



University of Kentucky
UKnowledge

Theses and Dissertations--Educational, School,
and Counseling Psychology

Educational, School, and Counseling
Psychology

2014

FULL-TIME NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY: IDENTITY AND DEPARTMENTAL PERSPECTIVES

Kathryn Dehner Cunningham

University of Kentucky, kathryn.cunningham@erau.edu

[Right click to open a feedback form in a new tab to let us know how this document benefits you.](#)

Recommended Citation

Cunningham, Kathryn Dehner, "FULL-TIME NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY: IDENTITY AND DEPARTMENTAL PERSPECTIVES" (2014). *Theses and Dissertations--Educational, School, and Counseling Psychology*. 27.
https://uknowledge.uky.edu/edp_etds/27

This Doctoral Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Educational, School, and Counseling Psychology at UKnowledge. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations--Educational, School, and Counseling Psychology by an authorized administrator of UKnowledge. For more information, please contact UKnowledge@lsv.uky.edu.

STUDENT AGREEMENT:

I represent that my thesis or dissertation and abstract are my original work. Proper attribution has been given to all outside sources. I understand that I am solely responsible for obtaining any needed copyright permissions. I have obtained needed written permission statement(s) from the owner(s) of each third-party copyrighted matter to be included in my work, allowing electronic distribution (if such use is not permitted by the fair use doctrine) which will be submitted to UKnowledge as Additional File.

I hereby grant to The University of Kentucky and its agents the irrevocable, non-exclusive, and royalty-free license to archive and make accessible my work in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known. I agree that the document mentioned above may be made available immediately for worldwide access unless an embargo applies.

I retain all other ownership rights to the copyright of my work. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of my work. I understand that I am free to register the copyright to my work.

REVIEW, APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE

The document mentioned above has been reviewed and accepted by the student's advisor, on behalf of the advisory committee, and by the Director of Graduate Studies (DGS), on behalf of the program; we verify that this is the final, approved version of the student's thesis including all changes required by the advisory committee. The undersigned agree to abide by the statements above.

Kathryn Dehner Cunningham, Student

Dr. Fred Danner, Major Professor

Dr. Kenneth Tyler, Director of Graduate Studies

FULL-TIME NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY: IDENTITY AND
DEPARTMENTAL PERSPECTIVES

DISSERTATION

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Educational, School, and Counseling
Psychology in the College of Education at the University of Kentucky

By
Kathryn Dehner Cunningham

Lexington, Kentucky

Co-Director: Dr. Fred Danner, Professor of Educational, School, and Counseling
Psychology

Co-Director: Dr. Jeff Bieber, Professor of Educational Policy Studies and Evaluation

Lexington, Kentucky

2014

Copyright © Kathryn Dehner Cunningham 2014

ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

FULL-TIME NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY: IDENTITY AND DEPARTMENTAL PERSPECTIVES

This study examines perceptions of 12 full-time non-tenure track faculty members about their professional and academic selves in a research-intensive university. A phenomenological approach is used to gain insight into the complexities of the experience of being a full-time faculty member, off the tenure-track, whose primary responsibility is teaching within a research-intensive institution. The notion of tenure-stream as the only desired path to being an academic is challenged by these faculty members' understanding of their identities. This researcher considers how professional identities may be understood and suggests that the meanings and values these faculty members attach to their professional roles may be embedded in their perceptions of how their role fits within the department.

Throughout this qualitative inquiry, the perspectives of these faculty members are positioned as a primary source of data about the experience of being a full-time non-tenure track faculty member. By using a phenomenological approach and taking a constructivist perspective this researcher finds that extant theories that view this population through a deficit model are inaccurate. Additionally, essentialist and homogenizing descriptions of this population are also found to be insufficient. A qualitative analysis suggests the viability of an alternative description of this population, one which reflects the nuanced view of professional identity these participants expressed. Based on structural categories adapted from Martin's (2002) three perspective view of organizational culture, their perceptions are categorized according to the congruence expressed between their social identity and their professional role. Perceptions shared about their departmental culture are similarly categorized which provides insight about the influence of policies, practices, and collegial interactions on professional lives.

KEYWORDS: full-time non-tenure track faculty members, lecturers, professional identity, job satisfaction, departmental perspectives

Kathryn Dehner Cunningham

September 30, 2014

FULL-TIME NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY: IDENTITY AND
DEPARTMENTAL PERSPECTIVES

By

Kathryn Dehner Cunningham

Dr. Fred Danner

Co-Director of Dissertation

Dr. Jeff Bieber

Co-Director of Dissertation

Dr. Kenneth Tyler

Director of Graduate Studies

September 30, 2014

Date

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Over the past ten years I have received support and encouragement from a great number of people without whom this dissertation would not exist. My co-chairs, Fred Danner and Jeff Bieber, have been patient mentors who have supported me through the process of developing an idea into a question that can be studied. They consistently opened their doors, and minds, whenever I knocked for answers to “a quick question” even though these were rarely quick discussions. I am also grateful to my other dissertation committee members, Lynda Brown-Wright and Ellen Usher, for their brilliant suggestions and support in seeing this study completed. I am also indebted to the 12 full-time non-tenure track faculty members who participated in this study for volunteering both their time and their candor about their experiences.

I also appreciate all of the support I have received from numerous colleagues over the years. I thank Kathi Kern for consistently offering encouragement and necessary resources. I am grateful to Bill Burke for providing an inspiring cautionary tale about the professional limits of remaining ABD and Cara Worick for believing I was capable of finishing. I also appreciate the support and encouragement I received from all of my new colleagues at Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, especially those in the College of Business. In particular, Anké Arnaud who helped me see how my findings were interesting and Sharon Patrick who provided care packages and moral support during the final stretch. Also thanks to Shirley Waterhouse and Dave Pedersen who provided motivation to finish. Finally, I am thankful to Tricia Adolph who helped me in formatting my writing into a readable document.

From my family I have always had unwavering support to complete this dissertation and constant reassurance that they would respect my decision to stop at any time. Their support and reassurance has been my emotional balm. I am especially grateful to my adult children, Rachel and Justin Cunningham. Throughout their childhood Justin and Rachel encouraged me to accomplish my goals, even as they were busy becoming incredible adults. They taught me that much of our identity is situated in our relationships with each other, regardless of where any of us may live or what degrees we may attain.

Finally I thank my husband, Jim. He has been a stabilizing force alongside me throughout this journey, providing a safe place to land whenever I would stumble and a wonderful embrace whenever we could celebrate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments.....	iii
List of Tables	viii
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Placement of Myself in the Study	5
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Organization of the Manuscript	7
Chapter Two: Review of Relevant Theory and Literature.....	9
Assumption That Non-Tenure Faculty are Credentialed Professionals.....	10
Current Organizational Practices May Create Challenges.....	11
Academic Identity within Framework of Faculty Role Performance	15
Academic Identity through the Perspective of Symbolic Interactionism	17
Academic Identity through the Perspective of Organizational Socialization	18
Academic Identity through the Perspective of Organizational Culture	21
Academic Identity through the Perspective of Organizational Fit.....	22
Summary	24
Definition of Terms.....	26
Chapter Three: Methodology.....	27
Research Perspective	27
Data Collection	30
Selection of Participants and Gaining Access	31
Procedure	33
Data Collection	34
Data Analysis.....	36
Threats to Validity	40
Chapter Four: Introduction of the Institution and the Participants	46
Institutional Setting.....	46
Addressing Budget Shortfalls	46
Introduction of Participants.....	48
Jeremiah.....	50
Allan.....	52
Faith	54
Ethan	57
Brenna.....	60
Kaleb.....	62
Helen.....	66
Leon.....	68
Gwen.....	72
Denis	75

Isabel	77
Carol.....	79
Chapter Five: A Tale of Two Selves: Self as Teacher, Self as Academic.....	83
Social Identity: Identification with a Professional Group.....	83
Identification with a Formal Role: “I’m a Teacher”, I’m a Disciplinary Researcher.....	85
Social Identification: Exploring Self-Perceptions about Professional Activities	97
Responses to an Espoused Social Identity: Conflict or Support?	101
Clear as Mud: Defining Professional and Academic Identity	105
Chapter Six: Organizational Support	114
In the Space of an Office	114
Show Me the Money... or Don’t: Perceptions about Support.....	119
Decision-making without Representation.....	125
Sitting at the Head of the Faculty Table	129
Professional Barriers: Not All Teachers are Created Equal.....	133
Chapter Seven: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations Chapter	142
Examining, Supporting, and Professionalizing Non-Tenure Track Faculty.....	143
Contributing a Perspective to the Research Conversation	145
Exploring Identification with the Lecturer Role.....	147
Exploring Identification and Job Satisfaction.....	148
Utilization of Organizational Culture Research Perspectives.....	149
Understanding Internal Perspectives.....	151
Internal Integration Perspective	152
Internal Differentiation Perspective.....	152
Internal Fragmentation Perspective	153
Perspectives about Departmental Culture: Sometimes a Mix, Sometimes a Match	156
Departmental Integration Perspective.....	156
Departmental Differentiation Perspective.....	157
Departmental Fragmentation Perspective	159
Job Satisfaction within Types of Departmental Cultures	162
Limitations	165
Implications.....	166
Conclusion	169
Appendices.....	171
Appendix A: Interview Protocol.....	171
Appendix B: Invitation to Participate	173
References.....	174
Vita	183

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 List of Participants	49
Table 2 Internal Perspectives	155
Table 3 Departmental Perspectives.....	161

Chapter One

Introduction

Few other occupations have such demanding, yet narrow, expectations for their occupants as an academic career does. Part of the professionalizing of the academic career came about as a result of an organizational socialization process “requiring a lengthy preparation period of education and training followed by an equally drawn out period of official apprenticeship” (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979, p. 3), which aptly describes the tenure process. The tenure process is intended to prepare the newly hired academics for their organizational role as a tenured faculty member. As graduate students faculty members were typically socialized by graduate school mentors, mentors whose own tenure-stream career path was prescribed according to the traditional organizational role. Yet the process that defines an academic career has shifted in the past decade, from the traditional expectation of attaining a terminal degree followed by a tenure-stream appointment to the current reality for many new faculty members, attaining a terminal degree followed by a non-tenure track appointment. While the tenure track provides clear expectations about one’s professional activities for approximately the first seven years after an academic appointment, equally clear organizational expectations are not available for those faculty off the tenure-track. The expected career path of tenure-stream faculty members is well known even though tenure, and the tenure process, is a fairly modern concept.

The faculty population in the late 1800’s reveals a cadre of tutors who had a baccalaureate degree, were about 20 years old, and were preparing for a life in the ministry. During this time a faculty position was considered a temporary situation rather

than a career choice. Eventually these tutors were replaced by permanent faculty and at the start of the 1900's there were 200 professors in 19 American colleges (Finkelstein, 2006) who had made a career out of instructing at the university. However, the faculty system was also bifurcated.

Similar to present-day full-time non-tenure track faculty teaching assignments, early tutors oversaw students' earlier general educational experience which occurred prior to a student's move into a professional career (lower-division courses). Similar to most tenure-stream faculty today the permanent faculty would oversee students' educational preparation leading to entry into a profession (upper division courses). Academic ranks, such as associate and assistant professors, were created in 1875 for these more permanent faculty members. Junior faculty members were expected to work their way into becoming senior faculty members; however, neither procedures nor a timetable for this process had been established. The timetable and specifications of the tenure process came as one result of a shift in responsibilities.

Prior to the 1940's faculty were expected to guide students not only through their academic studies, but also in their personal accomplishments. However, around 1945 a student personnel movement started that took on responsibility for the nonacademic needs of college students. As faculty members shifted away from nonacademic responsibilities for students toward primary responsibility for disciplinary expertise on their campus they also gained leverage in campus decision making. "Perhaps even more fundamentally, professors' expertise translated on their own campuses into leverage that enabled them to win tenure rights" (Finkelstein, 2006, p. 167). When the Association of American University Professors (AAUP) articulated the expected procedures and typical

timeline for acquiring tenure in 1940, the traditional career path for an academic was established. Additionally, the United States' need for researchers that could address social, economic, and national defense issues as well as teach increased public esteem for a full-time academic career, laying the groundwork for a social contract that supported faculty members in conducting research. In conjunction with the AAUP's 1940 Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure and the public visibility that accompanied academics' research efforts the traditional academic career path was cemented as a prestigious one.

An academic career began with receipt of a terminal degree and acquisition of an appointment onto the tenure-track. Typically after six or seven years of engaging in research, teaching, and service an individual would apply to be tenured. However, this traditional path for an academic career was in place for less than 75 years when a new model emerged. "While the tenure-based prototype continues to exist...there has emerged a *parallel* system of full-time faculty, term appointments have become the modal prototype among new hires for more than a decade and, if present trends continue, will become the prototype of full-time faculty work" (Finkelstein, 2006, p. 202-203, italics in the original). This phenomenological study aims to describe the experience of those faculty members whose academic career is taking place out of the tenure-stream in this parallel system.

We are observing a shift of increasing numbers of faculty whose career is off the tenure-track. According to Umbach (2007), "In 1975, approximately 57% of all faculty members were tenured or on the tenure track, while full-time tenure-ineligible faculty made up 13%... By 2003, the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty made up only

35% of the faculty, while full-time tenure-ineligible faculty had increased to 19%...” (p. 93). Researchers have been examining this trend (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Finkelstein, 2006; Gappa & Leslie, 1993) and recently began suggesting standards of good practice (Kezar, 2013) for the institutions that offer non-tenure appointments. These standards of good practice focus on institutional provisions for compensation, support, and giving voice to full-time non-tenure track faculty in ways that are comparable to institutional provisions offered to tenure-stream faculty. The essence of these standards is that full-time non-tenure track faculty need to be considered as professional equals to tenure-stream faculty in the academic system. However, before recommendations can be successfully implemented the experiences of full-time non-tenure track faculty members within a department need to be more fully understood. This study considers questions about the impact of these positions on those that hold them based on the perspective of these full-time non-tenure-track and their career aspirations.

At the risk of problematizing the career path of full-time non-tenure-track faculty even further, a quick glance at organizational roles must be taken. Universities gain prestige through the efforts of published research. Fairweather (1993, 2005) and Wolcott (1997) both found research activities to be more highly regarded by a university than teaching activities were. Although Fairweather (1993) found that tenure-stream faculty frequently engaged in teaching-oriented activities these activities were not career promoting, instead research and publications are associated with promotions and rewards. In this study, the organizational role of these participants centers on teaching; however, the university that is the context for this study offers promotion and reward opportunities

primarily based on research publications. The shift in career paths taken has not been matched by career opportunities offered by the university.

Placement of Myself in the Study

Ever since entering the context of higher education as a professional staff person ten years ago I have been intrigued by the notion of faculty status according to rank. This study was one way I have been able to peer into that world through the viewfinder of full-time non-tenure track faculty members. My goal in this study is not to argue for or against whether teaching-intensive faculty members should have equal access to the tenure-stream, although that question came up for me throughout conducting the study.

I started college as a nontraditional student and will end it that way as well. I am in the middle of my career as an educational developer whose role involves supporting faculty members, of all ranks, in designing learning experiences for their students. I provide the support to all university teachers, from graduate students to full professors and I typically work with those who are the primary instructor for a course. I am biased about the importance of providing substantial learning experiences for students as being the primary mission for all educational institutions, although I can see how researchers may see the university differently. My bias stems from a long history of being involved with teaching and learning, starting as an elementary school teacher until my current position as an educational developer.

Statement of the Problem

This qualitative study aims to investigate the causes and consequences of full-time non-tenure track faculty members' perceptions of their professional and academic selves at work in a research-intensive university. The participants selected for this study

were hired to “teach the majority of students” and are “key to creating the teaching and learning environment” (Kezar & Sam, 2011, p.3) within their department. Although researchers have found that most full-time non-tenure track faculty are as committed to the students, and may demonstrate a stronger commitment to teaching undergraduate students, than tenure-stream faculty (Kezar & Sam, 2011), what has been investigated less often is the impact these teaching assignments have on this growing population of faculty. All of the participants in this study are full-time faculty with a Ph.D. who accepted non-tenure teaching-intensive appointments in departments with tenure-stream colleagues. Although “there are over 50 terms referring to non-tenure track faculty...most terms for this group of faculty reflect a particular element of focus: lecturer-that they teach; part-time- amount of time they teach...” (Kezar, 2013, p. xx). According to this nomenclature the population for this study is full-time lecturers.

By accepting a position focused on teaching rather than research, these full-time lecturers potentially limit their earnings and professional visibility acquired through the accumulation of research publications (Fairweather, 1993, 2005; Leahey, 2007) and may experience a second-class status to their tenure-stream research-focused colleagues. Furthermore, if they opt to continue with their non-tenure assignment as a permanent career choice, their path to career success is minimally marked. Traditional tenure-track positions offer the new hire a clearly defined career route, specified in the tenure process, providing a professional anchor. At the research institution that is the context for this study, full-time lecturers have no similarly defined career path specified by traditional expectations and celebrations, yet they are fully credentialed professionals who are making contributions to the academy through their intensive focus on teaching activities.

Considering that these lecturers may or may not perceive having a professional anchor or celebrated career markers, I asked this population about how they envisioned themselves as a success in the future. I also asked these non-tenure track faculty members to describe their role in the department and provide perceptions about the ways that role did or did not contribute to a professional or academic identity.

The purpose of this study is to examine the narratives “that educators draw on to make sense of themselves and their practice” (Beijaad, Meijer, and Verloop, 2004, p. 121), with a particular focus on how this particular population makes sense of their professional lives.

Organization of the Manuscript

In this chapter I have aimed to provide a brief history of how the academic career came to be associated with tenure. I also explained some ways that accepting a full-time lecturer appointment may impact one’s career options. In Chapter 2, I look at how others might approach this topic and how the lens used to examine this population can reveal some assumptions being made. Chapter 3 focuses on the methods used for this study which grew out of the methodology (phenomenology). I also describe the selection criteria I used when recruiting participants for this study. I introduce the context and the participants in Chapter 4. First I provide a brief description of the institutional context in which this study was conducted. Then I introduce the participants and describe how they came to hold their current appointments.

I examine the major themes that emerged from the participants’ interviews in Chapters 5 and 6. In Chapter 5 participants provide their perspectives about professional and academic identity. In this chapter the participant’s words are used to explain how

each participant frames these concepts. Based on these explanations I then consider the social identity that is being espoused by each participant. In Chapter 6 I examine the ways that the participants perceived that their social identity is reinforced or diminished within the departmental context. While Chapter 5 focuses more on contributing to toward a theory about social identity of full-time lecturers, Chapter 6 focuses on the practical implications of providing organizational support and the perceptions created by the presence or lack of that support.

In Chapter 7, I expand my analysis by examining the integration of perceptions about holding a non-tenure track appointment with a lecturer's social identity by applying Martin's (1992, 2002) three-perspective view of organizational culture as a theoretical framework to explain the ways participants expressed integrating, or not integrating, their social identity and formal role. I also categorize participants' perspectives about their department using Martin's framework again. Overall, I suggest in this chapter that this study about the experience of being a full-time non-tenure track faculty can provide a unique perspective about social identity, formal roles, and a department's culture. While it was challenging to find a theoretical framework that helped to frame what I was hearing from the participants, applying dimensions from these organizational culture perspectives enabled me to synthesize the perspectives shared about identifying as a non-tenure track faculty member as well as perspectives about the inclusion of non-tenure track faculty within the department.

Chapter Two

Review of Relevant Theory and Literature

This study about the professional lives of full-time non-tenure track faculty members within a research intensive university involves multiple voices: non-tenure track faculty members' perspectives revealed through interviews, my personal perspectives revealed in the writing of this dissertation, and the research literature revealed in this chapter and throughout the dissertation. Although multiple voices are contributing to this conversation, a constraint of completing the study means that not all possible voices or perspectives are present. Instead it is a contributing comment to a larger conversation that began before this study was undertaken and will continue after its conclusion. I enter this ongoing discussion by focusing on a specific context in which the experiences and expectations for tenure-stream and non-tenure-track faculty are likely to be the most distinct, the major research university. In this chapter I consider how other researchers have examined this phenomenon of the professional lives and academic identity of non-tenure track faculty. This chapter also uses a phenomenological method to reflect on theoretical perspectives that might be appropriate to this current study. The data for this part of the study originate from empirical research rather than interview data (Randolph, 2009).

As is traditional in phenomenological methods, I begin the chapter with an explanation of my own position as I begin this study. I will then provide a review of representative research I used in studies examining important aspects of professional lives and academic identity: faculty productivity, socialization, organizational culture and fit within the organization. Each section concludes with a brief synthesis of perspectives

the researcher made that could be considered relevant to this phenomenon. I then conclude the chapter by describing how this investigation benefits from the theoretical perspectives offered by these researchers. Following the summary I provide definitions for terms used in this research that have multiple labels.

Assumption that Non-Tenure Faculty are Credentialed Professionals

According to the AAUP Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, between 1975 and 2011, full-time non-tenure track faculty positions increased to a level that matched the number of tenured faculty positions. This population of non-tenure track faculty has become of interest to researchers who study various aspects of higher education. Kezar and Sam (2011) have recently encouraged researchers to reflect on their assumptions about not being on the tenure-track when considering the work life of non-tenure track faculty. Since inaccurate assumptions form the basis of preconceived notions they tend to be reflected in the theories that are applied to the phenomenon being studied. This call for examination is made because, “existing theories [about non-tenure track faculty] have not proven robust for explaining behavior and, worse, are perhaps creating problematic stereotypes that shape new negative realities” (p. 1437), particularly regarding non-tenure track faculty members with full-time appointments.

Unexamined assumptions can be problematic in any study but since “much of the research on non-tenure track faculty have been conducted with quantitative methods and within a positivist paradigm” (Kezar & Sam, 2011, p. 1420), methods in which scholars seldom identify and bracket their assumptions, assumptions can be threaded through many study designs. For example, researchers working from the assumption that non-tenure appointments create a problem for both the non-tenure track faculty member and

higher education tend to theoretically frame their study according to a deficit model of these types of appointments. An assumption of deficit, such as categorizing non-tenure track faculty as laborers (Bland et al., 2006; Umbach, 2007), is not beneficial for understanding a population's lived experience and may prevent the use of theories that can "provide answers to basic questions about non-tenure track faculty satisfaction, productivity, commitment, or engagement" (Kezar & Sam, 2011, p. 1420). Some researchers (Kezar & Sam, 2011; Rhoades, 1996) have observed that non-tenure track faculty complete lengthy research training, describe attachment to the discipline and profession, and are socialized through graduate education in ways that are very similar to their tenure-stream colleagues.

Although much of the prior research about this population has focused on the impact of non-tenure appointments on students or the enterprise of higher education, there is less research available about the impact of these appointments on the non-tenure track faculty member. As mentioned above most non-tenure track faculty members have completed their research credentials and have committed themselves to become part of the academic community upon accepting their appointments. Typically a non-tenure appointment prevents access to acquiring the traditional mark of professional success in academia that tenure typically provides. However, these non-tenure track faculty members may experience other success indicators within their non-tenure teaching-intensive appointments.

