused upon adult education, continuing education, and professional studies. In this study, I examined leaders’ perspectives regarding the growing ranks of contingent faculty, how leaders sense it has impacted faculty culture at their campuses, and
what they believe to be the current state of this phenomenon. Surprisingly, there has been little research to understand what institutional leaders believe about the state of contingent faculty and the challenges posed by this new normal for faculty culture. The major themes in current literature suggest the long term drift from a cultural paradigm of tenured faculty to one made up of non-tenure track faculty (or NTT faculty for both full- and part-time instructors who are not on the tenure track and hired on contingent basis) pose potential long term threats to quality and sustainability in higher education (Antony & Valadez, 2002; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Fulton, 2000; Gappa & Leslie, 2002; Harrington & Schibik, 2001; Kezar, 2004; Kezar & Sam, 2013; Umbach & Wawrzynski, 2005).

Therefore, this investigation has the opportunity to reveal leaders’ beliefs about the advantages and disadvantages of this phenomenon not only in terms of faculty culture, but also in terms of how the phenomenon translates into student satisfaction and student outcomes. Without this evidence, higher education administrators may continue down the path of hiring more and more contingent faculty without benefit or consideration of the perspectives of expert leaders who have gone before them and are able to shed light on the intended and unintended consequences of this strategy.

This is an important perspective to explore because, as Gappa (2000) pointed out, the traditional notion that tenure is the only way to ensure quality, satisfaction, and greater student outcomes is not realistic for many institutions any longer. Furthermore, researchers (Gappa, 2000; Mitchell, Yildiz, & Batie, 2011; Monks, 2007; Morgan, 2009; Wellman, Desrochers, & Lenihan, 2008) suggest the trend toward hiring non-tenured, contingent faculty is certain to continue in U.S. higher education because this strategy provides
immediate cost savings and flexibility, despite the growing concerns about the ultimate impact on student satisfaction and success (Jacoby, 2006).

Moreover, while higher education’s habit of creating short-term solutions for long-term problems (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001) may have led to this massive growth of non-tenured, contingent faculty, according to existing research it remains unclear what if any new policies have been implemented by institutional leaders to respond to the challenges of the new faculty normal (Kezar, 2004; Kezar & Sam, 2013; Schuster & Finklestein, 2006; Wickun & Stanley, 2000). In a sense, contingent faculty have become the silent majority in American higher education, shouldering increasing workloads amidst decreasing professional prospects, fewer rights and resources, and little or no voice in the governance of the institutions they serve. Therefore, there is new demand to better understand the concerns and issues related to the use of contingent faculty. This new call to action has stirred up increased interest in examining leadership strategy or the lack thereof for the new dominant labor force in U.S. higher education, especially in the adult and continuing education and professional studies institutions where contingent faculty are most prominent. Moreover, my study will focus on adult and continuing education and professional studies because this domain not only makes the most use of contingent faculty in U.S. higher education, but it also appears to be the least prepared to sustain challenges posed by this phenomenon. These institutions hire the largest number of contingent faculty by far and yet they seem to provide the least amount of infrastructure and governance for these growing ranks.

Therefore the overall intent of this study is to provide a picture of not only what institutional leaders in this domain believe and perceive about the emerging culture of
contingent faculty to further the discussion, but also to identify any gaps in our understanding of this culture to raise more questions around this growing phenomenon.

**Justification**

Considering the magnitude of the growth of contingent faculty in U.S. higher education, it is troubling that there is so little research on leaders’ beliefs about this phenomenon or how leadership has responded to it (Gappa & Leslie, 2002; Kezar, 2004; Kezar & Sam, 2013). According to existing literature, administrators are trying to better understand how to meet the challenges of today’s growing contingent faculty culture without the benefit of adequate prior research (Kezar, 2004; Kezar & Sam, 2013). Kezar (2004) argued that administrators have been amiss at addressing the lack of policies, procedures, or practices to properly support the explosive growth of contingent faculty on U.S. campuses. Now that contingent faculty make up two-thirds of the professoriate at many institutions this issue is impossible to ignore any longer. The existing literature often explores this phenomenon from the perspective of the contingent faculty themselves (Kezar, 2004). Moreover, most of this research has been conducted by tenured or tenure-track faculty, which makes many audiences for this type of research wary of the biases and outcomes of these explorations (Gappa & Leslie, 2002; Lahey & Griffith, 2002). While there have been numerous studies by contingent faculty supporters on this issue, there has been far less examination of how the leaders responsible for overseeing contingent faculty understand or have made meaning of this phenomenon. However, my research study will differentiate itself from past efforts by examining the terrain of this no man’s land of contingent faculty culture from the high ground of institutional leaders rather than by going down into the
trenches with the instructors themselves to identify what contingent faculty culture means for adult and continuing education and professional studies today.

**Lack of Evidence**

Furthermore, while there has been growing research literature exploring the impact of contingent faculty in traditional higher education focused on traditional two-year, four-year, and research-based institutions, it seems the least amount of research on this phenomenon has been generated where it is arguably needed the most, at adult and continuing education and professional studies institutions. After all, the use of contingent faculty has always been a significant part of the strategy for containing the cost of instruction at these tuition-driven, access institutions for adults and professional studies students. Moreover, contingent faculty, meaning full-time and part-time non-tenured or non-tenure track faculty, have always delivered the bulk of the courses in this environment.

Nonetheless, the research indicates that in this environment contingent faculty have been little more than what Gappa and Leslie (1993) referred to as the invisible faculty, participating lightly if at all in the governance of the academic programs they supported and providing off-the-clock office hours to the students they served (Miller & Miles, 2008; Pope, 2004; Rhoades, 1996, 2011). Furthermore, while the wider discussion on the use of contingent faculty typically centers on traditional higher education, contingent faculty in the fields of adult and continuing education face many, if not more, of the challenges and obstacles to quality instruction and student engagement that their peers encounter at the traditional institutions.

Contingent faculty in many adult and continuing education environments often contend with high workloads with even less oversight, collaboration, support, direction,
guidance, and professional development; however, there is little data on what institutional leaders in adult and continuing education and professional studies believe about this issue or what they think it means for their institutions based on their own experiences. Therefore, a qualitative research study focused on the beliefs of institutional leaders regarding the contingent faculty at their institutions may increase our understanding of this phenomenon and give rise to questions that may help bridge this information gap to make greater meaning of it.

**Audience**

This examination will serve to better inform institutional leaders attempting to develop leadership strategies and identify patterns of policies and processes to help strengthen the relationship between their institutions and contingent faculty to better serve students and ensure higher quality instruction and greater student outcomes. While earlier studies served the interests of contingent faculty and their supporters by providing the perspectives of the contingent faculty themselves, this study solicited and analyzed the beliefs of institutional leaders who themselves have created the culture for contingent faculty at their institutions and thereby helped better serve their institution’s needs and the contingent faculty who serve the academic mission of the institution in the unique environment of adult continuing education and professional studies.

**Significance of the Research Problem**

The growing use of contingent faculty to minimize cost of instruction and maximize productivity is one of the most significant strategies institutional leaders have used for decades to contain operational costs and improve flexibility in higher education (Gappa & Leslie, 2002). However, this approach has had unintended consequences and created
controversy centered on course quality, faculty equity, and student issues related to retention and outcomes. Moreover, while overall cost of instruction has been reduced proportionately compared to other costs in higher education (Archibald & Feldman, 2008), overall operational expenses continue to rise.

On the one hand, this rise of the contingent instructor in higher education simply mirrors the same casualization phenomenon that has emerged in many other service industries in the United States. On the other hand, this trend appears to have had the opposite effect on the academy of what was originally intended by fiscally conscious institutional leaders. Instead of reducing costs, the price of a college education has continued to rise alongside the growth in numbers of contingent faculty and the administrative requirements for managing contingent faculty have also risen dramatically; however, this phenomenon may help establish a new model of casualization in conventional higher education as the new normal (Samuels, 2009; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). This new faculty normal may provide institutional leaders with the opportunity to create a world wherein contingent faculty are not merely a side-show of on-demand, low-cost, less engaged classroom instructors but a potential midway of highly-motivated consultants, department leaders, policy makers, decision-makers, and major players in the gradual transformation and emergence of a more cost-effective, efficient, responsive, and relevant higher education.

Nonetheless, the perceived successes and failures of this phenomenon that have given rise to the volumes of research literature on contingent faculty are emblematic of the growing concern over this decades-long, massive shift from the full-time, tenure track model of the 1960s (wherein 70% of higher education faculty were tenured or tenure-track professionals) to a new model of a responsive, flexible contingent faculty workforce that now makes up
about two-thirds of the instructorate in U.S. higher education (Feldman & Turnley, 2001; Gappa, 2002; Kezar & Sam, 2013).

Positionality Statement

My position on this phenomenon based on previous literature reviews and my own experience is that too little is known about leaders’ beliefs about today’s contingent faculty culture to establish any definitive patterns or perspectives about institutional understanding of this phenomenon or response to it. While the existing research has spent much energy examining faculty satisfaction, compensation, equity, professional development, and students’ outcomes related to the use of contingent faculty, little effort has been spent on exploring this phenomenon from the perception of institutional leaders responsible for establishing contingent faculty culture (Gappa & Leslie, 2002). Therefore, using traditional phenomenological research methods (Moustakas, 1994), my aim is to identify, categorize, and document leaders’ beliefs and understandings of the contingent faculty culture to create an authoritative, qualitative narrative of this phenomenon to increase our understanding of what is happening and explicate its possible meanings for its constituents in institutional leaders. It is my hope that the questions asked in the following section will help articulate the social, cultural, and historical characteristics that have helped this phenomenon emerge as the new faculty normal as perceived by leadership, and to provide heretofore unknown insights that lead to further questions and explorations to advance the discussion of today’s contingent faculty culture.

Research Question

The primary question guiding my study asks what do institutional leaders believe about contingent faculty culture in higher education today? The practical goal of this study is
to reveal the beliefs, understandings, insights, guidelines, and self-perceptions of a sampling of institutional leaders and how these beliefs influence the leadership styles used to establish contingent faculty culture at their institutions. Since phenomenology is committed to depicting and constructing descriptions of lived experiences of the participants of a phenomenon rather than explaining or analyzing a phenomenon, my study will use a qualitative approach to a phenomenological exploration of this topic (Moustakas, 1994). Furthermore, my research will attempt to reveal the essences of this phenomenon and establish certain intellectual goals by asking the following major sub-questions in the interview process:

1. What does it mean to be a contingent faculty at an adult and continuing education and professional studies institution?
2. What are leaders’ personal beliefs about the experience of working as contingent faculty?
3. What personal experiences inform leaders’ choices regarding strategic approaches or styles at adult and continuing education and professional studies institutions?
4. What patterns or practices do institutional leaders believe set their institutions apart from others in establishing contingent faculty culture?

This sample of interview questions, supported by a subset of evolving, related questions, will advance my exploration to reveal leaders’ beliefs about contingent faculty culture at adult and continuing education and professional studies institutions and the social, cultural and historical characteristics that helped establish this culture.
Theoretical Framework

Current literature suggests that the phenomenon of contingent faculty in higher education has not only led to poorer student outcomes and weaker student retention on the part of the students, but it has also created a sense of marginalization and alienation among contingent faculty. In turn, the research further suggests this sense of marginalization has negatively impacted student success and institutional sustainability (Gappa, 1984; Gappa & Leslie, 1993, 1997). A similar perspective informs my own personal paradigm of this issue, wherein I sense a relationship may exist between how institutional leaders construct their beliefs about contingent faculty and how these perceptions play out to increase or decrease the marginalization and disengagement of this growing faculty population. Based on the evidence, there is potential for making meaning of leaders’ adoption and application of behaviors, understandings, and other social constructs based on their beliefs about this population and how it relates to their attempts to establish contingent faculty culture at their institutions. Such an epoche may provide the potential data to help identify opportunities to reverse regressive trends based on traditional methods and improve student success and institutional stability and sustainability.

Furthermore, the literature suggests that an epistemology should inform the framework a researcher uses as a lens to view any phenomenon (Jones, Torres, & Arminio, 2014; Merriam, 2009). Therefore, my study used social constructionism as a lens for examining leaders’ beliefs about today’s contingent faculty culture. It is my belief that higher education’s current framework of shared governance, tenure, and other trappings of traditional faculty culture once emerged in reaction to the social interactions and cultural evolution of faculty and institutional leaders through decades of interaction and social
construct and this current phenomenon has evolved in a similar manner. Klotz and Lynch (2007) suggested that such social construction is responsible for the underlying understanding of the world we have and how we make meaning it. In other words, the authors suggested that our combined subjective interpretations of the world ultimately create our social reality and these shared understandings establish the rules, norms, identities, concepts, and institutions in which we live and work. Therefore, I believe that the same rise in the number of contingent faculty that emerged over the last five decades will continue to evolve itself to establish a new paradigm for faculty culture in reaction to this phenomenon.

However, before I continue, let me discuss social constructionism as a theoretical framework for qualitative research. Born out of a need to establish alternative approaches to the modernist, positivist, empirical approaches to the study of human beings, social constructionism is a theoretical orientation that takes a critical stance toward the “taken-for-granted ways of understanding the world” by challenging the assumption that conventional knowledge is based on entirely unbiased, objective observation (Burr, 2003, location 109 of 4826). Basically, it is in opposition to the positivist, empirical tenet that understanding can be revealed by observation and that the world exists exactly as we perceive it. Social constructionism as its name implies emphasizes examining the social, historical, and cultural specificity regarding a phenomenon, according to Burr, as key perspectives for making meaning of the world. For instance, Burr provided the example of the notion of childhood and what is natural for children to do has undergone dramatic change over the last two hundred years. Burr argued it is only recently that children have gone from the Dickensian notion of simply small adults to mere innocents in need of adult protection and supervision.

This same theoretical perspective can be applied to the notion of today’s faculty culture
and how it has evolved to arrive at a crossroad where the demands of a growing contingent faculty population are stressing the framework of the traditional institutional notion of a faculty norm. According to Burr (2003), social constructionism relocates problems away from the pathologized essentialist sphere of the traditional psychology about phenomenon and relocates inquiry within the paradigm of how phenomenon emerges from the social practices and interactions people engage in to create the phenomenon. Furthermore, social constructionism argues that one’s understanding of the world is manufactured or fabricated by people through daily interactions of all kinds over time to create a (more or less) shared vision of the world (Burr, 2003). Moreover, for the social constructionist, what we think of as truth is not a product of objective observation, but simply our currently accepted understanding of the world and it is subject to change through social processes and interactions over time. Therefore, I will frame my study through the theoretical lens of social constructionism to examine the social, historical and cultural characteristics of contingent faculty shaping leaders’ beliefs to improve our understanding about the good, the bad, and the ugly in practice at these sample institutions.

Table 1 describes in detail the theoretical framework and methodology for my study. This framework is more of an iterative and interactive process than a sequence of steps with each stage of the research process informing another in a cyclical manner potentially using multiple theoretical perspectives depending on where the data leads this exploration (Crotty, 1998; Jones et al., 2014).
In qualitative phenomenological studies such as this one, meaning-making and understanding often emerges from the emic or insider’s beliefs or point of view, so this brand of qualitative research can be accomplished through an interpretivist approach that emphasizes the socially constructed nature of the phenomenon through the lived experience of the study participants (Glesne, 2011; Jones et al., 2014). Furthermore, in contrast to other absolute perspectives such as modernism, empiricism, or positivism, interpretivism aligns itself well with my theoretical framework of social constructionism because it implies there is no single correct answer to an issue; rather, this approach suggests that artifacts such as structures, policies, and behavior are established through person-to-person social interaction and subjective perceptions based on history, culture, and experience, and all the researcher can do is document the participants beliefs under investigation as truthfully and meaningfully as possible (Butin, 2010).

Moreover, interpretivism suggests the world is an ongoing story as told by the particular individuals, groups and cultures, which in this case are the institutional leaders responsible for contingent faculty in adult and continuing education and professional studies institutions. This is the anthropologist’s theoretical approach for revealing social truths and
meaning about phenomenon. This approach also supports the notion of the researcher as narrator for this exploration because, as Butin (2010) pointed out, “for better or worse” (p. 60), the researcher is the one examining and describing the phenomenon throughout the exploration as truthfully and meaningfully as possible.

Moreover, while the interpretivist approach enables my research to reveal what leadership believes is happening and what they believe this phenomenon means, the notion of whether or not these patterns are in the best interest of higher education and the contingent faculty who work in this environment may require the additional perspective of critical qualitative theory. The advantage of framing my study within multiple theoretical perspectives is that it will provide me with the ability to use my research as a transformative process that may intensify my examination of the social issues of privilege, control, tradition and subjugation of contingent faculty from the perspective of the leadership in this study population (Jones, et al., 2014). Moreover, working within a critical framework such as social constructionism will enable me to unravel this phenomenon and the social and cultural interactions that have evolved over time within this world to better understand patterns emblematic of the cultural, historical, economic, political, and symbolic themes influencing the beliefs of the institutional leaders immersed in this phenomenon (Crotty, 1998; Jones et al., 2014).
Chapter 2 - Literature Review

A typical literature review for a qualitative study should identify what is already known about a particular phenomenon related to the focus of the study and what the proposed study may reveal to extend the existing literature and expand discussion of the phenomenon (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012; Maxwell, 2013). The existing literature on the growth of contingent faculty shows evidence of a significant volume of themes exploring the impact contingent faculty have had on shared governance, faculty satisfaction, faculty equity, value proposition, unionism, and the hypothetical byproducts these variables have had on student outcomes and student retention. Nonetheless, while all these variables provide important evidence for painting an expansive landscape that depicts the impact contingent faculty have had on modern higher education, these studies typically frame these narratives from the perspective of either the students or the contingent faculty themselves experiencing this phenomenon. The existing studies consistently overlook one vitally relevant perspective that may ultimately prove to have even more significance on this phenomenon than all the others combined, and that is the lived experiences and beliefs of the institutional leaders responsible for establishing the faculty culture shaping this phenomenon.

Furthermore, the steps and measures institutional leaders take to establish the culture for this new faculty majority ultimately have a significant effect on all the other variables and elements contributing to the success or failure of the contingent faculty, their students, and the sustainability and relevance of the institutions. To that point, the existing literature reveals one significant missing data point about this phenomenon, that while the demand and expectations for contingent faculty have dramatically grown and changed over the years, the data on how institutional leaders perceive contingent instructors and leaders’ beliefs about
establishing culture for this population remain scant (Gappa & Leslie, 2002). Therefore, this literature review will explore the major themes surrounding the contingent faculty phenomenon to identify how the literature relates to institutional leaders’ beliefs about contingent faculty culture and to reveal where gaps can be filled to improve our understanding of how institutional leaders view this growing phenomenon.

First, I will examine the use of contingent faculty and its impact on traditional governance to reveal what is known about the institutional relationship between leadership and the new faculty majority. Then I will examine the perceived value proposition leadership believes this phenomenon has provided in terms of cost, quality, faculty satisfaction and student outcomes. And finally, I will examine how this phenomenon has impacted the nature of faculty employment and faculty culture in terms of emergent roles, responsibilities and protections, including the new rise in unionism and collective bargaining in higher education. And finally, I will summarize the findings in the literature and synopsize the significant evidence to illuminate the way forward to respond to the challenges of this phenomenon and further the discussion of it.

**Challenges and Opportunities for the New Faculty Majority**

The tension of maintaining tradition in the face of increasing competition, rising costs, shrinking funds, and changing faculty culture is reaching a breaking point in U.S. higher education, according to the current literature (Dickeson, 2010; Gappa, 2000, 2010). While the rigid adherence to the regalia of what historically made an institution successful may recall its former greatness, it may not ensure an institution’s future against new challenges. Nonetheless, it is difficult for most institutions to break the mold of the past, according to Dickeson (2010), especially when such changes threaten iconic traditions such as shared
governance, tenure, and other established norms for faculty career paths. According to existing research, the once large role faculty played in shared governance has atrophied amidst the changing nature of faculty employment (Gappa & Austin, 2010; Tierney & Lechuga, 2004). It may be no accident that this retrenchment of shared governance coincided with the long, slow rise in numbers of contingent faculty and the shrinking footprint of tenure. The research suggests the traditional relationship faculty and institutional leaders enjoyed in the past has been diminished by the increasing use of contingent faculty (Ballantyne, Berret, & Harst, 2010; Mitchell, Yildiz, & Batie 2011; Schell & Loeb, 1986). Current research labels the contingent faculty phenomenon as casualization, which refers to the use of part-time or full-time, non-tenure faculty over tenured or tenure track faculty to reduce the cost of instruction. This strategy has meant the percentage of tenured or tenure-track faculty has steadily decreased and thereby fewer faculty play a decreasing role in the governance and administration of many institutions. Meanwhile, contingent faculty are a growing presence on most campuses, greatly multiplying their numbers, if not their influence at institutions.

Furthermore, because of this tension between the growing number of contingent faculty and the diminishing role faculty play in institutional governance, existing literature calls into question the eventual relevance of shared governance in response to the market-driven, cost-efficient era of the modern corporatized, higher education institution. In fact, existing literature (Bradley, 2004; Crellin, 2010) suggests that given the acceleration of the ranks of contingent faculty, leaders’ best opportunity for improving efficiency, scalability and economy on campus is to replace traditional shared governance with a top-down direct, administrative model with little room for faculty participation in governance. However,
other literature (Dworkin, 1985; Fulton, 2000; Hayrinen-Alestalo & Peltola, 2006) cautions that the flipside of this business strategy is a glaring lack of appropriate balance in the administration of educational institutions, lower quality courses, weaker student experiences, and likely more disengaged and marginalized faculty.

Furthermore, while traditional higher education argues the relevancy of shared governance amidst the shift from traditional tenure-track faculty to a contingent professoriate, the contingent faculty find themselves standing in the shadows of this dramatic shift. In fact, in this ominous scenario contingent faculty seem to be the legion of the lost in higher education’s battle to redefine its role, relevancy, and sustainability in the modern era. One problem central to this dilemma is that given the dramatic shifts in student needs and expectations, increasing public scrutiny, and ever more challenging economic times, there is an intense need to better understand the internal mechanisms that higher education uses for decisive decision-making in response to external pressures. Therefore, it is important for us to make meaning of the contingent faculty phenomenon so we can better understand its relevance and importance in terms of the evolution and sustainability of higher education.

Etzioni (2010) and McKenna (2012) challenged the true legitimacy of contemporary shared governance by arguing that the continued de-privileging of faculty traditions such as participating in governance may negatively impact higher education. Other researchers (Bloland, 2010) argued that it may be the death knell of the academy when shared governance is replaced by top-down, corporate-style management wherein professors become mere instructors and teaching is reduced to simple straightforward facilitation.

Along the same lines, Baldrige, Curtis, Ecker, and Riley (2010), Etzioni (2010), and Weick (2010) suggested that because higher education institutions are made up of complex
organizations focused on competing goals using multiple structures to carry out institutional visions and missions, there are no easy answers to such a dilemma. More often than not, institutional goals become vague, ambiguous, personal contests and impair the execution of the faculty’s pursuit of the traditional requirements of service, research and teaching. The literature acknowledges that shared governance traditionally symbolized the rational, participatory structure institutions use to maintain balance and perspective between different, competing organizational entities for control of the influence over operation of an institution (Baldridge, 1995; Birnbaum, 2004). However, other researchers have long suggested that this timeworn lever for institutional accomplishment has become less bureaucratic and more like organized anarchy (Cohen, March, & Olsen, 1972), wherein consensus-seeking parties create a drag on the fast decision-making and responsiveness required for market-driven higher education. There is most certainly opportunity for a new administrative model to go along with the new normal in the faculty workforce necessary for executing market-driven decisions in a contemporary higher education flooded with contingent faculty; however, existing literature also suggests the essential relationship among trustees, administration and faculty that made up the customary notion of shared governance is already barely recognizable at most adult and continuing education institutions, so the growing shift to a corporate-style institution powered by contingent instructors may be more of an alteration than a revolution (Baldridge et al., 2010).

In fact, Birnbaum (2004) suggested that traditional shared governance is now regarded as so cumbersome and inefficient that there is no longer any room for it anywhere in the competitive higher education marketplace. According to Birnbaum (2004), the farther an institution ventures from the traditional academic pole of say a research institution on the
continuum of higher education toward the market-driven, consumer-focused pole at the other end of the continuum, where education is a means to an end, the more appropriate and essential it is to deviate from traditional shared governance.

According to Wickun and Stanley (2000), part of this transformation means the re-framing of the new faculty majority role not just in terms of participation in governance, but also as the epicenter of the academic universe. Therefore, it is important for the research to increase our understanding of what it means to be a contingent faculty in higher education today in terms of participation in governance, academic administration and what leadership believes about these parts of the equation. Wickun and Stanley indicated that in modern market-driven higher education faculty behave less like scholars and more like conduits of the educational materials students require to fulfill their professional aspirations.