Current Organizational Practices May Create Challenges

Institutions of higher education are typically organized in a way that includes tenure-stream faculty as legitimate contributors to decision-making processes, while non-

tenure-track faculty are typically excluded from participating in governance issues. This organizational practice gives those who have tenure greater organizational power than those who do not, and those on a tenure-track greater power than those who cannot apply for it. A source of power that contributes to professional identity is the acknowledgement of one's career progress by an institution (Strauss, 1959). In order to join the tenured subculture, faculty members have traditionally produced evidence of professional performance that were "open to internal administrative as well as academic scrutiny" (Henkel, 2005, p. 164). Since non-tenure track faculty do not have institutionalized paths specifically leading toward a ceremonial announcement of a meaningful professional turning point, such as acquiring the power of tenure, public transformation of identity is difficult for these professionals. This lack of public transformation opportunities does not prove that non-tenure track faculty members have not engaged in difficult professional activities that have created meaningful turning points. Currently, there is not a ceremonial announcement of a meaningful professional turning point, similar to acquiring tenure, and the effort that results in a professional transformation of identity may remain unacknowledged by colleagues and, more significantly, by the institution. One result of this lack of acknowledgement reinforces power structures inherent within tenured and non-tenured subcultures; however, tenure-track faculty members have an opportunity to move beyond the subculture of non-tenured faculty and enter the more powerful subculture of tenured faculty. "Any institution, for instance, possesses regularized means for testing and challenging its member" (Strauss, 1959, p. 95), but while tenure-track faculty are mentored through efforts focused on authoring publications as evidence of scholarly activity to overcome the organizational

challenge of tenure, full-time lecturers are excluded from participating since their organizational task in the institution focuses on teaching rather than research. Since research publications tend to be the measuring stick by which professional success in academia is measured (Braxton, Luckey, & Helland, 2002; Fairweather, 2005), teaching-intensive faculty members are disadvantaged in being able to demonstrate their professional success. Despite suggestions for recognizing multiple forms of scholarship in promotion and tenure decisions (Boyer, 1990; Boyer Commission, 1998; Braxton, Luckey, and Helland, 2002), at the institution where this study was conducted there is no mechanism for recognizing evidence of the locally-oriented scholarly activity of teaching that would be considered equivalent to the public activity of research (Gouldner, 1957). As Fairweather (2005) suggests in his study, research publications are the coin of the realm in higher education. Without a mechanism with which to allow colleagues the opportunity to recognize the full-time non-tenure track faculty member on having been successful in an organizational performance required by an institutional challenge, there is no public entry into the full rights and responsibilities of joining the more powerful community of practice (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979).

Acknowledgment of professional progress, such as becoming a senior lecturer, requires no input from the disciplinary academy because it is based on departmental recommendations and occurs within the institution. Since there is no requirement for input from disciplinary peers to acquire distinctions, any distinctions acquired generate no academic visibility so efforts of full-time non-tenure track faculty tend to be recognized only by the department and occasionally institutional administrators. Unfortunately for the full-time non-tenure track academic, as has historically been the

case for tenure-track academics, “the department is now only one, and not necessarily the most secure or important, focus of academic activity and identification” (Henkel, 2005, p. 164). The departmentally oriented, local effort (Gouldner, 1957, 1958) of teaching does not create professional visibility beyond the institution, so a teaching-intensive position might negatively impact an academic career that depends on professional visibility. This situation may be the most salient for non-tenure track faculty in high paradigmatic consensus disciplines whose “foundations of current individual [research] agendas were laid down in discipline based doctoral and post-doctoral studies and often...early specialization and, thus, epistemic identity were established in that process” (Henkel, p. 167). As Henkel (2005) noted in her study of bioscientists and Reybold (2008) in her study of engineers, identity formation of academics within high paradigmatic disciplines is based on a strong commitment for contributing to the discipline’s knowledge structure.

In Lindholm’s (2003) study examining the person-organization fit of college and university faculty she found that “incongruities were especially prominent with regard to perceptions of personal versus institutional value placed on teaching” (p. 135). However, these incongruities may not impact professional commitment as other researchers (Tuma & Grimes, 1981) found “virtually no association between professional commitment and commitment to organizational goals” (p. 204). Full-time non-tenure track faculty make a choice to focus their professional efforts locally, at the institutional level, rather than nationally, at the professional level despite professing “stronger disciplinary than institutional loyalties” (Shaker, Palmer, and Chism, 2011, p. 51). By taking on an academic position that implies teaching is a professional value, the congruence between professional values and institutional or disciplinary values impacts one’s academic

identity remains unknown. In this next section, I will review theoretical perspectives that could support an investigation of non-tenure track faculty as credentialed professionals in order to understand ways that experience and the non-tenure track faculty member's identity may be framed.

Academic Identity within Framework of Faculty Role Performance

According to Blackburn and Lawrence's (1995) framework the impact of environmental conditions on an academic's productivity are strongly influenced by self-knowledge and social knowledge, in addition to socio-demographic characteristics. Their findings suggest that changing environmental conditions may not have a detrimental impact on academic productivity if steps are taken to address faculty members' self-knowledge and social knowledge. Billot (2010) confirmed similar findings in her study. However, since these researchers were examining products in the form of "effort (time) given to research, grant activity, applying for fellowships, dissertation involvement, communicating with fellow researchers" (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995, p. 281), their results are especially relevant to a tenure-track position, but may be less relevant to positions with a 75% teaching load. Self-knowledge and social knowledge are based on "self-judged competence, preferred effort to give to a role, and perceived institutional expectation of effort given to the role" (p. 288). Self-judged competency about one's lecturer responsibility could be relevant to understanding how full-time non-tenure track faculty members develop, modify, and maintain their academic identity as they reflect on institutional expectations about their teaching efforts.

The strongest predictors of social knowledge in Blackburn and Lawrence's (1995) model are "support and the effort faculty believed their institutions desired" (p. 281). In

this model support is based on perceptions about interactions within the faculty member's department, which contribute to a sense of departmental collegiality and the credibility of colleagues, including the department chair. Interestingly Kezar and Sam (2011) also reported that "a variety of different studies have demonstrated that department chairs (and sometimes deans) have the most impact on the hiring and general policies related to non-tenure-track faculty" (p. 101). It appears that department chairs may have a substantial impact on both the recruitment and the productivity of non-tenure-track faculty.

Unfortunately, since Blackburn and Lawrence's (1995) model was based on survey data, participants could not elaborate on their expectations about departmental collegiality or what constituted credible colleagues. Another concern with applying this model to teaching-intensive faculty is that the model relied on grant dollars generated as a measure of effort, a professional activity that most teaching-intensive faculty do not do. While teaching effort may be only marginally relevant in a faculty position that bases tenure on grant dollars generated and research articles published, measures of teaching effort become significantly relevant for a faculty member whose evaluation is based primarily on teaching effort. One complication of evaluating teaching effort is that teaching is much more difficult to define and measure than is the number of grant dollars generated. Blackburn and Lawrence conclude that behaviors and products are generated from self-knowledge and social knowledge which lead to new self-perceptions and perceptions about the organizational environment- which generate new behaviors and products. This cyclic interaction reflects a conceptual framework that Blackburn and Lawrence utilized in framing their study, a framework that could be useful in this current study.

Academic Identity through the Perspective of Symbolic Interactionism

Examining the meaning given to socially-constructed objects, such as tenure and non-tenure, requires a consideration of Blumer's symbolic interactionism. Symbolic interactionists view human behavior as an outcome of meanings associated with objects. Humans assign meanings to objects through interactions with self or with others. Iteratively these interactions can alter or confirm the meaning assigned to an object. These meaningful objects include physical objects, institutions, values, events, other people or categories of people, or anything else a person may encounter or observe. For example, in higher education having a non-tenure appointment has meaning as does having a tenure-stream appointment. Additionally, the meaning a person assigns to any certain object can be altered through social interactions (i.e., how other people react to an object), so that meanings are applied and revised through an individual interpretive process. Interactionists view people as engaging in an "ongoing cycle of interactions and altered cognitions, values, beliefs, preferences, and behaviors" (Blackburn and Lawrence, 1995, p. 289). Through the lens of symbolic interactionism, a full-time non-tenure track faculty member's perceptions about their academic identity is partly based on the various meanings these individuals ascribe to meaningful objects in their professional and academic lives, although these perceptions are not fixed.

Symbolic interactionist researchers "vary in the emphasis on the structure of identity, on the one hand, and the processes and interactions through which identities are constructed, on the other" (Howard, 2000, p. 371). Since the current study examined the processes and interactions that contribute to the construction of academic identity, symbolic interactionism is a useful perspective and helped me frame the meaning that

full-time non-tenure track faculty members assigned to academic regulations, evaluation procedures, and socializing interactions with others.

Academic Identity through the Perspective of Organizational Socialization

According to symbolic interactionists' view of organizational socialization, individuals, not organizations, determine perspectives about the functions and values of roles (Strauss, 1959; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). "In certain educational institutions, the granting of university tenure represents the formal recognition of crossing a major inclusionary boundary, as well as the more obvious hierarchical passage" (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979, p. 21). Although in recent history typically only faculty with research-oriented assignments have been permitted to apply for passage across the inclusionary boundary of university tenure, this type of socializing event creates a skewed career ladder "hierarchically favoring the movement up of only those persons coming from a particular functional or inclusionary location" (p. 26).

According to Van Maanen (1977) the Lewinian model of socialization is that an organization is in one of three socialization stages: unfreezing, changing, and refreezing. For decades in higher education only tenure-stream faculty, within institutions that granted tenure, were part of the university's organizational socialization process while other faculty (FTNTT, adjuncts, part-timers, etc.), were frozen out of socializing events such as tenure and promotion opportunities, provost teaching awards, and faculty governance. The increasing numbers of full-time non-tenure track faculty members are creating an evolutionary shift in the organizational social structure of the university. Examining the professional lives and academic identity of FTNTT faculty requires reflection about the ways in which the current organizational structure has remained

frozen and also the ways it has unfrozen enough to let other faculty inside the social structure. In some departments, the unfreezing is slowly coming about as some tenure-stream faculty welcome the addition of FTNTT faculty to the department; however, there are faculty who still speak fondly of the glory days of higher education, when the academy primarily supported tenure-stream faculty. A desire to maintain survival of the current state of authority relationships, work ideology, and organizational values can be motivated by organization nostalgia (Parker, 2007) “as if social change was affecting these places for the worse and if the organization forgot its roots it would be losing a central part of its reason for existing” (Parker, 2007, p. 71-72). One way to manage change is to acclimate new members through organizational socialization processes. Organizational socialization is “the process by which an individual acquires the social knowledge and skills necessary to assume an organizational role” (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979, p. 3) and encourages the new members to maintain survival of the current organizational structure. Organizational socialization is conducted through both formal and informal processes.

Tenure-stream faculty members, who want to make a professional transition into becoming a permanent member of the professoriate who are entitled to academic freedom, are required to complete an elaborate and formal organizational socialization process “requiring a lengthy preparation period of education and training [graduate school] followed by an equally drawn out period of official apprenticeship [tenure track position]” (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979, p. 3). Through this process established perspectives about the department and faculty roles can be conveyed from one generation to the next. However, “just as biologists sometimes argue that ‘gene pools’ exploit individuals in the

interest of their own survival, organizations, as sociocultural forms, do the same. Thus, the devout believer is the Church's way of ensuring the survival of the Church...and the productive employee is the Corporation's way of ensuring survival of the Corporation" (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979, p. 2), and the tenure-stream faculty member is the University's way of ensuring the survival of the University. However, some perspectives, values, roles, and "cultural forms may persist long after they have ceased to be of individual value" (p. 5) or are even organizationally functional. For example, many graduate departments continue to encourage doctoral students to aspire to tenure-stream positions just as businesses encourage employees to strive for more advanced positions in the company "despite the fact that there will be very few positions open at these levels" (p. 5) for the doctoral graduate or the business employee. On occasion post-docs will accept an assignment as a full-time non-tenure track faculty member with the intention of transitioning to a tenure-stream position, although the AAUP reports that this transition- even when a tenure-stream position opens in the department- is a rare occurrence (Curtis & Thornton, 2013). Regardless, these non-tenure track faculty members are determined to be the exception and may respond to their assignments in innovative ways.

Once an individual accepts assignment as a tenure-stream or a non-tenure track faculty member within the department, there are two poles on a continuum of responses to which the new faculty member can gravitate: custodial or innovative. At the custodial pole the faculty member will accept the position as it is described by the department chair and within the guidelines given in his or her contract and at orientation. At the innovative pole the faculty member will reject and redefine the assignment in order to create a mission and strategy that is different from a majority of the role occupants. "People

respond to particular organizationally defined roles differently not only because people and organizations differ, but also because socialization processes differ” (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979, p. 35). Listening to the participants describe informal and formal departmental socialization processes could provide clues about the processes that encouraged these full-time faculty to gravitate toward an innovative or custodial perspective about their non-tenure assignment.

Academic Identity through the Perspective of Organizational Culture

When examining the professional lives of full-time non-tenure track faculty members, and how those professional experiences impact the academic identity of the faculty member, organizational culture research can be illustrative about the ways these faculty perceive themselves within a department that includes tenure-stream colleagues. Since faculty are reported to identify more closely with their disciplinary department than their institution (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007), studies of organizational culture within higher education need to focus at the departmental level.

Martin (1992, 2002) has argued that analyzing organizational cultures is limited if researchers assign a static view of one perspective of that culture. Additionally, “identity in organizations should be understood as a moving pattern of shared differences” (Pullen, Beech, & Sims, 2007, p. 62). A singular perspective can be particularly problematic for organizations that are moving through a cultural change such as academic membership currently is. When I considered that identity consists of moving patterns within an organizational culture that can be viewed from multiple perspectives I questioned the legitimacy of a fixed person-organizational fit. Rather than assuming fit is fixed and static, different aspects of the work culture may both align with varying conceptions of self and

conflict with other conceptions of self to generate a fit that is fluid. Adding to this complexity for a non-tenure track faculty member is the occupying of two subcultures, an occupational subculture of being a contingent academic and a disciplinary subculture of being a degreed academic

Academic Identity through the Perspective of Organizational Fit

“Person-environment fit is defined as the compatibility that occurs when individual and work environment characteristics are well matched” (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). According to Kristof’s model (1996), there are four levels of organization fit: person-vocation, person-organization, person-job, and person-workgroup. Aspects of congruence, or fit, between a person’s values, needs and abilities and the needs and values of the organizational environment in which that person is working are examined on the broadest scale (person-vocation fit) to the smallest scale (person-workgroup fit). Person-workgroup fit, the smallest scale, considers how well a person fits within a specific sub-unit of an organization. In higher education, committees might be considered workgroups. Person-vocation fit, the broadest scale, examines the alignment between an individual’s personal characteristics and vocational characteristics without consideration of the place or environment where the vocation is executed. Comparing a faculty member’s personal values and expectations to the characteristics expected of a faculty member would fall under this level of focus, but in today’s shifting population of faculty members there is not a singular set of characteristics expected of a faculty member’s vocation. Comparing a faculty member’s knowledge, skills and attitudes (KSA) to expectations communicated in the job assignment would fall under the category of person-job fit. Person-job fit considers how well the individual’s KSA’s are

utilized and professional needs are met within a working context. All faculty members, regardless of rank, might struggle with person-job fit depending on how well the specific faculty member's knowledge, skills, and attributes fit within the specific job requirements of that person's academic assignment. Part-time instructors with young children may have intentionally sought a part-time teaching assignment to fulfill both family values and professional values by applying their intellectual attributes into a part-time position. This would be an example of a congruent person-job fit. Finally, congruence between a person's values, needs, and skills and the values and needs of the university would typically fall under the category of person-organization fit. However, because of the complexity of how academic institutions tend to be organized, previous researchers have noted that departments can function as institutional subcultures (Lindholm, 2003) making them more relevant than institutions in studies of person-organizational fit. If faculty members perceive the organization (department or institution) as supporting their vocation as teaching faculty this would be an example of congruent person-organization fit. "Fit refers to a relationship between P [person] and E [environment], which implies that both work in concert to influence outcomes" (Kristof-Brown & Guay, 2011, p. 4).

One condition of fit is that the dimensions for the person (i.e. holding a full-time non-tenure track position) must be defined in terms of the same content for the environment (i.e. full-time non-tenure track role in the department) (Kristof-Brown & Guay, 2011). In this study, the dimension that was revealed as having meaning for the person and the environment was the purpose of the full-time non-tenure track faculty member's role in the department. A second condition of P-E fit, that has created debate, is individual-organizational value congruence. In this study value congruence focused on

the value of a teaching position and the value of a research position (tenure-stream). Therefore, a full-time non-tenure track faculty within a teaching-oriented department may perceive a strong P-E fit, while a full-time non-tenure track faculty within a research-oriented department at the same university may perceive a misfit. Kristof-Brown and Guay (2011) have suggested that qualitative research could contribute to uncovering “what people consider when forming or changing their fit perceptions” (p. 39). In the context of higher education, the question of the interaction between fit and academic identity is one that remains to be asked.

Summary

Researchers have studied various aspects about the organization of higher education such as: the role of higher education in society, costs and benefits of tenure lines, the influence of faculty governance on institutional practices, and funding stream sources. Studies about the costs and benefits of tenure lines tend to focus on the benefit to the institution and costs to the student and the non-tenure stream faculty. However, those might be perspectives that are too narrow, especially when considering the experience of the non-tenure stream faculty. Selecting a vocation, followed by accepting a job within that vocation, is based on a series of expectations that come from assigning meaning to objects that represent personal and professional success. Research by Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) and other symbolic interactionists, justifies considering that the meaning given to objects to indicate personal and professional success may be influenced by interactions with others in the profession as well as self-reflective interactions. Although both full-time non-tenure track faculty and tenure-stream faculty have acquired the same vocational label of faculty, the person-job expectations are typically very

different. Research by Kristof-Brown and Guay (2011) and Lindholm (2003) indicate that in this study job requirements may have professional implications that could also inform academic identity. Full-time non-tenure track faculty members, who are not engaging in disciplinary research, may or may not perceive that this impacts their professional disciplinary prestige (recognition). Van Maanen and Schein's (1979) research indicate that the influence of holding a full-time non-tenure appointment on academic identity may depend on expectations expressed at organizational entry (what was communicated during new faculty orientation), socialization (how the departmental expectations and rewards are interpreted, how the new faculty was socialized to interpret success as a graduate student), and the meaning assigned to discipline-related activities (ability to contribute to their discipline, development of teaching, and intellectual growth). While Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) suggest that the socialization effects of graduate school "weaken and most often disappear when self-knowledge and social knowledge variables come into play" (p. 286) as the new faculty member adjusts to the norms and expectations of their faculty appointment, that adjustment is influenced by perceptions about the meaning and value assigned to academic activities which influences self-definitions of professional success. The interaction between the person's academic identity and the organizational culture where that identity is expressed is complex and, most likely, somewhat unstable rather than fixed as suggested by research Martin (1992, 2002) has conducted. This study is an opportunity to determine how these theoretical perspectives can be useful in framing the full-time non-tenure track experience. This study is also an opportunity for the full-time non-tenure track faculty members who are

experiencing these complex interactions to add their voices to the conversation and for the academy to gain a deeper understanding of the complexities of their circumstances.

Definition of Terms

The terms I use throughout this study are common, yet varieties of terms are used in the research about faculty: tenure-track, tenured, and non-tenure track.

FTNTT/Full-time non-tenure track/lecturer- I use these terms interchangeably throughout this document to refer to full-time faculty members who are off the tenure-track; however I tend to use the term lecturers most frequently when referring to the participants in this study.

Tenure-stream- This term was suggested by one of the participants and I agreed that it is a succinct way to refer to faculty who are either on the tenure-track or are already tenured. If a quote was used in which a participant used either term (tenure-track or tenured) I retained that term.

Chapter Three

Methodology

My purpose in conducting this study is to contribute to the building of a theory that explains the ways in which professional and academic identity may be experienced within organizational (i.e., departmental) and disciplinary cultures based on the perspective of full-time non-tenure track (FTNTT) faculty members. Although many theoretical frameworks can contribute to the understanding of the phenomenon of being an FTNTT faculty member (person-organizational fit, expectancy-value, faculty productivity model), none of these originate from the perspective of the social actor (FTNTT faculty member) interacting within a departmental and disciplinary culture that offers tenure. Additionally, based on prior research (Kezar & Sam, 2011) the experience of being an FTNTT faculty member is a complex, context-specific phenomenon that generates different meanings for those involved in that experience requiring a constructivist approach to researching this phenomenon. A constructivist approach to research acknowledges that multiple perspectives can be recognized and that the researcher plays an active part in constructing the interpretation of the data gathered. In consideration of my purpose and the phenomenon being studied, the most logical approach to this study was a qualitative approach based on a constructivist paradigm.

Research Perspective

Qualitative approaches to research are inductive and tend to be grounded in the data based on the assumption that the researcher learns from the participant. This method of research generates a wealth of detailed information to be categorized. Within the qualitative research paradigm there are a variety of approaches to inquiry that focus on

understanding a phenomenon as the researcher's goal for conducting the study (Patton, 2002). These approaches include, but are not limited to, symbolic interactionism, grounded theory, and phenomenology.

All three of these approaches require the researcher to become a witness to the lived experience of a phenomenon through interviews, observations or other inquiry methods; however, these approaches differ in their intent. Symbolic interactionism is a form of phenomenology that focuses on the interpretive processes humans engage in when interacting and the intent is to explain the symbolic meaning assigned to these interactions (Patton, 2002). Grounded theory researchers focus on explaining relationships between categories to generate a theory. The purpose of grounded theory is to create a theory based on objectively collected and analyzed data. Phenomenological researchers focus on understanding "the meaningful structure of an experience" (Dukes, 1984, p. 202). The purpose of phenomenology is to describe how people experience and interpret a particular phenomenon; a robust phenomenological study moves data beyond pure description. Initially, the researcher of a phenomenological study describes the essence of a phenomenon based on an analysis of meaning constructions within an individual's interview data, but then the researcher synthesizes each individual experience into structural categories that are common across experiences using both research literature and other data to support implications for future research studies (Giorgi, 1970; Hycner, 1985). I have selected a phenomenological approach because my intent in this study is to understand participants' perspectives about the experience of being a full-time non-tenure track faculty member in the context of a research university and to create a better understanding of social phenomena within this context. In this

phenomenological study about the experience of being an FTNTT faculty member and how those faculty frame their academic identity, the published literature is used as an analytic comparison for the study findings so that a series of hypotheses about the basic elements of the FTNTT experience and academic identity can be generated and explored in later studies. Therefore, the literature is incorporated throughout the research process in this study, including the stages of design, analysis, and synthesis.

In the design of this study, the literature was referred to when developing the initial interview questions and in determining whom to initially interview (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). In addition, since “it is impossible to know prior to the investigation what the salient problems will be or what theoretical concepts will emerge” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 49), the literature was also used during data analysis as a basis of comparison for concepts emerging from the data. The purpose of comparing this study’s data to the literature findings was to develop greater conceptual specificity of the data by using the literature as a “secondary source of data” (p. 51). Additionally, nontechnical literature (such as documents available on the university’s website) was used to supplement the data gathered from interviews and observations. Because I used the literature as a form of data, I had the opportunity to examine my assumptions and propositions through the lens of extant literature as I participated “in the creation of new understanding through dialectical use of question and answer when engaging with the literature” (Smythe & Spence, p. 13, 2012). Furthermore, based on a continuous review of the literature in constant comparison with the data of this study, I was able to consider new theories that might extend, explain, or even contradict what appears to be emerging from the data (Dunne, 2011). Discovering discrepancies between the findings in this study and those

reported in the literature forced me to consider, “What is going on? Am I overlooking something important? Are conditions different in this study? If so, then how are they different, and how does this affect what I am seeing?” (p. 51). By simultaneously exploring the literature while interpreting the data, relevant findings and missing perspectives were highlighted to create a harmonious “congruence between the research and the substantive literature” (Smythe & Spence, 2012, p. 21).

The literature was also referred to in the final writing stage as a point of comparison for how this study’s findings extended, validated, and differentiated from other research findings about the phenomenon of being a full-time non-tenure track faculty member among tenure-stream colleagues. Returning to the literature after analyzing my data required me to remain open to emerging concepts and question any taken-for-granted assumptions I made throughout the processes of thinking, writing and reading (Smythe and Spence, 2012). Throughout this study, just as the interviewees were conversational partners (Rubin & Rubin, 2012) who provoked thinking, the literature was also a conversational partner (Smythe & Spence, 2012). The literature, in this final stage, was considered a form of analytical discourse between my analysis of this study’s data and conceptual interpretations of that analysis based on published research findings to generate new insights about the experiences described. Finally, these insights were captured through analytical memos that documented the integration of extant knowledge and collected data in this study and “to justify my decisions for drawing certain conclusions and propounding specific arguments” (Dunne, p. 120, 2011).