Once again, in the new market-driven landscape, learning is a means to an end, therefore, administrators believe faculty do not need to create the course content they deliver, it can be pre-packaged and delivered like any other product, and students become typical consumers purchasing educational goods to meet a career need rather than aspirational leaners seeking deeper education. This model is the corporate approach championed by University of Phoenix, Excelsior, Southern New Hampshire University, and others, and now being copied in more traditional higher end adult and continuing education and professional studies programs.

Moreover, Miller and Miles (2008) suggested there may be no single prototype for contingent faculty culture in the new institutional paradigm, but there is opportunity to employ a wide variety of strategies to satisfy their needs through a form of governance or mutual decision-making. Miller and Miles envisioned the typical framework for potential
approaches as more “quilt-like” (2008, p. 42) than traditional top-down management so this study may reveal the use of many non-traditional leadership approaches. In these next-generation models, institutional leaders may call upon various constituencies and advisory groups, including the contingent faculty to join in on specific challenges and to satisfy various institutional demands. Therefore, it would further our understanding of this phenomenon if my study could identify leaders’ beliefs about the emergent roles contingent faculty might play at these institutions in the future.

As further proof of this shifting paradigm, Kezar (2004) noted the rush in the past to apply quick fixes to broken systems has mistakenly led institutional leaders to apply traditional management patterns focused on process and structure rather than collegial respect and relationships akin to more progressive leadership approaches. Iconic higher education leaders have long argued for new decision-making models to mediate the anxiety, competition, and complexity of 21st Century higher education and the new contingent workforce that makes the application of traditional governance ever more “complex and problematic” (Mallon, 2004, p. 61). Therefore, it may increase our understanding of this phenomenon to explore what leadership believes about the patterns and practices in place for establishing contingent faculty culture that sets their institutions apart from others.

Another important theme in the literature (Lahey & Griffith, 2002; Morgan, 2009) on the evolving role of governance amidst the new contingent faculty majority examines the increasing scrutiny from governmental agencies at the federal and state level as well as from the media and the public regarding consumer concerns with cost and quality and the relevance of higher education. This attention has energized U.S. higher education to reflect upon itself and enact new measures to shore up its diminishing integrity and value in the eyes
of the student consumers. This new emphasis on consumerism and relevance in higher education will be explored in detail in the next section.

The Value Proposition of the New Faculty Majority in the Era of the New Consumerism

Institutional leaders are under enormous pressure to justify costs and emphasize points of excellence and distinction in U.S. higher education. Lahey and Griffith (2002) warned that it is not only the nature of traditions such as shared governance that is under suspicion but also many of the other characteristics of the traditional faculty ecosystem including tenure, research, job satisfaction and teaching loads. Because colleges and universities face increased scrutiny and criticism from more directions than at any time in history, it is likely that this shift to consumerism is only going to intensify (Lahey & Griffith, 2002). Much of the criticism suggests that in order to improve the value proposition for students obtaining a college education, much of the traditional regalia of higher education must go. The big question is will contingent faculty continue to begrudgingly settle into their part of this emergent paradigm for cost control wherein the professoriate are simply low-cost hired hands or will they mobilize to preserve their preconceived notions of the necessary traditions of quality and professionalism in higher education?

As researchers have indicated, post-secondary institutions, particularly at two-year colleges and in adult and continuing education, use large proportions of contingent faculty to meet tight budgets and satisfy the need for flexibility and less expensive staffing in response to shifting market demands (Maynard & Joseph, 2008; Rhoades, 1996). Snyder and Dillow (2012) reported that as many as 51% of faculty at U.S. schools are contingent faculty, leaving only 49% tenured faculty. Furthermore, the number of institutions with tenure systems slipped to 48% (Snyder & Dillow, 2012). Other scholars (Maynard & Joseph, 2008;
McKenna, 2012) indicated that there is no doubt to the important role contingent faculty play in the sustainability of post-secondary institutions today, but moreover the role of the contingent faculty is undervalued by these same institutions.

In fact, onlookers consider the plight of contingent faculty to be deplorable considering their value proposition to the institutions they serve due to their heavy workloads, low compensation, scant professional development, and non-existent participation in governance of the institutions. Moreover, other researchers suggested that the overall value contingent faculty provide to their institutions cannot be thought of solely in terms of financial advantages, but also from an instructional context because of their professional affiliations and their experiential depth in the subjects they teach (Ballantyne, Berret, & Hast, 2010; Maynard & Joseph, 2008; McKenna, 2012; Rhodes, 2011).

Nonetheless, concerns persist in the literature about the negative impact contingent faculty may have on higher education as institutions more fully adapt to the new paradigm (Bradley, 2004; Fulton, 2000; Gappa, 2000; Maynard & Joseph, 2008). For instance, the American Association of University Professors (2003) reported that the declining percentage of tenured faculty in the U.S. may indicate that academic freedom is increasingly at risk, and thereby diminishing the ultimate value proposition of contingent faculty in terms of academic quality.

On the one hand, it is interesting to note that the language describing the plight of the contingent faculty workforce ranges from the invaluable measure of their contributions to the despicable nature of their very existence (Fulton, 2000). On the other hand, another way of looking at this shift is by examining the demographic stratification of faculty outside the protection of tenure-track. Doyle (2008) indicated that the younger the faculty today, the less
likely they are to ever be part of a tenure-driven system. Older faculty spent careers in an environment where tenure was the rule, not the exception; however, for today’s young faculty, that is no longer the case. The most troubling aspect of this retrenchment of tenure is that it creates a post-secondary educational system where the vast majority of faculty is made up of contingent workers with little or no role in the decision-making responsibility for institutional administration. This imbalance leaves an enormous amount of power increasingly in the hands of fewer and fewer faculty and it shifts power almost entirely to the professional managers.

Therefore, it is important to examine how institutional leaders view this change and identify what their beliefs are about what it means to be a contingent faculty at their institutions. Because of this power vacuum, there is growing evidence that colleges and universities sense a need to consider alternative arrangements to get contingent faculty involved in the administration of the institutions they serve (McKenna, 2012). McKenna cited a 2012 survey of faculty by the Coalition on the Academic Workforce (CAW) that identified three significant issues for contingent faculty in higher education based on data from more than 10,000 respondents. The first issue was the low median pay for contingent faculty, ranging from $2,235 per course at two-year institutions to a high of $3,400 per course at four-year institutions. The second point identified the problem of little or no wage compensation based on credentials, so no status was awarded for obtaining higher learning or terminal degrees. And the third point shed light on the issue of little or no support for part-time faculty outside the classroom, and no inclusion in institutional decision-making to make this happen. Because of the negative connotations associated with the plight of contingent
faculty it would be reasonable to assume this group must demonstrate strong dissatisfaction with their jobs in higher education.

However Maynard and Joseph (2008) provided evidence to the contrary and suggested contingent faculty harbor similar or the same levels of job satisfaction as their tenured colleagues. Meanwhile, Gappa and Leslie (2002) conjured up the anecdotally popular image of contingent faculty as dissatisfied academic vagabonds cobbling together menial teaching jobs from several institutions at a time while they chase the chimera of tenure. But these same researchers argued that while this image may not be entirely untrue, it is largely overblown. Gappa and Leslie wrote,

the picture is partly accurate for some part-time faculty, but it is substantially inaccurate for a very large portion of them. Instead, part-time faculty are usually employed elsewhere in full-time professional positions, have taught for at least several years at their employing institutions, do not seek full-time academic work, and are more motivated by the intrinsic satisfactions they find in teaching than by economic or career interests. (p. 60)

Moreover, Gappa and Leslie (2002) noted that contingent faculty are not a homogeneous group, and their various reasons for working as contingent faculty may hold the key to their overall job satisfaction. Martinak, Karlsson, Faircloth, and Witcher (2006) suggested that fears about a lessening of classroom quality due to a growing contingent labor workforce appear to be unfounded. Martinak et al. used a Maryland study to show the overall teaching rating for full-time tenured faculty compared with adjunct faculty teaching the same courses was separated by a slight 0.07 difference in scoring. Nonetheless, nowhere in the research is it indicated what leadership believes about the value proposition contingent
faculty provide these institutions. The next section of this review will explore the main strands of research on emerging faculty roles and responsibilities and rights related to union activity and collective bargaining among faculty.

**The New Faculty Majority and Emergent Trends for Roles, Responsibilities, and Rights**

While there is significant literature on how the growth of contingent faculty is impacting the operation of U.S. higher education and how faculty feel about it, less is known about the emergent rights, roles and responsibilities being adopted for them in the new normal in U.S. higher education. Furthermore, little or no research explores leadership beliefs about these changes and emerging challenges. Moreover, just as the level of appointments of contingent faculty in higher education has dramatically shifted from a minority of contingent appointments forty years ago to an overwhelming majority today, the literature suggests it is logical to assume that the roles and responsibilities contingent faculty assume in post-secondary education must be re-examined and potentially realigned. To this point, the scholars have suggested that while leadership continues to view contingent faculty as an important part of the financial solution for sustainability, they also eye contingent faculty suspiciously and with contempt because, anecdotally at least, they are considered part of the reason for lower student outcomes and poor instructional quality.

The research also suggests there are two significant theories that may provide clues about the rising cost of higher education and the potential roles played by contingent faculty. These theories reveal the essence of the dilemma facing higher education and its inability to constrain higher costs despite cost-cutting strategies like using cheaper, more flexible contingent faculty. On the one hand, the notion of a “cost disease” in service-heavy industries such as higher education imply costs rise or fall in direct relation to high or low
labor productivity (Archibald & Feldman, 2008). For example, technological progress can increase labor productivity to reduce costs because it minimizes labor expenses using sophisticated technology. The manufacturing industry is a good example of how costs were reduced over time through reductions in manpower and increases in the use of more efficient technology. Unlike manufacturing, however, higher education has remained a human resource-intensive business unable to reduce costs despite increasing its use of technology. In fact, there are instances where the use of sophisticated technology has led to increased criticism of decreased quality in higher education while failing to reduce costs, according to Archibald and Feldman.

On the other hand, Bowen’s (2012) revenue theory of costs in higher education implies that higher education institutions tend to spend everything they raise, therefore, revenue is the only ultimate constraint on the cost in higher education. This relates to faculty hiring and the use of contingent faculty in so much as institutions may look to improve the quality of instruction by hiring more full-time contingent faculty rather than tenured faculty; yet there is little discussion in the research related to institutional leaders’ perception of these notions, other than that the growing use of contingent faculty is one of the most common strategies for managing costs in higher education today. In fact, the research suggests this strategy of reducing cost of instruction may be the most tangible contribution contingent faculty have made to this date. This may be the reason why there is a perception that contingent faculty continue to be ignored by institutional leaders and eyed suspiciously by tenured faculty and college deans.

Nonetheless, contingent faculty remain on the periphery of the academy, labeled by researchers as “the marginal faculty” (Charfauros & Tierney, 1999, p. 141). Because of this
negative image of contingent faculty there remains mixed concerns and inconsistent notions about how to improve the instructional performance of this population as it becomes more important to the sustainability of U.S. higher education (Charfauros & Tierney, 1999). The contingent faculty workforce is complex and it is often difficult to determine the real issues from the baseless prejudices stemming from tradition. Research indicates part-time contingent faculty provide levels of instruction that differ significantly from their tenure track colleagues (Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011). However, these same researchers find that full-time contingent faculty demonstrate teaching practices similar to tenure-track faculty. Therefore, it is ill advised to lump notions of all contingent faculty together based on research.

Johnson (2011) used aggregated data to determine that there was evidence to suggest that the use of contingent faculty led to lower levels of academic challenge and lower student motivation at institutions. According to Johnson, this was because contingent faculty were more likely to assign higher grades than their tenured colleagues. Along the same lines, Gappa and Leslie (2002) used the results of research focused on 2000 community college instructors from the NSOPF (1992-93) to determine that part-time faculty use many of the same classroom methods as their full-time colleagues including lectures, discussions, and assessments; however, the survey revealed that the part-time contingent faculty appeared less “committed, accomplished, and creative,” (p. 64) than full-time colleagues based on criteria such as teaching awards, frequency of course revisions and updates, syllabi revisions, interdisciplinary teaching and collaboration, use of multimedia, and professional affiliations. Furthermore, Bradley (2004) reported that, while there have been few recorded violations of traditional academic freedom due to the contingent faculty movement, this may be more
emblematic of a “silent crisis” in the academy rather than a case of no issues due to the “silent self-censorship of thousands of professors holding temporary, insecure appointments” (p. 28-29).

Existing research on undergraduate education (Umbach & Wawrzynski, 2005) found that students reported to learn more from faculty who actively engaged them in the classroom, interacted more with students, and provided more challenging and rigorous learning environments. This research argues for using tenured faculty over contingent faculty for better learning outcomes and engagement because the common traditional perception is that tenured faculty demonstrate more engagement than contingent faculty. Based on the use of two national datasets on faculty practices, Umbach and Wawrzynski found that faculty behavior impacted student learning “profoundly” (2005, p. 176), so it is a logical leap of faith to believe that because research indicates the contingent instructorate is less effective and provides less quality if it does not engage students as well as its tenured colleagues, then you may conclude that use of contingent faculty leads to lower learning outcomes for students. Moreover, there is little or no data accumulated on the beliefs of the institutional leaders regarding this notion. Other research supporting this notion indicates that the best way to ensure high quality post-secondary teaching and learning experiences is to provide adequate support systems for faculty, contingent or otherwise (Charfauros & Tierney, 1999). For instance, according to Charfauros and Tierney, contingent faculty need to feel secure in their jobs and well prepared with mentoring programs and worthwhile compensation for their work so the research supports the notion that proper care and feeding of contingent faculty is an important part of the formula for success.
Ehrenberg and Zhang’s (2004) working paper on the impact of contingent faculty on graduation rates at four-year institutions found that the larger the percentage of contingent faculty at an institution led to a greater percentage reduction in the institution’s graduation rate. Another interesting sideshow to the use of contingent faculty that contradicts the financial argument for using them is that this strategy often requires institutions to hire greater numbers of administrators to manage the contingent workforce and reduces the emphasis on hiring or retaining quality faculty (Samuels, 2009). This sort of contradictory outcome of the use of contingent faculty raises the question of what institutional leaders are doing about the actual value proposition of contingent faculty. Furthermore, it would further the discussion on this phenomenon to learn what beliefs institutional leaders have about the tension between ensuring quality and containing costs through the use of contingent faculty.

Such tension also brings up the notion of equity in the contingent faculty era. This issue has been a focus of much literature related to the use of contingent faculty (American Association of University Professors, 2003; Antony & Valadez, 2002; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Jacoby, 2006). According to the literature, contingent faculty are paid much less than then tenure track or tenured colleagues (Monks, 2007). In fact, this research indicates full-time contingent faculty make up to 30% less in compensation than tenured colleagues at research institutions, and part-time contingent faculty fair even worse, making 70% less than tenured colleagues at research institutions, according to Monks. However, these numbers reflect overall pay beyond just classroom sections. Therefore, since tenured faculty have the additional burdens of research and service, a better definition of the compensation gap is provided by a look at hourly wage differences for classroom delivery.
Monks (2007) found that full-time contingent faculty make up to 20% less than tenured ones and part-timers make up to 40% less than tenured colleagues, so either way a significant gap in equity exists between tenured and contingent faculty, according to the research. Gappa (2000) noted that research indicates that management of contingent faculty continues to be an issue in higher education as well. For example, the hiring and retention policies around contingent faculty tend to be “a casual affair based on informal practices and commitments within departments,” instead of a top-down, centralized institutional arrangement that ensures “fair and consistent treatment” (Gappa, 2000, p. 80). Nonetheless, continued declines in public funding for higher education and emergent trends including consumer-focused market-based management strategies have led to the increased corporatization of U.S. higher education and devaluation of contingent faculty rather than a rebirth of faculty equity and collegiality according to the literature (Dobbie & Robinson, 2008). Basically this erosion of a tenured faculty majority and the job security, governance participation, and academic freedom that goes along with it has resulted in a shrinking of the academic aristocracy (Dobbie & Robinson, 2008).

Therefore, the response to this new corporatist approach in higher education has led not only to academic concerns about the use of contingent faculty, but also new labor issues related to this phenomenon. Historically, the combination of reduced participation in institutional governance among shrinking ranks of tenured faculty combined with the surge in contingent faculty potentially resulted in a spike in faculty unionism (Bornheimer, 1985; Carey, 1978; Rhodes, 2011). Faculty unions and collective bargaining have existed on U.S. college campuses since the 1960s, but unionism is on the rise again in recent years, particularly among contingent faculty according to researchers (Bradley, 2004; Kaplin & Lee,
2007; Rhoades, 1996). Long ago, Carey pointed out that a campus becomes ripe for unionism when the faculty feels disconnected from the administration of the college or university. Moreover, it is no wonder that contemporary contingent faculty are eyeing unions as a potential crutch since they have seemingly little protection and little or no institutional responsibility for their workplaces in the corporatized environs of today’s institutions. McKenna (2012) suggested that the trend of increased use of contingent workforces to provide institutional management with hiring flexibility is almost certain to increase the potential likelihood of labor movement activities in adult and continuing education. Rhoades (2011) examined the impact of decisions by U.S. National Labor Relations Board and state legislative actions attempting to weaken collective bargaining rights of state workers such as faculty at public institutions. In recent years, the Wisconsin legislature’s passing of Act 10 which prohibited state workers such as state college faculty from collective bargaining over anything other than wages was considered a major setback for faculty rights until it was struck down in state court where a judge found it violated rights to freedom of speech, freedom of association, and equal protection under the law. The Wisconsin Supreme Court later upheld the legislation (Marley, 2013). Interestingly enough this battle for workers’ rights is being waged primarily at public institutions, according to the literature (Wickens, 2008). For instance, the number of faculty represented by collective bargaining at public universities (38%) is six times that of the union representation at private institutions (6%), according to Ehrenberg (2004). Overall, faculty at public institutions account for 95% of all unionized faculty in U.S. higher education (Wickens, 2008). Basically, it is a Charles Dickens-like best of times, worst of times scenario for campus unionism because union
activity is on the rise at many schools, but collective bargaining is also under attack like never before (Rhoades, 2011).

Moreover, Rhoades (2011) suggested faculty organizing over the last three decades was concentrated mostly at public institutions (where tenured faculty have the smallest footprint), at community colleges, and notably at adult and continuing education and professional studies colleges. Meanwhile, research shows (Gilmore, 1981) that as support for traditional levers such as shared governance softens at many institutions, contingent faculty may view unionism as a way to safeguard their current working conditions. Administrative leaders may sense that the top-down, autocratic framework of the for-profits and many adult and professional studies programs may be the best answer to address the short-term economic challenges facing institutions; however, Gilmore argued that contingent faculty on the frontlines report that unionization and greater participation in the governance of the institution may be their best bet to help U.S. higher education respond to the shifting educational, social, economic, and political conditions.

Furthermore, the rise of the new unionism seems to coincide with the spike in the emergence of contingent faculty as the most common instructional engine powering today’s post-secondary classrooms (Bradley, 2004; Finkelstein & Schuster, 2001). The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) argued that the use of contingent faculty is a threat to academy traditions including academic freedom, shared governance, and quality academic values (Bradley, 2004). Because contingent faculty are unprotected against sudden termination, they may not risk innovation or invention in the classroom, engage in controversial discussion, or grade rigorously to avoid student complaints that may lead to dismissal (Bradley, 2004). In the not too distant past, however, the AAUP once stood against
faculty unions (Carey, 1978), so such arguments are subject to change over time due to dominant social mores and cultural attitudes. Furthermore, institutional leaders may fear faculty unions are likely to result in loss of commitment to the institution faculty show after unionizing; however, while the existing research provides few clues as to what exactly institutional administrators believe about this aspect of the contingent faculty culture, what is known according to the research (Wickens, 2008) is that collective bargaining did not appear to significantly impact the level of faculty commitment to the institution. For example, a Canadian study by Schell and Loeb (1986) indicated that there was no significant difference between unionized and non-unionized faculty in terms of commitment to the university they serve.

The literature’s ultimate analysis (Rhoades, 2011) is that in American higher education, faculty are increasingly managed professionals in organizations run by managerial professionals. Some feel the bifurcated system of contingent faculty is untenable in its current form as contingent faculty become the have-nots with low pay, no job security, heavy workloads, and low status (Kezar, 2004). Existing literature counters that unionism surfaces on campus in times of conflict and unionized faculty leads to defensive behavior on the part of the faculty and adversarial relationships with the administration (Birnbaum, 1980; Putten, McLendon, & Peterson, 1997). Other studies suggest unionism leads to increased red tape, less innovation, and concentrated control with increased procedures (Baldridge, 1978; Gilmore, 1981; Richardson & Mortimer, 1978). Nonetheless, collective bargaining appears to strike fear in the hearts of administrators while it emerges as the lever of choice for the contingent workforce intent on balancing the playing field between themselves and the professional managers of the institutions they serve.
Moreover, while there is no crystal ball to visualize the future for contingent faculty and unionism in the adult and continuing education space, more research on leadership beliefs about this trend combined with an analysis of earlier experiences may provide a glimpse of the likely path unionism will travel in the next decade. Ultimately, institutional leaders’ beliefs about the significance of the self-actualization and professional satisfaction for contingent faculty may have more to do with the path these faculty take than any union activity. According to the research, the big losers in this change have been the contingent faculty who lost wages, benefits and job security, and the students and their parents who have to shoulder more of the burden for financing higher education through cost-sharing (Dobbie & Robinson, 2008). Because of these losses, Ehrenberg (2004) found that the rise of contingent faculty has led to a movement for collective bargaining rights for part-timers. Ehrenberg noted “the growing use of contingent faculty, coupled with lower salaries and benefits that they receive has led to a growing movement to have contingent faculty covered by collective bargaining” (p. 1). Moreover, Dobbie and Robinson (2008) raised the question does collective bargaining and union activity rise in direct correlation with the growth in the use of contingent faculty or not? Dobbie and Robinson found that there was no evidence of that happening. In fact, they concluded that use of contingent faculty did not automatically correlate to a rise in unionization at the campuses they studied. The authors found no significant correlation between unionism and the levels of non-tenure track faculty at either four-year or two-year institutions in the U.S.

Gappa and Leslie (2002) found similar evidence that part-time faculty at community colleges nationwide were ambiguous about unionization based on responses to a 1992 Center for the Study of Community Colleges (CSCC). Gappa and Leslie reported that part-time
faculty replied “no opinion” (p. 63) to the question of whether or not collective bargaining had a place in community colleges. However, whether contingent faculty are unionized or not, the one argument that does not seem to go away is the sense that high use of contingent faculty leads to lesser quality for educational outcomes and lower retention.

Percy and Beaumont (2008) characterized the casualization movement or contingent faculty movement as a type of industrial revolution in the academy that represents a historic shift in post-secondary employment practices, an irreversible trend toward flexible human resources to power the new normal of the corporate university in the U.S. Percy and Beaumont noted that this movement is an irony in of itself because it represents to many a marginalization of the individual by transferring economic risk from the institution to the workers who then in turn become a risk to very institution they serve because of the commonly perceived notion of lower quality and lack of commitment on the part of these low-paid contingent faculty.

Entin (2005) recognized the complexity of such risk by using a Marxist lens to explore how post-secondary institutions shifted the economic responsibility of the institution to the students and their parents through cost sharing to meet higher tuition costs and to the instructorate by replacing expensive tenured-track faculty with flexible, more economical contingent faculty who are asked to carry the financial burden through lower pay and few if any benefits. Furthermore, Entin described it as the new academic capitalism, a sort of intentional assault on faculty control and a de-professionalization of the professoriate, which he refers to as the proletarianization of academic work. All this may stifle scholarly growth, pedagogical innovation, student engagement, but as Gappa and Leslie (1997; 2000; 2002; 2010) repeatedly pointed out in the literature, this trend is not likely going away.
Leadership and the Path Forward for the New Faculty Majority

Ultimately, this collection of research literature indicates the challenges and opportunities presented by the rise of the new faculty majority and its ensuing culture may lead to an opportunity for the recasting of rights, roles, and responsibilities for contingent faculty. Based on the current literature, researchers express an immediate sense of urgency to change how institutions view and make use of contingent faculty (Birnbaum, 2004; Crellin, 2010; Gappa, 2000). However, there are likely barriers to such a revolutionary change in higher education. First, there is little or no research about leaders’ beliefs on what is being done or what should be done regarding contingent faculty in the new paradigm of consumer-focused, market-driven higher education. Second, from the contextual perspective of establishing culture for the new majority, contingent workforce, it is important to ask whether or not traditions such as tenure and shared governance are obstacles or opportunities to the reinvention of contingent faculty in higher education at large, and in adult and continuing education where such traditions are less of a factor. The issue may not be that these traditions in their current forms are barriers to changing the role of contingent faculty, but that they may lack the appropriate mechanisms to co-exist with the reinvention of contingent faculty as significant stakeholders in the administration and sustainability of the modern university. If so, that means that the current notion of shared governance, the primary means of administration of the traditional campus, must implement new levers to accommodate the needs of the new normal in higher education’s instructorate. Perhaps traditions such as shared governance must make room for contingent instructors as decision-makers and active participants in the direction of academic programs and institutional business where and when appropriate.
Furthermore, this transformation may need to occur at the continued expense of the traditional tenured faculty ranks. Schools are rethinking how to integrate contingent faculty into the decision-making process, rather than simply looking at them as low cost flexible labor that many argue represents a “disinvestment” (Brody, 2010, p. 31) rather than an investment in sustainable higher education. For example, Villanova is one institution looking to position contingent faculty representatives on faculty councils. As Brody pointed out, “these measures can go a long way to support university-wide collegiality and allow adjuncts to become a more visible and vital presence in campus life” (p. 31). Third, and finally, researchers (Gappa & Leslie, 2002; Schell & Loeb, 1986; Wickun & Stanley, 2000) noted another troubling aspect of the contingent workforce is the haphazard approach to personnel policies governing these faculty. Some institutions treat the hiring and administration of adjuncts as an afterthought. Typically at research-oriented institutions they hire adjuncts in order to provide release time for senior faculty. Many institutions limit the number of courses a contingent faculty can teach for practical reasons; however, more troubling is the public perception of the miserable plight of the contingent faculty in today’s higher education workspace and how that impacts quality teaching and learning.

All this brings us to ask the question what role will the new faculty majority play in the corporatized university with its proletariat professorship? Research indicates that whatever the role, it will be a shrinking one for faculty since they make up about 30% of all personnel on campuses today and 55% of the campus professionals, down from 65% two decades ago (Rhoades, 2006). As previously mentioned, existing research (Rhoades, 1996) on work environment for contingent faculty focuses on employment guidelines and employee rights rather than what leadership believes are important or evolving professional
responsibilities for contingent faculty, so it would be helpful to better understand how this challenge evolves over time.

Crellin (2010) identified the phenomenon of the “changing academic workforce” (p. 73) as one of the top challenges to the governance of modern higher education. Crellin reported the new majority of contingent faculty may have significant implications for institutional operation and governance. The number of full-time tenure-track faculty continues to decline while the number of contingent faculty continues to rise. Other researchers made generalizations of how contingent faculty will mirror the changing dynamics of higher education itself by becoming more diverse, technologically adept, nimble, and responsive to the rapid pace of change in the world (Baldwin & Wawryzniski, 2011). These researchers used a 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:04) national data set sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to identify trends in teaching strategies and the integration of technology in the classrooms of contingent faculty. But, once again this sort of evidence does little good to expand what we know of leaders’ beliefs about contingent faculty and how they are viewed or used beyond the classroom in administration and management of academic programs or the overall business of contemporary higher education.

While traditional notions of the contingent professoriate conjure up visions of what researchers refer to as de-skilling, the new normal for contingent faculty may include up-skilling or re-tooling to better prepare them for the more demanding participation required for these new roles (Courtney, 2013). Pope’s (2004) research on trust and faculty participation in governance of post-secondary institutions points out that organizations that have positive relationships between components parts, for faculty and administrators, have
more successful outcomes. Pope pointed out that the issue of trust in higher education has been limited to the public’s perspective of its relationship with higher education and student trust of faculty or faculty trust of administrators, however, little or no research reflects the beliefs of institutional leaders regarding the importance of trust or how it plays out in establishing contingent faculty culture.

Birnbaum (2004) noted that market-driven institutions like the University of Phoenix reject any type of administrative role for contingent faculty in the corporate style university; their instructors are simply “transmitters off training material, not autonomous scholars; students are consumers purchasing products, not learners being educated…” (p. 9). The value derived from a system of faculty engagement in the management of an institution is not only viewed as negative in the corporate-style institutions, but also as a barrier to efficiency and effectiveness, and most of all, profit. Nonetheless, Birnbaum concludes research indicates that closed systems such as these may ultimately stifle “academic freedom, critical discourse, creativity, and liberal learning” (p. 9) and in the end meaningful, deeper education. Therefore, it is clear that additional research is necessary to expand our knowledge about leaders’ beliefs on what is happening with contingent faculty at their institutions to make meaning of this growing phenomenon and identify the way forward.
Chapter 3 - Methodology

This research study calls for a qualitative exploration of this phenomenon because this method allowed me to bring my own worldview to this study while also revealing greater understanding of institutional leaders’ beliefs about this contingent faculty culture (Creswell, 2007). Furthermore, I framed this qualitative study within the characteristics of phenomenological research using a social constructionist lens informed by the prior examinations of Husserl (1969, 1970, 1982) and theoretical domain experts Moustakas (1994), van Manen (1990), and others. I chose this method of analysis within a qualitative framework because it provides a relevant, systematic means to uncover and examine depictions of the lived experiences in this domain to arrive at a deeper understanding of the nature, meaning, and evolution of their experiences with this phenomenon.

Moreover, according to Moustakas (1994), any researcher engaged in a qualitative study in the phenomenological tradition must carry out “a series of methods and procedures” (p. 103) to satisfy the requirements for this type of investigation. Therefore, I used the following systematic process in exploration of this phenomenon:

1. Identify a topic of autobiographical meaning and value with social significance.
2. Conduct a comprehensive literature review related to the topic.
3. Identify and select appropriate co-researchers to include as participants in the study.
4. Inform the co-researchers of the nature and purpose of the study and reach an agreement on informed consent, confidentiality, ethical principles, and responsibilities for the study.
5. Develop a set of questions to guide the interview process.
6. Conduct and record personal interviews focused on bracketed topics and questions and conduct follow-up interviews or surveys.

7. Organize and analyze the collected data to create textural and structural descriptions and depictions of the phenomenon to reveal a greater understanding.

These methods utilized were open-ended without definitive or exclusive requirements, which provided me with a theoretical framework and methodology for accomplishing an orderly, disciplined study of a phenomenon with care and rigor (Moustakas, 1994). Furthermore, I used an interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) format to inform my research methodology for this study. According to Reid, Flowers, and Larkin (2005), IPA is best suited for research on lived experience because the inductive and interactive procedures of this approach help researchers develop an insider’s or emic’s perspective of the phenomenon. It is understood that the researcher works with the participants in a collaborative and semi-structured manner like co-researchers to identify and interpret relevant meanings used to make sense of the topic. Moreover, the participants’ lived experience is coupled with a reflective and interpretative methodology to enable the researcher to begin the investigation. Nonetheless, since my study is a qualitative, phenomenological exploration focused on the lived experience of a select group of participants involved in a common event it is beneficial to attempt to describe the universal experience of all the participants in the phenomenon to help understand the very nature of it (Creswell, 2007; van Manen, 1990). A phenomenon may be defined as any commonly experienced event such as teaching, learning, work, communication, leadership, or many other experiences. In this case, the phenomenon under study is the growing use of contingent faculty in higher education and how this phenomenon has shaped leaders’ beliefs about
faculty culture at their institutions. It is my purpose to explore evidence of leaderships’ patterns, beliefs, understandings, insights, guidelines, and perceptions, to improve our understanding of this phenomenon. Moreover, this study may raise questions that can further advance the discussion of this phenomenon.

According to Moustakas (1994), the initial challenge of such research is to identify an overarching question that has both social meaning and personal significance. This overarching question typically emerges from the researcher’s intense interest in a topic as in this case of this study. On the one hand, such a question should reveal the essence and meaning of the phenomenon being studied, it should uncover qualitative aspects of the experience, it should reveal new knowledge about the phenomenon to further the discussion, and it should demonstrate the engagement and passion for the topic by the researcher and participants to the study (Moutsakas, 1994). On the other hand, the question should not attempt to predict or determine causal relationships within the phenomenon and determine outcomes or make conclusions about a phenomenon (Moutsakas, 1994).

Furthermore, it is important that research question(s) in a qualitative study such as this one demonstrate the potential to help respond to common problems of practice based on the findings of the research (Maxwell, 2013). Maxwell reported that these types of questions help qualitative researchers gain insight into what is going on in a particular phenomenon, why it is happening, define meaning, and thereby potentially fills gaps left by prior literature focused on the topic and raise new questions for exploration.

Moreover, the immediate strength of such qualitative research focused on a phenomenon is its ability to capture the world in terms of the people, events, and processes that connect them in a particular phenomenon and reveal the outcomes for intellectual goals.
including better understanding how participants construct meaning of the phenomenon, the context in which participants act out their lived experiences in the phenomenon, the process events that take place in the phenomenon, the unexpected outcomes that result from the inductive nature of qualitative research, the opportunity for further research, and ultimately, the patterns of personal and social meaning that arise from the experiences of the people participating in this phenomenon (Maxwell, 2013).

Furthermore, qualitative phenomenology was the ideal methodology for this study because it provides a path to a critical perspective that reveals descriptions and classifications of the phenomenon unavailable from the empirical, statistical approaches of quantitative studies (Moustakas, 1994). In fact, according to Moustakas, phenomenological research emerged from such a discontent with traditional science’s focus on the material world (1994). Leading members of phenomenological inquiry include Descartes, Kant, Husserl, and Hegel, who believed that science failed to take into consideration the personal experiences of human consciousness as it relates to objects existing in the material world was failed science (Moustakas, 1994). For example, Descartes believed knowledge emerged from self-evidence. Brentano carried this notion further by developing the idea of human science to explore mental phenomenon or a science of phenomenon. Moreover, Husserl evolved this paradigm into a subjective examination of the essence of human experience in regards to phenomenon, which established today’s approach to qualitative phenomenological study. In phenomenology, there is always a relationship between the perception of natural objects and the internal perceptions, memories, and judgments of the perceiver (Moutsakas, 1994). Therefore, a phenomenological researcher makes no suppositions about phenomenon, but rather focuses on phenomenon fresh and naively, according to Moutsakas, and constructs
questions to reveal findings that provide the foundation for further understanding, research, discussion, and reflection.

One outcome of this study may be that it reveals leaders’ beliefs about optimum or preferable approaches for supporting contingent faculty or it may identify beliefs that prove to be ineffectual or harmful practices among the participant population as cited in existing literature (American Association of University Professors, 1980, 2003; Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011; Benjamin, 2002; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2004; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Lahey & Griffith, 2002). However, while qualitative research may ask how X plays a role in causing Y and which process is perceived as responsible for establishing the relationship between X and Y, the true causation for phenomenon in a qualitative study is typically revealed through the visualized sequences of events delivered from the lived experience of the participants in their own words (Maxwell, 2013; Weiss, 1994). Therefore, my primary purpose is to capture leaders’ image of their beliefs about contingent faculty culture through the lived experience of these participants in true phenomenological fashion to establish a better understanding of the meaning of this phenomenon and to further the discussion about it, but not to identify causal relationships or determine best practices.

**Research Tradition**

A significant function of theoretical tradition in support of any research study is to help the researcher apply a model or framework around the data of why participants believe what they do, behave the way they do, or why events unfold the way they do, by scaffolding off prior theoretical findings (Maxwell, 2013). Using existing research theory as a framework makes it simpler to tell the story of what is happening and why, according to Maxwell. Therefore, the reason my research will use a qualitative approach from a
phenomenological perspective is to develop a descriptive narrative of the essential patterns, understandings, guidelines, beliefs and perceptions of leaders responsible for establishing contingent faculty culture at these selected institutions. The social, historical, and cultural characteristics of this new normal for faculty will be captured through the perspectives of institutional leaders which in turn may identify whether or not these characteristics are perceived to resolve issues in performance and effectiveness of contingent faculty as identified by the previously reviewed research literature or lead to more issues and concerns. Nonetheless, it is important to understand these common experiences because it may help us reveal practices or policies to improve our understanding features of this phenomenon (Maxwell, 2013).

**Research Design**

Miles and Huberman (1994) explained that good qualitative explorations produce well-grounded data, rich in descriptions and depictions of human behavior, interaction, patterns and processes capable of capturing the chronological flow of events and consequences leading to better understanding of phenomenon. Qualitative research meets the needs of this study because one of the strengths of qualitative research is its focus on the processes that connect people and phenomenon whereas quantitative research tends to focus on the different variables at play in any given situation. By investigating the perceived relationships in a phenomenon researchers can understand the phenomenon more completely (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012). Moreover, Maxwell (2013) described the difference between quantitative and qualitative research as a distinction between “variance theory” and “process theory” wherein the former focuses on the statistical relationship between the key
variables that make up a phenomenon and the latter focuses on the processes that link the people, situations, or events in a phenomenon to create a shared experience.

Because qualitative research concerns itself with the lived experiences of the participants of the phenomenon and how they construct or make sense of it, it makes sense for me to use such a process-driven approach to help better understand this phenomenon myself and comprehend how to visualize it and authentically depict it for others (Maxwell, 2013). Moreover, a phenomenological approach will require focus on the specific culture for large numbers of contingent faculty on these campuses. This approach will enable me to collect data on this phenomenon through detailed participant interviews, and ultimately this study will identify commonalities and patterns in the viewpoints of the selected participants (Fraenkel et al., 2012). Therefore, my research is not simply an attempt to identify common practice or discover ways to improve practices; it is also about revealing beliefs and raising questions about beliefs and practices to further the discussion and exploration of this phenomenon.

Participants

Qualitative research emphasizes selecting research settings and sampling populations in a purposeful manner that supports the questions being asked by the study and informed by the researcher’s prior knowledge of the target population as well as existing research (Light, 1990; Maxwell, 2013; Miles & Huberman, 1993; Fraenkel et al., 2012). Therefore, the population sampled for this research included only senior management acting as key decision-makers overseeing large contingent faculty populations at prominent adult and continuing education and professional studies colleges in the United States. Participants’ responsibilities or activities may include hiring faculty, managing professional development,
providing faculty technical services and support, performing academic oversight, and participating or establishing practices for governance.

According to Reid, Flowers, and Larkin (2005), participants in an IPA study are selected based on their ability to understand the principles of their involvement in this study, give consent, engage with the researcher, and willingly share their experiences and opinions about the phenomenon. A typical sample size for a qualitative study need not be large, in fact Fraenkel et al. (2012) estimated between one and 20 participants is sufficient. Therefore, my study will sample up to five individual administrators from institutions with make-ups reflective of the study questions. This sample size also fits the characteristics of a typical IPA study of 10 or less participants (Reid et al., 2005), which may challenge the conventional notion that large sample sizes are needed for valuable research. However, since these institutional leaders are responsible for establishing the processes and policies for contingent faculty culture at their institutions, this sample should purposefully and adequately support my questions centered around the identity and meaning of contingent faculty at typical adult and continuing education and professional studies environments.

Moreover, by selecting participants who most typically represent the settings and populations participating in this phenomenon this sampling approach ensures capture of the “heterogeneity in the population” (Maxwell, 2013, location 2181 of 5059) to more effectively and efficiently reveal the maximum variation (Guba & Lincoln, 1989) most relevant to my study. I recruited participants by personal invitation based on previous professional introductions. No monetary incentives were provided to the research participants; however, the researcher offered to share experiential and empirical data with the participants for their own benefit at their own institutions.
**Data Collection**

Phenomenological research for a qualitative study also requires the researcher to allow a hypothesis to emerge from collected data rather than begin with a basic assumption of the phenomenon (Jones et al., 2014; Maxwell, 2005). To do that, I obtained data collected from the answers to my primary questions about participants’ lived experiences related to this phenomenon. Furthermore, Maxwell suggested that using multiple methods of data collection such as surveys, interviews, document reviews, or observation is important because it may broaden my range of understanding of a phenomenon. Therefore, first, I began by completing electronic surveys with the participants using a series of common interview questions about the culture and community of contingent faculty at their institution and the processes and systems they have implemented to establish and maintain that community. Next, to gain a better understanding of their lived experiences and beliefs about this phenomenon and establish a foundation for revealing deeper meaning about the patterns, guidelines, beliefs and perceptions emerging from this phenomenon, I conducted more focused and in-depth live interviews with participants using questions informed by the initial surveys. Finally, I used document reviews of institutional materials such as faculty handbooks, available policies and procedures, and other readily-available related artifacts to provide greater insight in the patterns of management for contingent faculty at participant institutions and help validate the representations and recollections provided by the study participants.

From this data I performed what Moustakas (1994) referred to as “horizontalization” of the data to identify significant statements that provide a basis for common experiences and patterns of beliefs. Then, I created clusters of meaning from these statements and beliefs to
develop specific themes. From these themes, I developed textural and structural descriptions that will provide depictions leaders’ beliefs of the phenomenon. I also used memoing with dates (Miles & Huberman, 1984) to capture field notes so I could better reflect on immediate impressions of the participants in the field study. Furthermore, I performed close-reading of the collected to data to categorize and code it into relevant and accessible chunks of information to more easily inform my resulting narrative focused on this phenomenon.

**Data Storage**

How one stores data collected in a qualitative study is almost as important as how one collects data (Jones et al., 2012). The data researchers collect from interviews, surveys, observation, and otherwise must be valid and impartial and it must be timely and precise (Maxwell, 2013). Therefore, I used digital recordings for in-person interviews to preserve the unadulterated language and feedback of study participants in their own words. Furthermore, I used electronic online surveys to capture evidence and by collecting participant responses to my precise and in-depth research questions and store this data in digital format. Finally, I assigned a participant code to each interviewee to protect the anonymity of the participants and categorize the evidence in visual matrices (Jones et al., 2014) to provide the participants with anonymity while maintaining control of the data sources.

**Data Analysis**

Maxwell (2013) explained that data analysis must be part of the design of any qualitative study and as such must itself be designed. Therefore, the data analysis stage occurred routinely and frequently throughout the data collection phase and informed my questions and data collection simultaneously. This part of my research process included merging information collected from participant interviews into a single document
immediately after data collection on routine basis as part of data analysis and storage. Then, I broke down the data collection into a phenomenological framework made up of multiple categories to describe the participants’ observations and lived experiences in matrix format. These categories were cross connected to identify and imply certain theoretical patterns that emerge from the data and demonstrate processes and patterns common across institutions effectively demonstrating oversight of contingent faculty to formulate a working hypothesis on the management of contingent instructorate in higher education. Moustakas (1994) suggested that the data collected in a phenomenological study like this one should allow for the development of individual textual and structural descriptions of the lived experiences of the participants in this phenomenon.

**Trustworthiness**

Qualitative researchers typically do not have the same opportunity for the planned strategies, samples, or statistical safeguards to control threats to validity or trustworthiness found in quantitative studies (Maxwell, 2013). Qualitative researchers typically address such threats as they compile their data and formulate the evidence of the research through an inductive process that diminishes the probability of rival hypothesis or alternative perspectives based on the collected evidence. According to Maxwell, the authenticity or trustworthiness of a study is always a key issue, but researchers can ensure its validity by eliminating as many threats to the validity of the data as possible in the research design by identifying specific threats and developing ways to rule them out as the evidence is collected. Maxwell identified researcher bias and reactivity or the influence the researcher has on the target population as the most significant threats to authenticity in qualitative studies. Therefore, in-depth involvement with the research participants, collecting rich data, and
respondent validation were three significant approaches I followed to ensure the validity of my qualitative research study (Becker, 1970). As such, this sort of data collection requires personal interaction, verbatim interview transcripts, detailed note taking including audio and video captures of interviews to remove respondent duplicity and researcher bias, personal verification, and follow-up questions to ensure accuracy. Using the respondents to validate their own words and experiences recorded by the researcher is the most effective way to rule out the possibility or researcher misinterpretation of any survey data or interview content, according to Maxwell (2013). Therefore, my study incorporated each of these elements in the data collection and validation phases of this study.

**Conclusion**

As the existing research points out, much of the examination of the culture for contingent faculty has been directed at faculty-centric concerns as they impact the ultimate institutional end-game of student outcomes and student retention. However, the existing research (Kezar, 2004; Kezar & Sam, 2013) reminds us that such explorations fall short of what is needed for us to fully understand and make meaning of the growing contingent faculty phenomenon.

Gappa (2002) pointed out that today’s model of higher education has become too large and complex for envisioning any single notion of the professoriate, contingent or otherwise. Gappa suggested that regardless of appointment type all faculty need to be treated fairly and equitably to ensure high quality teaching and learning. Certainly the impact of the growth of contingent faculty is complex and requires additional exploration in specific areas of concern to get a better handle on the outcomes (Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011). But the research is clear that as the faculty workforce becomes more diverse and casualized, old
safeguards such as tenure and governance become more complicated and difficult to sustain in a traditional sense. What is needed is a depiction of the strategies that have emerged and evolved at leading institutions for today’s academy and its instructors, based on the beliefs and understandings of the leaders responsible for establishing this culture, so other institutions can adopt or adapt these emergent methods for their own.

Clearly there is a need to shed a broader light on the evolving nature of the use of contingent faculty to not only to deliver instruction, but also participate in the administration and management of the business of post-secondary education. Part of the danger for higher education during this transformation is that the new faculty majority may continue to become lost in the shuffle toward market-driven, cost-efficient higher education that results in a potentially disengaged instructorate leading to lower quality teaching and learning and poorer student outcomes. Until now there has been little research on what institutional leaders perceive as optimum or necessary to achieve sustainability, satisfaction, and success using contingent faculty in higher education today. By revealing their common beliefs and perceptions, these institutional leaders may provide depictions of strategies that prove helpful and valid for other institutions facing similar challenge
Chapter 4 – Research Findings

This study used an interpretative phenomenological analysis of leaders’ beliefs to increase understanding of the use of contingent faculty supporting the mission of adult and continuing education and professional studies colleges at select Tier 1 research universities in the United States. Using a qualitative design approach, I collected interviews from senior leaders at five nationally prominent adult and continuing education and professional studies colleges at Tier 1 research universities in the U.S. to increase understanding of the contingent faculty phenomenon through the lived experiences of these five institutional leaders. The primary question guiding this study asked what do institutional leaders believe about contingent faculty culture in higher education today? The following section provides anonymous profiles of the five leadership participants in this study.

Participant Profiles

Five leadership participants were recruited from elite adult and continuing education and professional studies colleges at Tier 1 research universities for this study. Here are their profiles:

Andrew was the long-time Dean of a large adult and continuing education and professional studies college affiliated with a Tier 1 research university. He has extensive experience in the adult and continuing education environment and has been responsible for oversight of large faculty populations and curriculum in traditional higher education and professional studies. He oversaw approximately 200 instructors, most of who worked part-time at his institution. He has also published scholarly works and held high-level administrative positions at other research institutions.
Ben is the Dean of an adult and continuing education extension college at one of the nation’s foremost Ivy League institutions. He has extensive and noteworthy leadership experience in adult and continuing education, both at private and public institutions in traditional and online education. He oversees a large contingent faculty population of more than 800 instructors, most of whom teach part-time for his current institution.

Caroline leads a large online university for a premier, private non-profit Tier 1 research university on the East Coast. Previously she led one of the largest public university campuses in the nation, overseeing a large online operation as well its campus-based academic mission. She has extensive experience as a higher education strategist overseeing contingent faculty populations.

Denise is the Dean of an adult and continuing education extension school at a premiere Ivy League college in the East. She oversees a small but growing population of contingent faculty in support of her college’s academic mission for adult learners and professional studies students.

Edward is a long-time senior institutional leader who established one of the foremost adult and continuing education and professional studies colleges at a large, nationally renowned state university. He assumed leadership of the extension college at one of the nation’s leading elite state universities in the West. He oversees 2500 mostly part-time instructors, serving tens of thousands of adult learners and professional studies students. His extension college currently awards no degrees, but primarily delivers certificates for adult learning and professional studies and transferrable credit toward university degrees.
Themes

The analysis of the interview data collected from these five participants yielded three superordinate themes and 11 subthemes. The superordinate themes and their subordinate themes were: 1.0) Importance of establishing a professional identity for non-tenure track (NTT) faculty; 1.1) Belief that premium, discipline-specific professionals can be the most effective NTT instructors for adult learners and professional studies students; 1.2) Belief that discipline-specific graduate degrees combined with relevant and noteworthy work experience provide the most valuable learning experiences for adult learners and professional studies students; and 1.3) Belief that working professionals have unique needs and motivations to serve as NTT faculty; 2.0) Importance of establishing meaningful working relationships between institutions and NTT faculty; 2.1) Belief in recognition of the considerable value working professionals provide as NTT faculty; 2.2) Belief in the importance of aligning NTT faculty with the academic programs they support; 2.3) Beliefs about shared governance and academic freedom for NTT faculty in the context of adult learning and professional studies; 2.4) Beliefs about faculty organizing and NTT faculty; and 2.5) Beliefs about formal evaluations of NTT faculty; and 3.0) Beliefs about establishing context-based academic community and culture for NTT faculty; 3.1) Beliefs about showing respect for the role played by NTT faculty in the adult and continuing education space; 3.2) Beliefs about empowerment for NTT faculty; and 3.3) Beliefs about context-based levels of training and support for NTT faculty.

Superordinate themes and subordinate themes were established and included after being identified in interview data of three or more of the five participants in this study. Table 2 lists the superordinate themes and subordinate themes that emerged from the analysis of the
interview data. The table also records whether or not the participants indicated support for or evidence of the themes in practice. The following sections explore these findings in more detail.