Data Collection

Interview data, based on in-depth, semi-structured interviews with a total of 12

FTNTT participants, were analyzed and compared to other interviews, documents, policies, analytic memos, and my personal observations. The interview questions were refined based on a comparison of memos about previous interviews resulting in an emergent interview protocol. The initial categories and interview questions used to initiate this study were based on an awareness of existing, yet limited, research literature. Although some qualitative researchers disagree with entering the field with pre-determined categories (Glaser, 1978), other researchers (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) have agreed that pre-determined initial categories are problematic only if the researcher forces the data into these categories rather than allowing the categories to be altered according to the data as it emerges.

Throughout all of the interviews, I kept an interview protocol (see Appendix A) in my hand to guide the interview process; the protocol was used only to guide the direction of the interview. The study began with interviews of four FTNTT faculty members (two faculty members were from the same department). After conducting these initial interviews, I noted that prop (paper circles) I used as an assist for participants to demonstrate the relationship, if any, between academic and professional identity were distracting to the participants. Since these props were problematic I discontinued their use. In this way, I analyzed the interview data and refined the interview questions between the start of the interviews and the end of the interviewing phase.

Selection of Participants and Gaining Access

Since a large portion of the data for this study originated from interviews, selecting a site and recruiting willing participants were important steps in this research. Although this university houses many colleges, one college in particular includes over 15

departments. This large college was selected as the site for this study. A benefit of the chosen site for this study is that the full study population is known and publically identified through the college's website so that location of the participants and their contact information was already available. However, the challenge of successfully recruiting these faculty members to participate in the study remained.

Like all faculty members at a research-intensive university, full-time non-tenure track faculty members have many demands on their time. Therefore initiating a research relationship for this study was a two-fold challenge: gaining entry and appealing to participants. The dean of this college had expressed an interest in supporting the growing number of full-time non-tenure track faculty members within this college, so I was granted permission to conduct my study within that college. I began with two separate meetings, each with one administrator in the college in order to create a list of potential participants. These brief meetings provided two additional benefits to the study. First, I learned that within one department, multiple disciplines were represented. This information was helpful in selecting participants whose professional experiences were different from each other in order to better locate "the structural invariants of this particular type of experience" (Dukes, 1984), that is being a full-time non-tenure track faculty member within the context of a research-intensive university. Second, I gained some background information about the college. According to the first administrator, there is at least one department in which one program treats their FTNTT faculty as contracted instructors. Another program in the same department includes FTNTT in program decision-making and encourages them to take on leadership roles. A third program encourages their FTNTT faculty to dedicate their professional development

through the distribution of effort (DOE) percentage system to research. In addition, a mentor is provided to each new FTNTT faculty member. I was able to solicit four of the participants from two of these programs, but not from the program that was described as treating their FTNTT faculty as contractual labor.

This step of gaining entry was also a means for appealing to participants because I was given permission to invoke the administrator's name in making my request for an interview. A request for participation, as submitted to IRB, was sent through email. I arranged all 12 interviews through these emailed requests.

Procedure

The sample for this study was selected based on quota selection (Miles & Huberman, 1984) by recruiting faculty members from different disciplines and departments within the college. Since disciplinary and departmental culture was thought to contribute to academic identity and the FTNTT experience, I tried to recruit from a variety of disciplines and departments for the initial sample. My aim in recruiting from various disciplines and departments was intended to create a broader description of FTNTT professional lives based on data from participants with a variety of perspectives while also developing an understanding of the essence of the participants' experience that was invariant regardless of discipline or department.

My intention was to draw the rest of the participants in the study within the same departments from which the initial groups of participants were drawn using the snowball technique. My aim with this intention was to develop conceptual dimensions of the FTNTT experience that would capture multiple perspectives. Toward the end of each interview I asked, "Who else do you think I should talk to?" and/or "Who do you think

might have a perspective that is different from yours?” However, only one of the initial interviews generated a participant for the second phase. I revised my recruitment strategy and simply aimed at generating equal representation of the following fields: natural science, social science, and humanities. I interviewed eight participants for the second sample, which generated a final sample of 12 participants: four from the natural sciences, four from the social sciences, three from the humanities, and one from the formal sciences. During these next eight interviews, I heard about experiences that described ways these participants felt they were valued, or not valued, for their role in their department. The participants shared experiences that reflected how different aspects of their professional experiences informed their own perceptions of their academic identity as well as other aspects of what it means to be a professional. However, by remaining open to what the participants were sharing, I also heard that academic identity and professional identity were not completely defined by these experiences. The categories I had gleaned from an initial exploration of the literature, while helpful in designing interview questions, were not sufficient for capturing the experiences that were being described. After conducting all 12 interviews, I became able to describe some perspectives that were common to most of the participants, although there were still some perspectives that were distinct to individual participants.

Data Collection

In-depth, semi-structured interviews were the source of much of my data. All interviews were conducted using a style of qualitative interviewing called responsive interviewing (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). In responsive interviewing, the researcher views the participant as a conversational partner. This style of interviewing requires the interviewer

to form a relationship with the interviewee, a relationship that is based on trust (through maintaining promises of confidentiality and engaging in reciprocity of openness) and is consistent with my constructivist paradigm in designing this phenomenological study. During the interview, this partnered relationship was maintained through my use of a friendly and supportive tone, and reliance on questions that are flexible (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). Responsive interviewing tends to require more time than a typical semi-structured interview. Participants were told that the interviews would take at least 75 minutes; however, participants were offered an opportunity to engage in interviews of any length. Only one interview ended after only 75 minutes while the rest ranged in length from 85 minutes up to almost two hours, although the typical interview was 90 minutes.

A second form of data was gathered from observation of various new faculty orientations. These observations were used to provide both verifying and contrary data to the categories identified from the interview data. While attending the orientations, I took field notes about observed events that appeared relevant to holding an FTNTT position. I observed two university-wide orientations offered to all new faculty members; however, during the initial interviews, I was informed about another orientation that the college arranged specifically for full-time non-tenure track faculty. While only half of the participants indicated that they had attended the university-wide orientation, all of the participants reported that they had attended an orientation specifically addressing full-time non-tenure track faculty positions. During the study, I attended the university-wide orientation as well as this orientation, which was specific to full-time non-tenure track faculty.

A third form of data was gathered from documents available through the university's website. These documents were analyzed to determine whether confirming or discrepant evidence was available to justify the categories that were being formed based on the interview data.

Analytic memos were the final form of data collection. Analytic memos are both forms of data and forms of analysis. These analytic memos were written by me in response to an interview, an observation, a reading (both documents and literature), and became the connecting points between the various data forms and potential categories. In this study, I also utilized analytic memos as a way to bracket my assumptions about aspects of academic identity and as tools to refine my conclusions. Some of my assumptions when entering this study were based on my interpretation of the research literature as well as my personal observations, which provided me with the initial categories of socialization, expectations, values, and interactions. By explicitly identifying and documenting possible assumptions throughout the study process in a clear-cut written format, I considered how I might be imposing meaning on the data that was not reflective of the participant's experiences. Furthermore, some of these reflexive analytic memos also allowed me to reexamine interpretations made at the start of this study against emerging insights (Fischer, 2009; Watt, 2007).

Data Analysis

One threat to identifying the essence of a lived experience through a qualitative study is to force the data into pre-determined categories so that the study is one of verification of the categories, rather than a study in which the data are used to generate, refute, and refine the categories (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007). In phenomenological studies,

researchers attempt to bracket or set aside preconceptions about a phenomenon. Although I started this study with four potential sources of academic identity (socialization, expectations, values, and interactions), these categories were only used as a starting point for analyzing what is expressed as the lived experience of the participants. Categories, both pre-determined and those derived from the interview data, were compared with observational field notes, analytic memos, other interview data, institutional documents, and the research literature. A majority of the analysis focused on the interview data because the interviews provided the bulk of the data for the study; however, the research literature also influenced the analysis as I sought to contextualize my findings with existing theories. I returned to the literature during and after analyzing the data to determine how my results could be explained by, and contribute to, extant theory.

Another threat to phenomenological study is allowing the experiences expressed by one interviewee to alter how the next interview is analyzed. In order to bracket the unique experiences of individual interviews, I took some analytic precautions. Prior to beginning the transcription process, I listened to each interview to gain a holistic understanding of the interview. During this initial exposure to the recorded interview, I recorded my thoughts, ideas, potential biases, and understanding about what had been said. While transcribing the interviews, I acquired a more intimate awareness of each participant's experiences. During the transcribing process, I also recorded more ideas and thoughts as they arose. Transcripts of each interview in the initial sample of four interviews were analyzed twice. First, each interview was analyzed as a single-case study analysis to generate initial categories. These transcripts were first coded according to a start list of categories of codes drawn from the research literature: socialization,

expectations, interactions, and values. This initial coding helped to bracket my assumptions about the categories of meaning FTNTT faculty members reveal about academic identity because I was able to apply the categorical codes and then set them aside. Bracketing increases the trustworthiness of a study by ensuring “that our understandings are not just our own and that if other researchers studied our data that they would come to similar understandings” (Fischer, 2009, p. 584). In recognition of a need to bracket my bias toward teaching as the mission of higher education I also listened to these initial four interviews for indications that I may be directing the participants during the interview. Noting that during these initial four interviews that I had a tendency to encourage participants to consider participating on a graduate committee, for the other eight interviews I refrained from rephrasing these types of questions if a participant declined initial interest. The individual interview transcripts were coded again two weeks later by highlighting themes that indicated perceptions about academic identity and the experience of being an FTNTT faculty member. These themes were used to generate a summary that considered the participant’s implicit or explicit meaning while describing academic identity and experiences as a full-time non-tenure track faculty member. After the interviews were individually analyzed, interim case studies (Miles & Huberman, 1984) were written in order to assess “the adequacy of the data that have been collected” (p. 80), to compare all four interviews for commonalities and discrepancies.

After four initial interview transcripts were coded and summarized through interim case studies, the next eight interviews were conducted with an increased sensitivity toward developing an understanding of specific areas of the phenomenon. For example, when I initiated this study the research literature was helpful in designing

interview questions that would encourage participants to describe the essence of the experience of being an FTNTT faculty member. However, after examining transcripts from the first four interviewees, I realized that I needed to be more attuned to each participant's responses during the interview and resist my tendency to focus on questions in my interview protocol. This shift in my responsiveness during the interview provided more opportunities for participants to share their perceptions about role satisfaction, governance opportunities, and departmental support to teach upper division courses even though these were not categories I had initially considered. Closely replicating the initial analytical process, these eight transcripts were examined for meaning units that were eventually transformed, through summary and synthesis, into descriptions of the experiences of these FTNTT faculty members and their perceptions about those experiences. Conceptual categories were generated through single-case analysis. The single-case analysis was followed by cross-case analysis and synthesis. Through single-case analysis, I noted categories of experiences related to the FTNTT faculty role as well as perceptions about academic identity as described by each participant. Comparing and contrasting the individual cases, I synthesized the results through cross-case analysis to generate conceptual categories common to multiple experiences. This phase of analysis concluded as I determined where there were structural commonalities, as well as inconsistencies, among the experiences and perceptions reported.

The second form of data, institutional documents, was also summarized. Summaries of the institutional documents were recorded through document summary forms. Document summary forms "puts the document in context, explains its significance, and gives a brief summary" (Miles & Huberman, 1985, p. 55). These

document summaries were compared to the interview summaries and field notes to provide context for the study, create dependability (Lincoln & Guba, 1995) of the data recorded through the interviews, and to provide greater depth to the narratives given by the participants.

Finally, analytic memos were used to capture critical insights about the data and the analysis throughout the research study and to keep my assumptions explicit. Using Strauss and Corbin's (1998) advice, *memoing* was done concurrently with all other data collection. The memos were useful for developing propositions about relationships between categories, to construct possible explanations of perceptions about academic identity, and to create thick descriptions of being an FTNTT faculty member. These memos also helped to make connections among the data collected. Finally, the memos provided documentation of how I developed my particular interpretations while also supporting my efforts to connect concepts identified in my study to the research literature.

Threats to Validity

In both quantitative and qualitative studies, validity threats are “particular events or processes that could lead to invalid conclusions” (Maxwell, 1996, p. 90) or interpretations because an alternative explanation is more plausible. Therefore, in empirical studies researchers incorporate into the study's design methods that rule out plausible alternatives (Creswell, 2003; Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Sanelowski, 1986). One of the benefits of conducting a qualitative study is the opportunity to investigate discrepant cases because of employing an emergent design. In qualitative research the effort to validate findings primarily hovers around methods that confirm the

trustworthiness of the data and the meaningfulness of the findings. Trustworthiness (Guba, 1981; Krefting, 1991) can be established through documentation of the accuracy of the data collected and evidence that the researcher thoroughly investigated the possibility of discrepant evidence that challenges the implications or conclusions being made. Some preventative methods were included in my initial study design while other methods, such as bracketing, were utilized when opportunities emerged to examine evidence that conflicted with my interpretations or conclusions. Additionally, qualitative researchers are expected to generate valid descriptions, valid interpretations, and valid theory to aid with *confirmability* (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Valid descriptions of interviews can be confirmed through the use of tape recording and comparing those recordings to the transcriptions to avoid inaccuracy of the interview data. However, valid descriptions can be thwarted during the interview process whenever an interviewer's assumptions about what the participant is saying prevents responsive listening (Rubin & Rubin, 2012) or a request for in-depth descriptions of an experience or perception is not made. Valid descriptions of observations are also challenging to verify. According to Maxwell (1996), observations can be considered to have valid descriptions when they are "detailed, concrete, and chronological" (p. 89).

Qualitative researchers must also be aware of, and take measures to address, *representativeness*, *reactivity*, and *reliability* when interpreting findings, suggesting implications, or drawing conclusions. Not all of these safeguards combined, protect a study from biased interpretations or invalid conclusions; however, acknowledgement of these validity threats, application of measures to address them, and explicit

documentation of those applications can provide reasonable assurance to readers that the interpretations and explanations are more plausible than the possible alternatives.

Representativeness is threatened when a researcher draws research participants from a non-representative sample (Maxwell, 2013). Participants for this study had to have a terminal degree; in this study, that was a Ph.D. for all 12 participants. Participants all had to have teaching assignments, rather than research assignments, within the one college selected as the site for this research and had to have been teaching full-time at the university for at least one year but not more than five years. All of the participants had been hired as full-time lecturers between 2008 and 2012. According to the college's website, there were 70 full-time lecturers in this college when participants were being recruited with 39 holding a terminal degree. Seven of the 39 were senior lecturers, indicating that they had more than five years of full-time teaching at this university. All faculty members are listed on the website. The university website also has a directory of people that provided contact information and degree attained on each person's personal profile page. This directory provided the starting point for identifying potential participants.

In this study the size of the sample from which I choose to solicit participants was 32; however, only those faculty members who were willing to participate were interviewed. Nonparticipants may represent an aspect of the phenomenon that remains unknown, which is a limitation of this study particularly since the invitation to be interviewed was not issued to every full-time lecturer in this college. Because departments and disciplines have different cultures and those cultures could have an impact on the academic identity and the experience of being a full-time non-tenure track

faculty member, I decided to contact faculty from departments that represented fields within the natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities. I sent emails to 16 faculty members from seven departments who met my criteria for participation. The remaining 16 potential participants were never contacted because the initial 16 faculty members who were contacted generated 12 interviews that provided both structural commonalities as well as some important variations about the experience of being a full-time non-tenure track faculty member at a research-intensive university (Dukes, 1984; Maxwell, 2013). Thirteen responded that they would participate, one never responded despite repeated email attempts, and two responded that they would not participate. Of the two that declined the interview, one cited concerns about the risk of being involved in the study and a lack of available time, while the other declined because of a lack of available time. Another candidate initially agreed to participate, but requested delaying until a later date. However, when I followed up with this candidate near the later date, I received no response despite repeated emailed inquires.

Reactions to the researcher or the research project can create biases that affect study findings too. Miles and Huberman (1984) suggest that *reactivity* to research effects on participants can be reduced by informing participants of why I chose to interview them, what my study is about, how I will be collecting information, what I will do with the information, blending in with the research environment, and constantly considering alternative interpretations of data (p. 266). To address this, each invitation to participate (see Appendix B), as well as the informed consent forms (University of Kentucky IRB approval no. 12-0512), included a disclosing of the nature of the study which addressed many of these concerns as suggested by Miles and Huberman. Furthermore, as a member

of a unit that supports educational development around the research site, I was able to attend most events unobtrusively (i.e., new faculty orientation). To counteract reactivity bias I tried to be as discreet as possible when observing, as revealing as necessary when interviewing, and as open as possible when conceptualizing about the data.

Reliability of findings is addressed in qualitative research through triangulating the data to avoid “putting more logic, coherence, and meaning into events than the inherent sloppiness of social life warrants” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 273). One method to triangulate the data in this study was to engage in cross-case analysis using analytic memos, conduct second-level coding on data, and analyze interim case summaries. Another method that is also consistent with the constructivist paradigm guiding this study is to offer participants various opportunities to give me feedback. The first opportunity for feedback was in sending each participant an email with his or her transcript attached to provide an opportunity to check the accuracy of the interview transcript. A second opportunity was to request feedback about how I represented the transcribed interview with a brief summary of my findings (a technique also known as member-checking). These efforts were implemented in an attempt to generate implications and conclusions that are both trustworthy and meaningful. This commitment to examining and addressing threats is most apparent in the process of reflexivity.

Reflexivity is a process of reflecting on one’s own perspectives (Watt, 2007). One method of engaging in reflexivity is through articulating perspectives to committee members and other researchers during the design and planned analysis of this study and keeping a research journal. Relying on the techniques described previously helped to keep my assumptions, biases and beliefs explicit through reflexive journaling and

analytic memos. I have also created assumptions about initial categories based on my professional role within the university and the readings I have done about academic identity. During the interviews, I had to set aside these concepts in order to hear and ask for explanations about the participants' definitions of these terms.

In summary, my purpose in conducting this phenomenological study was to generate a description of the experience of being a full-time non-tenure track faculty member at a research-intensive institution. I also found out how these faculty defined their academic identity in this context. I used responsive interviewing techniques during the in-depth semi-structured interviews, which created transcripts that formed the bulk of the data. The participants' perspectives about their experiences and how they defined their academic identity were the focus of this investigation. By relying primarily on data collected directly from the full-time non-tenure track faculty, I was able to derive significant aspects about the professional experiences and academic identity of this population based on their perspectives. Hopefully, these findings will contribute to a better understanding of the professional perspective of this population of faculty members.

Chapter Four

Introduction of the Institution and the Participants

To protect the anonymity of the participants in this study I have not identified participants or their departments. However, understanding a perspective requires some context. Therefore, in this chapter, I offer descriptions of the institution that is the context for this study. I also introduce the participants that were involved with this study and their departments. Some details of the institution, departments, and participants are altered in order to maintain anonymity.

Institutional Setting

The setting for this study is a research university with very high research activity (<http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/>) and a student population consisting of full-time undergraduate students and graduate students, although undergraduate students make up a majority of the student population. The college that was the site of this study is one of the largest on campus. The university houses 16 colleges that serve over 28,000 students, seventy-five percent of these students are residential. Just over 70% of the students are undergraduates and, while a majority of the students are in-state, the number of out-of-state students has doubled in the past ten years. Class sizes range from small seminars to well over 500 students. One major concern for the university has been how to address budgeting shortfalls.

Addressing Budget Shortfalls

As with most universities in the United States, administrators at this institution attempted to address budgeting shortfalls by reducing costs and increasing tuition. Institutional administrators indicated that these changes were necessary due to reductions

in state funding, declining federal support for research, and low yields from short-term investment income. Budget changes had an impact on the full-time non-tenure track faculty at this university as well.

The university administrators suggested that by increasing the tuition and number of enrolled students (i.e., students taking classes, increasing the number in the entering class, increasing the number of transfer students, and increasing the number of students who retain as upper class students) the university could increase its revenue. Since both state appropriations (which had been reduced to 11% of the revenue) and tuition and fees are considered public fund revenue sources, the shortfall from the state funds could be compensated through increased tuition, fees, and number of students. Increasing tuition and fees for students was not well received by the student population.

In summer, 2012 the university president submitted a response for reducing costs and not raising tuition. One avenue for reducing costs was to reduce workforce costs. In a statement to the campus community the president indicated that, as part of a contingency plan to address potential budget shortfalls in the next two fiscal years, “some deans have provided one year’s notice to full-time lecturers” (university publication). Whether full-time lecturers with two year contracts, or longer, would be notified was not addressed; however, some of these lecturers were also given a one year’s notice which created confusion for campus faculty and staff. According to an anonymous data source, at the time of this study, the institution employed 168 full-time non-tenure track faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching. Of those 168 full-time non-tenure track faculty members, 101 identified as female, 63 identified as male, and four did not submit gender identification. The rest of this chapter introduces 12 of these lecturers, six

females and six males and all of them were lecturers when the workforce reduction was suggested.

Introduction of Participants

The participants for this study held a teaching-intensive, full-time non-tenure track appointment with the institution for at least one year and were credentialed with a Ph.D. All of the participants are also lecturers, none are clinical faculty. In this section I describe how each participant came to hold his or her position and offer non-identifying details in order to help the reader form a mental image of each participant. To maintain anonymity of the participants I have assigned each person a pseudonym.

Table 1 List of Participants

Participants (full-time non-tenure track teaching-intensive non-clinical faculty, a.k.a. lecturers because none are clinical faculty)

Helen	Humanities	(i.e. English literature, history, philosophy, etc.)
Allan	Humanities	
Brenna	Humanities	
Carol	Social Science	(i.e. anthropology, economics, linguistics, sociology, etc.)
Denis	Social Science	
Kaleb	Social Science	
Jeremiah	Social Science	
Gwen	Natural Science	(i.e. astronomy, biology, chemistry, etc.)
Faith	Natural Science	
Ethan	Natural Science	
Isabel	Natural Science	
Leon	Formal Science	(i.e. logic, mathematics, statistics, etc.)

Jeremiah

Jeremiah obtained his position as a lecturer by contacting the program director and asking for a job. Initially he received a part-time instructor position, but that quickly morphed into a lecturer position when the department chair sought to have only lecturers who had Ph.Ds. Although this position was not his professional goal, Jeremiah described feeling grateful about having a job. This gratefulness for employment contrasted with his expectation that, having graduated from a top-tier institution, he would have been able to secure a position on the tenure-track at a research-intensive institution. He justifies his situation by observing that most of the other Ph.D. graduates in his cohort are still trying to get their first full-time position.

Jeremiah blamed himself for his predicament because he chose a specialization in academia that had very limited job openings. Recently, he has seen four jobs available in his area for the entire country and knows that hundreds of applicants are applying. He lamented that each year a new “crop” of degreed Ph.D. applicants enter this competition, joining the hundreds that are still seeking their first full-time positions. Because of his experience with the job market, Jeremiah has taken on the mission of informing the next generation of graduate students about the realities of getting a tenure-track job in academia:

I want them to go into it with a realistic expectation of what actually they're getting themselves into. And also to not do it if they don't get into a top-notch program! Because I went to the best program in the world for what I do and yet there are no jobs.

Jeremiah acquired his teaching experience through teaching assistantships during graduate school. Although teaching assistantships allowed him to manage his own section, he had no formal instruction about managing an entire course before he acquired his first teaching position as a part-time instructor. Fortunately Jeremiah's wife, who had pedagogical training, shared with him the skills and techniques she learned as part of her program's expectations. While the experience of learning pedagogical principles as he taught was challenging, it also helped prepare him for the full-time non-tenure track opportunity.

The lack of rigor in pedagogical skills acquired through graduate school training contrasted sharply with the impressive rigor in research skills acquired in the same program. Jeremiah's metric for success from graduate school until now has been the acquisition of a research-intensive tenure-track position. Ironically, Jeremiah's success in his current situation is creating challenges to pursue a tenure-track position elsewhere. He has acquired confidence about his ability to instruct in the large-enrollment setting. As he and his wife continue to develop ties to their current departments and community, the desire to remain in the same locale increases which adds to the difficulty of finding a tenure-track position. Additionally, Jeremiah enjoys the relationship he has established with his current colleagues, feels that he is an integral part of his current program, and observes that, "other department and programs, a lot of places are dysfunctional." So he feels that breaking ties with his current program would require taking many risks, both professionally and personally.