Table 2

Evidence of Superordinate and Subordinate Themes in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Super-Ordinate Themes</th>
<th>Andrew</th>
<th>Ben</th>
<th>Caroline</th>
<th>Denise</th>
<th>Edward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Identity for NTT faculty</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Beliefs about recruiting working professionals for NTT faculty</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Beliefs about degree requirements for NTT faculty</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Beliefs about needs and motivations for NTT faculty</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Relationship Building between Institutions and NTT Faculty</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Beliefs about the value of NTT faculty</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Beliefs about oversight of NTT faculty</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Beliefs about participation in shared governance and academic freedom for NTT faculty</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Beliefs about potential for unionism for NTT faculty</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Beliefs about evaluation of NTT faculty</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Community and Culture for NTT Faculty</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Beliefs about respect for NTT faculty</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Beliefs about empowering NTT faculty</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Beliefs about care and support of NTT faculty</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identity for Non-tenure Track (NTT) Faculty

The popular social discourse about contingent faculty in higher education describes NTT faculty enduring poor working conditions and unsatisfactory relationships with the institutions they serve (American Association of University Professors, 2009; Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Baldwin & Wawryznski, 2011; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kezar, 2012; Schuster & Finklestein, 2006; Umbach & Wawrzynski, 2005). However, this is not how institutional leaders in this study described their view of reality for non-tenured track (NTT) faculty serving their academic missions on a contingent basis. The image of the NTT faculty identity manifested in this study departs from the common social discourse in the current literature shaping popular opinion about contingent faculty. Furthermore, it is important to consider that the following body of evidence manifests itself from the purview of senior leadership’s perceptions of the contingent or NTT faculty experience. Therefore, this evidence does not attempt to reflect what casualized faculty think or feel or even actually experience, but instead captures the beliefs of their institutional leaders based on the lived experiences of these senior administrators at elite adult learning, continuing education, and professional studies institutions.

For the participants in this study, even the label “contingent faculty” is a point of debate, as demonstrated by one leader who was concerned that the term “contingent faculty,” is an inappropriate and undesirable label for the many dedicated, scholarly professionals teaching off the tenure track at his institution.

Andrew, who led an adult and continuing and professional studies college for a Top 50 research institution, dismissed the notion that anyone would even imply his institution uses contingent faculty to teach its courses, although the full-time and part-time faculty at his
professional studies college work by appointment without tenure and would therefore satisfy the common definition for contingent instructors established by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP, 2003). Andrew explained his feelings this way regarding the label contingent faculty:

We don't use that term (contingent faculty). Typically, they're part-time faculty. If I can call people part-time versus full-time, part-time faculty have other full-time jobs... They're teaching no more than one course for us at a time. Full-time faculty are exclusively working for (our institution).

According to the beliefs reported by the leaders in this study, the identity of NTT instructors (at their institutions) manifests itself from the highly valued teaching roles they perform, mostly part-time, in the context of their unique adult-oriented academic missions. Another participant, Caroline, offered this example of how her institution emphasizes properly framing the identity for NTT instructors right from the beginning: “They come to teach,” she said, “so they don't have research expectations, committee (or) service expectations. They're here to teach.”

By shaping a premium instructor role focused on teaching part-time, leaders in this study appear to help NTT faculty transcend the lesser image of the contingent instructor captured in popular opinion. According to these leaders, because of the nature of the unique academic missions for elite adult and continuing education, their NTT faculty understand and fully appreciate the importance of their teaching roles, so there is no confusion regarding responsibilities for NTT faculty in good standing. Based on the interviews collected in this study, the difference between the common social discourse on contingent faculty and the beliefs of the leaders in this study seems to begin with the unique, contextual identity these
leaders apply to the role of their NTT faculty. Leaders in this study clearly believe NTT faculty enjoy a positive self-image that manifests itself from the institution’s commitment to recruit the most qualified working professionals available.

The following sections explore the subordinate themes that emerged from the leadership discourse on this approach for creating a valued, professional identity for the NTT faculty at these elite institutions.

**Beliefs about recruiting discipline-specific professionals for NTT teaching roles.**

One subordinate theme that emerged from the interview data collected in this study was leaders’ belief about recruiting the best possible, discipline-specific professionals available for NTT faculty roles. Researchers suggest that some institutions meet demands to staff course sections by hiring “the least expensive and most vulnerable candidates” (Gappa & Leslie, 2002, p. 80) rather than the best-qualified and relevant ones. Gappa and Leslie (2002) called this bottom fishing when academic departments are not held accountable for poor or inconsistent hiring practices. Research indicates the issue worsens when the most available instructor is an aspiring academic really looking for full-time, tenure track, academic work instead of a part-time teaching role consistent with the NTT ranks.

Maynard and Joseph (2008) referred to such hires as involuntary part-timers. Their research shows that such hires are less satisfied with their roles in higher education and may demonstrate less commitment and correlate with poor student outcomes. Leaders interviewed in this study indicated that they took a different approach to hiring NTT faculty. The leaders in this study reported that it was critical to hire only highly respected, accomplished discipline-specific professionals who wanted to fill NTT teaching roles either part-time or full-time. One participant, Edward, reported that he believed his institution hired NTT
faculty who are professionals, at the top of their game and able to provide experiential learning and practitioner expertise that might not be available from the more theoretical-based tenured faculty on campus:

For the certificate programs that we offer in the extension (college), our unique niche that we grasp in the market place has to do with practitioners as our teachers. For our certificate programs we are not looking necessarily for Ph.D. people, we are looking for practitioners who are highly regarded in their field and who are interested in teaching in the programs that we have.

Furthermore, Edward explained that because his extension college focused on business management, legal studies, engineering and technology and the entertainment industry, credible, relevant work experience along with appropriate academic credentials are essential for his faculty. Drawing on in-demand professionals from the industries that hire the graduates of these adult and professional studies programs is an important consideration, according to these leaders, in order to enhance the credibility of their colleges, build real world business relationships, and embed discipline-specific relevance in their academic programs. Typically, the hiring process at these institutions commands an intense focus on recruiting top talent rather than seeking flexible and economical ways to fill teaching spots to meet fluctuating enrollment demands. One leader noted:

If we're going to serve working professionals, we’d better have people in the classroom who have relevant, current experience or they (students) will complain, and they do, and they’ll leave the program if we don't have people with relative experience.
Based on the interview data collected in this study these leaders believe in recruiting high-end, full-time or part-time NTT faculty who primarily have or have had professional careers in the workplace. They teach because they enjoy passing along their knowledge to students. Edward provided this example of how faculty are chosen at his extension college:

Our faculty here are screened heavily to make sure that they are people who have really high standing in their fields. We will have people from the studios; there are entertainment and art instructors from Fox to 21st Century or whatever. People who are teaching production or are directors, those sorts of things for TV and radio and itself. It’s pretty impressive. It’s not like we get Steven Spielberg but we get people who are well known.

The constitution of contingent faculty at these elite institutions is not homogenous. While many NTT faculty come from professional workplaces, there are scenarios where professional academics or institutional administrators with in-demand expertise fill out the ranks of the contingent instructorate. The makeup of NTT faculty at Ben’s institution, an extension program at a top Ivy League campus, has three distinct categories of faculty helping to achieve its academic mission. Ben provided the following detailed description of NTT faculty at his institution:

One (category) are tenure-track faculty at other institutions who want to learn to teach, or want to get (my college’s name) teaching on their resume, who all learned to teach online, so that's one big category. Another category are professionals in their field who love to teach, and want to give back, and so we have a fair number of practicing lawyers that teach law-related classes. We have people from the finance industry and accounting industry teaching finance and accounting, and so we have quite a few
fairly senior people... And the third category are Ph.D. students and post docs who want more experience teaching, particularly in the online environment, and they can do that at (my institution). It's very attractive for their resumes.

Nonetheless, a significant reason why it is so important for these elite institutions to recruit premium NTT faculty rather than rely on tenured, campus-based academic theoreticians is the type of students they enroll as adult learners and professional studies students. Caroline explained that the students enrolled at top adult and professional colleges like her own expect to learn from real world professionals and practitioners who can provide relevant experience in the discipline they are studying:

Our online students are for the most part graduates. They’re older. Average age is 33 to 35. They are absolutely demanding about people who have current knowledge in the field. They’re trying to enhance their credentials. They will not tolerate somebody who has never worked in a working environment. They won’t; they’ll drop the class or leave the program.

Furthermore, in the case of elite adult and professional studies colleges like these, sometimes even highly regarded faculty from other institutions take on the role of part-time instructor because they want to gain experience teaching in a new modality such as online or they want to gain exposure to that institution’s approaches or models. Ben recalled in his previous leadership role at a highly regarded and successful, large state institution, he regularly recruited reputable faculty from other major institutions because his school offered them a chance to teach online while their own institutions did not:

When we started (his prior virtual campus) about seven years ago, one of our biggest surprises was we got top faculty from major universities all over the country teaching
for us and they've very consistently said the reason they were doing it was because they had no opportunity to teach online at their school because it was prohibited, and they thought it was really important to learn, so they came to us to learn how to do it and see what they thought.

This notion of requiring relevant work experience from highly regarded, accomplished professionals as part of the makeup of the NTT faculty at these institutions leads this exploration to the next subordinate theme regarding appropriate academic credentials for NTT instructors.

**Beliefs about degree requirements for NTT faculty.** Another subordinate theme that emerged from this study was the de-emphasis leaders placed on requiring terminal degrees for NTT faculty. The leaders in this study believe working professionals may provide equal or in some cases greater relevance and professional credibility in adult learning and professional studies classrooms than full-time, tenured faculty. Gappa and Leslie (2002) reported NTT faculty, particularly part-timers, are likely to teach occupational subjects and professional studies where terminal degrees may be uncommon or not relevant to the needs of adult learners and professional studies students. Therefore, another difference between the common social discourse on contingent faculty identity and the beliefs of the leaders in this study begins with the unique, contextual identity these leaders attach to the role of the NTT faculty.

While the holder of a terminal degree is the gold standard for traditional undergraduate and graduate college campuses, and certainly valued and respected by all the leaders interviewed in this study, there is a collective belief among study participants that in the context of adult learners and professional studies students, working professionals with a
minimum of a master’s degree in the field of study they are teaching may provide a better match to meet student expectations when education is a means to an end.

All the leaders in this study reported their institutions require at least a master’s degree related to the discipline they will teach, and professional success demonstrated through their work history and professional affiliations. Furthermore, the dominant discourse among these leaders legitimized the notion that high-end, working professionals with current knowledge in professional disciplines and sufficient academic credentials are appropriate to provide relevant, experiential learning for today’s adult learners and professional studies students. Because of the emphasis these leaders place on relevance and workplace accomplishment in terms of the needs of the students enrolled in their programs, they prefer working professionals more so than terminally degreed, tenured professors whose primary roles are research and institutional service over teaching activities and responsibilities.

Andrew reported that NTT faculty at his college must have a minimum master’s degree in the discipline and credible, relevant work experience, to be considered for a teaching role:

(We seek faculty who) almost always have an advanced post-graduate degree in a field in which they're teaching, as well as multiple years of work experience, depending on the field. We would never want people who don't have a Master’s teaching students who are seeking master’s degrees.

In support of the preference for hiring master’s level working professionals for professional studies courses, Edward pointed out that traditional terminally degreed candidates, either tenured or post-graduates, may not have the relevant work experience
necessary to capture the experiential real world knowledge required by adult learners seeking advanced certificates or graduate degrees:

One of the challenges for faculty on campus, of course, is that in terms of our environment, most of them may or may never have been a practitioner and so they don’t have that perspective. But they have something else to offer and I would never ever denigrate the role that campus faculty have in helping people to think and analyze and do all those sorts of things that they do really well.

Another leader, Denise, reported that it is important to look for both academic credentials and professional expertise when recruiting NTT faculty:

We would want academic credentials first. I don't think we've brought anybody on board who has less than a master’s degree. We are often looking for a doctorate, but we would take a master’s degree and multiple years of professional accomplishments as somebody who could be appointed as contingent (faculty). Only (a) master’s (degree) would be really rare. We would typically expect a doctorate or a terminal degree of another sort...

The theme that NTT faculty provide a different learning experience for adult learners and professional students than tenured theoretician-based faculty is heard repeatedly from the narratives of these institutional leaders. This leadership theme is understandable in light of the types of students enrolled in their programs and their demands for real-world classroom experiences. Denise reported high-end NTT professionals embed the relevance and quality into adult learning classrooms that adult students are looking for when they enroll at her institution:
(They) enable programs that serve the adult professional learner to be highly relevant through some instruction that comes from experts in the field in which we are teaching people. That improves the quality of instruction, enhances relevance of the material, and increases the perceived value, perhaps, and the real value and the respect from the students enrolling in the program that there are professors of the practice, people from the industry, also teaching in the program.

One common criticism in the dominant social discourse over the growing use of contingent faculty is the notion that NTT faculty are a source of cheap instructional labor for higher education. The interview data collected from participants in this study challenged this notion that the primary motive for using NTT faculty was to reduce the cost of instruction. Collectively, the leaders in this study reported their primary motive for using NTT faculty in place of tenured faculty was the professional credentials and credibility these part-timers delivered to the next generation of practitioners enrolled in the adult and professional studies classrooms, beyond the added values of scale or economy they provide.

Leaders in this study also acknowledged that hiring contingent faculty from the professional ranks provided scalability without diminishing full-time, campus-based resources. “The use of contingent faculty who are academics, for example,” Denise explained, “is designed to enable the programs to serve growing populations of students and not borrow away faculty from campus instructional objectives.”

Another notion that emerged from the interview data collected in this study is that these leaders believe that if an institution strives to be recognized as a premier provider of adult and continuing and professional studies, concerns such as institutional brand, name
recognition, academic quality, and student satisfaction, will only travel as far as the reputations and performance of the faculty carry them. Andrew described it this way:

    I guess my message is any institution that's going to be serving working professionals had better have current, working experience through the faculty members. Hiring contingent faculty becomes almost a necessity if we’re going to do our job in a professional education, a graduate education …for working professionals.

    Ben pointed out that one of the reasons that adult and professional studies colleges at Tier 1 research institutions do not have the same difficulties with contingent faculty that many other institutions report is that they have the advantage of being able to attract the highest quality teaching candidates from all three common instructor populations for one simple reason. Premium NTT faculty want to be affiliated with top flight academic institutions because of the cache it carries in their professional lives. Ben explained it this way: “here at (my institution), the greatest advantage is it lets us hire the best teacher for each specific course, as those courses evolve for adults.”

    Participants reported one interesting characteristic of NTT faculty was how open-minded and adaptable to change the NTT faculty ranks are in comparison to tenured or tenure track faculty. Leaders in this study indicated the attitude of NTT faculty typically aligns well with the ever-shifting demands for change in adult learning and professional studies. Caroline described it this way:

    We find that they (contingent faculty) tend to be a little more open-minded because they want to continue working with us. Open-minded in terms of being flexible about change, being flexible about the new technology, technological enhancements for teaching and learning in the classroom.
However, the conversation always returns to the relevancy the contingent instructorate provides these institutions in terms of access to professional skill sets and workplace reputations and connections that may not be readily available to these institutions on campus. Caroline explained further:

As I see it, as long as we're going to be educating students for work for careers that we’re always going to have to align ourselves very closely to industry and (we need) to bring those experts into our classroom, in whatever structure or way that we possibly can.

Ben put it succinctly when he concluded: “our goal is to give the adult part-time learner the best teacher for them.”

Beliefs about needs and motivations for NTT faculty. A third subordinate theme that emerged from interview data on instructor identity was the issue of motivation of NTT faculty teaching on a contingent basis. While much of the existing literature on contingent faculty is concerned with issues resulting from low pay for long hours, the social discourse of the leadership interviewed in this study suggested that it is necessary to read between the lines when examining the true needs and motivation for NTT faculty teaching in higher education. Because teaching on a contingency basis requires so much time and effort, these leaders suggested institutions may not be able to pay individuals enough money to make it worth their while, so other factors should be considered for motivating someone to teach voluntarily in this capacity.

Most of the existing research indicates financial compensation is low for most NTT faculty, but findings in this study aligned with Feldman and Turnley (2001), who reported satisfaction levels may have less to do with pay scale than other factors. The leaders in this
study reported various levels of financial compensation, some very high and some average, but they all agreed that the motivational spirit of the NTT faculty was high regardless of the pay scale. The common belief among all the participants in this study was that financial compensation was no more important than other aspects of the typical NTT faculty’s affiliation with elite colleges in terms of motivation toward high performance in the classroom. Caroline pointed out that sometimes NTT faculty are highly motivated by things that make teaching easier such as office space, on-campus meeting areas, and parking:

One issue (is) our adjunct faculty want a space on the campus. They want to come in and they want to get their notes ready before they go in the classroom and so on so they want a faculty space that they can rotate in and out of when they come to campus. It doesn't have to be a permanent home for them but they want a space that they can work out of as an adjunct faculty member. ...Some of them (are) online (and) don't come to campus but when they do they still want a place that they can go to as a faculty member to just get online. To get their class stuff organized and materials organized. Things like that. Even the people who don't come here often but come for faculty meetings, come for commencement, things like that, they want a central place where the contingent faculty, adjunct faculty can have a home. They can be in the college or somewhere else on the campus but that's what they're asking for. The second issue is the big issue for them, that's parking. A lot of times these people if they come to campus it's in the evenings, it's on the weekends, they teach at different hours... It's a big issue for them. Nothing else compared. Salary, benefits, all those, nothing else compared to having space and parking.
Once again such perceptions are entirely from the perspective of these leaders based on their administrative relationships with faculty and neither cannot nor do not conclusively reflect the actual thinking, feelings, or experiences of contingent instructors. However, these beliefs do provide further insight into leadership’s lived experience with the reality for contingent faculty on their campuses through their relationships with them in these academic communities.

Another motivational factor that emerged from the leadership discourse was the notion that NTT faculty are excited about working with adult learners and passing on their expertise to the next generation. Denise said the following about this aspiration:

The students are really good to work with. Everybody tells me that they're (NTT faculty) excited about that experience (working with students). Their peers on the faculty body associated with a particular program are very engaging and exciting to work with... All of those things are the pros (for contingent faculty).

Caroline repeated the notion that NTT faculty at her college are excited to be on the front lines of adult learning and professional studies and that they are especially excited about being aligned with a Tier 1 research university:

There's a pride to be affiliated with the institution and they are there for the holy trinity of the instructor of service and teaching and research. They really are there for the teaching part of that and that's what they get out of it. That’s the thing, they get a salary but really what they're getting is an affiliation with a world-renown institution and they're also getting to practice their craft with new people.

Pay scales reported in this study ranged from average compensation of $3,000 per course to above average pay of more than $10,000 per course or higher, with the most
selective institutions paying the most money per course to high-end NTT faculty. Again, however, most of the leaders in this study reported that they believed the amount of money they paid did not correlate with higher or lower satisfaction among their NTT faculty. These leaders felt other variables were equally important, if not more significant, to the formula for meeting the needs of their faculty. Ben believed his Ivy League institution provided lucrative financial opportunities for NTT faculty, but it was not the paycheck alone that kept their interest:

At (my institution), it's really good. We pay well. Many, many of the people we hire are on the (institution’s) payroll somehow, so they already have benefits, and so the contingent faculty (here) is probably one of the best (paid) contingent faculty jobs around the country.

However, Ben repeated that the institution’s brand was probably the biggest attraction for contingent instructors: “(my institution’s name) allows us to attract people who normally make $500 an hour and pay them almost nothing.”

Other leaders reported lower pay but high satisfaction among their NTT faculty. Caroline said her college pay scale is average per course, but the real reward for NTT faculty is being affiliated with a highly reputable academic institution, providing them with something more than money. Caroline explained it this way:

If you look at just the contingent faculty, the contingent faculty by and large are very happy with their affiliation (with my institution). They score very high in terms of the affiliation with the university with their experience teaching here… I think we do a lot to bring, to really bring people into the university at particular times so that they
feel very much a part of our success and a part of this student progression and success here.

Leaders in this study reported that pay scales might increase when their college or extension school needs to hire talent from among the tenure-track faculty on campus. “Sometimes we may recruit some stars from campus for engineering, let’s say or technology, and end up paying them (higher) when that happens,” Edward explained, “but, that’s not a standard approach.”

When the discussion returned to motivational factors for premium NTT faculty, the common conclusion among these leaders is that financial compensation is all relative depending on the institution. Typically, the faculty are motivated by more than just a paycheck. Denise added this about the pay at her institution:

For contingent faculty, the range is approximately, depending on how big the course is you're teaching, it's about $10,000 to $18,000 per course. From benchmark work that I've done, I understand that to be fairly high pay for a course but it is not high pay for the hours that it takes to teach a course. For example, if you're a lawyer billing hours, this is not sensible ... it doesn't equate to your salary at all. It's lower than some of the really high quality faculty on campus would receive.

Andrew described the social discourse on NTT faculty compensation at his institution this way:

I think there's always a sense of ... compensation is important symbolically. You still want to be paid what you think you're worth. ...I always found that giving a raise always seemed to be appreciated, even when it didn't make a whole lot of difference. Five hundred dollars more before taxes doesn't necessarily make or break anybody's
financial situation, but they do appreciate it. It's the symbolism of compensation that matters more than the reality of it.

Finally, Caroline explained that compensation is not a non-issue, but in general the NTT faculty look at things from a holistic perspective.

It, again, it varies by college …I can’t say they're satisfied but I can't say they're not. There's not a lot of difference in the perception of the contingent faculty versus the full-time faculty. There's always going to be an element of faculty who are concerned about compensation, so there's a small percentage of faculty (here) that are concerned about compensation. It's fairly similar when you ask the contingent faculty. So, contingent faculty aren't a lot less dissatisfied if that's the proper way to say it?

On the flip side, Denise reported that one of the disadvantages of hiring NTT faculty who are working professionals is that it is difficult to provide compensation that comes close to matching their hourly rates in the professional workplace. However, she added, for most NTT faculty their desire for an affiliation with a top tier academic institution makes up for any loss in compensation:

It’s hard to pay professionals from other work places at a rate that they may be paid in their professional careers. It's sometimes difficult to find quality people and assure quality control at the standards that the university expects. It's sometimes difficult to keep people.

Finally, Andrew summed it up in terms of how he views compensation and the role it plays in motivating part-time faculty: “Our pay is not high, but these people aren't feeding a family off what they get paid part-time;” he said. “It's very secondary for their lives.”
Relationship Building for Institutions and NTT Faculty

Umbach and Wawrzynski (2008) reported relationship building between an institution and its faculty is important because institutional work environments impact faculty roles and expectations and in turn faculty characteristics and behaviors impact the environment for student learning and outcomes. While the following evidence cannot definitively reveal what casualized faculty think, feel, or experience about their relationships with the institutions they serve, it does reveal the beliefs of these institutional leaders based on their lived experiences overseeing contingent faculty work environments. Along these lines, the leadership participants in this study report they believe the issue of relationship building in the context of their environments was about proper alignment of faculty, respect for faculty, and evaluation and appropriate support of faculty within the academic programs they serve. The following sections explore these subordinate themes in detail.

Beliefs about the value of NTT faculty. One subordinate theme to emerge from the interviews collected in this study was leaders’ belief in recognizing the value NTT faculty provide and acknowledging their contributions to the unique academic mission of the adult and professional studies college. Existing research provides evidence the common perception of contingent faculty in post-secondary environments is that they exist primarily as means for cost-control. This is accomplished by replacing higher-priced, more valuable tenured-faculty with low cost, potentially less effective NTT part-timers or full-timers who cost less and receive fewer benefits. Participants in this study acknowledge that NTT faculty, particularly the part-timers, afford extension schools and professional studies colleges some measure of cost control, but there is much more to the role than that in their minds. Based on the social discourse of the leaders in this study, the driving force behind their use of
contingent faculty is first and foremost the relevance and professional expertise working professionals bring to the classroom through work experience and the flexibility and ability to scale teaching resources.

Caroline explained NTT faculty provide the benefit of scale by enabling her institution to hire high quality faculty for in-demand courses and programs rather than limiting scheduled courses based on faculty availability. However, institutional motivation behind the use of NTT faculty has more to do with the relevance faculty bring to campus than simply economy and scale:

We go out and select the faculty that we want. We're able to bring in people with relevant, current knowledge in highly specialized fields. Whereas, it’s a disservice to our students if we don't bring in the best. And honestly some of the junior faculty do not have, they may have current research skills, but they may not have current knowledge of the field because the fields are changing so rapidly.

In other words, the relevance NTT faculty provide these institutions cannot be undervalued. Denise reported that NTT faculty allow her college to keep pace with trending careers and shifting employer demands:

(The) advantages are flexibility for the program. We can broaden our horizon of people who we can employ to teach. Again, relevance, I would say, (is important) to the program's objectives and the particular student population that we're attempting to serve.