Jeremiah views success as being acknowledged as a renowned expert in his field. He recently received professional recognition at a disciplinary conference when he

presented his solution to one of his field's top unsolvable problems. He also plans to have a book published within the next couple of years. He feels this view of success is in contrast to some lecturers who envision their success as being an expert at teaching in their field. In fact while Jeremiah respects the success of a close friend who recently won a prestigious teaching award, he also perceives that this person is trapped in a lecturer position because, in Jeremiah's opinion, without published research there is no hope of getting a tenure-track job and, with such an intensive commitment to teaching, there is not time for research.

Similar to many of the participants in this study, Jeremiah finds teaching large enrollment service courses challenging mainly due to the large number of students in the course who deny interest in learning the content. However, unlike some other participants, Jeremiah also teaches a seminar course about his research interest that involves just twelve students. Jeremiah felt that this type of intellectual stimulation invigorated his teaching overall. Despite all of the benefits of his current situation, Jeremiah covets a tenure-stream position for many reasons but primarily so he has more time for research. Regarding job security, he described the lecturer and instructor positions as being the most stable "as long as these classes [large enrollment service courses] are needed by people", but the trade-off for that stability means not being able to speak out on politically-charged issues, such as how university resources should be directed.

Allan

For Allan research and teaching are symbiotic when research ideas are being tried out in the classroom. Allan reports enjoying his role and assigned responsibilities;

however, he frequently expressed concern about feeling like there was a countdown for how long he could leave the non-tenure track if he chose to do so. Allan rejected a tenure-track position because he preferred the lifestyle associated with a smaller city and the lecturer position. Based on his passion for teaching and multiple experiences as a teacher, Allan felt that he was well suited for a teaching-intensive position such as the lecturer position demands. While he appreciates his current lifestyle, is respected in his program, and enjoys teaching, he also feels left out of the “ethos” created by going through the tenure process. Allan describes this type of ethos as a “sort of identity based on a particular mode of being, habits that you establish.” Additionally, he considers the developing two-tier system problematic for those in the lower tier because he feels a two-class system prevents a common ethos from forming among faculty who teach.

Allan had multiple experiences teaching throughout his postsecondary education, starting as an undergraduate lab instructor. Even in this early role Allan had full responsibility for a class of 20 to 25 students. He received accolades from his undergraduate program for his teaching skill and was selected to be a lead teaching assistant. He felt his assistantship increased his teaching confidence and ignited his preference for teaching in higher education. He continued to be selected for teaching assistantships throughout his graduate education, which increased both his skill set and his interest in teaching, despite being socialized to attain a research-intensive position after graduation. Allan continues to contact with doctoral advisor who reminds him that, “You didn’t get a Ph.D. to be a lecturer did you?” This question, and other concerns, has created a sense of temporariness about his role as a lecturer despite repeatedly saying that he enjoyed his position. Allan appears to be in a state of flux as he considers the wisdom

of keeping the contract-based position of lecturer over the suggestion that he seek out a tenure-stream position. He described his ideal position as one in which he could continue doing his teaching-intensive efforts under the protection of tenure. Unlike tenure-stream positions, a contract-based position has no official timeline so Allan's decision could remain in flux throughout his career in higher education, should he remain in the role of a lecturer.

Faith

Faith accepted a tenure-track position immediately following graduate school. However, she left that position and took on her current position as a lecturer. When asked about her willingness to give up a tenure-stream position she said that her tenure-stream job had been "very intense...two courses, each with their own labs" every semester and another four-week summer course. She was also expected to engage in research. Comparing her tenure-track position with her lecturer position, Faith has found the lecturer position to be "much less stressful. I feel like this is a very good job as far as stress level and amount that they expect of you." She feels that her current position "is a better environment for me as far as work-life balance." Although Faith is still working on some research collaborations from her previous position, research activity is not expected in her current position.

Faith realized she preferred teaching when she was in graduate school and became involved in the university's teaching certificate program. Faith chose to become a graduate student in a department in which all of the faculty members had to teach because "they were much more open to a student being interested in teaching than

someone in the [other] school.” She felt she had a graduate experience that was better than her peers, who were not encouraged to teach.

Despite research not being part of her current responsibilities, Faith would like to continue her scholarly teaching research as well as present her findings at conferences. However, she is also concerned that experimenting with innovative teaching strategies may negatively impact students’ evaluations of her:

My contract is 75% teaching. If student evaluations are terrible...I think the department respects me enough to know that I would be really trying to increase student learning. I mean that’s the goal right? But I don’t know how it would look honestly to a committee that was evaluating me.

When asked about how she thinks she’ll be evaluated for contract renewal, Faith was concerned about “perceptions of the faculty members on those [evaluation] committees based on what they’ve heard and what they’ve seen and just my interactions with them.” She feels the problem of perception is a bigger problem for lecturer positions:

Because as an academic you can have a strong publication record and that’s very strong evidence that you’re doing what the college wants you to do. But being a lecturer... it seems to me just in talking with other lecturers, that maybe it’s a little bit more subjective than I would like.

Faith perceives a lot of variation in how lecturers are viewed by the tenure-stream faculty in her department. Her experience has been that she is expected to conduct her instruction as she wants “and making my own contributions. And there are other faculty

members who don't feel like that's part of our role. So there's a big variation in the department about what tenure-track faculty would think about what we do."

Faith expressed a desire to teach upper level courses for her department "and there's some push back from other faculty members about me even teaching a 300-level course." One motivation for teaching an upper-level course is the frustration that comes with teaching only large-enrollment service-courses:

I really enjoy the service courses, I do, but it's a little disheartening after a while when you have so many students who don't care. It's just a little bit disheartening. And I just want a new challenge you know. I don't want to teach the same service course. I teach the same one in the fall and the spring...So I'm feeling a bit, honestly- bored. I want a new challenge, you know?

When asked what she finds intellectually stimulating Faith responded that she enjoys identifying "student misconceptions and I really like to integrate student feedback into my course without lowering my expectations and their level of learning" and declared that "being an effective educator to me is an intellectual pursuit." However, trying to sort out what the misconceptions might be for 300 students is difficult because it is not a situation "where we're discussing in class and I can hear their feedback," although she takes advantage of technology to address this as much as she can. Faith describes her future success as having acquired respect for these efforts:

The respect of the people in the department is important to me so I think just the respect of my colleagues would be important. Also, respected by my students...just being respected by my students would be important to me. But also contributing to course development and course learning gains by students in our

department. I want to be part of the discussion about how to increase student learning.

Ethan

Ethan transitioned out of a post-doc position at a research institution into being a visiting professor at a small liberal arts college. This transition was primarily due to a desire to move closer to family and a job position for his spouse.

Because Ethan attended a private university to acquire his Ph.D. and a graduate institution for his postdoc, his teaching experience was limited to teaching assistantship positions until his visiting professorship position. Ethan described his pedagogical training as being fairly limited: “a weeklong crash course in teaching, but I didn’t get the kind of instruction that I think would have been really helpful to me as an instructor. I kind of had to learn those on the fly.” He wondered if better preparation to teach during his graduate education might have had a positive impact on his bid for liberal arts college positions.

Ethan views his role in the department as “a teaching specialist where I’ll be able to help the students get a good experience in the classroom.” Initially, he entered his current position as a course coordinator, but has been transitioning into the role of a pedagogical expert-- that is changing, updating, and trying to improve some of the courses. These efforts have created “a little bit of friction with ... the professor who originally put those [courses] in place because you know he worked very hard on them.” This friction has created questions for Ethan about authority over the courses. “It’s not really clear what authority- and that’s part of the problem is that there’s no real defined ‘who’s in charge’ and nominally, I am in charge of the [courses], but it’s certainly...I try

to do that without stepping on too many toes.” When asked whether he felt that this friction was related to his status as a lecturer he felt the issue was “more that I haven’t been here for very long, more than it’s not a tenure-track.”

Ethan relies on easily accessed resources to meet his professional development needs to keep up with his discipline because he does not feel that he has the time to attend conferences. He attends talks on campus and reads disciplinary articles from peer-reviewed journals. There is a teaching-focused thread in his discipline’s professional organization, “some people are very active in it, and some people completely ignore it. So I guess that’s not too different from any other branch of the field.”

When asked about the department’s expectations for his performance or contract renewal Ethan did not think those expectations were “really all that well spelled out”; however, he also felt that he knew generally what he was supposed to be doing: “high expectations of teaching class well, being involved in the departmental day-to-day stuff, and then developing myself as an educator.” Ethan expressed “some conflict between what I would like to do and what the size of the university allows me to do.” The size of the university refers to having to teach really large classes, which he feels is “not very conducive to doing some of the teaching that I would like to do...a lot of times I’m the presenter of the material. I’m not really teaching.”

Overall, Ethan expressed feeling valued by his tenure-stream colleagues and having some academic freedom. He thinks that “the tenure-track faculty see me as an asset to the department... I think they understand that their strengths are not always in teaching.” Ethan feels that despite some content conflicts he has freedom in how he

teaches the courses, although “we have pretty clear expectations of what we’re supposed to teach for these intro classes.”

When Ethan went through graduate school, he felt his time was:

on that border between the time when everybody was expected to go into academia and be a professor and when people were saying, ‘It’s okay if you want to go into academia, but there’s all these other directions that you can go...here’s industry research, patent law, here’s...’ And so our graduate council sponsored different seminars and panels where recent graduates would come back and talk about their experiences in different professional careers.

These broader expectations were reinforced by Ethan’s perception of how his advisors viewed his career choice: “I think that they’re really happy that I found something that I liked and that I enjoy...they knew I wasn’t really a hard core research lab all the time kind of person.” His perception was also that not all scientists were like his advisors because:

there are scientists who are really focused on...being the best in their field or being really influential in some area and they can be pretty harsh on their graduate students, especially when you get into the really high level institutions like Emory or Harvard.

Ethan views the tenure-stream path as only one path to joining the academy and sees tenure-track as less than secure. He feels that “going tenure-track is not that ideal of a situation” because he sees tenure as “just job security” and “before you get tenure you have less than lecturer non-tenured job security.” To acquire tenure, faculty in his department need to get a grant awarded to them and,

those funding rates are so razor thin that you can have a perfectly good grant and it gets thrown out for something very minor....once you get tenure yes, you have job security, but until then you have less than normal job security. And even as a non-tenure track I have plenty of job security. I have, there's 200 kids out in the hallway, somebody's got to teach them...I have plenty of job security.

Brenna

Brenna began her academic career as a part-time instructor at the institution from which she received her Ph.D.; while Brenna was still in graduate school, she had an expectation that she would be on the tenure-track once she graduated. However, as she neared graduation she felt that a part-time position would suite her lifestyle better because of the flexibility it offered. Her husband already had a position in the area and she was able to enjoy being at home with her young children. She said the part-time position was a beneficial arrangement:

Was it ideal in terms of salary? No, but I still felt pretty lucky to be able to be home and still remain professionally active and have the flexibility I wanted to have because at that point in my life I just really wouldn't have wanted a full-time tenure-track job.

She also published a book during this time and believes the book publication was taken into account when she applied for the position she has now. When asked what motivated her to put together the research and finances to get her dissertation published while she was a part-time instructor taking care of two young children she replied,

I guess it's just in your mind that this is the next step. I had talked to a publisher early on at a conference and I knew people were interested in it...so you just start

moving in that direction ...I'm always positioning myself thinking, 'How do you make yourself marketable?' And now, 'How do I make myself indispensable to where they're not going to want to get rid of me?'

She also felt that part of her motivation for getting the book published were the many forewarnings she received when she accepted the part-time position. "Because from the beginning people had said, 'Well, if you go part-time you will never be the full-time tenure-track, that route is completely closed off. You will forever be stuck in this part-time ghetto.'" Brenna said she was not sure that she believed the warning; however, she did think,

...that may be typical, but surely there's some way to move beyond this if at some point I decide to and so I'd always seen a book as the way to do that and so that was incentive to get it done...it's served me well so far because I think I probably wouldn't have gotten this position had I not had that.

While in graduate school Brenna participated in a teaching certificate program which involved visiting various institutions. As part of that program she saw herself at the small liberal arts college

Because I wanted to focus more on that teaching mission. And I saw myself at that point, as less of a researcher. It was more, 'Okay, I've got to do this so I can teach' ...I still see myself largely as a teacher...and this position is really an ideal fit. Because right now I do 75% of my time teaching, 20% is called professional development but it's really, it's my research and then 5% service. And so it's a nice balance for me between the teaching and there's still some time dedicated to research and a recognition that that's part of who I am. Because I don't think I

would have wanted just to be a teacher without that research component. But the balance worked out very nice and it fit well with where I'd seen myself headed in the future.

Brenna finds the large classes she teaches more challenging, and less fulfilling than the smaller classes she taught at another institution. However, she tries to tackle the large class instruction as a puzzle,

I don't look at it as, 'Oh dear I've got this burden.' It's, 'Okay if this is what we have to deal with, what can we do to make this better?' And so it's my puzzle to figure out, what am I going to do to enliven this?

Despite feeling that she is a valued member of the faculty she also noted that, As far as job security that's a concern, especially last summer when the university said they were cutting positions...we've [she and her husband] have kept that in mind, that this may not be a sure thing. Although the dean seems to suggest that we don't have much to worry about. But again I'm always positioning myself. If I'm teaching those big lectures that the others don't want to teach as much, I think it gives me a little bit of protection. They're going to fight for me, to keep me around, if I'm serving the department in useful ways. And so that's part of my strategy.

Kaleb

When Kaleb went on the job market he was also looking for a position that allowed him to stay close to family. Unfortunately, he discovered that openings for tenure-stream positions were rather limited. Kaleb held a postdoc teaching position while on the job market for a tenure-track position. He attributes his search for a tenure-stream position to expectations established by his graduate program.

At [my alma mater] you're just going to do research right? Even the teaching aspect of it is diminished relative to the research aspect. So the PFF [Preparing Future Faculty] program was an attempt to say well some people may want to go teach at a liberal arts school. But there is almost no recognition that people wouldn't want to be professors coming out of a program like that.

However, when he graduated he found that "tenure-track jobs are increasingly becoming rare." His graduating institution also recognized this as a problem and created teaching postdocs to support those "who had Ph.Ds. from their program and they didn't have jobs." The teaching post doc "was a year of teaching multiple classes each quarter so that if you needed to you could bolster your resume a little bit through getting maybe a publication or two out there, but also people just giving you a job while you were actually doing it."

Although "you're always told tenure-track is the way to go," Kaleb enjoys his current position and felt the separation between teaching and research aims were established in graduate school.

From the first quarter I was there till the last quarter I was there, I taught. So I was never an RA [research assistant]. And it's almost like they separated people into pools right? There's an RA pool, these are the people we think are going to go on to do great things and these are the people in the TA pool who we need to teach all of our classes for us.

Kaleb doesn't feel that his position has job security.

Because they basically say in those contracts that it's all contingent on them having money. So it feels like...any year could be your last year. I think the

department has worked hard make it so that if they say we're going to be here for at least two more years then we'll be here for at least two more years. And we've never gotten any indication that they wouldn't just continue these positions on, but I don't feel particularly secure in these positions...it always seems like something could change.

The reason for this concern becomes apparent when Kaleb goes on to explain.

The reason these positions exist is because some dean pushed for them to hire lecturers and say, 'Hey this will reduce the number of part-time instructors you have to hire, it'll be a faculty member but it won't be a tenure-track faculty member' and so people hired lecturers. But when the money starts tightening up, and the budgets change, and the deans change and all of a sudden they're like, 'Why did we hire these lecturers? Isn't it cheaper to hire part-time instructors?'

You just wonder if there may be another switch like that. We could switch back to a different strategy,' so I don't feel really secure in this position.

If given the opportunity to have a tenure-track teaching-intensive position, Kaleb would take it; however, he also admits that, "I'm of the cynical opinion that tenure is going away in general. So I'm trying to realign my expectations to perhaps never having a tenure-track job."

Kaleb described a lot of confusion about how he would be evaluated. In Kaleb's second year he was asked to produce a portfolio in preparation for his evaluation. He recalled that:

Our first contract renewal was last year. And that process was painful because we were told a week before it was due that we need to provide the department with

all this stuff...basically a tenure portfolio, like a teaching-thing and a research-thing, and a statement about this, that, and the other.

This experience, along with some other incidents in the department created the “sense that while we’re faculty, we’re also not real faculty right? It’s like they know what to do with the assistant professor going up for tenure. They don’t really know what to do with us.”

Kaleb feels that his department is a “pretty congenial department” despite the confusion about whether his department sees him as a full-time faculty member or a contingent faculty member. A few of the lecturers in his department, including Kaleb, are collaborating to conduct research about teaching. As the department searches for ways to attract students through course offerings, Kaleb sees that, “I’ve been included in that plan. It sounds like they have some value, or they assign some value to me.” He stated that the role of lecturers in his department is to teach the large-enrollment service courses.

The first semester here I had 200 and some odd people in that class and it was the largest class I’d had by a factor of six or seven. I’d had 50 people in my class was the most I’d ever had at [my previous institution] and so having 200 to 250 in my class...was a pretty big change. But I got over it...you have to if that’s what you’re going to be doing semester after semester, you have to get used to it.

Kaleb also noted some limitations to his role as a lecturer:

There are some structural barriers we come up against. So for example, we lecturers are not allowed to teach 400-level classes, but grad students are. Which to me is a joke, but it’s also a pretty big slap in the face. Where it’s like, ‘We

don't want you guys teaching these upper level classes, but the grad students- who don't have Ph.D. s- can teach upper level classes.' And apparently that has nothing to do with perhaps expertise...it's all about how certain departments are afraid that their lecturers would request to teach those classes when they're being specifically hired to teach lower-level classes.

Helen

Helen had relocated to the area to be close to family and, after receiving her Ph.D., accepted a position as a full-time instructor at a community college. However, the position was contractually-based so when the community college was making cut-backs her position was eliminated. She applied for a tenure-stream position, but was called back to interview for a lecturer position, a position which she accepted. While she appreciated having a full-time position that included benefits and higher pay, the department had a reputation for having "a tendency to depend on adjuncts, PTI's [part-time instructors], and FTI's [full-time instructors] to do things that faculty don't want to do." Helen decided that the department was "really entrenched in this hierarchy" so when she was given the opportunity to move to another department she did so. In her current department "the lecturing position is an attempt to at least address, in some way even if it's just a gesture, the overuse or the over dependence on adjuncts." She also sees in her new department efforts to "to equalize, at least in some ways, democratize things" such as including lecturers in the forming of bylaws and voting in departmental decisions. However, she also feels that while these efforts are admirable and steps in a positive direction "it's not really the same as making everything equal." When asked about how making everything equal would look, Helen responded that

making pay differentials equal, making expectations between research faculty and teaching faculty equal. I mean obviously one is prioritized more than the other because this is supposedly a research-one institution, right? So as long as that's the case there's a built-in hierarchy. And they will use lecturers to do more of the teaching so that they can fund the other stuff.

Helen communicated that faculty her department, tenure-stream and non-tenure-track, are supportive and friendly. Helen's professional commitment to the department is 75% teaching and 25% service, and that service involves supporting the department in many ways. Her service commitment involves "participating on committees, doing other stuff to promote the department...mentoring." When asked about her mentoring responsibilities these included "undergraduates, TAs, like mentoring new teachers." In her department,

every faculty member teaches undergraduates, every single one of them...I don't know how long that will go on, or how tenable that is given the other demands on the tenure-track people and actually on lecturers as well...everybody just kind of comes in and works at whatever they're told to do.

Helen appreciates her colleagues saying, "In our department I think in general they try to be very democratic," even as these colleagues struggle with continuing a democratic way of functioning. "When you have been told that the world works in a certain way it's hard to really change that view until it's been sort of operationally different for a long time. I think it's a question of becoming habituated." She also sees her position as offering some job security in the long term, but not necessarily in the short term.

I would be expelled before a tenure person. But that's kind of a short-term sort of immediate response to whatever is happening within the institution. I think in the long-term economically, lecturers are a very good deal, especially with Ph.D.'s. And that gives you job security but it's the kind of job security you get for undercutting other people, you know?"

Throughout the interview Helen also expressed conflict about her professional choice: that in order to stay in the area with her family she chose a local lecturer position rather than seeking a tenure-stream position at the national level. Yet she also acknowledged that "tenured people have obviously given up a lot you know. I think that's a horrible life balance... [because] it pays off to live in a community where you didn't grow up. Transience is what pays off." Like other participants who envisioned themselves entering the tenure-stream after graduation, Helen has "been pretty vocal about being upfront in [my department] with graduate students" to warn them about the difficulties of entering the tenure-stream.

Leon

Leon had served in two visiting assistant professor positions, each lasting one year, and prior to accepting his current position. As other participants have indicated is also true for their disciplines, Leon reported that engaging in a post-doc experience, such as a visiting professorship, is becoming an expectation for those applying for tenure-stream positions. In Leon's discipline there is an expectation that a Ph.D. graduate will focus on research or on teaching, and teaching has less prestige. Despite the lack of prestige, during the two visiting professor positions Leon found he "was just losing interest in doing research." He recalls, "I was losing interest. I still applied for research-

heavy positions, but ... the thrill of the research was sort of lost in those two years. I was actually looking forward to moving to a teaching position.” This was a new perspective which differed from his perspective in graduate school:

Throughout grad school I always assumed that I was going into academics and I would be a research-heavy academic...so it's sort of a surprise to myself and other people that, right before my defense, that I started losing interest in doing research. And I tried...I thought, 'Well maybe once I get out of grad school and start a job maybe it'll be a little bit different,' but...I don't know the interest just never rekindled.”

Although he had taught one class on his own as a graduate student and been a teaching assistant for recitation sections while in graduate school, these experiences did not ignite a passion for teaching:

I think it was actually my second year out of school that I really fell in love with teaching...It was a smaller school; you know where it was a teaching-centered school. That was the first time that I really interacted with students in a way that I just thought, 'Yes, I could be happy doing this, forget about the research. If I could find something where I can teach and not have to worry about research that would be great'.

However, finding a tenure-stream teaching position was difficult, “I don't think there are as many academic jobs as there are Ph.D. s and that's the sort of thing that most people really want” rather than research positions with the government or industry. He described how he perceived the job market:

So I think the market is just saturated. Also now that most of the job search is conducted online, we have these big online databases that you'll have maybe five to seven hundred fresh Ph.D.'s each year [applying to] 350 or so academic positions and pretty much every fresh Ph.D. applies to every position.

In his current position he teaches the same service course at least twice each semester. During a typical semester he is the instructor for about six or seven hundred students. "This is not the kind of thing I fell in love with when I was teaching [at the teaching-centered university]". Leon recalls that when he taught smaller classes that,

by a month into the semester you already knew all of your students, two months into the semester you could actually, as you're writing exam problems, you could even say, 'Oh yeah, these people are going to get this one. These people are going to struggle.' Just really knowing students and seeing how you're helping them."

He also feels that students in the large-enrollment service courses "don't necessarily see how [the course] fits into their degree program. It's just a checkmark on a transcript so there's very little enthusiasm on their part."

Despite these frustrations Leon recalled that at the last conference he attended that "I was actually drawn toward the education side. I think I only went to one or two research talks and then to a bunch of the [disciplinary] education talks." Later in the interview as he describes a departmental project he recently led, he also suggests that "even though I've lost interest in pursuing [disciplinary] research, you don't go this far into your education and then stop learning. So it's interesting to continue learning."

Although the project provided some needed intellectual stimulation it did not offset the heavy teaching responsibilities. Leon does not see himself continuing to teach

large-enrollment service-courses for the rest of his future. “When I see myself in seven years I really see two options, either staying in academics by trying to move to [another] program...or think about making a transition into industry.” Part of the motivation for this shift is based on the teaching demand; however, his role in the department is not clear and that is also creating problems:

Even to this day I don't think we've [the lecturers] have really figured out how we're supposed to fit into the department. As an example, the only promotion we have to look forward to is the promotion to senior lecturer. And that's supposed to be offered at the end of the fifth year. So we have several lecturers who just finished their fourth year and we still don't have any real definition about the difference between a lecturer and a senior lecturer. We don't have any have any definition as to how the promotion process is supposed to work...I think the department has just treated the whole lecturer program as, 'Well this is what the college wants us to do and we'll play it by ear.'