Ben acknowledged that there is an economic advantage to hiring contingent faculty. “They're cheaper, and so it's financially more attractive,” he said. “I would say at the public
institution, the primary driver of using contingent faculty is the financial advantages. It's an absolute necessity in order to keep education affordable.”

But he re-emphasized the leadership chorus about the relevance and flexibility NTT faculty provide his extension school: “… our focus at the extension school is adults, part-time learners, and the nature of what they desire to learn for career and personal goals move over time…”

Moreover, increased student engagement is another example of the value of NTT faculty according the dominant discourse of this group of leaders. These leaders believe the experiential component NTT faculty bring to the classroom leads to greater student satisfaction. Edward provided the following perspective:

They (NTT faculty) play a lot more in the practice. They don’t have the pressure of having to publish. They are doing this in almost all cases for the love of the work. It’s not only for the money, I will guarantee you that, because they don’t get paid a lot, so they are doing it because they just love to teach. When you have people who love to teach they tend to do a really good job in my opinion. Students generally have a very, very good experience with them, which if they didn’t, that news would spread rapidly and we would (see a) decrease in enrollments.

Beyond the advantages of scale, economy, relevance, and engagement, NTT faculty bring to campus, they also provide value as a constant in the instructional workforce these colleges cannot afford or achieve by using only full-time, tenure-track faculty from their own campuses. Caroline reported the following example of this:

We've had very candid conversations about this recently. One is to insure that we have some consistency in teaching. We're able to have a sufficient number of faculty
in the classroom. With some of our tenured-track faculty who are heavily research-based they have a light teaching load because of their research.

Establishing the value of the NTT faculty ranks is a way of creating a certain ethos of pride and excellence in the work these instructors provide to the institutions they serve. Caroline remarked that it boils down to finding the best talent for your teaching positions and treating them appropriately, so they feel valued and respected. The rest takes care of itself.

I’m such a believer in finding the best talent that you can find in these various academic programs. If we have, for example, a brilliant global health program with international faculty, and we take students, even online students, (they) are (all) able to have international experiences and go to Africa and work on projects as part of their course.

As important as recognizing the value of NTT faculty is to relationship building, leaders in this study believe it was equally important to provide a sense of belonging and collegiality for contingent instructors. Therefore, this exploration now turns to leaders’ discourse on the importance of aligning NTT faculty with the academic programs they support.

Beliefs about alignment of NTT faculty. Another subordinate theme that emerged from the leadership discourse on relationship building was institutional attempts to properly align NTT faculty with the academic programs they support as instructors. The leaders in this study believed it is appropriate for NTT faculty to be hired and managed by the academic programs in order to fully understand the role they play and the value they add in support of unique academic missions, rather than centralizing faculty administration outside the academic programs as evidenced in some literature. Seminal researchers (Gappa, Austin, &
Trice, 2007; Kezar, 2012) reported the problem with this approach is that formal processes and standards for hiring faculty may fail to become institutionalized. However, the indication here is that these leaders are satisfied that the benefits of aligning faculty hiring within the academic programs outweigh the risks at this time.

Moreover, the leaders in this study indicated it is important for NTT instructors to personally connect with a person from the academic program they serve, connect with someone who is responsible for handling problems and issues that come up and to have someone to act as a mentor and coach for instructors. Throughout the narrative of the interviews in this study there is a strong sense of the importance of establishing a personal support framework for NTT faculty who are busy with professional careers and have limited time. Gappa et al. (2007) suggested faculty must feel satisfied and motivated by their work and work environment to ensure the institution’s quality and well-being. According to the leadership in this study, the most effective way to do that is to locate the recruitment and management for contingent faculty within the respective academic programs driving the academic missions for the colleges, as evidenced by the following interview: “We have the colleges make the decision about hiring the faculty,” Caroline reported. “They recruit the faculty; (they) hire the faculty. “

Leaders in this study also reported their institutions like to include existing full-time faculty in the faculty hiring process. Andrew gave this account of how it happens at his college:

Generally, the full-time faculty member would be involved in helping to recruit the part-time faculty member, so there would be that beginning of a relationship. Sometimes they might be recruited to be a facilitator in a big course. That might be a
way to test them out. You give them a smaller assignment first, then you might put them in a standardized course, initially, with a fairly established syllabus, and then eventually maybe you might give them an elective to teach, where they can do more of the design themselves.

Leaders in this study also reported college-wide guidelines used to aid academic programs in the hiring process are in place, so the importance of common practices and standards for hiring is not lost on these leaders. Additionally, some institutions employ further safeguards. Edward explained his institution has an advisory board that oversees the recruitment and hiring of faculty to further professionalize and standardize the process:

Those contacts are made (by) recommendation through our program advisory board. Our continuing education (people) are looking to find out who are the key people in the field that we (should) then ask to teach for us. When it comes to (our) transfer credit courses that we offer, those faculty (must) have their Ph.D. degree as they go on campus like tenure track faculty. We have to recruit three different times depending on the program. Regardless, faculty must be approved, whether its certificate programs, or in the (institution’s) transferable courses, it has to be approved by the academic unit.

Edward explained that the NTT faculty at his institution are direct reports of the academic programs they support, even though as Dean of the college, he and his administration may have the ultimate responsibility to provide the overarching framework for the design, delivery and support of the courses:

They (faculty) are linked to individual department programs in the extension (school). Their contacts are through our program staff who are their primary contacts for
working with us (but) academic leaders of the programs identify the needs and often identify the talent.

Another part of aligning NTT faculty with the academic programs they serve is by providing them with curriculum frameworks to work from or sometimes including them in some capacity of the curriculum design. Andrew offered this reflection of the types of administrative or academic frameworks in place for contingent instructors at his campus:

It varies by discipline. In some cases they have fairly standardized syllabi. In other cases they have a little bit more flexibility. Usually they're teaching something that's already been developed. They're usually working professionals whose maturity and dependability we trust. Generally, they'll meet with a full-time faculty member. As long as we have full-time faculty, we have built-in mentors, so that's very important from our point of view. As I said before, we would never have a program of just part-time faculty.

Furthermore, these institutional leaders believe in orientating the NTT faculty with academic curriculum objectives by providing the framework for them to work from without over-proscribing content and facilitation of their courses. Edward said the following of his extension college’s approach to design and delivery of professional studies:

We do develop the curriculum structurally. Some faculty are involved in the development of that but then most faculty are given a structured curriculum. Not a page-by-page read these lectures, but significant outlines of the content we want them to cover and then they are able to take that and run with it. We don’t heavily interfere unless we see signs of poor performance that (my institution) will get involved. Students are probably the ones who are foremost in their (the academic program’s)
minds because most of our students are practicing in the fields that they are studying in. So, they’ll be able to pick up pretty quickly whether someone is out of date at that sort of thing.

By establishing good working relationships between the faculty and the academic programs, leadership report being able to provide part-time NTT faculty with the opportunity to establish connections with full-time faculty and administrators to answer questions or provide guidance if needed. Master instructors provide oversight and guidance for part-timers. Moreover, advisory committees and administrators in the programs with the discipline-specific knowledge about the needs of the students are closest to the hiring process so it allows for the best candidates to be selected. Leaders in this study believed that by aligning faculty with the academic programs, it actually does enable them to provide standards for faculty by providing common syllabi, master course content, and faculty development programs including colloquia and symposiums to enhance the teaching experience for NTT faculty.

Beliefs About shared governance and academic freedom. The leadership in this study reported interesting perspectives about higher education traditions such as shared governance and academic freedom in the context of the adult and professional studies environment. The dominant discourse among the leaders in this study suggested the traditional levers emblematic of tenured environments may have less appeal and little meaning for NTT faculty at adult learning institutions. While the dominant discourse on relationships at large (Baldwin & Chronister 2001; Dworkin, 1985; Fulton, 2000; Hayrinen-Alestalo & Peltola, 2006; Kezar 2012) between institutions and contingent faculty often centers on the missing link of shared governance models for NTT faculty, the interview data
collected from the participants in this study suggest such traditions may not be contextually appropriate for the consumer-driven, delivery-focused marketplace of adult and continuing education and professional studies.

On the one hand, while acknowledging the need for inclusion and a sense of belonging for NTT faculty, most of the participants in this study reported that NTT faculty typically avoid involvement with administrative or programmatic duties, preferring to serve in teaching roles with no responsibility for campus ministrations. On the other hand, leaders in this study believe there is always room to better engage the NTT faculty in conversations about how an institution manages faculty, designs curriculum, or delivers educational products outside of the realm of shared governance. They do not believe a current lack of participation in shared governance diminishes their NTT faculty ranks. This finding is understandable given the unique nature of the contingent faculty populations these leaders employ and the popular opinion that part-time professional faculty tend to avoid expanding their roles in higher education beyond teaching. Along those lines, Andrew explained that there is little interest in shared governance for part-time faculty at his institution:

No, we don’t have any real interest in having them (NTT faculty) participate in governance. That's the full-time faculty who do that. They (NTT faculty) come to graduations, they come to social events, we invite them to Christmas parties. A lot of it is really the informal. It's making them feel like they're part of the community. Not necessarily part of governance. They wouldn't. I've never heard anybody even express an interest in that. They certainly don't have the time for that.

Denise agreed with the notion that at this time there is no movement toward including part-time NTT faculty in governance roles at her institution:
Their (NTT faculty) opinion is always asked for, but they don't share in decision-making governance at all. I would add one more thing to my prior answer though, which is mentoring students. I think that plays out after (completing) the program because sometimes students will return post-graduation to ask advice, or indeed, even to hire a person's company or their expertise for their own work.

Edward summed up his feelings about NTT faculty’s role in shared governance this way:

I think what we have is contingent faculty, are many different kinds of people and different kinds of things interest them. For some, they don’t want to be part of our governance structure or something like that. They don’t want anything to do with that. Even traditionally, there are only a small number of people who really want to do that. I think it’s an issue of trying to find areas that they might want to be involved with you in.

Ben also reported there is little interest in traditional shared governance for NTT faculty at this time, but he was uncertain if NTT faculty might assume alternative responsibilities at the management level in the future.

The bottom line is I don't know. They (NTT faculty) will not participate in shared governance in the traditional academic sense because the traditional academics won't give up power to them in that way. You won't see it as much that way. They absolutely need to participate in the management somehow, because they are a primary supply chain to all of us, and if they aren't managing that supply chain, well, we can't control quality, and so I think we will all end up giving a seat to them at some senior level in some form.
As for the notion of academic freedom, leaders in this study suggest the term may be misapplied in many environments and probably has even less meaning for faculty serving at adult and continuing education campuses. Edward reported the following:

From my experience, historically, I think the term academic freedom is totally misused on campus. That it’s used as a way to say that nobody can tell faculty how to teach or ask them to improve their teaching or anything like that when in fact my belief is that academic freedom is the ability of faculty to teach the content that they think is appropriate. It doesn’t have anything to do with the methodology they use.

Part of the reason, I think, that there has been a lack of accountability about faculty’s role with regard to students, is because of this concept or misconception of academic freedom.

Caroline’s institution was the lone outlier in the discourse on shared governance among this leadership group. Her institution has taken steps to include contingent faculty in the shared governance process as a means for enhancing NTT faculty relationships with the institution. However, the majority of these leadership narratives echo Bradley’s (2004) and Crellin’s (2010) arguments that an administrator’s best opportunity for effectively establishing relationships between the institution and NTT faculty may be to ignore calls to re-introduce traditional style shared governance models for this unique population. Instead, the move toward a top-down, direct, administrative approach should be accelerated, based on current evidence. That approach leaves NTT professionals free to do what they do best, which is teach adult learners and professional studies students. Baldridge et al. (2010) suggested adult and continuing education has always been powered by corporate-style
institutional governance, so the lack of traditional levers is not alarming to NTT faculty who traditionally are more focused on teaching than campus ministrations.

**Beliefs about evaluation processes for NTT faculty.** Gappa and Leslie (1993) and Kezar (2012) suggested evaluation processes should be part of the relationship between faculty and institutions. Furthermore, the evaluation process should be tied to re-appointment, and promotion if there is any opportunity for that in the context of the institution. While current research argues student evaluations are weak indicators of faculty performance, nonetheless, Kezar (2012) suggested a formal evaluation process can serve multiple purposes in a typical contingent faculty setting. The American Association of University Professors (2009) also indicated contingent faculty may be insecure about being too rigorous because students may submit poor surveys in response to challenging or difficult courses. This research suggests this phenomenon may lead to less rigor or lower standards in contingent faculty-facilitated courses. Along those lines, all five of the leaders in this study reported faculty evaluation is an important ingredient in the recipe for successful faculty relationships in adult and continuing education and professional studies.

Andrew provided the following example of how NTT faculty are evaluated at his college:

It varies by field. Sometimes full-time faculty will sit in on their classes. Of course we do course evaluations every semester. It really varies. If the full-time faculty are doing their job, they're in touch with the students all the time. If the students have an issue with somebody, they will have heard about it.
Another participant reported using student evaluations and professional peer evaluations where the academic program formally evaluates the outcomes of a faculty member's work. Denise described a two-fold process for evaluating faculty at her institution:

We use student evaluations to consider the quality of the faculty who are teaching, but we also have senior program directors who are close to the programs so would balance what a student would say against what a professional observer would say. That's a protective practice.

Ben reported using a mixed methodology that triangulates student survey data and course reviews with actual student grades to better establish instructor performance:

We do course reviews, we do student surveys, and we also look at student performance. Any class where the students all get As is a flag, even if they all get A minuses. Every class, every semester, we analyze grade distributions and flag courses where we think the grading might have been too easy, and then we actually cross-correlate grades and faculty ratings. ...There's nothing magical about it, and one big difference is we actually use it, and most institutions don't.

On another note, Caroline believes her college places similar emphasis on faculty evaluation, but does so using the typical approaches plus the added vantage point of considering student learning outcomes as part of the decision-making data:

(We) have course evaluations like everybody else, so we're able to (do that) through our institutional research office ...I'm almost sure that every institution has that, not that we're that unique. ...Student learning outcomes have been laid out... faculty can add to them, but they can't detract from them. We're monitoring what students are learning, in that regard. ...The data is reported to our institutional research (office) so
we can track that by faculty member, contingent, full time, by college, by section. We can track all of those things so we are able to track how well the students are doing.

…Our students pay a high price for their education. We want to make sure that they're receiving education in these core areas that we perceive are critical.

Denise pointed out that an important aspect of the evaluation process is making sure the data is collected and cycled back to the instructors teaching the courses:

We give them (instructors) evaluation feedback. We give them personal feedback. They see their student evaluations, but they also get feedback from the program director, both an administrative program director and an academic program director who is typically from the standing faculty at (my institution). The most important thing we do is we help them with pedagogy because particularly folks who are professors of practice, are not always people who have taught before. We're very careful about pedagogy because you can't just walk in and teach well.

Furthermore, based on the current research part of establishing satisfactory relationships between institutions and NTT faculty requires creating new patterns and policies. The beliefs of these leaders demonstrate a sense of importance for ensuring conventional approaches for aligning faculty with the academic programs they serve through orientation, evaluation and course reviews are done well. Moreover, once data is collected and analyzed, it is vitally important that feedback is conveyed to the instructors teaching the courses so they can make adjustments and corrections in the spirit of continuous improvement.

**Beliefs about faculty organizing and unionism.** It is impossible to explore relationships between NTT faculty and the institutions they serve without considering the re-
emergence of faculty organizing on today’s campuses. Existing literature describes evidence that unionism may surface when faculty feel unrepresented or disrespected by administration (American Association of University Professors, 2009; Birnbaum, 1980; Putten, McLendon, & Peterson, 1997). The leaders in this study reported no current union activity among the NTT faculty in their ranks. Furthermore, collectively there was a sense among these leaders that union activity usually emerges from a dissatisfaction elsewhere in the working relationship between the institution and faculty. Andrew gave this opinion: “I think usually unionization is a sign of something having broken down beforehand.”

The leadership participants in this study believe that faculty organizing is not something their NTT faculty are interested in at this point for a number of reasons. While the perceptions of these leaders cannot conclusively reflect what faculty think or feel about potential union organizing, these leaders believe they are aware of the needs of their faculty and they believe faculty are respected and treated well as a matter of course, thereby making union organizing a non-issue for their faculty.

Denise indicated her Ivy extension college may not be fertile ground for faculty organizing because it is small albeit growing. She believes her faculty feel well treated and respected, therefore, there is no need to seek the mediation of a union:

There's just not enough critical mass in some ways. I do think, and I'm alert to this, that treating people well, paying people as well as we can, and engaging them, so that they have the capacity to list on their sheet of accomplishments their teaching at a high quality university, that all of that goes a long way toward not provoke people towards unionization. They don't feel the need. They're treated well as it is.
These leaders believe that by understanding the needs of their faculty in the context of adult learning and professional studies, by respecting them, and by encouraging good working relationships with them, there is little need to involve outside decision makers to recalibrate their work environments. Edward provided this perspective about the lack of union organizing among his NTT faculty:

I have not seen any of it (union organizing) as in our instructors looking for something else. There is not a whiff of unionization or anything like that. ... Here is the thing, and there is just no doubt about this, there is a prestige associated with being affiliated with (my college). I will see bio instructors who have received award in their fields or something like that and they often mention in their bios that they are instructor at (my college). They obviously see it as a benefit of honor to do that. I think that the teaching and being affiliated with (my college) are the two by far bigger things.

Finally, Andrew expressed similar sentiments about using the benefits of positive relationships with faculty to diffuse any notion of the need for faculty organizing on his campus:

I'd like to think that our part-time faculty wouldn't even have a concept of what a union is. Of course, who knows? Again, it could change very dramatically very quickly but I'd like to think that part-time faculty should not even think about that as even a remote possibility. What happens is that some schools generate that vulnerability, which then leads to what happened in Washington DC and probably what's happening in other cities like Boston eventually. More schools become unionized. I think (our NTT faculty are) pretty well supported. We have our
orientation, we have manuals, we invite them to social events, sometimes department meetings, they know who the department administrators are if they have any questions. So far, they've not unionized, like (another local institution) have now I guess. So far, I'm not hearing anything about anybody being disgruntled. It can change very abruptly of course.

**Culture and Community for NTT Faculty**

One symptom of the growing contingent faculty phenomenon is the personality crisis gripping faculty culture at many institutions. This crisis, in particular, impacts adult and continuing education colleges since some of the literature suggests leadership re-make their academic ranks in the style if not the substance of the full-time, tenure-track academic environments of traditional campuses. Therefore, the third superordinate theme that emerged from the interviews in this study was leaders’ beliefs about establishing culture and academic community for the NTT faculty in adult and continuing education and professional studies environments. Leaders in this study report relying on a combination of respect, empowerment, and service and support to establish a sense of culture and academic community for NTT faculty, specifically in ways contextually appropriate for adult learning and professional studies.

The leadership narrative in this study centered on the belief that institutions should create a cultural environment in which NTT faculty are able to carve out meaningful roles as educators. There is a sense among these leaders that different academic cultures manifest themselves in different ways at different institutions. The leaders in this study provided a variety of examples of community to express their beliefs about this topic, although not all the leaders in this study believed they had adequately achieved this objective at their college.
Once again, while the following evidence reveals the beliefs of these institutional leaders based on their lived experiences overseeing contingent faculty work environments, it cannot and does not conclusively reflect what casualized faculty think, feel, or experience regarding community and culture at these institutions.

First, as the research from Gappa and Leslie (2002) and Gappa et al. (2007) suggested, these leaders believed it was important to fully understand and appreciate the role NTT play as contingent instructors and how they support the academic mission for adult learners and professional studies students. Second, these leaders believed it was important to foster faculty ownership of the courses they taught to properly empower faculty. And third, these leaders expressed beliefs that it was necessary to provide adequate training and support for NTT faculty to help establish a sense of community.

Beliefs about respect for NTT faculty. One subordinate theme related to establishing culture and community for NTT faculty emerged from leaders’ discourse on understanding NTT faculty roles and showing respect for the important contributions these instructors make toward their colleges’ academic missions. Furthermore, the cultural unrest unfolding at many institutions is not evident in the beliefs of these leaders because they feel they have consciously made efforts to understand the nature of the NTT faculty required to best serve the interests of their unique and demanding adult student populations. Moreover, they seem to have contextually positioned NTT faculty within their colleges to effectively serve their academic missions.

The leaders in this study expressed beliefs that the role of NTT faculty on their campuses was vital and no less important than any other teaching appointment, but the NTT faculty role also had its own unique characteristics, challenges, and requirements. Therefore,
these leaders believed it is important to fully understand these diverse characteristics and how institutions go about respectfully shaping such teaching roles to best align the instructors’ needs and expectations with those of the institution and its students in the context of adult and continuing education.

One part of the discourse on respect for the role contingent instructors play at these adult and continuing education institution is the labeling used to identify instructors at these institutions and the meaning attached to those labels. Some leaders in this study reported using unique titles for NTT faculty roles that they felt more adequately categorized and respected the role played by these teaching professionals. Some leaders relied on traditional labels such as part-time instructor or instructor, while others provided more empowering labels for NTT faculty such as Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Master Lecturer.

On the one hand, Caroline noted her institution uses more part-time NTT faculty than full-time, so they use the conventional term Adjunct Faculty to identify the part-time faculty and provide the label of Teaching Faculty to refer to their full-time, NTT instructors. “Teaching faculty are employed full-time but not tenure track,” she said. “It varies by college. We have more (part-time) contingent faculty than full-time teaching faculty, but they are increasing the number of full-time faculty.”

On the other hand, Denise’s smaller, elite professional studies program at her Ivy League institution had a unique label for non-tenure-track contingent faculty; she referred to them as Professors of Practice.

It is useful to note the composite for NTT faculty at these institutions as reported by the leaders participating in this study boils down to three general types of educators: tenure-track hopefuls from other lesser known institutions interested in teaching at Tier 1 colleges;
high-end professionals excited about sharing their experiences and expertise at the post-secondary level; and doctoral candidates or post-graduates seeking teaching experience. Furthermore, in terms of establishing community and culture for the diverse instructor types in the contingent ranks, another theme that emerged from this study is the notion that the NTT faculty, because of possible affiliations with other institutions, their own degree activities, or their day job requirements, usually do not want anything more than a part-time teaching assignment from these schools. “They don't necessarily want to be more involved with the college,” Andrew said. “As a matter of fact, they're not looking for a social life, but they're very committed to their teaching.”

Caroline pointed out the type of people hired into NTT roles are typically satisfied because the opportunity meets their needs and expectations. “If you look at just the contingent faculty,” she said, “the contingent faculty by and large are very happy with their affiliation. They score very high in terms of the affiliation with the university with their experience teaching here.”

Moreover, the established culture of collaboration, teamwork, and collegiality at Denise’s environment adds to the culture of respect for the NTT faculty:

The experience of working as an instructor on a team in a program is very valuable. It's valuable in whatever professional sphere the individual comes from, whether they're an academic or a practitioner, because it lends additional credibility that they were teaching in a particular program at an Ivy university.

Along the same lines, leaders in this study felt it was a poor strategy to rely heavily on instructors who were intent on making a living through teaching on a contingency basis.
“Ideally we’re doing something wrong,” Andrew explained about using aspiring academics too heavily, “exploiting that, and you're also, I think, harming your students as well.”

With that in mind, these leaders reported that the academic programs at their institutions also rely on some full-time NTT track faculty to lead and act as master teachers in these programs. While there is high use of part-timers to meet the demand for teaching assignments, no one reported relying entirely on part-time adjuncts to meet all their course development and facilitation needs. Andrew reported the following: “We would never use only part-time faculty. We don't have any programs that are 100%, part-time faculty taught.”

Another part of the equation in regards to respect is the notion of setting proper expectations for NTT faculty. The leaders in this study believed there should be a common set of expectations established on the part of the leadership and the contingent instructors who serve their academic missions at these institutions. These leaders believed the tensions created by unmet expectations or bifurcated employment systems at other institutions simply do not exist in their environments where affiliation with a world-renown academic institution is the professional prize contingent faculty may value the most. Andrew explained the part-time faculty climate at his college:

We rarely have problems with our part-time faculty. Typically a part-time faculty member would teach one course either semester or per year; we don't want them teaching much more than that. A full-time faculty member generally teaches three courses a semester. It might be less if they're more research active, or if they have an administrative assignment.
Andrew pointed out that his institution made a conscious effort to hire faculty who were specifically interested in part-time teaching roles, so their expectations aligned with the institution’s expectations:

I think it's important to disaggregate the part-time person (from) the people (who are) looking for (traditional) academic careers. Frankly, I never wanted to hire people like that. If someone comes in and says "I can teach anything. Give me as many courses as you can.” That for me is the worst kind. First of all, no one can teach everything, or even more than a few things. Secondly, we don't want someone who's that available and that needy. Ideally, part-time faculty see the relationship to their university as a secondary part of their lives.