Leon sees lecturers as having some job security:

The tenure-track position, short-term, it's much less stable. But long-term, if you do get tenure then it's just extremely secure...I think lecturers have more security in the short term...for the first four years we're on a two-year contract, after our fourth year we can go on to a two-year rolling contract and then after a fifth year, if we get promoted to senior lecturer we get a three-year contract. So I think from the start we have better security than an assistant professor, but upon promotion it's just extended a little tiny bit.

When asked how he thought the tenure-stream faculty would describe his role within the department he replied,

I think there's a divide. I think there's a reasonable group that does believe that what we do has value. But I think there's also a group of die-hard researchers who really look down on us. And they describe this position as if our job is really, really easy because well a professor has to teach and do research where we only teach...I think that the most animosity comes from faculty who have never really been involved at all in these lower-divisional courses...And I think that the friends that lecturers have among the faculty are those that have been involved in these really large lower divisional courses.

Because of the large numbers of students that lecturers teach Leon sees lecturers as the "department's face to the whole college and to the greater university, [because] their students are almost only interacting with the lecturers."

Gwen

Like many of this study's participants, Gwen received her Ph.D. from the same department for which she is now a lecturer. Her first choice was to obtain a research postdoc position. "To get a tenure-track position or a research professor position I have to have a postdoc...Even if you've done research on the side, it's where you don't have a postdoc" that prevents tenure-track appointments. However, since she was unable to acquire the necessary funding to secure a postdoc position, Gwen applied for his current lecturer position.

Similar to other participants, Gwen would like to stay in the area because of family ties; however, unlike most of the other participants Gwen is willing to move her

family if a more permanent position were offered to her or her spouse. Other than the lack of permanency Gwen seems to feel that the lecturer position is mostly suited to her career goals,

I want to be able to go back at a decent hour to my child. I don't want to be worrying about grants and publications and that stress of getting tenure...and I love teaching so I feel that maybe this is a good fit for me.

But her advisors would disagree, "people tell me that this is a dead-end job." And sometimes Gwen agrees with them, "Sometimes I think, 'You know I do have a lot of good research ideas which would take me ahead, so maybe I should try to get a postdoc at some point and then try to move on toward, like a regular tenure-track research position'" but then she confesses that she considers how the stress of being in the tenure-stream would impact her life. Gwen has mixed feelings about the prospect of conducting research:

In future semesters, future years I'm going to try to research in the summer. And I'm going to try to keep some low level of research going through the year...but the thing is, that's not part of my job description. So whatever I do is above what I'm required to do, so it is going to be extra time put into that. But I think that might keep me more satisfied. And it would keep me from feeling like I wasted all my ...intellect.

She admits that research would provide "a satisfaction with what I'm doing," but "I could choose to not want to do any research or try to move ahead, just try to be satisfied with this and that would be fine. So the pressure is kind of my own pressure...it's not from the

outside.” Yet when she talks about what success in five years would look like, the pressure from outside creeps in.

The outside pressure focuses on the golden ring of tenure and Gwen is not sure it is a ring she wants to grab, saying “The minute I start thinking of myself in an actual tenure-track position then I immediately start thinking do I really want that? Do I really want all the stress of getting tenure?”

The professional development and service expectations for Gwen’s contract are as vague for her as it other participants in this study described:

Right now it’s supposed to be 75% teaching and the rest is distributed between service and professional development and the professional development could be anything. It could include research or it could be going to workshops for teaching related stuff.”

However, Gwen finds that teaching is time-consuming so “really all I do is teaching because I don’t know how I would have time to do anything else. I’m doing this all the time.”

Gwen does not perceive her situation as one that is being forced on her. “I put myself here right? I put myself in this position.” Yet she also states that, “I do feel like they [tenure-track faculty] are treated at a ...you know more preferred.” Gwen’s experience within the department is that support for her work is limited to those aspects that do not require the department any extra funds. Her positive perspective about many aspects of being a lecturer in this department did not extend to funding and she seemed to feel that the stigma of being a lecturer was reinforced by the department’s funding

practices. “I’m doing an excellent job with what I’m doing. I know that, but I’m not valued because I’m a lecturer. You know, ‘You’re teaching staff, anyone could replace you, but not tenure-track professors.’”

Gwen considers tenure-stream faculty to view her role as a teaching job, although they are aware that she has a strong desire to do research as well. She feels supported to engage in research activity, but said colleagues would be surprised if she found the time to get the research done. She feels there is an expectation that she fulfills her teaching tasks and not let the research efforts get in the way of teaching.

Denis

Like many other participants, Denis received one of his graduate degrees from the institution that offered him his current position as a lecturer. After applying for “a good number of academic and nonacademic jobs...in a variety of different states” he found his current position posted on a standard website. Denis cast his net wide in his job search, including small liberal arts schools, research positions, and government positions. He conducted a broad search because:

Basically, research positions are difficult to get. They’re very competitive and the bottom line is that most people who go into a Ph.D. program in psychology with the intention of getting a research-one job at an institution like this probably aren’t going to get it. For the first couple of years, I probably had assumed that’s where I was going, a more research-oriented type of job.

The difficulty of finding a research-one position, internal questions about making a career commitment to publishing research, along with his developing interest in teaching, motivated Denis to open his job search to include many options.

Toward the conclusion of Denis's graduate program he engaged in an analysis of his graduate school experiences, asking questions such as:

What do I like about the experiences that I had? What do I like about doing research? Do I want to be a person who has to try and come up with a very steady program of research like you have to do at a research-one institution if you want to be a faculty member at an institution like that? Would I like to try to do research in some other capacity where I can have some of that flexibility but I don't necessarily have the pressure of trying to do it all the time and having to publish all the time?

Denis cites the result of this introspective line of questioning as the reason that he applied to a number of different positions.

Although he perceived his graduate program as one that expects their successful students to acquire positions where "their career's based on the research they produce," he has not experienced any pressure from his advisor to take on that type of position. He said that while there may have been some initial disappointment in his choice, he also perceived a message from his advisors that "we want you to do the kinds of things you feel will fulfill you and get the balance that you want out of your academic career."

Those in his cohort who desired traditional tenure-stream positions at research-intensive institutions tended to be,

people who came in kind of knowing that they have a specific set of interests that they have with respect to research. They have ideas about how they want to explore certain phenomena. And they have a program that they manage to either set up relatively early with their advisors- a program of research that goes,

‘What’s next, what’s next, what’s next?’ and they build on that. And they kind of glide into that track relatively well.

During his graduate program Denis observed that while teaching appeared to be valued it is not the top priority. He perceived this as a pragmatic choice considering the circumstances:

At a place like [his institution] those faculty members, they’re not necessarily evaluated based on how well they teach and while I’m sure most would be great teachers, and many are good teachers, their real sort of bread and butter is the money they bring in from grants and the research they’re able to put out and the status that that brings back to the university.

Denis sees career success for himself as having five indicators: teaching a variety of courses, conducting some research including collaborative projects, having some of that research published, generating new pedagogical-content knowledge, and engendering students with life-long ability to think scientifically.

Isabel

Isabel attended a liberal arts college for her undergraduate degree and a large research institution for her graduate degree. Her undergraduate experiences involved undergraduate research with instructors who were focused on undergraduate education rather than research. When she attended graduate school “the last thing I ever wanted to do was to be in the classroom.” Her intention was to work in industry after receiving her Ph.D. However, as she moved through graduate education she noticed the long hours that her graduated peers had to endure as industry employees. Additionally, she was given an

opportunity to teach recitation sections in graduate school, enjoyed many aspects of teaching undergraduate students, and enjoyed the teaching experiences.

Although Isabel focused on a teaching career as she completed her Ph.D., she said that education classes were not part of her curriculum. “You know how many education classes I’ve had? None. That’s not part of your training in [the sciences], it’s about the [science], it’s about the research. So if you’re going to teach...you have to do a research degree to get to teach.”

When interviewing for her current lecturer position “she met with faculty ...and then I taught a class...so I guest lectured as well in a class... and then the faculty made the decision and they picked me.” In this way the department integrated her into the faculty membership, which he feels is important to being respected by her tenure-stream colleagues. Isabel felt that this respect is also due to the appreciation her tenure-stream colleagues have for teaching in that, “We’re all in this for the same goal- to teach students, either at the undergraduate or graduate level”, and:

Because they don’t want to teach these classes that we teach. I love teaching. I love it. But there are a lot of our faculty that don’t want to be messing with it.

They don’t want the hassle. So some of it’s just they don’t want to mess with it.

Additionally, in teaching “service courses for just about every other department on campus and for many of the other colleges on campus” the lecturers in this department are providing revenue for the department which she feels may also engender appreciation. Isabel feels that her situation might be unique from other departments where “there’s definitely kind of a system, a ‘we’re better than you hierarchy.’” In her department “when there are issues that come up about undergraduate issues, if there’s

something about the way things are being taught and somebody wants to know something they turn to us,” which Isabel feels demonstrates one way that her professional voice is respected. Another way is “the department acknowledging the importance of teaching and acknowledging that what we do is important. You don’t have to like teaching, but if you acknowledge that what we do is important, I think that’s okay.”

Isabel is able to express her intellectual creativity every semester in teaching a course that no one else on campus teaches. This course is smaller (N=120) than the other courses he teaches (N=300+). The required courses have a common exam for every section and so there is not much content or administrative flexibility; however, the smaller course allows flexibility. Isabel also says that a promotion to senior lecturer would be an indicator of her career success because the promotion would let her know that the department values her efforts and role in the department “so I think success is one being promoted, being recognized within the department, but also getting validation from the students.”

Carol

Carol applied for her current position to solve what she called the “two body problem” when her husband was interviewed for an institution located in an area that allowed them to live closer to their families. Although her husband acquired the tenure-track position he sought, her tenure-track position did not materialize so she accepted the lecturer position that was offered. Even though “it wasn’t the job I was looking for” she says she was happy to have a job.

Carol felt her success would be indicated by having two books and many articles published along with offering many conference presentations. Carol is certain that in

order to feel she is successful that she would also need to be in a tenure-stream position, if not already tenured, within the next seven years. She feels supported by her program in acquiring a tenure-stream position.

In her current role Carol aims to “do what assistant professors do and then some.” She sees herself as being “a very dedicated teacher” and “a very dedicated service provider” while also being “heavily research active. I’m on the undergraduate studies committee for [her department]. I am creating courses, co-designing new courses for the program, designing an introductory sequence. I’ve been in charge of our recruitment efforts.” While teaching and service activities are specified in her job expectations, the professional development portion “has been very unclear as to what they really mean by that, except that it’s not supposed to be research.”

Despite policy restrictions, Carol has received both support and encouragement to use the professional development portion of her time for research by her department. Her program has provided a mentor “who helps me see the kinds of things that I should be doing. Helps me think about where to submit book proposals, how this article fits into some particular journal” and is generally helping to achieve her aim of doing what she is “supposed to do to look like a tenure-track faculty member despite the fact that I don’t have that job.” She feels the same support from her advisors “because of course anybody who’s trained you and thinks you’re worthwhile doesn’t want to see you in a job that doesn’t have the prestige you should have.”

Throughout the interview Carol indicated that she viewed the title of lecturer as stigmatizing. As Carol sees it, “the problem [of being a lecturer] is bigger than [this

institution]. It's that I have to go outside of this little community and go to academic conferences where people have their own impressions of what the word lecturer means." Recently Carol participated, as an invited member, in a prestigious panel at a major disciplinary conference "despite the title [of lecturer]." Carol suggests that the invitation came because either she is "doing a good job of hiding it" or that the larger disciplinary community "has been able to ignore it because I'm doing reasonable work in my research." However, she doubts that she will ever be invited to be a keynote speaker with her current title and wonders "what opportunities are being missed just because of the title I have." She was recently approached at a disciplinary conference about joining the executive committee of a prestigious journal and was encouraged to apply once her book is published. Again she wondered if "he would have said that if he knew the title [of her position] because I don't know that he does."

The greatest conflict for Carol in her role as a lecturer is that her career goal is focused on conducting research and becoming a renowned scholar in her field. However, along with many other participants in this study, Carol saw a tenure position at a small teaching school as more problematic for her career aspirations than her current non-tenure-stream position has. Despite having a traditional, and clearly defined career structure for promotion and tenure, small schools were viewed as having teaching load requirements that eliminate time available for research. While Carol is grateful that she teaches three classes a semester rather than four, as is typical as some of the small teaching schools, she is challenged with managing the workload while simultaneously getting more involved in her disciplinary community. "I'm having a harder time getting involved in [service to the full profession] just because I'm so busy at the local level."

However, Carol also acknowledges that because of her role her research requirements are flexible compared to her husband's research requirements. And while Carol is grateful to have a job and for her program's support she knows that other lecturers in the college have less satisfying experiences. As has been reflected in other participants' comments, she feels this discrepancy is because "all the policies and things haven't been ironed out" regarding lecturers' role in the college.

Chapter Five

A Tale of Two Selves: Self as Teacher, Self as Academic

“In the study of human cognition and behavior, identity is one of the key foundational concepts helping to explain why people think about their environments the way they do and why people do what they do in those environments” (Ashforth, Harrison, & Corley, 2008, p. 334).

The purpose of this chapter is to consider aspects of social identity that were revealed by the participants who are in the context of a research-intensive institution with tenure-stream colleagues. First, I will examine how these full-time non-tenure track faculty members expressed identification with the role of teaching-intensive “lecturer.” Next, I will explore whether a participant perceived his or her formal role as converging with his or her social identity. I will also consider how participants’ perceptions about her or his formal role seemed congruent or incongruent with perceptions shared about departmental colleagues’ expressed value for the lecturer role. Finally, definitions participants provided for academic and professional identity will be examined.

Social Identity: Identification with a Professional Group

In higher education there are typically two groups of faculty: those on tenure-track plus those who are tenured (tenure-stream) and those who are not on tenure-track (non-tenure track). As members of an academic department, both tenure-stream and non-tenure track faculty members engage in “a process that is motivated by the desire to construct an identity that is privately and/or publicly evaluated as worthwhile or significant in some way” (Dutton, Roberts, & Bednar, 2010, p. 267). In addition, both

groups of faculty can hold a variety of appointments. This study focuses on those non-tenure track faculty members holding Ph.D.'s whose full-time position is a teaching-intensive appointment (lecturer). I am interested in the social identity of these faculty members who are excluded from the possibility of tenure. Because their professional environment includes faculty who are tenure-stream I wondered in what ways these non-tenure teaching-intensive faculty members, who were similarly socialized in their academic preparations during graduate school as their tenure-stream research-intensive colleagues, perceived their formal role of lecturer. In conducting semi-structured interviews I heard these members of the faculty describe their social identity and how these identities related to their formal roles in the department.

Social identity is not an identity that is separate from a personal identity, but is an aspect of personal identity expressed in a social setting. Tajfel (1978) defined social identity as the part of an individual's self-concept that is based on social group (or groups) membership "together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership" (p. 63). Social identities, particularly those expressed through formal role identities, are used to distinguish between groups (or membership to a group) while personal identities distinguish individuals from each other. Whereas personal identities are based on the aggregation of attributes, preferences, and experiences, formal role identities are socially enacted "cultural, discursive or institutional notions of who or what any individual might be" (Watson, 2007, p. 136) and as such are a category of social identity. During the interviews I conducted participants shared perceptions about their formal role as a non-tenure teaching-intensive faculty member (lecturer) and how that role did, or did not, conform to their social identity.

Identification with a Formal Role: “I am a teacher”, I’m a Disciplinary Researcher

The stronger a social identity is the more that aspects from both the core of identity (I am, it’s important, I feel) and the content of identity (I care about, I want, etc.) are expressed. Isabel described teaching as the core of her identity as well as the content of her identity and these aspects aligned with her formal role in the department: “When people ask what I do, I’m a teacher. I teach [science]. That’s what I-- that’s how I describe my job,” a claim which reflects the core of her professional identity. When asked how she would differentiate academic identity from professional identity, she revealed the content of her identity as well:

I think they’re pretty similar because-- I mean that’s how the things that I do, that I would consider as a professional are all related to the academics. When I think outside of the department, if I go to a conference, where am I spending my time at the conference? At the [disciplinary] educator talks. If I’m invited somewhere-- like publishers will invite us to go to things and give feedback and stuff-- it’s as an educator or as a faculty member... as an instructor. So, the other things that I do that are peripheral to that are all-- come back to that same job as a teacher. So I’m a [physical scientist], I’m a [specific type of physical scientist] by training. That’s what I was trained as... as a [specific type of physical scientist]. But now I see myself as a [disciplinary] educator. (Isabel)

Other participants also identified with the core and content of their formal role in the department and did not perceive their formal role activities as separate from their disciplinary or academic activities. For example, when Denis was asked how he responds

to the questions about what he does, he did not differentiate this from his academic activities or identity:

I mean if someone asked me what do I do, I would say either, 'I'm a lecturer at [this institution]' or 'I'm a professor at [this institution]. I teach at the university. I teach in the [disciplinary] department.' They would all be around, like teaching, basically (Denis).

Ethan also perceived his formal role as part of his identity as a scientist, "I still see myself as a scientist...but my job is as a lecturer and I think that within being a scientist, you can be an educator within being a scientist, that can be part of it" (Ethan).

Two other participants described their social identity as shifting because of the preferences they had for activities associated with their lecturer roles. For example, Leon realized that his identity had shifted over the years as he found he preferred teaching activities to disciplinary research activities:

You know, I feel like I've drifted away from the identity of a [disciplinary researcher]. Even some of the other lecturers, they still-- even though we're not required to do research like over the summer-- for fun, they'll work on research problems just to see 'Can I get a paper out?' So one of our newer hires, he was talking about, 'Oh well, what do you study? And I said, I used to be a... And just the fact that I, some people say, 'I'm a [microbiologist]' or 'I'm a [geophysicist]'... and just the fact that I subconsciously said it as, 'Oh well, I used to be a...whatever.' So I think I have really drifted away from an identity as a pure [researcher].

In response to a question about when he thought this shift happened, he revealed a connection he perceived between research activities and identity: “I think it was just over the first year or so that I got here and I was no longer actively trying to pursue research because I always think of the [disciplinary] identity as being tied with actively pursuing research.” Leon is expressing a perspective about his disciplinary identity requiring disciplinary research content. Furthermore, in his discipline, identity appears to be related to one’s research specialization since he speaks in the past tense about what he used to research, rather than in the present tense about his current professional activities.

Brenna indicated that teaching had been at the core of her social identity since graduate school; however, like Leon, she separates her disciplinary researcher role from her current role:

I really saw myself at the small liberal arts college because I wanted to focus more on that teaching mission. And I saw myself, at that point, as less of a researcher. It was more, ‘Okay, I’ve got to do this so I can teach.’ At some point, I became more of a researcher because I was doing more of that when I was getting my book manuscript ready. But I still-- I see myself largely as a teacher.

(Brenna)

Conversely, Allan viewed his teaching activities and his research as intertwined. He sees teaching as “sort of at the center [of my identity], but then there’s all these other things going on. If I didn’t... I guess I would say that, if I didn’t teach, I would have no research. I would have no research. Not that it’s impossible to have research, but I would lose a lot of the research I’m invested in. I would have to find something very different.”

Allan's perception that his teaching activities are integral to his research activities mirrored his graduate program in which teaching, and research about teaching, was heavily emphasized.

Part of the content of Faith's identity also included research about teaching. Faith had acquired a certificate in graduate school that required a contribution to scholarship about teaching and learning. Throughout the interview, Faith described efforts she made to integrate teaching into her graduate preparation. These efforts seem to indicate that she began a shift from research scientist to educator during her doctoral program. When asked to what profession she belongs, Faith also identified as a teacher "more than being a [scientist] now. I think I get more satisfaction out of being a good educator than being a [scientist]." Faith's use of the word 'now' indicates that she currently identifies as an educator rather than a research scientist. She also indicated that this shift away from research scientist was not necessarily a shift away from identifying as a scientist who educates:

I still feel like I know the discipline really well and I really enjoy being in the department where there's active research going on and I can keep up with the research much more so than [I could at another institution], which is the small school where I was at. But, I think of it mainly in how can I get my students excited about science with this frame than doing my own research. Both my sister and mother, and quite a few people in my family, are teachers at the grade school, high school levels and I just, you know, think of myself as a teacher, educator.

(Faith)

Additionally, her first position out of graduate school was a tenure-track position at a small liberal arts college and one she chose because it had a teaching-intensive focus, yet included opportunities for research with undergraduate students. Faith also shared that she felt that the pedagogical research study she conducted in graduate school was important to her and that she wanted to prepare it for publication eventually.

Three participants in this study did not suggest having either the core or the content of a teaching identity based on how they described their formal role. While all three were pleased with a full-time position in a research-intensive institution, all three also considered their non-tenure status as a disappointing career move. Carol frequently referred to the distance she felt between her desired appointment as a tenure-stream faculty member and her current appointment as a full-time non-tenure track faculty member:

I avoid the word 'lecturer'. In fact, when I got my business cards I tried to avoid having the word lecturer written on there and they wouldn't let me. Whenever I have to... whenever I write emails... whenever I write bios, I usually say 'faculty member' just because... especially things like letters of recommendation. If I'm writing letters for my students, I don't want them to be discriminated against because somebody got a hold of it and thought, 'Ugh, this is a lecturer.' And I'm not saying anyone would think that way but, in my mind, knowing that some people do think that way, I want to avoid that harm coming upon my students for example. But just in terms of... you're talking about academic identity. Since I see myself being in a tenure-track position, eventually I'd rather not have the

historical record of-- of having had been in this position. So, when I write articles, 'member of the faculty' works-- works better for me. (Carol)

Not all of the participants experienced this strong connection between holding a tenure-stream appointment and being respected in the disciplinary research community. There was an interesting contradiction to Carol's reluctance to identify as a lecturer for two participants from differing fields:

With our field, I feel that there isn't that hierarchy, so no one really cares what exactly you are. No one cares what exactly you are. People like to talk about research and inputs... if I were emailing someone and introducing myself, I do say I'm a lecturer doing this. But, when you're speaking to someone, somehow it's not that formal. It's a lot less formal, so... I feel like what you are is not in the forefront. It doesn't matter. (Gwen, natural sciences)

I can think of a lot of the [disciplinary researchers] that are very highly regarded, that when they put their credentials, they're an independent scholar. That's what they call themselves because they're not linked to a department. And one I'm thinking of, she comes from a wealthy background that she has been self-supporting, but she's also balanced family and kids and a couple of years ago she had a book that came out that made a big splash. And no one ever makes a big deal about the fact that she's not a tenure-track faculty member somewhere. It's just there's even an independent scholar. You say that and people think, 'Oh well, you're making it work and you're focused on your research... immersed in your research.' And I don't get the sense that there's the stigma necessarily about that.

I'm sure there are some people that are kind of snooty about things like that. But again, I'm running in circles where it's people that are more... a little less invested in the establishment. They see themselves as looking down on those kinds of arbitrary distinctions anyway. (Brenna, humanities)

However, the professional activities of a lecturer, with a heavy emphasis on teaching, also conflicted with Carol's view of her social identity as a disciplinary researcher.

It would be a very wonderful job, I think for-- for a lot of people who didn't have the aspirations towards doing the research and-- and becoming... what do I want to say...? more... largely... prestigious in their field in some way. So people who aren't interested in doing research are never going to-- just teaching your subject matter is not going to gain you renowned probably. Maybe teaching renowned, and that's fine if that's what you want. That's great, but if you have any desire to do research like I do, then you-- you can't be satisfied with a lecturer job because it's not designed for that ... I'm not in the position of people who want to be lecturers... Maybe for them, if they were treated exactly the same, they will be completely happy with that job and that job title. But, because I have that aspiration for the-- the research aspect of it, then I have to have the tenure-track job... as long as tenure is the measure by which success is measured in the research community, that's what you have to do. So even if it was all very happy here, I think I'd still be pushing towards tenure, tenure-track just because of the-- the research community. (Carol)

Carol's aspiration is to gain renown among her disciplinary colleagues. She perceives teaching as a local activity that does not and cannot lead to developing prestige.

Helen also saw the goal she had envisioned achieving when she went through graduate school and the professional role she currently held as being far apart:

... I don't know. I know that [my identity is] not what I thought it would be. It's not; you know... it's not in [my original discipline]. I had kind of like a superstar dissertation director...she does a [specialized form of analysis]. So I think she thought that's what I would do, too... And I worked on [this publication], which is [a disciplinary journal], as an editor. So this is what I thought I would do and this is not what I'm doing, so. This feels more like I'm a mechanic or something, you know? This feels more like I'm doing nuts and bolts of... My job is always to get students to do what I think they need to do and to make them feel like it's their choice, even though it's not. (Helen)

When Helen describes her undertakings as an editor, she expresses an attachment to those activities, perceiving them as valuable. However, when she describes her teaching activities she frames these efforts as those you might find a laborer doing, not a prestigious professional. Helen struggled with integrating her teaching activities and her research interests:

I never thought I would teach this much. You know, I thought I would have a 2/2 load, you know... do research. And for a while I did research within my field still until I had a book chapter come out in 2011 and that was kind of the end of it.

Because I thought if I have any scholarly direction, it should go towards [the area

I'm teaching in] and away from... I mean everything should be integrated. So what I teach should fit into what I'm doing as far as research goes. So not just having time to do that much more processing of information and that much more discovering of different things... As long as they're split like that, they are separate I think. The more integrated you can become, the more-- the more fused they become. But if all of your research interests and all of your writing interests are completely different from what you're teaching... you know if I spend most of my days teaching and then-- it's weird... it's fragmented I think. It's like I have a part-time job doing something completely different like running a garage.

Throughout her interview, Helen revealed her struggle with the conflict she felt between her current formal role as a teaching-intensive lecturer and the expectations she had initially established for herself as a research-intensive faculty member within her discipline. Although Helen shared that she felt these aspects of her academic life should overlap, for her they did not. Part of her difficulty may be a struggle with the prestige she expected to attain as a disciplinary researcher. Another participant had recently resolved the prestige issue, yet still sought the status of being in the tenure-stream. Jeremiah considered being in the tenure-stream as the main indicator of professional success, despite having recently gained renown from disciplinary colleagues.

I basically solved, if I can say that, one of the top five unsolvable problems in the field. I just went there... and just... 'There you go'... and there's stunned silence. And I knew at that point I'd essentially made my career there. So professionally, in that regard, I feel great! I feel great about how everything's going. And I think I'm kind of a patient person. I think the lectureship years actually all-in-all are a

pretty sweet deal...I mean, so I have a three-three load which is, I know, very good for a lecturer.

Additionally, although Jeremiah described feeling satisfied with his current non-tenure assignment, throughout the interview he also described himself as functioning as though he had a tenure-stream appointment. Jeremiah's departmental colleagues support his desire to engage in research activities along with his teaching, "It really feels like I'm a tenure-track professor doing one extra class." Jeremiah acts like a tenure-stream faculty member and feels he is treated like a tenure-stream faculty member in both his department and with his disciplinary colleagues in professional conferences. So it is logical that he would not identify as lecturer despite viewing "lecturers [as] about the most stable position" professionally. When asked how he would introduce himself he identified himself according to his disciplinary specialization and he saw the attainment of a tenure-track job as a metric for knowing that he had achieved professional success.

Kaleb identified as a lecturer, but was encouraged by his department to engage in research. He also perceived that his departmental colleagues viewed his position as a professional rest stop, which may have been because Kaleb had initially applied to this university for a tenure-track position:

They [in the department] are certainly willing to see some research as part of my job duties. Even though I'm technically a lecturer who is primarily about teaching classes, they certainly encourage us to do that. Just out of the fact that maybe we would move on at some point, ... I think they recognize that these are perhaps not

the jobs that we were hoping to get and so we'd need to continue to publish to try and get tenure-track jobs somewhere down the line.

However, unlike Carol and Jeremiah, Kaleb did not perceive his department as encouraging him to see himself as a tenure-stream faculty member with just one extra class. Instead, Kaleb felt that his department's expectations for his formal role, particularly regarding research, were frequently unclear:

When we came here, [we said] that we'd like to do some research. And they said, 'Oh yeah, we'll certainly have that as part of your job role.' But then apparently, they got overruled by the dean. We were going to actually have research as part of our DOE [distribution of effort], but then they were like, 'Just call it professional development.' They didn't want us to have any research as part of our DOE.

Despite being unclear about expectations in this formal role, Kaleb seemed to enjoy having a lecturer position:

I wanted to be in an academic environment because it's an environment that is conducive to learning. It's conducive to people asking questions... there's always a presentation to go to. There's always interesting stuff going on here and you just, I don't know, I feel like that's part of my job because teaching-- you can constantly revise your classes. It's never done, right? So yes, I'm teaching the same classes again and again, but there's always a new example to bring in.

He also sought opportunities to engage in research about his teaching. However, Kaleb stated that he would take a tenure-track position if one were offered, "Especially if it was a teaching-intensive, tenure track position." Kaleb seemed to feel that finding a

teaching-intensive, tenure-stream position was unlikely since he also shared that, “I’m trying to, I guess, realign my expectations to perhaps never having a tenure-track job.”

Like Carol and Jeremiah, Gwen socially identified with her discipline, and specifically her specialization; however, she also did not seem to experience the same frustration as Helen, Jeremiah, or Carol about not having a research-intensive role. In fact, Gwen claimed that, “I have a teaching job and I’m quite happy to be in a teaching job.” Yet, like Kaleb, not being on tenure-stream, was brought up as a concern.

Although many participants were content with their lecturer roles, and some had intentionally sought out a teaching-intensive position, not being on the tenure track created concerns for a few of these same participants. Tenure-stream faculty positions are still considered more prestigious than are non-tenure positions and still tend to be regarded as the mark of professional success in the world of higher education. “Historically, the notion of professionalization in the academy is inherently tied to tenure, but there has not been the same conscious connection made between professional status and faculty who are not tenured” (Kezar & Sam, 2011, p. 1423).

For example, Allan and Gwen were conflicted about accepting their appointments as a permanent professional position. However, this conflict seemed to originate from their mentors and from the state of higher education having “no socialization to think of non-tenure track faculty as professionals” (Kezar & Sam, 2011, p. 1423). For others, such as Helen, Carol, and Jeremiah, to remain in a position that is non-tenure track means not acquiring the metric for knowing that professional success had been achieved. Despite this bias in the academy, Denis, Ethan, Faith, Isabel, Brenna, Kaleb, and Leon viewed

their non-tenure appointments as professional academic appointments. These participants perceived their identity as a lecturer as salient to their sense of self and their professional goals. Denis, Allan, Isabel, Kaleb, and Faith also perceived their lecturer roles as an opportunity to conduct research that would contribute to the scholarship of teaching, so that the lecturer role was also a pedagogical researcher role. Although Gwen, Ethan, and Brenna did not express interest in conducting pedagogical research, they also did not perceive the role of lecturer as stigmatizing. Helen, Carol, and Jeremiah saw the role of lecturer as stigmatizing, especially regarding future goals, a perspective that may have been reinforced by some tenure-stream colleagues.

Social Identification: Exploring Self-perceptions about Professional Activities

Isabel, Denis, Ethan, Leon, Brenna, Faith, Kaleb, and Allan, who socially identified with their formal roles as lecturers, expressed value for the professional activities of being a part of the teaching-intensive faculty. Gwen socially identified with her specific discipline, but also expressed value for activities involved in being a lecturer over a disciplinary researcher. Jeremiah and Carol socially identified as research-intensive faculty despite their formal roles and expressed value for primarily engaging in research activities specific to their discipline. Helen also identified as a research-intensive faculty, but found her formal role as a lecturer as being in conflict with that identity.

Identity salience is determined by how important an identity is to an individual's core sense of self and future goals. The perceptions that an identity is valued, versus stigmatized, appeared to originate from three sources for participants in this study:

- 1) personal value the individual attributed to the role of teaching and being a full-time instructor;
- 2) social value of the role communicated in the department through tenure-stream colleagues;
- 3) social value of the role expressed by mentors and, in particular, graduate advisors.

A social identity is simultaneously shared and created through narratives as individuals navigate their social environment. The socially constructed professional identity espoused by the lecturers in this study is an integration of identity salience and social experiences, primarily those social experiences occurring within departments (Petriglieri, 2011). A participant's social identity and formal role in the department were usually, but not always, convergent. Convergence of a formal role and social identity involved a participant's social identity being reflected in his or her formal role activities. Divergence of a formal role from a social identity involved a participant's social identity and the activities of a formal role being in conflict.

Isabel, whose social identity as an educator converged with her formal role as a lecturer, explained that she perceived herself as integrated within her department:

When there are issues that come up about undergraduate issues, if there's something about the way things are being taught and somebody wants to know something, they turned to us. Because they ask, 'Well, what do you see in class? What you have going on?' So I could say, 'Well, here was my experience. Here's what we did.' And so I think they respect our opinions. They realize that we're the ones that are on the frontline of these undergraduate students, of these freshman level courses in that we know best how to teach the students, not them. (Isabel)

Whereas Carol, whose social identity as a researcher diverged from her formal role as a lecturer, shared that her department also included her:

The program director also incorporates lecturers into the program as if they're just regular faculty members...treats us just like anybody else; does not treat us any differently and so I feel like a... one of the core members of this program. (Carol)

Isabel identifies as, and values being, a non-tenure track, teaching-intensive faculty member; a role for which she perceives her colleagues also value her. The value she feels and perceives from others is also congruent with the formal role she occupies in her department. In other words, she associates the meaning of “disciplinary educator” with her formal role activities (Petriglieri, 2011) and those activities converge with her social identity. Isabel also perceives that her department mirrors her perceptions about her formal role. On the contrary, Carol associates the meaning of “disciplinary researcher” with her social identity. Carol engages in research activities similar to her tenure-stream colleagues, which also allows her to engage in activities that have meaning for her social identity as a disciplinary researcher. Having an academic position that requires primarily teaching-intensive work is not consistent with activities associated with a researcher identity and may contribute to her perception that the formal role of lecturer is divergent from her social identity. Carol perceives that her departmental colleagues mirror her perceptions about both her social identity and formal role and that they support her intention to change formal roles if approval to do so were granted by the college dean.

Participants, who perceived that the perspectives they held about their formal role and social identity converged but were not mirrored by their departmental colleagues,

expressed a sense of separateness or marginalization from being a full member of the department's faculty. Both Kaleb and Leon indicated that their social identification was as an educator in higher education, an identity that converged with their formal role. However, in their department, they described some colleagues who viewed them as occupying the position of a contract laborer. This laborer view seemed to be magnified by the department's confusion about how to integrate these non-tenure track faculty members into the department:

[We] got the sense that while we're faculty, we're also not real faculty, right? It's like they have... they know what to do with the assistant professors going up for tenure. They don't really know what to do with us... It seems like whenever they need us to be faculty members they treat us like faculty members. Whenever they don't want us to be faculty members, they don't treat us like faculty members. So for example, we haven't had too many opportunities to teach extra classes because of budgetary issues. But the one time they asked me to teach an extra class, apparently the rule is that faculty members get 10% of their salary to teach an extra class. Except for some reason, they were going to pay us a flat rate that was lower than 10% of our salaries. And again, we argued with that and it eventually got raised up to 10%. It wasn't that much of a difference, but it still was like, 'Why do we have to fight for this if we're faculty members?' (Kaleb) I'm actually of the first generation of lecturers in the department and, even to this day, I don't think we've really figured out how we're supposed to fit into the department... And I think it's just... I think the department has just treated the

whole lecturer program as, ‘Well this is what the college wants us to do and we’ll play it by ear.’ (Leon)

Confusion by departmental colleagues about the formal role that Kaleb and Leon hold may impact the value, meaning or enactment of Kaleb and Leon’s formal role and social identity as they define it (Petriglieri, 2011).

Responses to an Espoused Social Identity: Conflict or Support?

When mentors, professional colleagues, and departmental colleagues reflect the convergence or divergence of one’s formal role with one’s social identity, they may be providing a form of organizational support resulting in a sense that perceptions are congruent. Five participants: Denis, Ethan, Faith, Isabel, and Brenna, described their social identity as converging with their formal role. They also described congruence between their perspectives about their formal role as a full-time, teaching-intensive faculty as similar to the perspectives they heard from peers including departmental colleagues, disciplinary peers, and graduate advisors.

Conversely, three participants, Helen, Carol, and Jeremiah, described how their formal role diverged from their social identity. Carol and Jeremiah’s departmental colleagues and advisors, who spoke to them about holding a teaching-intensive, non-tenure appointment, were perceived as mirroring these perspectives about their formal role. Helen did not perceive that her departmental colleagues mirrored her perceptions about her social identity as a researcher. When asked how she would finish the statement, “I am a...” she replied, “Teacher, I guess. That’s depressing”, because her current role as a lecturer was not where she saw herself ending up professionally. However, she described her departmental colleagues as being supportive of her formal role. These three

participants perceived their current non-tenure, teaching-intensive role as divergent from their social identity of being a researcher in the tenure-stream with those colleagues who are intensively focused on research. The internal and external standards for their social identity did not converge with their current formal role as a lecturer. Because these non-tenure track faculty members' espoused social identity and their formal role was divergent, I perceived an identity conflict being created. In congruence with their colleagues and graduate advisors, Carol and Jeremiah espoused the identity of a tenure-stream faculty member while enacting the formal role of a full-time non-tenure track faculty member with a teaching-intensive appointment. Helen, perceived her department as expressing positive regard for her professional role as a lecturer, but she did not attribute importance to the lecturer identity. She also enacted the identity of a non-tenure track, teaching-intensive lecturer. While this enacted identity was congruent with the identity her department perceived her to have, it was divergent from the identity she had for herself. "Individuals can themselves threaten one of their identity's meanings if they act in a way that is inconsistent with [that meaning]" (Petriglieri, 2011, p. 646). Helen's actions, in fulfilling her teaching-intensive formal role, may indicate for her that the association between her professional actions and her social identity are not justified. This conflict of actions and identity create a distance between her social identity as a renowned researcher and its current meaning as indicated by her professional actions (Petriglieri, 2011). Although Carol and Jeremiah had a social identity divergent from their formal role, they act in ways that are consistent with their social identity's meanings by layering disciplinary research actions on top of their teaching actions. They also perceived that their departmental colleagues supported them in engaging in research

activities in a way that was consistent with their social identity, rather than their formal role.

Identity conflict created through incongruence in perspectives also seemed possible in situations in which mentors or department colleagues expressed a negative view of the lecturer position, especially if that position converged with the participant's social identity. Allan and Gwen expressed a social identity that converged with their current formal role, a convergent view that seemed to be congruent with that of their departmental colleagues. Despite this convergence and congruence, both described feeling pressure from their mentors to continue searching for a tenure-stream position.

Although they conveyed their commitment to an identity as a lecturer, both Allan and Gwen indicated that they felt some doubt about the wisdom of accepting an academic appointment that does not have a tenure option. Allan described feeling some conflict between his current formal role and the career expectations established in graduate school. These doubts appeared to stem from external rather than internal sources.

Although Allan described a positive identity as a lecturer, he was frequently cautioned by his graduate advisor that, "You didn't get a Ph.D. to be a lecturer did you?" (Allan). I found Allan's conflict interesting because he described his graduate program as one that emphasized teaching as an integral part of his doctoral program, which seems to indicate that the issue is with the non-tenure status, not the teaching role:

The idea [of my doctoral program] is knowing, doing and making. So the knowing part is the theory... the theoretical things... the research that you're doing. The doing is we put a lot of emphasis on the pedagogy. So you go in there and... no one had fellowships, everyone taught. And you taught all four years and

we began by teaching in communication, public speaking classes and other things and then we moved into the writing courses. And I imagine, in my head, that a lot of this was, 'Well, we just need them to teach.' So, one of the things is that there is going to be teaching. 'We just got to let them know that they're not getting out of this.' But then also, that your research can be coming out of that teaching as well. So, it's really hard to think that you're doing this research sort of in a vacuum. (Allan)

Gwen was experiencing conflict about her willingness to maintain her non-tenure status as a permanent career move from external sources as well. Early in Gwen's interview she stated that, "There are times that I feel that I'm, and people tell me that, like this is a dead end job." Later in the interview, when she reflects on if she would truly want a tenure-stream position, she reconsiders.

I think personally, if I would just ignore all these people telling me things, I think I would be happy in a position like this... if I could get to do research and get some publications...if they would say that my distribution of effort, if that would include maybe 20% research, maybe 25% research...I would be happier with that, with the same position" (Gwen).

Neither Allan nor Gwen described an internal drive to seek a tenure-stream position.

Allan appreciated the integration of his research with his teaching that his current position affords. Gwen is also satisfied in her formal role and would like to dedicate some of her professional activities to research as a way to contribute to her discipline.

Kaleb and Leon, who also had a social identity that converged with their current formal role, described feeling marginalized by some of the colleagues in their

departments because these colleagues espoused views that were incongruent with the participant's views of their formal roles and the social identity they espoused and enacted. Both the tenure-stream mentors and these tenure-stream colleagues may create potential harm to these individual's social identity through identity devaluation, which "generally stem from intergroup differences and the tendency of people to devalue outgroups" (Petriglieri, 2011, p. 646).

Clear as Mud: Defining Professional and Academic Identity

Differentiation between professional identity and academic identity appeared to be unrelated to self-perceptions about the value these participants had for their social identity, but attempts to differentiate revealed interesting dimensions regarding perceptions about relationships between their formal roles and social identity. These dimensions may have been revealed because these participants did not all have the same social identity, despite having the same formal roles. How social identity was expressed (i.e., by completing the prompt "I am a...") and whether that identity fulfilled a self-definition of either professional or academic identity seemed to inform perceptions about the value associated with the formal role held in an academic department.

Isabel perceives educating students as an important part of her identity and suggests that her professional identity and academic identity are overlapping:

If I were to meet somebody and they said they were a [physical scientist] versus a [disciplinary] educator, I would see them both as... that's their profession. I mean with [physical scientists], we talk about these divisions...but there's so much overlap that those divides are changing so we're all kind of melding in together anyway. And so, there's definitely a continuum of all these other fields.

[Disciplinary] educators are kind of a little bit on the side as far as... because you span everything, but you're not any one. You might be teaching a little bit of everything, but you're more worried about the teaching aspect of it. The [physical scientist] I would think as probably more of a professional thing, whereas the [disciplinary] educator I could see as either professional or as academic. And I think it depends on the environment where you're working. I think if you were in industry, you won't see [disciplinary] educators in industry. You would just see the [physical scientists]; you know the [specific type of physical scientist]. Whereas when you're in academia, we see somebody as if you're doing tenure-track with research and teaching. You are both... you're both of them. But, I don't really see myself as a [physical scientist] anymore. Yes, that's how I was trained. But, I'm in [disciplinary] ed now. That's my... that's how I would describe myself. And so, if I were meeting somebody new and they were like, 'Oh well, what's your area of expertise?' or 'What is your focus?' then I would say education; it wouldn't be [a physical scientist]. (Isabel)

Isabel makes a clear distinction between faculty in the research profession and faculty in the teaching profession. She makes this distinction based on the work these individuals do which also determines where they are employed as professionals (i.e., industry versus higher education). However, for her the distinction between professional and academic is primarily a reference to where people are employed. Academics are only found in higher education and professionals are either in industry or higher education. In academia, Isabel envisions all faculty as a continuum of professionals that include both teaching-intensive and research-intensive, non-tenure track and tenure-

stream, and all disciplinary divisions. This perspective of the continuum is a unique view of the non-tenure/tenure-stream difference that is typically described as hierarchical in professional publications (Kezar & Sam, 2011; Purcell, 2007; Thedwell, 2008).

Brenna also defined being an academic as the core of both her personal and social identity and her intellectual musings fed into her classroom teaching practices:

You know, and this may not be the answer you were looking for, but it just strikes me that... something about academics, there's a curiosity and there's a constant wondering and wanting to figure things out and just think about things. And so in my academic world, the questions I'm answering and bringing those into the classroom to try and inspire students to be asking similar questions as they go through, even if they're watching some silly TV show a lot of times it'll raise questions you know in your mind. You'll think-- you'll want to analyze further. And I want students to want to analyze those things further. And so I think my professional identity and my academic identity it's that bringing that lens of analysis to life whether it's in the classroom or in my research. And then I think that continues into private life as well though... because I sometimes feel like I'm training my children by asking them those questions, 'What did you think of this?' Some of the same things I'm doing in the classroom to try and get them to think and modeling that kind of behavior, where you're approaching life through this analytical lens. And so you know, I don't know that it stops at any point way in life. I think when you're kind of wired that way, you bring that to...no matter what your... what aspect of your day you're facing. (Brenna)

For Brenna, her professional identity and her academic identity are overlapped. Brenna describes an intention to create a research-teaching nexus as she attempts to get students to bring “that lens of analysis to life”, that analytic lens that she uses.

Although he no longer identifies as a disciplinary researcher, in a way similar to Brenna, Leon perceives himself to be an academic:

I guess maybe, scholar might be a better phrase. Given the fact that I still, even though I don't actively pursue research to create new knowledge, I'm still deeply in love with learning. And I think that's a key for being an academic or a scholar is that you never stop learning. You're always interested in what else is out there.
(Leon)

When I questioned Leon to clarify if he defined the terms ‘scholar’ and ‘academic’ as interchangeable, he clarified:

Yeah, I guess I don't quite see the difference yet. And I almost like the word “scholar” as more appropriate to that. And I would almost look at “academic” as a little more institutionalized. In other words, the scholar is...regardless of what they do-- It's just the way that they view the world. Whereas an academic-- that's more implying that they do have-- their employment is with the university, where they're actually-- part of their job is to either create or exchange knowledge.
(Leon)

According to Leon's definition of scholar/academic, he identifies as an academic since the university employs him. Denis also perceived himself as an academic who teaches:

I mean my profession is that I'm an academic in some respects... That's my job. I'm in an academic field. I teach students in an academic setting. Alright, so in certain contexts, that would be considered academics. So, I engage in some other activities that you find at the academic institution. I teach, but I also have an opportunity to try and do some research and other things that are important for kind of fulfilling the academic role that would be expected at a university. Yeah, so I'm an academic. Yeah, I'm an academic. (Denis)

Initially Kaleb said that academic identity and professional identity were "interchangeable". However, when asked to define academic identity, he said it was "Being well read, being an expert in your field." When asked if he would give the same definition to professional identity, he replied, "Probably not, because professionally you would have to obviously display competency in your job," which he saw as different from being an expert in his field. When asked how he could display competency in his role as a lecturer he replied, "Being a good teacher, right? I mean since so much of my job is teaching, then I do take pride and have an identity as being a-- at least decent, if not decent, then good teacher. You know I think anybody in this position would have to have that as part of their professional identity."

When I asked Ethan how he would define academic identity, he made a distinction by defining professional identity as related to disciplinary affiliation and academic identity as determined by one's role within the department:

I would say academic identity would be kind of your job title: lecturer, professor, instructor... that kind of thing. As a professional identity, I would say that's kind of... scientist, neuroscientist and it doesn't really directly have... when I'm

teaching, I'm not directly doing science. I... but I am still a scientist. I'm not coming into class every day with a hypothesis and testing it. (Ethan)

Isabel, Denis, Ethan, Leon, Brenna, and Faith who socially identified with their formal roles as lecturers, also described a great deal of overlap between their academic identity and professional identity. This overlapping of academic/professional identity concepts tied tightly to the professional activities of being a non-tenure track, teaching-intensive faculty, which were also considered features of their academic identity. Additionally, the research that Isabel, Denis, and Faith were interested in conducting focused on disciplinary pedagogical research creating integration between their research interests and their formal role activities.