Gappa et al. (2007) suggested that every faculty comes into higher education with his or her own set of expectations and experiences. These characteristics shape a faculty member’s understanding and expectation for faculty work (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995), so it is important for administrators to understand the characteristics of their faculty and apply a support framework that best meets the needs of the institution’s unique faculty makeup.

**Beliefs about empowering NTT faculty.** Beliefs about how to empower contingent faculty may take different forms. One leader cited the importance of providing NTT faculty with a place to call home on campus. She anecdotally recalled that these things may sound like minor issues, but in her mind nothing else compared to them for her NTT faculty. She said salary, benefits and so on, pale in comparison to the simple things contingent faculty feel they need to perform their jobs well. However, according to the research (Gappa et al., 2007; Kezar, 2012), empowerment must go beyond providing the little things. It means providing faculty with a sense of ownership over the courses they teach, autonomy to teach the courses
as they set fit within the department’s strategy for academic outcomes, and all this embeds a sense of responsibility in the NTT faculty to ensure student well-being and safe-guard the academic reputation of the college.

Andrew reported the part-time faculty at his institution have an affinity for the students they instruct. While neither Andrew nor any of the other leaders in this study can determinately capture what instructors think or feel in terms of the faculty-student relationship, he does believe instructors are empowered by the sense of obligation they feel toward their courses and students:

I think part-time faculty feel a sense of pride and again, it's very much related to the particular course and kind of student they're teaching. The more advanced and motivated the students, the more mature the students, typically the more engaged they are.

Sense of ownership may or may not include responsibility for the actual development of the courses; in some cases it does not. Academic programs may provide an approved syllabi for the scholar practitioners to adhere to or they may provide a fully developed course for them to teach. Nonetheless, there is a overriding sense that the NTT faculty are the most important intellectual and pedagogical components of any course according to the social discourse of these leaders. Ben provided an example of how his institution emphasized ownership of the courses by the NTT faculty who deliver them. “When we hire the faculty,” he said, “it's their course, and so we've approved the syllabus for inclusion in programs, but we really don't intervene.”

This sort of empowerment, these leaders believe, strikes an aspirational chord among the NTT faculty to help ensure a high degree of faculty presence and engagement within their
courses. Again, this sort of ownership may or may not reach right down into the course development process at these institutions (some may limit course development to master teachers as opposed to each individual part-time or adjunct faculty). The facilitation and delivery of the course as it corresponds to student engagement and participation, is entirely up to the faculty teaching the course. For instance, leaders in this study reported that some or all of the course design for their classroom and online courses are orchestrated by full-time faculty working within the academic programs, but part-time faculty facilitate many sections of these master courses. Andrew explained how his college approached course design and development:

We would never hire a part-time faculty member to develop a course that didn't already exist, unless they were so uniquely specialized and capable in their field. Generally when you first come in, you're teaching something that someone else has already developed and taught.

There is a movement toward the master course model among most of the leadership participants in this study, however, at least one leader still successfully uses a faculty-powered course development model. Ben reported this about his Ivy League extension college’s current approach:

For our unit, contingent faculty are hired to write a course or a series of courses, with no employment guaranteed beyond the course or short series of courses. …All of our faculty create their own courses. We have not gone (master courses), although we obviously will, because it's a necessity, some of the online teaching methods have not gone to a master teacher model yet, but we're starting to in places where it makes sense, like finance and accounting.
Another element of this sense of ownership extends to how faculty at these institutions are encouraged to embed rigor in their courses. Some existing research (American Association of University Professors, 2007, 2009) indicates that contingent faculty shy away from putting too much rigor in their courses because they feel vulnerable to student feedback. They fear poor feedback will jeopardize their continued employment; however, these institutional leaders expressed the belief that they have hired the right people and sufficiently empowered them to feel secure in their pursuit of excellence through rigorous and demanding academic requirements. Denise explained there is an emphasis on academic rigor by contingent faculty at her small but elite extension college:

   We come at it from the other side. If they're not demanding enough, they'll be at greater risk (of not being rehired) if they're not demanding… We certainly on-board people with an expectation that they will be rigorous and demanding. We make it clear that that's a priority.

These leaders also believe in respecting the sanctity of the instructor’s sense of responsibility and ownership of the courses they teach. Edward pointed out that he respects the role NTT faculty play by providing a workforce orientation that might be unavailable to his students otherwise.

   Especially with the types of certificate programs that we offer. The things that we offer are in business management and legal program, technology and engineering, entertainment studies and the art, education I think that’s about five or six of them. They’re all oriented towards the workforce and to professions. It’s not like we are offering history courses or things like that, except those (institution’s name)
transferable courses. For what we are teaching the faculty that we hire are practitioners and (they) are the best.

Finally, the leaders in this study repeatedly emphasized that their NTT instructors enjoyed the autonomy to teach courses with little interference from the academic programs. Therefore, on the one hand, there is a great deal of empowerment shown to the NTT faculty by these colleges, according to these leaders. On the other hand, despite the strides made in NTT environments at these elite colleges and extension schools, the interview data yielded evidence of a continued bifurcation of the roles played by tenured faculty and the contingent instructorate on the campuses at large. As one participant acknowledged, contingent faculty clearly do not command the same respect as traditional tenured faculty. Contingent faculty are excluded from certain practices on the campus like the ability to vote on any meaningful faculty agendas. They are still dismissed as less knowledgeable than the tenure track faculty. In other words, the participant reported, the contingent instructors at her extension school may feel like second-class citizens among the university at large.

This leads to another of leaders’ beliefs about caring for and supporting faculty. That includes providing proper training and support as discussed in the next section.

**Beliefs about care and support for NTT faculty.** According to the existing literature, support for NTT faculty is often lacking at many institutions. In response to this concern, Kezar (2012) reported that NTT faculty support frameworks should include coaching and mentoring, instructional design support, technical support, library support, and other types of infrastructure centered on what is needed for NTT faculty to be effective in the classroom. Faculty support is also on the minds of the leadership participants in this study who report that it is important to provide training and orientation for NTT faculty, as well as
provide ongoing support beyond administrative measures. Leadership in this study report that the role of NTT instructors at their elite continuing education and extension campuses focused on teaching and learning, not administrative duties, research and writing, or any traditional institutional-leaning aspirational activities. Therefore, the leaders in this study believe they hire working professionals to teach, above and beyond anything else, and prepare them for faculty orientation and support accordingly. Leadership participants cited faculty orientation, faculty manuals and handbooks, as well as social events, and department meetings, as proof of the support structure for contingent faculty in place at their institutions.

Caroline gave this example at her institution:

> We have a center for onboarding for all new faculty so they can be connected with peers who teach in their area. They are mentored by (other) faculty and the co-director of the center, who is actually a mentor. She's been a faculty member for many, many years. She has the ability to really help them become onboard.

Caroline pointed out that there are no mandatory training requirements, but there are many resources available for anyone who wants to take advantage of them.

> We spend a lot of effort on the front-end part of it. It just depends on what the faculty need and want. We don't have a lot of mandatory training for them, but we have a lot that's available if they're interested. We've got two courses on ADA compliance that they can take online. We have faculty development seminars in the summer and throughout the year that they’re welcome to participate in. There’s just, if faculty really are interested in engaging in that way, there are tremendous opportunities for them.
One outlier in the group was Denise, who reported establishing a mandatory onboarding and training for the faculty at her extension college:

For both our standing faculty and the adjuncts that we hire, we do on-boarding and professional development in the online space. Often people have either not taught in that space or if they have, they've been just cut loose to figure it out. They don't always perform effectively without cultivation of those skills. We offer courses and in fact we're going to start mandating that they have to go through the training. Most people who go through it are pleased (with it); they're happy to have done it.

Feldman and Turnley (2001) and Maynard and Joseph (2008) reported higher faculty satisfaction levels are possible when faculty expectations are appropriately set and met by institutions. Leaders in this study reported that orientating NTT faculty into the academic mission and expectations of the college was an important aspect of ensuring a good working relationship with contingent faculty. While the leaders in this study cannot speak definitively for faculty’s impressions of the service and support they receive, collectively, these leaders believed their institutions take the appropriate steps, either formally or informally, through academic mentorship, master teacher relationships, one-on-one meetings with academic programs, and more. One participant reported his Ivy League extension college had a large number of master teachers and a master teacher trainer ready to support NTT faculty at his institution. He also reported plans to establish a formal training program in the future.

Ben, who has just completed his first year, as head of his Ivy League extension college was another outlier on the subject of training for NTT faculty. He acknowledged that formal orientation and training is currently not available at his college, but it is an element he
plans to add to his support framework. "We do not (have it now), but we will over the next year," Ben explained. "Historically, we haven't done that, but we would like to do it…"

What Ben’s institution does provide in lieu of a formal orientation and training program is support structures for faculty that may provide a knowledgeable course producer who helps them assemble the course they will teach and prepare for the course delivery. Ben described it like this:

Not so much formal training, but every faculty member that's teaching a course for us is assigned a producer, and they take as much or as little help as they want from that producer. It's guiding them as they go into different modes and a lot online, or lecture capture, or just more active learning in the classroom. We will have much more faculty consulting support on technology-based tools for teaching. We will not standardize around one course type and teach all faculty only that set of pedagogy.

Another participant revealed her college used a resource center for on-boarding new instructors to connect them with colleagues who teach in their disciplines, among other things. Through this center, NTT faculty received mentorship from a more experienced faculty member. New instructors also begin a relationship with the instructional designers supporting course development and delivery.

Instructional design support was another area these leaders believed was necessary for supporting faculty. Caroline reported the following:

The (instructional designers) really focus on (training and course development)… they’re very professional. Most of them have master’s degrees or doctorate degrees. They talk about how students learn and how to really design the courses around how students learn. The faculty are orientated around the university’s student learning
outcomes. So regardless of what kind of courses they’re teaching, there are responsibilities and there are measurements around whether the students are learning the core student learning outcomes or the core student learning objectives. We (also) do on boarding for these individuals, plus we have resources and support systems online for them to access (on their own).

Another participant, Denise, reported similar benefits from providing training and instructional design support:

They (instructors) first go through a course that is offered online for faculty and they come into an online course as students with their peers. That course is led by an instructional designer. The four-week course takes them through tactics on the use of the LMS and on effective pedagogy in an online space. Then they typically would sit with an instructional designer to develop the online portions of their course. That becomes essentially a tutorial while development is occurring.

Caroline added this observation regarding the importance of providing training and support for contingent faculty, mandatory or not:

It can't be an afterthought. It's got to be very well planned and financed and orchestrated so I think those are the critical issues they sound so basic but they’re so, they're just so important, and I think sometimes at other institutions adjunct faculty are an afterthought. Because they're not there all the time they just don't think about the support systems that they need.

At Denise’s institution, where the number of faculty and amount of course sections delivered is much smaller than other participants in this study, she explained that formal
training and support enhance the relationship between her staff and the NTT delivering the courses, leading to better courses and a more satisfactory teaching and learning experience:

The outcomes of that (training) are that faculty praise the instructional designers, describe them as brilliant creative people. (Instructors) are thankful for the experience they had. They become essentially dependent on those people and often say things like, “gee, I never really had an opportunity to think about my pedagogy before, I feel like I teach better not only online but in my classroom teaching,” regardless of whether it's for our program or not as a result of having had a thoughtful experience about my course content and my pedagogy.

Along the same lines, the formal training and orientation at Edward’s institution is a must-have for his large course design and delivery effort.

We have a faculty orientation, instructor orientation, that we offer every quarter for all new faculties who are starting to teach with us. We have trained sessions that we put on about how we are moving from blackboard to campus. All faculties who are teaching online for us in the fall had to go through an online program on teaching on campus so that they can teach our courses. We provide a lot of support to faculty in terms of making sure that they have the facilities they need, the equipment they need, the training they need, the orientation that they need to work with us effectively.

These leaders believed such orientation and training help make the NTT ease into the cultural environment of these adult and continuing education and professional studies institutions, but it is still a long way from establishing a community for them. As Ben acknowledged during his interview, his institution has not done a good job of establishing
any particular culture among contingent faculty, although he saw the value of doing so in time.

The best answer is… we don't create a culture amongst our contingent faculty. They're all free agents. I think we do a terrible job of creating a community of that faculty, and I think we'd be better off if we could do that, but we've never even tried. That's probably more of a year three or four item for me. (I have to) figure out if there are any advantages to building the culture and community around these folks. Most of them don't want it. They just want to do this on the side of what they’re already doing…

Wickun and Stanley’s (2000) reported that contingent faculty work environments typically fail to provide appropriate support mechanisms for NTT faculty; however, the concierge support evidenced in the interview narratives in this study are emblematic of the fundamental entitlements much of the research suggests should be at the center of institutional efforts to create an ideal academic work environment that encourages faculty success and satisfaction.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to explore leaders’ beliefs about the contingent faculty phenomenon in adult and continuing education and professional studies environments in higher education. These are the beliefs of institutional leaders and cannot determinately reveal what faculty think, feel, or experience as contingent instructors at these institutions. Nonetheless, based on the dominant social discourse on contingent faculty among the leaders in this study, some overall observations can be made to help extend our understanding of this phenomenon.
First, it appears that the need to create a highly valued identity for the NTT beyond the commonly held perception of the contingent faculty ranks is of paramount importance to establishing equity, value, and appreciation for this important teaching role for adult learning and professional studies. Furthermore, the ways to make that happen begin with recruiting high caliber working professionals who are interested in an affiliation with a reputable academic institution, enjoy passing on their knowledge to the next generation, and have aspirations to teach beyond simply making additional income. In other words, the NTT faculty hired at these institutions desire something more than money from these teaching opportunities. Typically, their aims are aspirational in that they hope to enhance their reputations as working professionals, beyond moonlighting for an additional paycheck. They are looking for increased prestige to enhance their professional careers outside of academia as opposed to expanding their professional footprint in the academic arena. They are also interested in teaching working adults in their disciplines to pass on their knowledge and expertise to the next generation. Along those lines, leaders in this study believed that their NTT faculty typically are not interested in full-time academic careers, but wish to maintain their high profile, demanding professional careers inside or outside the academy and supplement their professional status and incomes with part-time teaching assignments at premier institutions serving adult learners and professional studies students.

Second, after establishing an identity for the NTT faculty, another important element is the need to establish meaningful relationships for them within the academic programs and the institutions they serve. One participant described it this way:
(We provide) the capacity to expand the relationships, so we build relationships from the university and standing faculty to industry and practitioners. There's a lot of advantages in that space.

Third, these leaders also attach significance to the importance of establishing culture and community among scholar practitioners but there was uncertainty about how well that is being done or how it can be accomplished. Nonetheless, Edward argued that it remains important to find ways to engage contingent faculty so they feel embraced by the institution but not overwhelmed:

I think finding unique ways to involve (faculty) in what the organization (is doing) and what we are trying to be. I’m also going to appoint a faculty advisory board for online programs and courses so that we have people from campus, and faculty from campus, also contributing to what we are trying to do and what we are thinking through. All those are ways I think that are intended to try to help, getting contingent faculty (to be) part of a larger community.

Finally, based on the narratives collected in the interviews these institutional leaders seem to stand apart from contemporaries at other institutions in the adult and professional studies arena when it comes to hiring and managing contingent instructors and part-time faculty. Their primary motivation for hiring NTT faculty is based on the academic mission of their colleges, student satisfaction, and student outcomes, rather than a financial bottom line. Finally, Andrew said this of the typical reason behind hiring of contingent instructors in higher education at large:

I think they're doing that partly for sinister reasons, because it's a cheaper way out, but also I think it's a lazy way out. I think if Jay comes in and says 'I know I'm
teaching one course, but I really could teach three, if you have them.’ You've now saved that department the hassle of trying to find more part-time faculty. It's the lazy solution. It's a lazy and a cheap solution, and neither one of them are reflective of the ideals of higher education.
Chapter 5 – Discussion of Research Findings

This study employed an interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) to examine leaders’ beliefs about the contingent faculty phenomenon in higher education. Through a qualitative research design based on a social constructionism theoretical framework, this study reveals significant themes centered on NTT faculty identity, relationship, and culture with the institutions they serve, based on the beliefs of senior institutional leaders. This study attempts to better understand the contingent faculty phenomenon in higher education, specifically in adult education and professional studies, by exploring the insights and perspectives of the leadership responsible for establishing identity, relationship, and culture at these institutions. This study does not determinately reflect what faculty think, feel or experience about the contingent faculty phenomenon, but rather it attempts to extend our understanding of the new faculty normal through the beliefs of senior leadership responsible for establishing faculty work environments.

This research was guided by the following question: what do institutional leaders believe about contingent faculty culture in higher education today?

After examining the research findings collected from participant interviews in this study, three superordinate themes emerged for analysis in this chapter: 1) leaders’ beliefs about identity for NTT faculty; 2) leaders’ beliefs about relationship building between NTT faculty and the colleges; and 3) leaders’ beliefs about establishing community or culture for NTT faculty.

As this study progressed, I was able to examine these findings through the theoretical lens of social constructionism to reveal how leaders’ beliefs about NTT faculty framed the
dominant social discourse about this phenomenon on their campuses and how it played out in terms of a socially constructed reality for NTT faculty.

I was also able to examine how leadership beliefs emerging from this social discourse compared with or extended themes in the dominant social discourse about this phenomenon in existing literature and public opinion. More conclusively, I determined that what emerged from the evidence collected in this study was the sense of importance these leaders placed on establishing context-based, organizational frameworks for identity, relationship, and culture that established certain characteristics and expectations for their NTT faculty workspaces.

Furthermore, the social discourse that emerged from the interview data collected in this study revealed a socially-constructed image of a context-based, cultural fit between working professionals employed on a contingent basis as NTT faculty at these institutions and what they enable these colleges and extension schools to provide for adult learners and professional studies students in terms of their academic missions. This cultural fit amounts to a manifestation of a higher order identity for NTT instructors, what I characterize as the emergence of the Scholar Practitioner role in the context of adult learning and professional studies.
Figure 1. Superordinate themes in scholar practitioner environments.

The iconic image of the scholar practitioner in higher education manifests itself from the intersection of research, professional practice, and education to create a unique instructor role (Sewall, 2005). The term scholar practitioner has a variety of connotations in educational practice, depending on the academic discipline it is applied to and how it is being used in a particular environment, but for the purpose of this study the researcher uses this term to identify highly regarded, accomplished, working professionals, such as business leaders, lawyers, engineers, accountants, architects, screenwriters, artists, medical professionals, and similar practitioners, integrating their professional practices with the aspirational pursuits of teaching and or research for adult learners and professional studies students. Furthermore, in this instance the term scholar practitioner typically refers to a part-time hire; however, it could refer to a full-timer who demonstrates substantial contributions as a working professional in the case of instructors teaching in schools of education or medical and science instructors who are working professionals with significant roles of teaching and research as part of their accomplishments.
Furthermore, use of social constructionism as a lens to examine this particular phenomenon not only focuses on the language used by leadership to characterize and identify NTT faculty working as scholar practitioners but also the application of practice as well. According to Burr (2003), social constructionism departs from the essentialist sphere of traditional psychology about a phenomenon and refocuses inquiry within the paradigm of how an event manifests itself from the discourse of social practices and interactions people engage in to create the commonly accepted beliefs about a phenomenon. This theoretical framework is based on philosopher Foucault’s view of macro social constructionism (1972, 1979) which examines how subjective reality is created from language, methods, and practice to determine identity, subjectivity, change, and power relations (Burr, 2003). The social discourses examined herein this chapter reveal language, methods and practices used to shape reality for contingent faculty based on the lived experiences of the participants in this study. This analysis of findings explores “metaphors, representations, images, stories, and statements” (Burr, 2003, p. 64) to paint a picture of the contingent NTT faculty phenomenon in light of the experiences of the participants in this study. While social discourse constructs the reality of a particular phenomenon in the world, there may be any number of discourses surrounding an object or event and each one strives to reveal the truth about that phenomenon, according to Burr (2003).

Furthermore, such social discourses are not considered the personal opinions of positivist theory; personal opinions are essentialist concepts based on one’s personality (Burr, 2003). In this study, I did not seek to reveal the personality-based beliefs inside a participant’s head, rather this study attempts to capture the essence of a phenomenon through
participants’ beliefs about the images, representations, and manifestations of events as they appear in the discursive system the participants inhabit on a daily basis.

To begin, much of the existing literature (American Association of University Professors, 2010; Benjamin, 2002; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2004; Harrington & Schibik, 2001) on contingent faculty depicts disenfranchised and diminished contingent instructors, labeled the invisible faculty by Gappa (2008). Such research provides a dissonant chorus of recommendations about how to use various levers such as shared governance, compensation, faculty organizing and other mostly traditional approaches to satisfy the seemingly unmet needs of the untraditional, emerging contingent faculty majority.

However, as Hamlet remarked to Rosencrantz and Guilderstein about his confinement to Denmark in the eponymous Shakespearean tragedy, “there is nothing either good or bad … but thinking makes it so…” This researcher senses such is the case of the socially constructed reality of the contingent faculty phenomenon in that it may be a crisis real or imagined, true for all or just for some, but it is just as it is thought to be, depending on the beliefs of the institutional leaders constructing the dominant social discourse about contingent faculty. Interestingly, the bulk of the current research on the contingent faculty phenomenon is equally ambiguous.

While the evidence indicates more than half of all instructors in higher education are now working as non-tenure track (NTT) faculty or employed on a contingent basis (American Association of University Professors, 2010; Baldwin & Wawryznski, 2011; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006; Umbach & Wawrzynski, 2007), the overall research findings as to whether or not this is a good thing or bad thing remains unclear.
The data collected in this study of leaders’ beliefs about NTT faculty mirrors the research writ large in that it supports some evidence-based beliefs about contingent faculty while challenging or extending others. More importantly, the data in this study reveals additional evidence of a socially constructed reality for NTT faculty that manifests itself to be whatever an institution makes of it, depending on institutional leaders’ interpretation about the purpose and value of NTT faculty as related to the academic missions of the colleges. This socially constructed reality for NTT faculty at these institutions leads to what the researcher believes is the establishment of the more definitive scholar practitioner model. This scholar practitioner type for adult learning and professional studies is objectified by the data collected in this study by a number of essential characteristics or elements of varying degrees of importance to this model, as shown in Figure 2.

![Figure 2. Essentials for Scholar Practitioner model.](image)

The weight of importance these essentials or characteristics carry for the scholar practitioner model in this unique context is demonstrated by their various locations along...
spheres of influence on the model’s center, as shown in Figure 2. Characteristics residing on the inner ring closest to the core scholar practitioner role hold the most importance and have the most impact on NTT faculty serving in this capacity according to the interview data collected in this study.

Furthermore, the findings in this study disambiguate some of the confusion around the nature of contingent faculty and relate to work from Gappa and Leslie (2002) and Gappa et al. (2007) regarding essentials that all faculty, regardless of appointment type, should experience in their workspaces. Gappa et al. placed respect for faculty at the center of this collection of essentials made up of equity, academic freedom, flexibility, professional growth and collegiality. Gappa et al. suggested that faculty and institutional characteristics must be taken into account before implementing any such essentials. Moreover, many recommendations by Gappa et al. seem geared for traditional higher education at large, not the unique adult learning and professional studies landscape. Therefore, consideration of the importance of high-level essentials such as governance, tenure, and safeguards for academic freedom must be contextualized for the unique environments of adult learning given this domain’s heterogeneous faculty populations, unique academic missions, and financial challenges and limitations, among other things.

The findings in this study bridge that gap between the existing research and discovery about this phenomenon. By aligning data collected in this study and comparing and contrasting it with the contextually relevant elements in significant literature, I categorized the collective beliefs of the participants in this study through the lens of social constructionism to reveal how their social discourses negotiated the complex characteristics
of this phenomenon to establish successful, scholar practitioner environments on their own campuses.

The discussion that follows in this chapter focuses on the themes revealed by the findings in this study and how they support, challenge, or expand upon the seminal literature about the emerging contingent faculty majority. In this chapter, I continue with a discussion about the researcher’s analysis of the findings revealed in this study. Then, in the discussion, I describe limitations of these findings and how the findings are informed within the context of these leaders’ environments. And finally, in this discussion, I close with implications for further study, how other educational professionals may make use of these findings, how I will make use of the findings in this study, and finally, a concluding statement.

**Interpretation of Themes**

Jones et al. (2012) posited interpretation in a qualitative study means clarifying, explicating, and explaining the meaning of some phenomenon as revealed by the data collected by the researcher. With that in mind, three significant themes about the leadership discourse on NTT faculty emerged from the findings of this study: 1) leaders’ beliefs about identity for faculty; 2) leaders’ beliefs about relationship building for faculty; and 3) leaders’ beliefs about establishing community for faculty. In a phenomenological study, the researcher seeks to inductively create broad themes or ideas from instances in the evidence that help interpret how the ideas revealed in the study are linked within a phenomenon (Jones et al., 2012). Along those lines, all three of these large themes are interrelated, context-based elements for recasting the NTT faculty role into the higher order scholar practitioner model manifested at the institutions led by the leadership participants in this study.
These thematic findings alone may not be entirely unique or significant since they mirror findings in the current literature. What is significant about the data collected in this study is the granular reasoning behind the larger beliefs in the social discourse of the participants in this study and how they support big picture themes for NTT faculty identity, relationships, and community at their institutions. A compelling aspect about the findings in this study is how the discourse of these participants simultaneously puts them among the thought leaders powering the common social discourse about contingent faculty at times and how at other times their beliefs challenge or extend understanding of literature-fueled trends, depending on the context of a college’s academic brand and mission in adult and continuing education and professional studies.