Jeremiah, who did not socially identify as a teaching-intensive lecturer, also described professional and academic identity as overlapping, practically indistinguishable, as he said, "I call myself a [disciplinary specialist] in both instances." Jeremiah perceives himself both professionally and academically as a researcher. So for him there is no distinction when defining these terms. In fact, Jeremiah perceived academic identity as a concept particular only to those in higher education, and a concept that would be seen as professional identity outside of academia:

The only people who really know anything, or care anything about [academic identity] are those within academia and [professional identity] is, say I talk to my neighbor and he's like, 'Oh, you teach at [a university].' That would be something different, but...um...it's still-- it's still basically the same thing. (Jeremiah)

Gwen and Allan made distinctions between academic identity and professional identity. Their perceptions were that academic identity was invoked when conducting research while professional identity was demonstrated by formal role activities.

So I guess academic identity for me would be the [natural scientist] doing research, putting out papers into the world, new things that I discovered or study about, new ideas, that help to explain this field ... Okay and that's very big for me...not that I'm doing anything about it right now. But it's still to me, that's still a big thing. I think professional identity... I don't know if this is what you might call professional identity... but I think it's more about how well I do my job in the current job that I am in. (Gwen)

This [academic identity] is sort of what I-- I see as more, most important to me, because that's when my research and my pedagogy feed into each other. The professional identity is sort of more being a part of that professional culture to me.

At least that's how I'm reading this. (Allan)

According to these responses Gwen and Allan's academic identity is based on their formal role as a researcher doing either disciplinary or pedagogical research activities. For Gwen academic identity is the disciplinary research activity that is important to her, but she is not currently conducting. For Allan, his research and his teaching feed into each other, forming the most important part of his academic identity. They also defined professional identity differently. For Gwen professional identity meant the degree to which she fulfilled her current formal role as a teaching-intensive, non-tenure track faculty. Yet when asked to what profession she would say she belonged she gave her research specialization. For Allan, professional identity came from being involved in the

professional culture of his discipline. Finally, Isabel self-identifies as a disciplinary educator for both her academic identity and professional identity as does Faith and Leon.

Some of the participants in this study made no distinction between their perceptions of professional and academic identity; additionally their formal role was seen as congruent with this identity. These non-tenure track faculty members perceived themselves as academics by virtue of the professional role they have within academia. Their conceptualization of what it means to be an academic and a professional is associated with the actions they perform in their formal role. Other participants overlapped their perceptions of professional and academic identity, which also revealed the associations being made between meanings given to their professional actions and their social identities. These non-tenure track faculty members also perceived themselves as academics who occupy an important professional role within the academy, yet their academic identity was typically constructed from the meaning they associated with their intellectual activities beyond their formal role. A third group of participants made clear distinctions between professional identity and academic identity. For this group, navigating the space between these two distinct identities was challenging. The formal role they hold is incongruent with how they perceived themselves as academics creating a conflict between their formal role and their social identity. However, an identity conflict between a formal role and a social identity did not necessarily equate to an identity threat. What did appear to create an identity threat was a perception of a lack of organizational support. Although each participant had slight variations in their definitions of academic identity and professional identity, their desire for departmental colleagues that value their social identity was unanimous. Furthermore, the full-time non-tenure track faculty in this

study, who perceived their social identity as being valued by colleagues, expressed a sense of belonging within the department. Finally, as described in the next chapter, perceptions about one's formal role, regardless of whether the participant socially identified with the formal role, appeared to be influenced by perceptions of organizational support.

Chapter Six

Organizational Support

In this chapter I describe participants' perceptions about fairness of treatment within the university, paying particular attention to their descriptions about office-sharing, monetary award differences, representation on the faculty senate, collegiality in the department and opportunities to teach upper division courses. I focus on what the participants shared as lesser issues (office-sharing and monetary award differences) first, while major points about fairness of treatment within the organization (representation on the faculty senate, collegiality in the department and opportunities to teach upper division courses) will conclude the chapter.

In the Space of an Office

Perceptions about having to share an office were mixed. A few participants expressed frustration about having to share an office. Other participants had their own offices and had never been asked to share an office. Many of the participants in this study shared offices, but they saw the situation as beyond the control of the department. For example, Carol who shares her office said, "The sharing offices they would fix if they could, but we've had weird space things."

Throughout her interview, Carol mentioned many ways in which she felt she was a fully integrated member of the department. Carol is being encouraged to maintain her research efforts in fulfillment of her professional development percentage of her distribution of effort, which also supports her social identity. She is engaging in service to professional organizations and other campus departments as part of her service. Other participants, who also described themselves as a full faculty member of the department,

shared offices without feeling that doing so was unfair even in comparison to tenure-stream faculty who did not share. Brenna also perceived office sharing as unproblematic:

This semester I've only seen [my office mate] about three times because our schedules are opposite, but when she's here it's really nice. It's nice to have someone ...especially last year when I was just getting my feet wet. I had some plagiarism cases to deal with and I had [her] right here and I could say, 'Have you dealt with this?',... And we have a corner office, so that's nice. If we have to share at least we have a good office and a nice space! ... Now I do worry as we add more people if we won't be the ones that are booted somewhere. But again, I think though that we're teaching the big classes. There's enough student traffic to come see us. We get some protection because of that. Our role is an integral one that might keep us from suffering that fate of being banished to another floor!

When I asked this faculty member if she thought tenure-stream faculty might be open to sharing an office due to space issues, she described sharing with tenured faculty while a part-time instructor and explained her view of how tenure-track faculty might see office-sharing as a threat to prestige.

I don't know [if tenure-stream faculty would be threatened], well I say that, but I used to share with- when I was part time I had floated around. There were several people I shared with over the years. One being a couple of doors down and I was in his office probably for five years again though I came in the evenings. But they never seem to have problem with sharing that and allowing me to be there at certain times. So yeah I think it just depends on who it is. Some individuals are a little more flexible and go with the flow. (*So it's more the personality*) Yeah, I

think it's more the personality. Although, you know, younger faculty kind of have to prove themselves a bit more and feel probably like they need to establish their, their territory... define their turf. So I can see a younger faculty member not wanting to share when they look and see no one else is sharing. I think it'd probably be some of the more established faculty that would be more willing to do that than possibly some of the younger ones for reasonable reasons. We have some faculty that aren't up here all that much because you have a couple of office hours a week and there's plenty of time where you could share an office and never even see each other. Most people would see that as it's not going to change my life too much to have someone in here. (Brenna)

Brenna has decided that the office situation as one that is beyond the control of the department, although she also reveals that she and her officemate may be the ones asked to move to another floor. Those faculty selected to move to another floor would be a departmental decision. Brenna does not indicate why she feels that she and her officemate may be the ones selected for moving, but she does suggest that their roles as full-time non-tenure track faculty, who teach a large number of the department's students, may safeguard their office space. While the value her department has for her formal role may protect her physical space, her perception of being a full member of the department's faculty provides support for her social identity as an educator. Throughout her interview Brenna indicated that she felt she was a fully integrated member of her department. This perception of integration may create an expectation that the department will treat her as a professional, not as a contractual laborer.

Conversely, another participant found the promise of an office, and then a threat to that promise, as a particularly disturbing indication of how the department devalued his role. Throughout his interview Kaleb described his department as being differentiated into tenure-stream and non-tenure roles. He saw the department as having a lot of difficulty with determining how, or even if, to integrate the new full-time lecturers as full members of the department.

It's been tough. I mean that's probably been one of the biggest obstacles of this job is that we were told when we were hired that we were full faculty members. That we would be able to vote on undergraduate matters. We wouldn't have much to do with the graduate program but that's fine, but we would be considered faculty members. And then there have been many instances over the last couple of years in which we have been treated as something other than a faculty member. Not a part-time instructor but they just don't know what to do with us in some cases. So for example, we were told both of us, you could tell we were coming out of big grad programs where we had to share offices. Both of us, in our job interviews, were like 'We're going to get our own offices right?' Talk about what you're looking for in a job- my own office is one thing I would want. And we were told, "Yes, you're going to get your own offices. You guys are faculty members." And then some dean said, "Nope, lecturers don't get their own offices they have to share offices." And so you're trying to say, "Well, we're faculty members. You wouldn't treat any other faculty member like this. Why are we being treated like this?" Well, clearly because we're something other than a real faculty member.

Although Kaleb did have his own office, he did not feel that having his own office was a demonstration of organizational support or fair treatment since the department was not appearing to make an effort to provide an office. Kaleb explained that he was benefitting from fortuitous circumstances that could change at a later date.

I mean obviously I still have my own office, but that's because we basically lucked out because we had a person retire and so they gave us that office and so we were able to have two offices. So they've basically kind of ignored who has these offices. But they told us, you know, that we were going to have our own offices- I'm sure in good faith. 'We will be able to provide you...' and then later finding out that no, they are going to change that policy.

In another department, the participant did have to share an office, but was assigned an officemate who was not on campus for the semester. When asked if she resented having to share an office Helen responded,

No, because I think this is a systemic issue. I mean I think that inequality is built into the system. It's the system, it is not necessarily... that [this department] would design it that way. I suppose they could try and get everybody, everyone their own offices but I don't think that there are enough spaces to do that. I think they did this for me deliberately because they knew [the officemate] was leaving. So... I don't know that, I just suspected.

Instead of assigning the organization, or its agents, blame for the lack of equitable office space Helen described inequality inherent in the system as the root cause of the inequality. Although Helen's formal role and social identity were not convergent, she described her department as very supportive of her formal role. Similar to Carol and

Brenna, Helen also perceived that she was considered a full member of the department. Interestingly, while Carol, Brenna, and Helen all had shared offices they did not perceive the sharing of an office as evidence of a lack of organizational support from their department. All three of these participants, who also perceived that they were fully integrated into the department, described their sharing of offices as being beyond the control of the department. Kaleb, who had his own office, perceived the threat of losing that office as partial evidence that he was not a fully integrated faculty member. Kaleb also indicated that he did not perceive that his departmental colleagues reflected the value he had for his social identity in his formal role.

Isabel currently has her own office and has no indication that that would change in the future, even though she is in a department that is being relocated. The administrators of that department have involved the entire full-time faculty, tenure-stream and non-tenure track, in decisions about how the new facility should be structured. Isabel gave an example of how the department requested that she give her input regarding the new space, which she viewed as evidence of organizational support. She was also aware that this support might not be common practice in other departments:

I was asked what I wanted to see [in the new building and office]. ‘Here is something some other buildings have around the world. What you like and dislike about this?’ I don’t know that that’s happening in other departments.

Show Me the Money...or Don’t: Perceptions about Support

One of the benefits of accepting a tenure-track position is job security in comparison to those employed in organizations outside of higher education. However there is a perceived cost in that most faculty members, since they are typically paid for

only a nine or ten-month contract, tend to earn less compensation through pay than their for-profit sector counterparts and full-time non-tenure track faculty receive even lower monetary compensation. Financially, full-time non-tenure track faculty members in this college have salaries that are approximately 10% less than their tenure-track colleagues. Although the participants in this study did not emphasize concern about this discrepancy, Helen noted that the difference in pay might be evidence of the university's commitment to research positions over teaching positions:

From the beginning [departmental representation] was set up in a more democratic way that doesn't make things unequal. Money would make things equal. So for a reality check you look at pay differentials to see where the University is actually spending, I mean that's across the board. You look at the medical school faculty, I don't know too many faculty who make that much money.

Pay differentials depending on discipline is an organizational norm. Other organizational norms reinforced the lesser value of the full-time non-tenure track faculty members in comparison to their tenure-stream colleagues. For example, the provost's teaching award offers a much larger monetary bonus to tenure-stream recipients (\$5,000, category one teaching award) than it does to full-time non-tenure stream recipients (\$3,000, category two teaching award) (source: Provost's website) a discrepancy of which these non-tenure track faculty seem to be unaware. Conversely, these non-tenure track faculty members are aware of how their pay compares to external referents (i.e. tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty at other institutions) and reported being on par, or having greater pay than, those external colleagues.

What for me was really influential [in accepting this position] is- a good friend of mine teaches at [another institution] and she's in a tenure-track position there... and when I was talking this over with her, because I mean I really struggled, 'Do I want to go full-time?' At that point it wasn't ideal [to go full-time] and she said, [referring to the pay being offered] 'That's a lot more than I'm making teaching four classes each semester.' She said, 'As far as salary goes...' she thought it was just a great deal! And looking at it then with my colleagues in other institutions who will be more closely- their expectations their research and teaching- would be more in line with what I'm doing- I'm doing better than most of them because I teach fewer classes and end up making more money. (Brenna)

According to Kaleb, "The teaching load isn't that bad, it's 3/3, and the pay is kind of commensurate with what you would get at a liberal arts tenure-track position." While Allan selected his current appointment over a tenure-stream position in part due to comparison of salary options.

This was one of a couple of job offers that I received at that time. One was sort of, was sort of tentative and that was actually in New York, New York City. And I had another one at [another institution], but that one was not a very good offer in terms of salary... as much as the romance of New York City draws people I just couldn't see myself doing that. That was a tenure-track job. So I decided this mostly based on lifestyle and some salary, salary reasons.

Another aspect of financial support that was noted by all of the participants was access to travel funds. Although some of the participants indicated that their teaching responsibilities prevented them from taking advantage of the travel opportunities

available to them, positive perceptions were expressed about the department providing support for professional development and conference attendance by offering these funds, which has been found to enhance perceptions of organizational support (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Because the college provides funds for foreign conferences, Carol attributed her foreign travel support as evidence of the college's rather than the department's support, so that she felt supported to travel by both entities, "We can get travel funds, so I can go to conferences. I've been able to get from the college travel money to go to foreign conferences."

The perception of organizational support for travel funds from the department was particularly high for participants who were aware that their colleagues contributed to their own travel funds through research dollars:

The chair does try to find money for us to go to conferences. If we've requested it he's going to do his best- because he realizes that we don't have research dollars- that he's going to try to get us to conferences and pay that. You know the same way that he would for, if he had an assistant professor that the focus is to try and get them tenure. And if they need other support to get that, he helps. And so he does the same thing with the lecturers. We don't have research money to spend to take us to a conference. The only way we're going to get that money is from the department funds, which are dwindling. But he's going to work to do that. (Isabel)

Prior to her current appointment Brenna had funded both the publication of her book and her own travel expenses. Having that previous experience as a basis of comparison also contributed to her perception of organizational support based on the department's willingness to fund her travel and publication efforts:

Yeah there is no difference. There's not even any difference in our department between research funds. I get the same research funds, that and travel money for conferences... and before I was doing- and I think that's probably why I was able to get the position I'm in- because I published a book in that time when I was [in a previous situation] ... but it was all at my own costs. Even when I was getting the book manuscript- photocopying, copy things, paying the shipping and overnighting it to the publisher- it was all at my expense. Now anything I do like that, research-wise, it's covered. I have funds available and so that makes a big difference as well.

Brenna, Denis, and Kaleb all perceived this support as a demonstration that the department valued the professional development of full-time non-tenure track faculty in the same way they valued the professional development of tenure-stream faculty. Kaleb said that, "One of the great things about this job and this department is that they have been fairly generous with the travel allowance and stuff like that. So we are able to go to conferences" a perception that was echoed in my interview with Denis:

So there is money for us to typically, within the department, to pay for faculty members to go to conferences. And since I've taken advantage of that last year to go to [professional/disciplinary conference] Yeah, so there's financial support for that kind of stuff. (Denis)

Throughout their interviews both Brenna and Denis described feeling fully integrated into their department and that their colleagues' perceptions that their formal role reflected their social identity were congruent with their own perceptions about that convergence. Kaleb, despite feeling that his formal role and social identity converged, did

not perceive his departmental colleagues as being supportive of his perspective. Yet he did perceive that his desire to participate in professional conferences was respected equally to his tenure-stream colleagues when requesting travel funds.

Based on social exchange theory on which organizational support theory is based, positive perceptions of being treated fairly by an organization, such as receiving travel funds and pay equivalent to external referents, can inhibit job turnover. Unfortunately internal inequities, such as what full-time lecturers are experiencing, can be more problematic than external inequities (Shore, Tashchian, & Jourdan, 2006). The study participants at this university currently view their pay as equitable to external referents. While higher pay compared to externally referenced tenure-stream faculty may create a positive impact to remain with the university, lesser pay in comparison to internally referenced tenure-stream faculty may have a greater impact on the full-time lecturer's decision to leave. "While individuals are pleased to receive higher pay than others, they find it quite distressing to receive lower pay" (Shore et al., p. 2592). As with other universities, tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track faculty have left this institution for higher pay at other institutions.

Since this university has an open-pay system, colleagues can easily research comparison of internal pay equity. Pay equity tends to be perceived as reflecting how an organization demonstrates value of an individual's talents and credentials. At this university the pay is currently viewed as inequitable in comparison to internal referents. In the past this inequity may have been justified because non-tenure track faculty may not have had a terminal degree equivalent to their tenure-stream colleagues; however, that

degree discrepancy is becoming less likely while the pay discrepancy and course restrictions remain, creating a sense of being a second-class faculty member:

If you're dealing at all with the difference between the old-style lecturer and this new style of lecturer- the difference being that the majority of people hired [now] have a Ph.D. And that said, they should have the credential- they have the credentials- to teach the same thing as their assistant professor counterparts, yet they're sometimes limited in the courses they're allowed to teach or there's no room for negotiation in pay...or anything like that- so the structure of the new position is such that they're almost necessarily in that position, I think that second-class kind of position. (Carol)

This sense of being a second-class faculty member was also reflected in the lack of representation within university governing bodies.

Decision-making without Representation

Although Isabel, Ethan, and Leon described having non-tenure track faculty representation on their department's executive committees, this was described separately from representation on university-wide governing bodies. Isabel perceived that having full-time non-tenure representation on departmental executive committees was another indication of her departmental colleagues' respect for teaching faculty:

When we're at faculty meetings and we're going into executive session they go, 'All tenured faculty and senior lecturers,' which is just [the senior lecturer], 'Stay' and that's the official announcement and the rest of us leave. So senior lecturers are included in that. Which is just one person but still that they include that, and it

shows something-if it's not a University wide thing or college thing it shows the attitude that the department has for teaching faculty.

Isabel described her social identity as an educator and her formal role as a teaching faculty as converging. She also described her departmental colleagues as expressing a value for her social identity that was congruent with her own. Alternatively, Leon and Ethan perceived this representation of a non-tenure track faculty member on the executive committee as a requirement of college by-laws and are therefore were less likely to perceive the representation as a form of organizational support:

I will vote in departmental matters and everything except for stuff involving graduate-student training, the things that really aren't, don't touch on anything that I do. So I'm allowed to vote in everything except for tenure decisions and graduate-student training. Those are the two areas that our bylaws say we don't vote in. (Ethan)

Yeah, there's a role for the lecturer, [one] has to be involved with the salary committee, etc. And that's actually in the departmental by-laws, these committees have to have so many members and you have to have members representing different groups. So the executive committee must have a lecturer and must have an assistant professor etc. (Leon)

Ethan and Leon both perceived that their formal roles and their social identity converged; however, they also described ways in which departmental colleagues expressed views that were not always congruent with the way Ethan and Leon perceived themselves.

Conversely, Helen, who is in a department in which the director of undergraduate studies is a full-time non-tenure track faculty member, participated in the creation of her department's by-laws. The difference in whether departments are perceived as voluntarily including non-tenure track faculty on executive committees or whether departments are perceived as adding non-tenure track faculty due to by-laws may impact perceptions of organizational support and value of one's formal role. Researchers have found that treatment of employees by an organization's representatives, which is perceived as discretionary, has a stronger positive impact than treatment that is perceived as resulting from organizational mandates (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). One university mandate that appears to have a major negative impact on perceptions of organizational support and value of one's formal role is representation on governing bodies.

Whereas travel funds and support for professional development activities were perceived as one way the department was supportive, a lack of representation for non-tenure track faculty on governing bodies was reported by many of the participants to be problematic for them as faculty members. Although Brenna recalls discussions about voting on hiring decisions and faculty senate, "'Do I vote?' [I ask] and [colleagues say] 'Oh yeah, you vote.' Or if there's been even any doubt they'll say, 'Ah well just vote we don't ... we're not going to bother checking on it.' So there's never been anything where I've not been included....'" The other participants, who discussed voting, indicated that they do not have the option to vote on graduate matters or for representation in the faculty senate. Not having an option to vote on graduate matters or tenure-stream hiring was not perceived as problematic despite my queries about this issue. However, a lack of representation on the faculty senate was frequently noted as being problematic. Although

departmental representation in undergraduate and non-tenure departmental matters was appreciated, a lack of representation for non-tenure track faculty on university-wide governing bodies was reported by many of the participants to be problematic, even by those participants who felt strongly supported by their departments.

The state of this university is such that lecturers don't get representation. There's a staff senate and there's a faculty senate. Lecturers cannot be on the faculty senate. Lecturers cannot vote for a faculty senator. Lecturers can nominate faculty senators, but they can't vote for them. They can't and they have nothing to say about the staff senate so lecturers have no representation and whether they're faculty or not is up for discussion. (Carol)

Lecturers don't vote for the board of trustee faculty representative. And this is really one of the big things that I have seen that, and I understand that lecturers are a smaller group but that doesn't make us any less of an important group. I mean size and might aren't always the same thing. And so that's one thing that I don't understand why that's the case. I don't understand why a lecturer, I can understand their logistics with [it] maybe because you're on a two year contract. But with the staff representative it's the same thing there's no guarantee that they're going to be here within five years. And so I don't understand why that is a policy that was put in place ... We're not part of the faculty Senate and I don't believe we vote on the faculty Senate. We don't vote on the Board of Trustees representative for the faculty rep nor can we run for the faculty rep. We can't be elected as a faculty rep or even vote on who is representing us, but they are

representing us so we have representation. So we have decision-making without representation without our vote. (Isabel)

We don't have power, lecturers don't have power. We don't have a vote for anything that means anything. Right? Now some departments do have votes and they let lecturers vote on certain things, but not on hires not on ...we can't vote in the... faculty senate or whatever. We can't vote for the president, you know we can't do anything and I think that really rubs lecturers the wrong way, especially since there's so many of us now. There's some programs ... where there are more lecturers than tenure-track, and that's pretty ridiculous. So there is not one tenure-track [disciplinary] professor in [this program], all lecturers. (Jeremiah)

Many participants equated the lack of representation at the university level as representative of the university's, not the department's, lack of valuing their formal role. However, support from an organizational representative, such as the chair of the department, seemed to offset some of this. Wayne, Shore, and Liden (1997) found that "when members [full-time non-tenure track faculty] have strong relationships with their leaders [department chairs], they are more likely to fulfill their role requirements and have high levels of performance" (p. 105). For professionals in higher education, supportive chairs may negate some of the institutional bias being felt from lessor pay and a lack of representation as well as the negative bias felt from departmental colleagues.

Sitting at the Head of the Faculty Table

Many participants in this study communicated feeling supported by their chairs. Even in departments in which the full-time non-tenure track faculty members perceived themselves as marginalized by some of their tenure-stream colleagues, participants

reported a positive and supportive relationship with their chairs. While marginalization by colleagues was distressing, many of the participants attributed this behavior to faculty members who were attached to a traditional separation between those who are on the tenure-track and those who are not:

I think there's a divide. I think there's a reasonable group that does believe that we do have value. But I think there's also a group of die-hard researchers who really look down on us. And they describe this position as sort of if, our job is really, really easy because well a professor has to teach and do research where we only teach. (Leon)

This divide is perceived as more apparent to Leon when he serves on a committee. He shared his analysis of departmental colleagues who serve on committees, when asked about his perceptions about being valued for his service on committees:

I think generally positive in terms of the committee work. And I think that's largely because I think the faculty that has the least respect for lecturers they're also people who have sort of checked out. And it's very unlikely that those people would be elected to those committees. So for the most part what I see is we have [a certain number of] tenurable faculty and another [number of] lecturers. So we have almost 40 people and I really believe that there are about ten people in the department that actually run the department and they're the ones that are constantly elected to these positions, and even when they're not elected for these positions whoever is the representative spends most of their time talking to this other person trying to figure out how to do things. And I think most people who are involved in running the department they're more friends to the lecturers. So I

think it's more of the people who are off in their own world, they're the one that, where there's more animosity. (Leon)

At another point in the interview Leon had described being appreciated and shared the value he feels his role brings to the department:

So I think that quite a few people acknowledge that we are, that lecturers do have a role that we do play, that we can add value to the department. It's not just a matter of having another body, but that's an important point when discussions come up about 'Well should this position be filled with a lecturer or can we just cover it with part-time instructors.' I think it's in terms of organizing courses, doing course development- you know that's how I think we should be using lecturers to add value to our department. (Leon)

When Ethan was asked whether he felt that his tenure-stream colleagues valued his role, he responded,

I think they really value us as lecturers. I've heard, everybody I've talked to has been very complementary about those of us who are in lecturer position ...so I think that the tenure-track faculty see me as an asset to the department.