The following sections examine the star-crossed nature of leadership beliefs in this study in detail.

**Establishing Identity for NTT Faculty**

Non-tenure track faculty seem to be facing an identity crisis in U.S. higher education. On the one hand, NTT faculty, particularly part-timers, are characterized as low cost, temporary instructors, poorly supported and unprepared to meet the needs of students in the same manner as tenured faculty (American Association of University Professors, 2003, 2010; Baldwin & Wawrzynski 2011; Benjamin, 2002; Harrington & Schibick, 2002). On the other hand, seminal literature from others (Gappa & Leslie, 2002; Gappa et al., 2007; Kezar, 2012) suggest that, despite all these shortcomings, NTT faculty appear to be fully able and just as committed as tenured or tenure track colleagues. Which is it? Benjamin passed off such praise for NTT faculty as anecdotal attempts by his well-meaning colleagues to respect
the contributions of non-tenure track colleagues while soft-peddling the negative consequences of the growing use of contingent faculty.

However, significant research (Baldwin & Wawrynzski, 2011; Leslie & Gappa, 2002) compiled from multiple national surveys recast the NTT faculty identity in a different light that shows them to be a mostly stable component of the faculty workforce, largely with considerable teaching experience, bolstered by advanced degrees, and particularly well-suited to teach occupational and professional studies. The social discourse of the leaders in this study strongly align with the latter research that suggests NTT faculty are a stable and learned instructional workforce capable of fulfilling the unique academic mission of adult learning and professional studies. These beliefs relied heavily on the establishment of a context-based identify for the unique NTT faculty working as scholar practitioners at elite professional studies colleges, which leads to the next subordinate finding.

**Beliefs about faculty context.** Based on the interviews collected in this study, the source of the complexities between leaders’ beliefs about reality for contingent faculty at these elite adult and continuing education environments and the findings in seminal literature on this topic lie in the motives masked within the data collected by these many studies. As mentioned earlier in this study, one of the issues with some literature on the contingent faculty phenomenon is that it often originates from tenured faculty, faculty unions, or other proponents of the traditional levers of faculty power focused on shared governance, tenure systems, or equity issues at large. The sense this researcher has after examining the data collected in this study is that significant issues emerging from the contingent faculty phenomenon may be less about the inadequacy or inferiority of NTT faculty and possibly more about an emerging identity crisis at the institutional level of adult and professional
studies colleges and extension schools. This institutional identity crisis drives some institutions to reshape their own images so their faculty ranks appear more like traditional tenure-track environments (in style if not substance), and possibly without careful consideration about the cost of this makeover and the potential impact on faculty and students.

It is difficult to tell if such a makeover will be worthwhile for faculty since some existing research indicates the mold for faculty identity is not broken for most NTT instructors. Citing data compiled from the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF 1992-93), Antony and Valadez (2002) questioned if contingent faculty really were unprepared for and dissatisfied with their roles in higher education as popular opinions suggests. They questioned if NTT faculty really wished they were full-time tenure track faculty, were they more or less satisfied than tenured track faculty, and did many contingent faculty choose the NTT path because it allows them the flexibility and opportunity to teach while maintaining their rewarding full-time professional careers? The summary conclusion from Antony and Valadez was that contingent faculty were no less satisfied than other appointment types. Moreover, Antony and Valadez found NTT faculty to be strongly committed to academic work even though they may be dissatisfied with particular elements of their position. This research correlates to the social discourse of leadership participants in this study who reported NTT faculty at their institutions enjoyed a highly positive context-based identity as instructors supporting their colleges’ academic missions. This finding is understandable based on the beliefs of these leaders that their academic programs only hire highly reputable and accomplished in-demand scholar practitioners, which may disaggregate
these leaders’ faculty populations from contingent faculty en masse and contribute to the brighter outlook these leaders embody regarding NTT faculty.

Along the same lines, this study’s findings aligned with research from Martinak et al. (2006), who reported instructor ratings for contingent faculty were on par with full-time colleagues. Martinak et al. acknowledged in their survey of adjuncts working in Maryland’s public higher education system, that this may not mean part-time scholar practitioners perform better in the classroom, but rather “the currency of their information and practical application is different” from that provided by full-time faculty and no less valuable (p. 43). Moreover, there was a collective sense among the participants in this study that NTT faculty were adequately prepared and provided an appropriate teaching and learning experience for adult, part-time learners, in the context of what adult students desire to learn for career and personal goals. There was also a sense among the leaders in this study that such relevance and context-based appreciation for the adult learner might not be as readily available from the ranks of traditional full-time, tenured faculty. Once again it is important to consider these beliefs in the content of the unique in-demand scholar practitioners made available to these institutions based on their elite reputations. As these leaders readily admitted during interviews, the estimable institutional brands they carry enable them to attract NTT faculty otherwise unavailable to less recognizable institutions. Likewise, leaders in this study considered it a disservice to their students if they did not bring in such notable or accomplished scholar practitioners with relevant, current knowledge in highly specialized fields, which leads to the next subordinate theme of faculty recruitment.

**Beliefs about faculty recruitment.** Another area of concern in the existing literature regarding the identity of contingent faculty is the way NTT instructors are recruited by
institutions. Existing research indicates issues about hiring practices have risen to the top of the list of concerns over the use of contingent faculty. Some institutions try to meet demand to staff sections by hiring “the least expensive and most vulnerable candidates” (Gappa & Leslie, 2002, p. 80) rather than the most-qualified and relevant ones. Gappa and Leslie (2002) called this bottom fishing when academic departments are not held accountable for poor or inconsistent hiring practices. Other research from Maynard and Joseph (2008) indicated the issue worsens when the most available instructor is an aspiring academic really looking for a full-time, tenure track academic work instead of a part-time teaching role more commonly available in the NTT ranks. They referred to such hires as “involuntary” part-timers as opposed to Gappa and Leslie’s voluntary part-timers who are “specialists, experts and professionals” with primary occupations outside the academy. Gappa and Leslie referred to their NTT faculty archetype as “free lancers” or “career enders” who “prefer” to teach part-time, apart from their careers beyond higher education. Leaders in this study reported their NTT faculty populations are very much voluntarily teaching in higher education in the same manner with little or no interest in higher education beyond part-time teaching roles because of their lucrative and demanding full-time professional occupations. These findings align with Gappa and Leslie’s results, whereby leadership participants believe it is preferable to hire working specialists, experts or professionals who are comfortable with non-tenure opportunities leading to the manifestation of a high-value identity for NTT faculty that ensures the discipline-specific academic credibility, commitment, and quality necessary for high-end NTT roles in the unique context of these elite institutions. Leadership beliefs in this study correlate with data in the national surveys of faculty, indicating little evidence to support the popular image of NTT faculty as “under qualified, nomadic, or inadequately
attentive to their responsibilities” (Gappa & Leslie, 2002, p. 62). However, based on the evidence revealed in this study, I found the differences go beyond even that for NTT faculty at these elite adult learning and professional studies colleges. The image of the scholar practitioner revealed by leadership participants in this study portrays a higher caliber of instructor above and beyond the “career-enders” and “free-lancers,” or moonlighting tenured academics at other institutions as depicted in the existing literature.

The findings in this study create an emergent social discourse focused on the context-sensitive ability of elite institutions to recruit faculty who are at the top of their game professionally, actively contributing to the advancement of their professional fields, and are highly regarded among peers in the disciplines they teach. While such advantages in recruitment may not be so readily available to lesser known institutions where emphasis on recruitment may hold less significance and investment, the participants’ beliefs collected in this study unanimously confirmed Gappa and Leslie’s (1993, 1997, 2002) recommendations that NTT faculty should be considered vitally important contributors to the institutional academic mission and treated accordingly. Gappa and Leslie suggested that institutions should invest in NTT faculty through relationship-building, professional development, and community building, rather than “treating them like replaceable parts” (2002, p. 66), to ensure the successful outcomes demonstrated by leadership belief’s about the scholar practitioner model in place at these elite adult learning and professional studies institutions.

As Caroline reported during her interview, it is the primary objective of leadership to provide the best teaching and learning experience possible for the students. Caroline suggested that aspiration begins with recruiting the best instructional talent:
Why wouldn't we bring the most brilliant people in the world to the classroom? Either online, face-to-face, (or) video conferencing? Any possible way that we can, why wouldn’t we bring those brilliant minds to our classrooms and our students? We're lucky we’re able to have people have expertise and from different countries contribute to our classrooms and to our teaching and contribute to the dialogue. Why wouldn't we want the greatest experts in construction management? People who are running companies? People who, every day know what's happening in the industry? Know the nuances and changes? Why wouldn't we want to bring that to our classroom?

Beyond such intense emphasis on recruiting the right types of scholar practitioners, the findings in this study revealed significant insights on considerations for faculty satisfaction explored in the next section.

**Beliefs about faculty expectations and satisfaction.** Another area of concern with faculty identity is the popular depiction of disgruntled contingent faculty unhappy with their lot in the faculty ranks in both the literature and the minds of the public. On the one hand, existing research bespeaks of considerable contingent faculty dissatisfaction about low pay, little or no compensation for credentials, little or no support outside the classroom, and no inclusion in institutional decision-making (Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012). On the other hand, some researchers counter that despite these legitimate grievances most contingent faculty report satisfaction levels comparable to their tenured colleagues, depending on which aggregate of contingent faculty is under the microscope. Collectively, the leadership discourse in this study supported the latter opinion of contingent instructors, not the former. The luminous language around this finding has a lot to do with type of NTT
faculty in the ranks of the instructors at these elite institutions. Leaders in this study reported their NTT faculty, the scholar practitioners who voluntarily teach part-time, exhibit little or none of the dissatisfaction that popular opinion and some aspects of the critical literature report on contingent faculty. Furthermore, the NTT faculty working under these leaders are believed to be relatively happy with their roles because they fit aspirations of working professionals who enjoy teaching but do not want to increase their footprint in academia. Another element critical to creating this identity for NTT faculty is the importance of establishing context-based roles for scholar practitioners in adult and continuing education environments. The leaders in this study reported it was important to set correct expectations for NTT faculty according to the contextual nature of the college’s academic mission.

Whereas existing research indicates evidence of concern regarding the roles NTT faculty assume under typical employment arrangements with most institutions, Maynard and Joseph (2008) reviewed data from a “job fit” perspective, based on data collected from the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF), which revealed most NTT faculty do not harbor negative attitudes toward their roles in higher education. The leadership beliefs in this study revealed a similar context-based, cultural fit between what working professionals employed on a contingent basis provide institutions and thereby what these institutions provide faculty and adult learners and professional studies students in terms of their academic missions. This context-based cultural fit supports the manifestation of the higher order identity for NTT instructors as scholar practitioners as evidenced by the glowing language participants used to describe their NTT faculty in the data collected in this study. Likewise, Maynard and Joseph (2008) indicated that several factors influence faculty satisfaction, and thereby performance, most importantly whether or not the NTT faculty role
is consistent with the instructor’s employment expectations or desires, in other words, the instructor’s self-identity. This notion aligns with Feldman (1996), who indicated it is important for institutional leaders to take into account the desires of prospective instructors, rather than assuming that all potential instructors expect or are satisfied with a particular employment situation.

Furthermore, Maynard and Joseph (2008) suggested NTT faculty who prefer working part-time voluntarily reported “higher levels of work and pay satisfaction, organizational commitment, and lower turnover intentions than those who gave involuntary reasons for working part time,” (p. 142). Once again, leadership in this study revealed a unique emphasis on hiring scholar practitioners who preferred part-time teaching assignments in their professional disciplines that allowed them to teach in addition to their demanding full-time professional occupations. While the seminal literature encourages expansion of full-time faculty roles to improve faculty identity and student outcomes, the findings in this study indicate there are alternative paths to success by making hires appropriate for the unique context-sensitive adult learning and professional studies workplace. Based on these findings, the bottom line reality for NTT faculty at these institutions seems to extend our understanding of the dominant social discourse about this phenomenon at other institutions. In other words, NTT part-time faculty who are in that position by choice rather than by a lack of alternatives, are just as or even more satisfied and committed as full-time or tenured faculty.

Building Relationships between Institutions and Faculty

Another area of interest that emerged from the social discourse of the leadership participants in this study was the idea of establishing good working relationships between
colleges and NTT faculty. The dominant social discourse in the literature suggests that existing institutional frameworks for orientating faculty, shared governance, academic freedom, administrative oversight, and compensation are set up for past faculty models wherein most instructors were full-time and tenured or tenure track, not the growing workforce of part-timers that makes up nearly half of all instructors in U.S. higher education (American Association of University Professors, 2009). Some researchers suggest this is a problem because current frameworks exclude contingent faculty from participating in these traditions at most institutions, sometimes leading to faculty interest in collective bargaining. However, the findings in this study revealed leaders believed relationship building was more about alignment, expectations, and the aspirational finer points such as NTT faculty motivation rather than simply raising compensation levels or expanding participation in shared governance for NTT faculty.

**Beliefs about faculty motivation.** Existing research acknowledges the heterogeneous ranks of contingent faculty engage in post-secondary teaching for many different reasons, but concerns in the literature over relationships between NTT faculty and the institutions they serve indicate a disconnect between NTT faculty and their tenured colleagues and institutional administrators, thereby leading to the personality crisis and role confusion discussed earlier in this chapter.

Based on the interview data collected in this study, the disconnect between NTT faculty and the institutions they teach for begins with faculty motivation for teaching on a contingent basis. McKenna (2012), Maynard and Joseph (2006), and Rhoades (2011) all reported the value of NTT faculty should not be calculated in terms of reduced cost of instruction, but rather from an instructional context because of the discipline-specific
relevance, professional affiliations, and valuable work experiences NTT faculty bring to adult learning classrooms. Some of the leaders in this study believe likewise that the primary reason many other institutions rely on contingent faculty is to reduce instructional costs rather than improve the classroom experience. Typically, such faculty hiring results in recruiting the most available instructors who are willing to teach as much as possible in pursuit of potential for full-time academic opportunities.

Leaders in this study demonstrated that their faculty are more aspirational about their motives for teaching in adult and professional studies. While they appreciate reasonable compensation for the work they perform as scholar practitioners, there is more to the relationship than that. More often than not these faculty have an affinity for teaching adult learners to pass on their professional expertise. Typically, they are also looking to enhance their reputations as working professionals by being affiliated with a Tier 1 research university than collecting another paycheck. Therefore, these faculty are inspired to teach adult learners because institutional leaders place an emphasis on the high value these instructors bring to the classroom both aspirationally and professionally. This tangible recognition of one’s value as an instructor by senior leadership goes a long way toward eliminating the sense of powerlessness, confusion, and alienation NTT faculty report in literature calling for radical change in the treatment of contingent faculty (American Association of University Professors, 2003, 2009, 2013; Kezar, 2012). Evidence of recognition and respect for NTT faculty also shows regard for their equitable treatment because it acknowledges these faculty members come to work with a unique set of motivations and expectations, according to Kezar (2012).
Beliefs about faculty compensation. Another hot button in the social discourse about working relationships between NTT faculty and colleges is the topic of financial compensation levels for contingent faculty. The leadership in this study provided an interesting twist on that conversation. Most of the existing research indicates financial compensation is low for most NTT faculty (CAW, 2012). Wickun and Stanley (2000) suggested contingent faculty should be paid more across the board to elevate their standing among tenured colleagues and raise their own level self-worth; however, the findings in this study aligned with Feldman and Turnley (2001), who reported pay scale may mean less to NTT faculty than other factors.

The leaders in this study reported various levels of financial compensation, some very high and some average, but they all agreed that the morale of their NTT faculty was high regardless of the pay scale. The findings in this study supported the notion that while it is necessary to pay a reasonable salary for NTT faculty teaching on a contingent basis, the allure of this sort of teaching activity cannot be measured solely on the amount of money an institution is willing to pay. Because leaders in this study believed their contingent faculty are less reliant on their part-time teaching incomes due to financially rewarding full-time careers, it is understandable that financial compensation would seem less important to these leaders. Leadership participants in this study believed the issue of relationship building in their environments was more about proper alignment of, respect for, and support of scholar practitioners within the academic programs they support, rather than greater financial compensation.

Leadership beliefs in this study aligned with Kezar’s idea (2004) that relationship building within the NTT ranks is more about demonstrating leadership and establishing trust
between faculty and the administration of the institution by providing essential elements within the workplace environment, rather than larger paychecks. Such an emphasis on establishing trust between the institution and the NTT faculty serving their academic missions relates to Gappa et al.’s (2007) research on the essentials for faculty success, which places trust in the institution at the center of all other requirements.

Beliefs about faculty evaluation. Another area of concern in the dominant social discourse of the literature is the apparent lack of standard and formal evaluation processes for contingent faculty at many institutions and how this diminishes the working relationship between faculty and the institutions they serve. However, leaders’ beliefs in this study aligned with the significant research (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kezar, 2012) that evaluation processes are mandatory for strengthening relationships between faculty and institutions. Furthermore, the evaluation process should be tied to re-appointment for faculty, and promotion, if there is any opportunity for that in the context of the institution. Moreover, evaluation processes should be monitored by academic programs overseeing the faculty and include feedback channels to report results to NTT faculty in to ensure continuing improvement (Kezar, 2012).

Correlating to this research, the leaders in this study reported mandating evaluation processes but they are not always uniform in approach and may vary from department to department. Sometimes, full-time faculty also attend an instructor’s class to evaluate performance. All the participants reported using student evaluations at the end of every semester. One participant reported using student evaluations and professional peer evaluations whereby the academic program formally evaluates the outcomes of a faculty member's work. Another participant reportedly planned to implement formal reviews of
contingent instructors by full-time staff or instructors within the next year to supplement the student surveys they currently use, so that they collect data points on instructor performance beyond student feedback.

The important takeaway from this data is that the leadership discourse in this study suggests NTT instructors should receive feedback on their performance to better align their instructional activities with the academic mission of the college. Evaluation feedback also improves the relationship between the college and the faculty by emphasizing their responsibilities for the important roles they play in support of the academic mission and also emphasize the institution’s expectations for their performance.

**Beliefs about shared governance.** The analysis of leadership beliefs herein revealed a sense of urgency for setting expectations and providing opportunities for NTT faculty to properly support the scholar practitioner model. This finding supports the dominant discourse in the current literature from Gappa et al. (2007) and Kezar (2012) that it is important to acclimate faculty in the evolving environment of the contingent ranks in higher education. All the participants in this study reported the role of the scholar practitioner at their adult and continuing education and extension campuses focused on teaching and learning, not administrative duties, research, and writing, or any traditional institutional-leaning aspirational activities alluded to in existing research. These leaders believed that they hired scholar practitioners to teach beyond anything else and set such expectations accordingly.

In fact, some participants made it clear that because NTT faculty were highly successful professionals teaching voluntarily, typically they were not looking for a full-time career in the academy, greater participation in governance, or “a social life,” with the
institution. This finding contradicts calls in the literature for greater opportunities for NTT participation in the traditional academy from Kezar (2012), Gappa and Austin (2010), and others. However, it was congruent with findings from Feldman and Turnley (2001) and Maynard and Joseph (2008) who reported high satisfaction levels and good classroom performance when NTT faculty expectations are appropriately set and met accordingly by institutions. Here again, proponents of the traditional levers of the academy have reached back into the past to identify potential resolutions for improving contemporary institutional relationships for NTT faculty. Gappa and Austin (2010) recalled that calls for shared governance originated with the 1966 the Statement on Governance of Colleges and Universities which recommended faculty participation in governance included curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and any other aspects related to the educational process. Gappa and Austin argued this statement makes it clear that faculty should participate in shared governance activities, however, such calls seemed aimed at contingent faculty who aspire to deeper involvement with the ministrations of the institutions they serve. Based on the discourse of the leaders in this study, such approaches may not be appropriate for majority of NTT faculty teaching part-time, particularly the scholar practitioners teaching at elite adult learning and professional studies colleges.

As reported in the literature review, some of the existing research (Baldridge et al., 2010) suggests shared governance is already barely recognizable at most adult and continuing education institutions and other research (Birnbaum, 2004) describes shared governance as so cumbersome and inefficient there is little room for it in competitive higher education marketplaces like adult learning and professional studies. Nonetheless, some seminal literature (Baldridge et al., 2010; Birnbaum, 2004) suggest institutional leaders
consider moving even further away from traditional notions of faculty power such as shared governance, while other significant research argues for moving toward it. Considering that academic aspirants most likely to be interested in greater involvement in governance make up as little as 17% of the overall contingent workforce (CAW, 2012), it is questionable if greater participation in governance and other traditional activities will provide much benefit to the contingent faculty population at large.

**Beliefs about unionism.** Finally, a swell of recent union activities on many college campuses, particularly among NTT faculty, has raised concerns in the common social discourse about the conditions for contingent faculty and why faculty have decided to take their complaints to the union hall instead of the administration of the colleges they serve. The leaders in this study felt that there was little interest in union activity on their campuses at this time because they have done a good job of maintaining strong relationships with their faculty and empowering them with a strong, valuable identity as a scholar practitioner while continuing to work on the framework for an evolving academic community of scholars among the contingent faculty.

Gilmore (1981) long ago reported the demise or disappearance of shared governance might cause contingent faculty to view unionism as their only safeguard to ensure satisfactory working conditions. However, based on the existing research and the collective beliefs of the leaders in this study, increased union activity is not a fait accompli at colleges relying on contingent faculty. The fact is only about 21% of institutions have faculty unions (American Association of University Professors, 2009) and the most prestigious institutions and most private colleges and universities remain non-union (Delaney, 2014). Moreover, Dobbie and Robinson (2008) suggest that there is little correlation between faculty
organizing and high use of contingent faculty at an institution. Other factors weigh more heavily on the faculty decision to organize beyond the casualization of the instructorate. The literature on this topic (Birnbaum, 1980; Putten, McLendon, & Peterson, 1997) suggest faculty seek out union organizing during times of conflict and that unionized faculty sometimes lead to an adversarial atmosphere on campus between faculty and administrators.

The leaders in this study suggested interest in union organizing indicates there is an apriori problem with the relationship between the NTT faculty and the institution. Because the leaders in this study have demonstrated effective strategies for establishing identity for NTT faculty and building relationships with them, it is likely they silenced or at least deferred the conversation on the need for collective bargaining at their institutions, while other schools and colleges have not. Since completing the interviews in this study, at least one institution led by a study participant has seen the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) file a petition with the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) to hold an election to establish union representation for the part-time faculty on its campus. The NLRB will conduct voting to determine whether a majority of eligible part-time faculty want to remain union free or be represented by a third-party union on campus.

Creating an Academic Community or Culture for NTT faculty

Building on the themes of identity and working relationships for contingent faculty, the leadership discourse in this study also suggest the importance of establishing a sense of academic community or culture. This sense of importance about academic community is not only evident in this study but it also is identified as an essential element for faculty success according to seminal literature on contingent faculty from Kezar (2012), Gappa et al. (2007) and others. Gappa et al. report many of the factors affecting higher education,
fiscal challenges, calls for accountability, shifting faculty responsibilities, increasing workloads and changing or disappearing governance models mean fewer administrators and faculty get to see the big picture in higher education from the inside out. This means it is more difficult than ever to create a sense of academic community, particularly for adult learning and professional studies. Kezar (2012) suggested a sense of academic community must emerge from an institutional framework of integration, communication, collaboration, and support for NTT faculty. The failure to appropriately integrate NTT faculty into the intellectual life of the departments and colleges they serve only leads to a deepening of the rift of an already bifurcated faculty work environment at many institutions. My sense is that much of the source of the luminous language around a sense of faculty satisfaction and belonging that leaders in this study engendered, emanated from their belief that the instructors they hired expected or even desired less involvement with the institution because of the demands placed on them from their full-time careers. Such beliefs may not be transferable to other institutions in adult learning with various faculty populations. Nonetheless, the leaders in this study agreed with the research that a vibrant sense of academic community is desirable and NTT faculty appreciate opportunities and occasions to interact with colleagues, but how to do that and how far to go with it is a matter of debate among these leaders of adult and continuing education and professional studies institutions.

Beliefs about NTT faculty performance. Based on the finding in this study another a good place to start building a foundation for academic community is by acknowledging the academic performance of NTT faculty in support of the college’s academic mission. Within the context-based role for NTT faculty, leaders in this study contradict popular opinion fueled by existing research (AAUP, 2009) indicating potential low classroom effectiveness of
contingent faculty. These leaders unanimously reported NTT faculty can be just as effective as tenured instructors and provide even more relevance in the proper context for adult learners, correlating with existing research from Baldwin and Wawrzynski (2011). The leadership findings revealed in this study regarding teaching and learning performance for NTT faculty align with Umbach and Wawrzynski (2007) in that there is little conclusive evidence to show that NTT faculty have a negative impact on student learning. Based on the data collected in this study, institutional community coupled with the professional experiences and passion for teaching NTT faculty provide helps establish the platform for the scholar practitioner identity to fully emerge. All this is based on the recognized professional qualifications of faculty, motivational aspects, and appropriately set expectations by the institution, all aligned in the proper context for adult and professional studies environments by senior leadership.

Beliefs about NTT faculty support. Leadership beliefs in this study also supported Kezar’s (2012) finding that NTT faculty support frameworks should include proper orientation, opportunities for engagement and collaboration with colleagues, coaching and mentoring, instructional design support, technical support, library support, and other types of infrastructure centered on what NTT faculty require to be effective in the classroom. Evidence of support frameworks at the institutions led by the leadership participants in this study contradicted Wickun and Stanley’s (2000) complaint that many contingent faculty environments failed to provide such support mechanisms. Evidence of faculty orientations, faculty manuals and handbooks, social events, and in some cases, department meetings and committee assignments sampled from this study exemplify the support structures for contingent faculty in place at these institutions.
Furthermore, one participant described the personalized support her college provided NTT faculty, citing the positive welcoming experience of a recent NTT faculty hire. She explained how she called the instructor personally to invite him to teach and to describe the program to him. The instructor met with department chairs and deans in the academic unit associated with the program. The end result was the instructor had a genuine sense of being respected, wanted by the college, and effectively supported by this demonstration of support, all personalized for his needs. Such concierge support displayed by this college was emblematic of the fundamental entitlements Gappa et al. (2007) suggested should be at the center of institutional efforts to create an ideal academic work environment that encourages faculty success and satisfaction.

**Beliefs about NTT faculty empowerment.** Part of aligning NTT faculty within the contextual framework of a college’s academic mission requires leadership to appropriately empower faculty. Leaders’ beliefs in this study echoed the sense of importance of establishing critical elements of empowerment such as autonomy and respect for contingent faculty contextually in the college’s culture. In the context of adult and continuing education and professional studies environments, leadership in this study believed this means providing faculty with a sense of ownership over the courses they teach and the autonomy to teach the courses as they set fit within the department’s strategy for academic outcomes.

For instance, it is interesting that leaders in this study supported master course models, but not simply from the perspective of cost-savings or concern for the course development quality provided by part-time faculty, but more so from the perspective of respect for the time constraints premium part-time scholar practitioners live within and the practicality of more appropriate resources providing this function in the operational chain, rather than
expecting busy teaching professionals to design and develop courses from soup to nuts in their spare time.

**Beliefs about NTT faculty positionality.** In order to set the groundwork for a sense of academic community, the leadership discourse in this study reported it is important for leaders to position faculty properly and contextually within the institution’s academic mission. With that in mind, I found that leadership beliefs in this study aligned well with Gappa et al.’s perspective that it is important to contextually position NTT faculty within their colleges to effectively serve their academic missions. Such research suggests that every faculty member comes into higher education with his or her own set of expectations and experiences. These characteristics shape a faculty member’s understanding and expectation for faculty work (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995). Therefore, it is important for leadership and administrators to understand the characteristics of their faculty in the same manner the leaders in this study believe they do and likewise apply essential elements that best meet the needs of the institution’s unique faculty makeup and align them with the institution’s unique academic mission.

Along the same lines, an important aspect of positionality depends on leadership beliefs about trust and respect for contingent faculty. The interview data revealed in this study correlate to Pope’s (2004) research on the need for trust between colleges and faculty. Pope pointed out that organizations that demonstrate positive relationships between faculty and administrators are likely to have more successful outcomes, which is at the essence of the leadership ethos expressed by participants in this study. Moreover, existing research suggests a strong academic community that demonstrates value and inclusion for NTT faculty adds to the intellectual vibrancy of a college, builds on the relationship between the
college and faculty, and further empowers the faculty identity, all which enhance the climate for students’ learning (Gappa et al., 2007).

Conclusion

The findings in this study closely relate to arguments from Bradley (2004) and Crellin (2010) that an administrator’s best opportunity for effectively leading NTT faculty may be to ignore calls to re-introduce traditional levers such as shared governance models for this unique population and instead accelerate the move toward a top-down, direct, administrative approach that leaves NTT scholar practitioners free to do what they do best, which is teach adult learners and professional studies students. The leadership discourse in this study reports that it is important to align NTT faculty with the true sense of the academic missions of adult learning and professional colleges and avoid the distraction of calls for returns to traditional regalia of higher education designed for different faculty and different times.

Such findings aligned well with research from Baldridge et al. (2010), that adult and continuing education is commonly and appropriately driven by corporate-style management, rather than traditional institutional governance models, so the lack of traditional levers is not alarming to voluntary NTT faculty who are more focused on the classroom than campus ministrations. Moreover, there was a tangible sense of appreciation among the leaders of these premier adult and continuing education and professional studies colleges for the wisdom of Birnbaum’s (2004) suggestion that the farther an institution ventures from the academic pole of a traditional research institution toward the market-driven, consumer-oriented pole of alternative education on the continuum of higher education, the more appropriate it may be to dismiss calls for traditional approaches to faculty identity, relationships, and academic community. Ultimately, it is important to remember that the data
collected in this study focused on senior leadership’s perceptions of the contemporary contingent faculty experience, however, such evidence cannot and does not actually reflect what casualized faculty really experience, think, or feel as this phenomenon evolves in adult learning and continuing education. Such a limitation must be triangulated with the large existing supplement of literature generated on the perspective of the contingent faculty by themselves or their proponents. This study merely provided additional but previously overlooked evidence from the perspective of senior leadership.

**Implications for Further Research**

The intellectual goals for this study centered on revealing what senior leadership at elite adult and continuing education and professional studies colleges believed about the contingent faculty phenomenon. Using examples of the social discourse of five senior administrators, I attempted to reveal leaders’ belief about how contingent faculty fit in the evolving post-secondary education landscape, what roles they play, and how their contributions are valued by the institutions they serve from the context of adult and professional studies environments. By doing so, I hoped to reveal significant themes about contingent faculty and identify significant characteristics of this growing phenomenon specifically in terms of adults and professional studies environments. I hoped to extend intellectual goals achieved by existing research by identifying new opportunities for exploration and identify characteristics of effective practice, from leadership’s perspective, that aligned with or extended existing research on this phenomenon in the dominant socially-constructed discourse about contingent faculty in U.S. higher education. I identified the following opportunities for future research based on the evidence collected in this study.

**Need for Research Disaggregated by Faculty Type**
This study revealed evidence that leaders’ beliefs at elite adult and continuing education and professional studies colleges are in alignment with significant themes in the current literature. They believed faculty represent the most important intellectual property an institution. They also believed faculty represent the institution’s best opportunity to ensure high quality and excellence in teaching and learning and enhancement of social well-being. That being said, much of the existing research fails to precisely disaggregate NTT faculty types appropriately between academic aspirants seeking traditional-oriented full-time careers in higher education and the majority of NTT faculty who teach part-time in addition to their primary discipline-specific professional careers. Therefore, I recommend future research attempt to disaggregate faculty types more precisely to provide more granular evidence of identity, working relationships, and culture and academic community, specifically in adult learning and professional studies. More research should specifically focus on institutions part-time scholar practitioners working in adult learning since literature reports this space, made up of students age 25 and older, is outpacing the number of traditional age undergraduates in percentage increases (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013).

**Need to Disaggregate Research by Institution Type**

The existing literature’s dominant social discourse on how to mediate issues with contingent faculty often seems tilted toward conventional undergraduate or graduate environments and aspiring academics seeking traditional full-time careers in the academy. Much of the existing literature reveals the need for equity, inclusion, autonomy, collegiality, opportunity, and most of all, greater respect for contingent faculty. However, while the literature acknowledges the contingent faculty population is a mixed bag of scholar professionals, aspiring academics, moonlighting full-time tenured faculty, all serving various
academic missions from an institutional context, it often fails to disaggregate beyond categorizing results from two-year colleges and four-year institutions, public or private. This failure makes it difficult for subsequent researchers to author comprehensive, conclusive narratives that properly depict the diverse nature of this growing phenomenon for specific faculty populations.

The literature insufficiently addresses the needs of colleges employing the many dedicated part-time professionals working in adult learning and professional studies who have no interest in expanding their footprint in the traditional academy. What this means is that while the existing literature acknowledges a bifurcated system of faculty equity and opportunity in higher education, it does not sufficiently apply such disaggregation required to adequately examine the disparate issues for the various groups in the heterogeneous ranks of contingent faculty at the various institutions they serve according to unique academic missions. Administrators and proponents of adult learning and professional studies must begin to provide additional research to adequately provide a foundation of context-sensitive data specifically on contingent faculty working in adult and professional studies environments to advance this field.

**Limitations of This Study**

The question of sample size is always an issue in research studies, particularly qualitative ones where as few as three participants is considered adequate for meaningful research findings. This research was well within the acceptable sample size for a qualitative study with five participants, however, the focus of this study was specifically on adult learning and professionals studies colleges affiliated with prominent Tier 1 research universities, therefore conclusions and recommendations derived from the findings in this
study may not be applicable for all continuing education faculty and environments or other types of more traditional higher education institutions.

A second potential limitation of the study is the lack of diverse prior research on the contingent faculty phenomenon specifically focused on adult learning and professional studies. As reported earlier, one of the strengths of this study is it fills a gap in the literature left by a void of available research on the beliefs and perspectives of senior leadership responsible for establishing faculty identity and culture in adult learning and professional studies. However, this strength is also a weakness for this study in that there are few direct comparisons in the literature to confirm or challenge the findings in this study and little research to expand upon for this unique and specific attempt at better understanding the contingent faculty phenomenon in adult learning and professional studies. Unfortunately, much of the existing research on contingent faculty is developed from the perspective of tenured faculty making observations about their NTT colleagues or it arrives from the perspective of contingent faculty or union proponents of the NTT instructorate. Furthermore, much of the existing literature examines the experiences of contingent instructors in community college environments and traditional four-year institutions, not alternative environments in adult learning and continuing education. As the available research expands along with the growth of the new faculty majority, subsequent research should make use of studies like this one to extend the literature on our understanding of how the growing ranks of contingent faculty are evolving in adult and continuing education and professional studies environments and impacting faculty culture and student outcomes.

A third possible limitation of this study is its sole focus on the administrators’ perceptions of this phenomenon based their own lived experiences apart from the lived
experiences of casualized faculty. This approach, while intentional and appropriate for the precise focus of this limited study, leaves opportunities for further research questions about what faculty think, feel, or experience regarding their work environments at these specific elite institutions. Further research on this data triangulated from the perspective of the faculty experience and supported by other available data may provide more conclusive findings that will further extend our understanding of this phenomenon.

A final potential limitation includes omitting specific questions regarding availability of data on student outcomes related to the beliefs and observations of leadership participants in this study. In retrospect, self-reported data such as the interview narratives collected in this study may suffer from bias and it is difficult to verify independently. The participants’ contributions need to be taken at face value and attempt to confirm, deny, or support the findings based on the existing literature. In hindsight, it could have been useful to obtain pre-existing data such as summative student surveys or performance data on student grades that could have helped support beliefs about NTT faculty and confirm beliefs about instructor classroom performance revealed in this study. Subsequent research in this direction would benefit from quantitative data that triangulates leadership beliefs about faculty performance with student outcomes to confirm findings. Furthermore, it would be useful to compare and contrast faculty thoughts, feelings, and experiences at these institutions with the reported perceptions of the leaders in this study.

**Personal Reflection**

While the primary goal of this research was to advance understanding of the contingent faculty phenomenon in adult and continuing education and professional studies, another outcome from this research is the opportunity for me to take advantage of these
findings in my own career to form operational and aspirational perspectives that can be applied to everyday practice as an administrator in adult continuing education and professional studies. Prior to embarking on this intellectual journey into the lived experiences of institutional leaders overseeing the evolving nature of NTT faculty identity and culture in adult learning and professional studies, I held certain assumptions and biases about issues and concerns regarding contingent faculty. Through the findings of this study, I have gained a new understanding of the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead for administrators responsible for establishing identity, working relationships, and culture for NTT faculty in adult learning and professional studies.

Moreover, I better understand that evidence pointing to faculty motivation and aspirations for teaching in adult learning and professional studies reveal efficient and trustworthy ways to establish faculty identity and construct workable and reliable faculty culture that improves teaching and learning experiences for faculty and students. These findings, such as faculty aspirations for aligning themselves with respected schools and colleges and their affinity for meaningful interactions with the academic programs they serve, will help this researcher work more effectively to support a framework of essentials for meeting the needs of NTT faculty. What I learned from the dominant discourse in this study regarding leadership beliefs about NTT faculty aspirations for involvement in shared governance and other regalia of traditional higher education will help me focus my efforts on more meaningful strategies for improving the scholar practitioner work environment in adult learning and professional studies.

Furthermore, the questions raised by this study and the conclusions contained herein will potentially help me to strategize and operationalize mechanisms to enhance the value of
NTT faculty at my own institution as a senior administrator working to best support the academic mission of the college. The findings of this study provide me with incentive and motivation to examine this phenomenon more precisely and in detail as contingent faculty culture and identity continues to evolve in response to the emerging nature of faculty work and community in adult and continuing education and professional studies in U.S. higher education.

**Implications for Other Colleges and Universities**

Based on the findings in this study, there are some considerations for other institutional leaders who might make use of this data at their own institutions. First, *caveat emptor* should apply for any institutional leader considering making changes based on the existing literature. Many of the findings in the existing research concerning the contingent faculty phenomenon is contextually-based, meaning institutions tend to have their own unique academic missions and faculty and student characteristics, so findings at one school or college may not apply well at another. One size does not fit all. Findings in this study may be applicable for some institutions similar to specific academic missions of the institutions led by the participants in this study, but certainly not all institutions.

Dickeson (2010) suggested institutions today have four main challenges: increase revenues, decrease expenses, improve quality, and grow reputation. Along those lines, how well institutions recruit and employ contingent faculty touches upon all those areas. The findings in this study demonstrate that it may not be necessary for schools and colleges to follow the research trends to the letter. Along the same lines, Gappa et al. (2007) suggested colleges should ask the following questions about their workplaces. First, what enhances the college’s ability to recruit and retain high quality and capable faculty? And second, what are
the essential elements of academic work and the workplace that ensure satisfying and meaningful work for a college’s faculty? Because of the heterogeneous nature and academic missions at various higher education institutions and the diverse faculty who teach in them, the answers to these questions are going to be different for various schools and colleges. The likely answers to these questions will be context-based and as mentioned earlier, more “quilt-like” (Miller & Miles, 2008) regarding the framework for building faculty identity, relationships and culture.

Second, despite such complexity, the findings in this study suggest the possibilities of the potential for the scholar practitioner model customized for the unique academic missions of various schools and colleges applying it. The data in this study revealed a scholar practitioner model very unique to the challenges and opportunities of elite adult and continuing education and professional studies environments. In these environments, characteristics of the scholar practitioner model emphasize relevant, real world educational experiences taught by highly accomplished discipline-specific professionals and practitioners, typically as part-timers. Leaders in this study believe such characteristics lead to strong student outcomes, better student engagement, and greater student retention. In other words, as one institution led by a leader in this study emphasizes in its promotional literature, it is all about students learning how to be the best by learning from the best.

Third, the leaders participating in this study repeated over and over again that adult learning and professional studies students have unique expectations and needs. Therefore, schools and colleges must put student needs and expectations alongside of equally important internal pressures such as leadership aspirations, and academic aspirations for faculty identity, relationships, and community. The findings in this study stress senior leaders’
acknowledgement of the importance of service to students. This notion drives the type of faculty the institution hires, how the institution aligns faculty in the organization, how the institution trains and supports the faculty, and how the institution establishes academic community for faculty. The findings in this study support research (Gappa et al., 2007; Kezar, 2012; Pope, 2004) suggesting respect for faculty is at the center of the universe for institutional well-being. However, the leadership participants in this study add that student success should also be placed at center stage alongside respect for faculty. Finding that equilibrium between aspirations for institutional identity and meeting the needs of the tuition-paying student should be the key takeaway from this study for leadership application at other institutions.

Conclusions

As Umbach and Wawrzynski (2005) suggested in their research on contingent faculty, much of the discussion about faculty work seems shrouded in myth, opinion, or conjecture. The findings in this study have significance because this data eliminates some of the myth and conjecture by revealing the findings of the social discourse of five prominent senior leaders in adult learning and professional studies regarding the evolving nature of the contingent faculty phenomenon.

Based on the interviews collected in this study, leaders at these elite adult and continuing education and professional studies colleges and extension schools revealed that by hiring discipline-specific professionals as scholar practitioners, by establishing a relationship that is respectful and rewarding for them, and by establishing a culture that emphasizes teaching, discipline-specific professional relevance, and a community of scholar practitioners,
it is possible to avoid many of the issues causing concern about the NTT faculty phenomenon at others institutions.

This study fills gaps in the current literature regarding beliefs about NTT faculty for adult and continuing education and professional studies environments by revealing the social discourse of institutional leaders who have considerable impact on the cultivation and motivation of faculty in this space. While this study cannot and does not reveal what contingent faculty think or feel about their experiences among the new faculty majority, this study does provide a significant alternative perspective on this faculty group heretofore obscured in the generalizations of the current literature. By contextually applying research-based, evidence-proven practices and policies for their NTT faculty teaching on a contingent basis, this body of institutional leaders manifested itself into the personification of another Shakespearean maxim: “This above all: To thine own self be true.” The leadership in this study constructed a confident sense of remaining loyal to the core academic missions of their colleges by creating faculty identity, relationships, and culture from the context of what they believe is necessary and appropriate to meet the needs and expectations of the students enrolled at these elite adult learning and professional studies environments.

Leaders in this study report NTT faculty at these institutions may not participate in shared governance, enjoy full equity with tenured colleagues, or other traditional benefits on the scale called for by Kezar (2012) and Gappa et al. (2007) and other researchers. However, the leaders in this study believe the NTT faculty at their institutions are adequately prepared and appropriately supported to appropriately fulfill the academic missions of these institutions to their students’ satisfaction in a fiscally responsible manner. Furthermore, NTT faculty in these environments are recognized by their leadership as premium scholar
practitioners adding value and relevance for adult learners and professional studies students at these institutions.

How the characteristics and essentials revealed by leaders in this study and others are adopted and applied going forward lies in the hands of the senior leadership at their particular institutions. The decisions leaders make will result in where their colleges fall on the continuum of successful adult and continuing education and professional studies. To properly assert institutional values and identity going forward, leaders must settle the identity crisis in adult education within the context of their own institution and their unique academic missions. They must decipher what is in the best interests of the tuition paying students enrolled at their institution and then wrap faculty culture and institutional frameworks around that the way leaders in this study have done. By doing that, leaders can then appropriately determine the faculty types for identity, culture, and relationships needed to best service the aspirations of and operations for their students. The coming decade will render the winners and losers in the institutional race to reshape American higher education, and the adult learning and professional studies space is a significant front in the battle. Institutional leaders must quickly and perceptively identify what is needed to serve their student demographic to ensure the sustainability of their colleges. History will render its verdict with the rise and fall of enrollments at each institution.
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Hello participant,

This is Charles Kilfoyè, I am a candidate for an Ed.D with a specialization in higher education form Northeastern University in Boston, MA. I am calling you today to invite you to participate in my qualitative study on Making Meaning of the New Faculty Majority: The Growing Ranks of Contingent Faculty in Adult and Continuing Higher Education. I am working with my advisor, Dr. Reiss Medwed, on this project.

I am calling you today to ask you to participate in my study. My study focuses on leadership’s beliefs about the use of contingent faculty in adult and continuing education and professional studies colleges at Tier 1 research universities. I believe you are a good candidate for participation in this study because you are a senior executive in an adult and continuing education environment and you have a proven track record as an authority on the oversight of contingent faculty culture in higher education.

Your participation is completely voluntary and you can refuse to answer any questions, or all questions if you decide not to participate in this study at any point.

I will provide you a copy of an unsigned consent document for your keeping by email if you agree to participate in this study. I will also provide a detailed explanation of the proposed study at a later date and I can answer any questions you have about how you will participate in the study.

This study should take no more than four hours of your time during the summer of 2014.

Does this sound like something you would be willing to participate in? I can give you my telephone number: 617 593 1125, and email address: kilfoyè.e@husky.neu.edu. Please contact me right away if you have any questions.

Thank you

Charles Kilfoyè
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Request to Participate in Research
We are inviting you to take part in a research study. This form will tell you about the study, but the researcher will explain it to you first. You may ask the researchers any questions you have. When you are ready to make a decision, you may tell the researcher if you want to participate or not. You do not have to participate if you do not want to. If you decide to participate, the researcher will give you a copy of this consent form to keep.

We are asking you to participate in this research because you are:
- a senior administrator responsible in whole or part of establishing faculty culture at your institution.
- A senior administrator with a demonstrated history of leadership and accomplishment in the domain of adult and continuing studies and professional studies at your institution.

The purpose of this research is to increase our awareness of leadership's beliefs about the challenges and issues related to the growing use of contingent faculty in higher education. By interviewing a purposefully selected group of institutional leaders that may include deans, vice presidents, and executive directors at adult and continuing education and professional studies colleges at Tier 1 research universities in the U.S., we hope to deepen our understanding of this growing phenomenon and expand on existing theories and explorations.

You must be at least 18 years old to be in this research project.

The study will take place in a manner that is most convenient for you: in person if you are local to Northeastern University, on the phone, or via web conferencing technology. The interviews will take between 20 minutes and 60 minutes to complete. Your entire participation time should be no longer than four hours to complete this study.

If you decide to take part in this study, we will ask you to participate in the following:
- Verbally agree to participate in this study.
- Participate in an initial telephone pre-interview discussion or web conference to learn about the study process and answer a few initial questions regarding the participants' roles and responsibilities at their respective institutions. This interview will take approximately 20 minutes.
- Take part in one major interview by telephone, web conference, or in person, depending on their preferences, to answer the study’s primary questions and sub-questions. This interview should take no more than 60 minutes.
- Review transcriptions to validate their answers to the primary question and sub-questions.

Total time required of participants will be about four hours.

There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts to you for taking part in this study. However, if you feel uncomfortable with the topics or questions, please let the researcher know and you can refuse to respond to that question or topic.

There are no direct benefits to you for participating in the study. However, the information obtained in this study may help advance our understanding and of this growing and important phenomenon in higher education.

Your part in this study is confidential. That means no one will know if you took part in this study and no one will know what your answers are. Any reports or publications based on this research will use only group data and will not identify you or any individual as being of this project.

The decision to participate in this research project is up to you. You do not have to participate and you can refuse to answer any question. Even if you begin the study, you may withdraw at any time.
You will not be paid for your participation in this study.

If you have any questions about this study, please call me, Charles Kilfoye, at 617 593 1125 or email me at kilfoye.cc@husky.neu.edu. I am the person mainly responsible for the research. You can also contact Dr. Karen Reiss Medwed at k.reissmedwed@neu.edu, the Principal Investigator.

If you have any questions about your rights in this research, if you have any questions about your rights as a participant, you may contact Nan C. Regina, Director, Human Subject Research Protection, 960 Renaissance Park, Northeastern University Boston, MA 02115 tel. 617-373-4588, email: irb@neu.edu. You may call anonymously if you wish.

You may keep this form for yourself.

Thank you.

Name of Investigator: Charles Kilfoye
Appendix E

Semi-Structured Interview Questions

Participant Questions Focused on Leadership Beliefs About the Contingent Faculty Phenomenon

4. What are your personal beliefs about the experience of working as a contingent faculty?

5. How well supported are your contingent or part-time faculty?

5. What do you believe are the advantages or disadvantages of using contingent faculty rather than full-time faculty at your institution?

6. What practices, policies, and processes does your institution provide to safeguard the notion of academic freedom and self-actualization for contingent faculty?

7. What personal experiences inform your choices regarding leadership approaches or styles for managing contingent faculty at your institution?

8. What patterns or practices do you believe sets your institution apart from others in establishing contingent faculty culture?

9. How does your institution assess or evaluate contingent faculty?

10. What emergent roles do you see contingent faculty playing in the future at your institution?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. What are the biggest challenges on the horizon for using contingent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty at your institution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. What labels do you use to identify contingent faculty?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. What minimum qualifications do you require?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. How do you compensate faculty?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. What academic expectations if any do you set for faculty?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Do you require any formal orientation or training for your contingent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Is there any union activity among your contingent faculty?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Do you view union activity as a sign of something going wrong?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Do you have instructional design or ed tech support? If so, how many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people in this role?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Who does the hiring of contingent faculty at your institution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Do contingent faculty have any role in shared governance or the man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agement of academic programs at your institution?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>