That...they're glad that I'm here and that I'm doing what I'm doing. (Ethan)

To press this point further I suggested that the gratitude was due to the tenure-stream faculty being relieved of the burden of teaching these courses. He laughed and replied,

No, they still have teaching, teaching duties. They still have teaching responsibilities. I think they understand that their strengths are not always in teaching. And so providing students with really good teachers helps them because

they are teaching mostly more upper-level classes and so it helps them by making sure the students have a good foundation in [this discipline]. Unlike some of the other courses, [this discipline] is very sequential where if you don't get a good, the basics down, you're going to have a really hard time with [advanced topics], you're going to have a really hard time with [other advance topics]. So I think they appreciate that they don't have to go back and review stuff the students should already know. (Ethan)

Ethan, Brenna, and Isabel perceived their role as a full-time non-tenure track faculty member to be an important contribution to the success of the department. These non-tenure track faculty members perceive the organizational support they receive as part of their psychological contract with the department. Aselage and Eisenberger (2003) examined the integration of perceived organizational support and psychological contract.

PCT, psychological contract theory, "gives primary attention to the relationship between the favorableness of work experiences and the favorableness of the treatments the organization has obligated itself to provide" (Aselage & Eisenberger, 2003, p. 495). According to this theory a faculty member will perceive the psychological contract breached when a department or the university fails to fulfill its obligation to the employee. However, not all contract breaches negatively impact attitudes and behaviors. If the contract breach is perceived as being involuntary, or beyond the control of the department or institution, then outside circumstances have disrupted the contractual obligation the organization has. If the contract breach is perceived as voluntary or as a deliberate violation then the faculty member will tend to hold the department or university responsible for the unfavorable treatment depending upon how the breach was

attributed. Finally, when a faculty member perceives a department to be supportive then contractual breaches should be well tolerated. This was found to be the case when these participants described their perspective about teaching introductory level large-enrollment classes.

Professional Barriers: Not All Teachers are Created Equal

The participants who felt that course assignments were outside of the department's control still viewed their department favorably despite the difficulty it created,

Some of the difficulty though is that I have, being at a large institution, I have to teach really large classes and that's not very conducive to doing some of the teaching that I would like to do. A lot of times I'm the presenter of the material. I'm not really teaching. So there, there is some conflict between what I would like to do and what the size of the university allows me to do. (Ethan)

Even though teaching large classes created situations that conflicted with their professional values as lecturers, Ethan, Isabel and Brenna attributed their teaching assignments to the size of the university, rather than assignments that their college made:

I think the big thing is, is that, and this is going to be the logistics of any large University, is that we're teaching 265 students at a time. In the fall when we start classes every room is completely full and there's just no way that I can really truly interact with every single student. As much as I tell students to come to my office hours, if they all came it would be a nightmare because I have 700 students. And so, I think that's going to be true anywhere, but I think with a large classes even, that's probably the biggest thing, is that I would love to be able to interact

more closely with students. To be able to really have a conversation with more of them even if it's in little groups. (Isabel)

For Isabel and Ethan the large classes are an expected loss that comes with having a teaching-intensive appointment at a large university. Brenna, who perceives no differentiation in status between her non-tenure appointment and the tenure-stream appointments, has been encouraged to vote on all departmental and university matters. Brenna also teaches large classes,

The part [of my lecturer position] that's not ideal is the size of the classes. I would say it was a little more fulfilling at [a nearby four-year, private institution] to be dealing with fifteen students that I could get to know very well and really work intensively with them on the writing and that's harder to do with the 50 or 300! When people come up to me and say 'Oh, I'm in your 109 class' and I think "I've never seen you before in my life. Nice to meet you!" (Brenna)

However, Brenna also views her current teaching situation as a professional challenge to be solved:

And for me that is the challenge, and I like a challenge, is to figure out ways to do it better because you know I feel even in a class of 50 I can interact well with them and push them in certain ways. I have some methods that work well. With the 300-person class, it is more of a challenge and so I'm looking at some, using some new technologies. I don't look at as 'Oh dear I've got this burden.' It's 'Okay if this is what we have to deal with, what can we do to make this better?' And so it's my puzzle to figure out, what am I going to do to enliven this? (Brenna)

This perspective of seeing her teaching challenge as a puzzle to be solved, rather than as an assumed loss, allows Brenna to perceive the department as supporting the psychological contract despite the challenges. She also uses the pronoun “we” in reference to the teaching situation. Finally, she frames her teaching load as a way to support her side of the psychological contract:

So, these lecturer positions were a way to still emphasize teaching, and the teaching mission. And we do- we teach three as compared to my colleagues who teach two a semester, two classes and so we do have a little heavier teaching load. And I’m teaching a lot of the big classes, like the survey introductory [course], and so we’re carrying a lot of teaching load that then is freeing up some of the other people. But the way I see it is that’s what my position entails. (Brenna)

One way that departments may be managing the psychological contract breach is to offer opportunities to teach upper division courses to offset the intellectual and emotional drain of instructing large numbers of students in the department’s service courses. Brenna was also offered the option, and Isabel had taken the option, of teaching upper division courses which would contribute to their perception of an organizational support of the psychological contract. However, participants who were not allowed to teach upper division courses, viewed this contractual breach as renegeing by the department- indicating that they saw the department as voluntarily declining to fulfill a promise, as was the case with Leon and Kaleb:

In this department in particular, lecturers have been- for the most part- have been restricted to teaching freshman courses. And one of the arguments, you know faculty have argued that only research-active faculty should be allowed to teach majors. (Leon)

I will say there are some structural barriers we come up against. So for example, we lecturers are not allowed to teach 400-level classes, but grad students are.

Which to me is a joke, but it's also a pretty big slap in the face. Where it's like, 'We don't want you guys teaching these upper level classes, but the grad students- who don't have Ph.D.'s- can teach upper level classes'. And, apparently, that has nothing to do with perhaps expertise, or you know, it's all about how certain departments are afraid that their lecturers would request to teach those classes when they're really being specifically hired to teach lower-level classes. (Kaleb)

As mentioned previously, both Leon and Kaleb had formal roles that converged with their social identity; however, they also perceived that many colleagues did not have views congruent with this perspective. Faith also felt that her formal role converged with her social identity as an educator. Although she described feeling supported in many respects by her department, her view of her social identity conflicted with her departmental colleagues when she denied the opportunity to teach upper division courses. Faith viewed this departmental restriction as a contractual breach of the psychological contract and a breach of the legal contract she had signed with the university:

I know that I can teach upper level courses and there's some push back from other faculty members about me even teaching a 300-level course, which is in my contract that I can teach. But there's some faculty members who don't want it...I really don't understand it. But I, you know this person has been saying, 'They can't even teach 300-level classes' - which is not true so I found it in my contract. I wouldn't have signed the contract if it didn't say that I could teach 300-level classes because that's important to me to teach upper level courses. .. I got my

Ph.D. teaching [it]. I was hired at [another university] to teach [it]. I've taught it multiple times. I mean that's my specialty. And I've been getting some push back like, 'You can't teach that upper level course and no other lecturers do' and the chair seems okay with it [her teaching the course], so I don't know what's going to happen. I don't know. So that's where I'm kind of hitting the, I see now that some faculty members are not quite respecting what we can do....I understand why they want research faculty to teach upper level courses because they can really... focus what they know and they can integrate their research. And they can really add to the depth of the course by understanding the literature and things like that. But [this area] is not like that, [this area] is a very, it's a course that...the only way to do it well is to teach problem solving skills ...and research faculty, I don't think they could do it any better than I could. I mean they're not putting their own research into the teaching very much. It's very much a problem solving, critical thinking type course. (Faith)

Teaching assignments that were limited to lower-division large-enrollment courses became problematic especially when combined with the sense that colleagues in the department did not value the full-time non-tenure track faculty member's role:

[I] am free to pursue what I find interesting when I have time; whereas, I think the tenure-stream are more restricted. Everything they do they have to think about in terms of 'Is this going to lead to a publication?' But I also think that in terms of the way the academic community is used to thinking, there's a feeling from the tenure-stream that what they're doing is really worthwhile and what the non-

tenure stream are doing is not really, we're not really contributing in a meaningful way. (Leon)

If a participant expressed distress about a lack of support from the department, usually indicated by tenure-stream colleagues expressing a lack of appreciation for the high numbers of first year students being taught in large-enrollment service courses, then a perception that the psychological contract had been broken seemed likely. When a participant described teaching these challenging classes while perceiving appreciation from both the chair and tenure-stream colleagues, the psychological contract seemed supported.

My main goal as an academic, my main goal for me is as a teacher. But that's my mission is to teach students ... I think that's going to be very different for somebody who's in a tenure-track position, than in a lecturer position. Because I think they're going to see their emphasis on is on teaching, still on teaching but teaching graduate students with very specialized skills in developing, not necessarily teaching graduate students but helping graduate students develop their own skills. Whereas I'm very much focused on kind of building the base of knowledge so they can go on to other things. And, of course without us the whole thing collapses! (Isabel)

I'm on the undergraduate committee. I'm involved in undergraduate education. I'm kind of, I see it as part of my responsibility to be a little more up on the technology and then share that with others. That's my role here, is to really facilitate the undergraduate teaching and I think that's probably what they're intending with those positions is finding people who are really dedicated teachers

who then can carry some of that load in the department and lead the charge, rally the troops to make that more of a priority. (Brenna)

Both Isabel and Brenna described ways in which their departmental colleagues expressed value of their converged formal roles and social identity in a way that was congruent with how Isabel and Brenna perceived themselves. Allan expressed a conflict with his perception of organizational support. Initially, in the interview he described a collegial environment in which the psychological contract was supported and he was fully integrated into the department as a colleague:

So, once I was here they sort of embraced me that way. We, we've done a lot of social things together outside of campus. So I've always felt very comfortable being able to voice my concerns or just being around them- you know I don't have to run and hide when my boss comes around or something like that, you know what I mean? So I enjoy really working for, so it's not just that I like the people that I work with, I mean we actually socialize outside of... just the office I guess you could say. (Allan)

This integration and sense of collegiality was supported by his sense of why he was hired; however, he ran into a conflict when he felt the psychological contract was breached because he was not allowed to teach graduate courses:

In that sense and I think this sort of why I'm there, in that sense I can teach graduate courses in an undergraduate environment I guess. By the way that's another thing that I'm sort of, I wish I could do as well. Be able to teach graduate course is something that I think a lot of instructors, professors love to do. With

that said even if I was to go to a smaller school I mean it's not like I'd have that opportunity anyway, for the most part. (Allan)

While Allan stated earlier that "according to my contract I'm not allowed to teach graduate classes," he then admits his difficulty with the fairness of this restriction:

[Referring to the expectations provided during orientation for lecturers] 'You don't teach graduate courses', which I will say even if I never taught another graduate course, never taught a graduate course in my life just the fact that the they sort of put that barrier up is very disturbing to me. Especially seeing... so we hire two [tenure-stream faculty]...one was an established assistant professor so he's been, he was at [another university] and so he's been around for a while but the other is straight out of Ph.D. so I've actually had more experience than him. We have this same degree and yet because of the positions, it is sort of wide open for him and I'm sort of stuck behind these limiting factors because of the job description. Which that part is upsetting to me. I will admit. I'm not sure how to intellectually get through, and I should say intellectually I can get through it, but emotionally I think, "It's not fair!" ... as my kids would say. (Allan)

This sense of a lack of fairness could stem from his perception that the department has broken an unspoken assumption: 'You are one of us.' Although Allan is included in social events along with the tenure-stream faculty and the director of undergraduate studies for his department is a full-time non-tenure track lecturer, he is experiencing a restriction that indicates that his formal role is not afforded privileges equivalent to the formal role privileges his tenure-stream colleagues have. The stigma of not being permitted to teach graduate courses, whether he wants to teach them or not, may conflict

with his social identity as an integrated academic member of the faculty who teaches. While Allan is a member of an integrated department, there are still times when he is professionally differentiated from his colleagues. Faith perceives her department as having divisions of roles and having to argue for the right to teach an upper division course, that is part of her research and teaching experience, emphasizes that differentiation. Kaleb and Leon experience marginalization when their departmental colleagues' views about the formal role and social identity these participants hold are incongruent from the views held by the participants. These various experiences, whether the experience is a course restriction or a lack of representation, may break the psychological contract these non-tenure track faculty have with departmental colleagues. When colleagues break the psychological contract then perceptions about one's social identity and about the department's support of one's formal role may shift.

Chapter Seven

Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations Chapter

I conducted this qualitative study to learn about the experience of being a full-time non-tenure track faculty member in a research-intensive institution that offers tenure to those in the tenure-stream. Although I expected the interviews to focus on the participants' struggle with their academic/professional identity, only one of the participants appeared to have this identity struggle. Instead I learned how participants identified with their teaching-intensive role. These semi-structured interviews also revealed what these non-tenure track faculty members perceived about their departmental culture as well as their overall job satisfaction. Two major themes emerged from the data as contributors to job satisfaction for full-time non-tenure track faculty: professional identification with the teaching-intensive role and a sense of inclusion within the department. Identification with the teaching-intensive role is in line with social identity research (Ashforth & Mael, 1989), which indicates that role fit may also lead to role-enhancing behaviors. Having a sense of inclusion has been associated with impacting both teaching performance and job satisfaction in previous studies about non-tenure track faculty (Kezar, 2013; Waltman, Bergom Hollenshead, & Miller, 2012) and seems related to one's perspectives about the department. In this chapter I will describe a framework I created for categorizing identification with the teaching-intensive role based on data from this study. Data about the participant's sense of inclusion contributes to a second framework that I developed to capture participants' departmental perspectives. Also, within this chapter, I will contextualize my findings within the existing literature as well as explain how development of departmental policies and practices might benefit from a

combined focus on both internal and departmental perspectives of full-time non-tenure track faculty.

Examining, Supporting, and Professionalizing Non-tenure Track Faculty

In the past, researchers (Chait & Trower, 1997; Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007) have categorized full-time non-tenure track faculty according to such aspects as the faculty member's professional background (specialist) or intended career goal (aspiring academics). Chait and Trower (1997) found that some faculty intentionally sought out non-tenured appointments in order to have a position that focused primarily on teaching. Gappa, Austin, and Trice (2007) also found that some faculty voluntarily sought a full-time non-tenure track position because it had advantages over part-time positions while avoiding the challenges of tenure-track positions. While these perspectives were also shared by many of the participants in this study, these broader categories did not address the complexity of identity perspectives shared or the influence of the departmental culture on the non-tenure track experience. Conversely, Kezar (2013) and Waltman et al. (2012) examined the impact of departmental culture on the professional experience of non-tenure track faculty. Although Kezar (2013) and Waltman et al. (2012) considered departmental culture, they did not include identity perspectives in their investigations. In this study I include both perspectives about identification with the teaching-intensive role and perspectives about a departmental culture to be able to generate descriptions of the multiplicity of full-time non-tenure track faculty experiences.

During my study, I interviewed 12 full-time non-tenure track faculty members, all holding Ph.D.'s, whose primary task is teaching undergraduate courses. In these interviews we talked about how they came to hold their teaching positions, whether they

saw themselves as teachers, and what they did and did not like about their position within their department. After transcribing the interviews I looked for patterns of meaning within each interview and across interviews. I also used research literature to gain a better understanding of the themes suggested by the participants' data, such as: occupational identity, organizational culture, perceived support, and job satisfaction.

By using these phenomenological methods, I sought to describe the experience of being a full-time teaching-intensive faculty member off the tenure-track in the context of a research-intensive tenure-granting institution. The following is a synthesis of common meanings across individual reports of these experiences and provides perspectives about social identity, formal roles, and organizational culture in this context. I examine whether the social identity expressed by these lecturers appears to be reflected in the formal roles they had accepted. I also consider the influence of organizational culture when I examine how these lecturers perceived these formal roles as being supported by departmental policies and practices.

The data collected for this study focus on the experience of being a full-time non-tenure track faculty member. For lecturers in this study satisfaction with their professional experience was not about whether their position was tenure-stream or non-tenure stream (except when tenure was noted as an avenue to acquire job security or prestige). Instead satisfaction seemed to be about role expectations, i.e., having a teaching-intensive or research-intensive position, and being in a supportive department. However, discussions about non-tenure track faculty members' experiences within a culture of tenure-stream faculty can bring up questions about the legitimacy of supporting and professionalizing non-tenure positions.

Hiring non-tenure-track faculty members into tenure-granting departments creates a complex dynamic. For example, the participants in this study are in teaching-intensive positions created by the department to reduce the teaching load of tenure-stream faculty members without increasing the department's long-term commitment to more faculty members. Since departments are hiring many non-tenure track faculty members with the intention of receiving strong teaching performances, policies and practices that enhance performance and increase student learning would seem important to implement (Kezar, 2013); however, debate is ongoing about whether non-tenure track positions should be considered members of the faculty. Whether non-tenure track appointments should exist at all, whether they should remain permanently excluded from the tenure-stream, or whether they should have access to current support structures is a necessary debate that is beyond the scope of this study. Until these debates are resolved then efforts toward "creating a culture to support and professionalize non-tenure track faculty" (Kezar, 2013, p. 2) are important to diminish exploitive policies and practices that may deter performance. As described in this chapter, I have turned back to the literature to determine how my findings might contribute to understanding how these non-tenure track faculty members view these policies and practices.

Contributing a Perspective to the Research Conversation

While both Kezar (2013) and Waltman et al. (2012) examined the impact of departmental culture, Kezar (2013) focused on job performance and Waltman et al. (2012) focused on job satisfaction. Both studies also included part-time non-tenure track faculty in their studies. Limiting my pool of participants to full-time non-tenure track faculty created both limitations and benefits. A limitation is that the perspectives in this

study are unique to full-time non-tenure track faculty who are members of departments that have implemented many of the policies that Kezar (2013) suggests would support teaching performance. These supportive policies include transparent hiring practices, professional development support, and access to teaching resources, supportive chairs, academic freedom and professional autonomy. A benefit is that the perspective of this study's population can provide unique insights about the non-tenure track experience as well as evidence for policies and practices beyond those that have already been suggested.

In addition to examining the influence of perspectives about departmental culture on these participants' professional experience, I also consider the influence of their internal perspective about being a teaching-intensive lecturer. I gathered evidence about internal perspectives from three areas in the interview narratives: professional growth activities, self-identifying statements, and ambiguity about career goals. Kezar (2013) defines capacity in her study as relating to "the issue of professional growth" (p. 157). I utilized participants' descriptions of professional growth activities to gain insight about their intent in engaging in these capacity-building efforts. I also examined expressions of satisfaction with one's formal role as a teaching-intensive faculty member to provide more evidence about self-identification with the lecture role. Additionally, I examined statements regarding initial and current career goals. In order to categorize these three types of subjective data, I utilized an organizational culture framework which will be described later in the chapter. First, I will explain the use of a participant's professional growth descriptions to provide evidences about his or her social identity.

Exploring Identification with the Lecturer Role

All of the participants shared examples of being supported in professional growth opportunities, to include having funds available for off campus opportunities. I examined how participants intended to increase their professional capacity through these development opportunities. This examination identified a potential link between how participants socially identified with their teaching-intensive role. I uncovered this link by listening to how participants interpreted their professional development, which is part of their distribution of effort (DOE). Participants appeared to interpret their DOE and role in the department in ways that reflected their espoused social identity.

For instance, participants in this study are all required to spend 75% of their time teaching, which is typically equivalent to a 3/2 load, and 25% is supposed to go toward professional development. Throughout the interviews, when asked about professional development expectations in the DOE, participants responded that their department's expectations were vague. Lacking specifics about professional development expectations allowed participants to generate individualized expectations. These self-generated expectations seem to reflect each participant's social identity and, occasionally, the department's perception of the lecturer role. Therefore, the meaning assigned to "professional development" generated different behaviors and appeared to be based on how the lecturer self-identified within the department.

For example, participants who viewed their lecturer role as reflective of their social identity interpreted their professional development expectation as time spent to build their teaching capacity, or to support the teaching capacity of colleagues. These efforts include attending seminars and workshops, engaging in scholarly research about

teaching in the discipline, and following pedagogical tracks at disciplinary conferences. Participants who viewed their lecturer role as not reflective of their social identity tended to interpret the professional development percentage expectation to build their research capacity. These efforts resembled research efforts typical of tenure-stream faculty, such as presenting research findings in a peer-reviewed journal and at a disciplinary conference. In this study, lecturers were encouraged to focus professional development time on disciplinary research only in departments in which the lecturer role was perceived to be temporary (i.e., until the lecturer accepted a research-intensive, tenure-stream position). Because two participants focused these efforts on research activities, they were eventually offered the research positions they desired. Since I did not collect data about teaching performance I lack evidence regarding the impact this focus on building research capacity may have had on teaching performance. However, an individual's capacity building aims and professional development activity could be useful in examining role commitment and performance in future studies.

Exploring Identification and Job Satisfaction

Data from this study also indicate that perceiving one's formal role as reflecting one's social identity may be as important to job satisfaction as departmental culture. In the study by Waltman et al. (2012), about job satisfaction among non-tenure track faculty, most participants reported being committed to their positions because of the satisfaction they derived from teaching. Many participants in my study also expressed a strong commitment to being a lecturer, but there were some exceptions. Lecturers, who did not prefer a teaching-intensive appointment, indicated less job satisfaction regardless of department policies or culture. These exceptions were participants who envisioned

their career as one based on research-intensive activity. Conversely, other participants in this study intentionally selected their positions as a career decision. These lecturers chose to stay off the tenure-track because their non-tenure position permits professional flexibility and emphasizes teaching over research. Since job satisfaction may influence role performance then the integration of a formal role with one's social identity may influence performance as much as Kezar (2013) suggested departmental culture does. I also examined the interview data for cues about how this integration of formal role and social identity might be expressed in order to construct broad categories. I used an organizational culture framework as a basis for structuring my findings.

Without the benefit of longitudinal data that would include multiple interviews, I have only a snapshot view of these lecturers' internal and departmental perspectives. In a search for consistency across responses I asked the same question in different ways throughout an interview which seemed to generate consistent responses within each interview. However, without the benefit of an in-depth immersion in each lecturer's professional life I cannot determine which participants, if any, engaged in impression management strategies when responding to my questions. Despite the possibility of error in some aspects of this study, interesting patterns between internal and departmental perspectives were noted and may be worth further investigation.

Utilization of Organizational Culture Research Perspectives

Martin (2002), an organizational culture theorist, suggests that cultural research studies "give voice to the perceptions and opinions of those who are less powerful or marginalized" (p. 11) by describing their subjective experiences in ways that "shakes loose our preconceptions, expands the categories we use to think about organizations, and

offers new alternatives for action” (p. 11). Organizational culture perspectives focus on “three dimensions of comparison: the relationship among cultural manifestations, the orientation to consensus in a culture, and treatment of ambiguity” (p. 120).

Kezar (2013) refers to Martin’s framework in her study describing departmental policies and practices that may impact the teaching performance of non-tenure track faculty. However, Kezar’s use of Martin’s framework is limited to her suggestion that non-tenure-track faculty may have a sense of the organizational culture of higher education that differs from tenure-stream faculty members’ sense of culture. I found Martin’s (1992, 2002) dimensions to also be useful in this current study. However, I utilized these dimensions to categorize a lecturer’s description of his or her social identity and to provide a framework for capturing the lecturer’s perspective about his or her departmental culture.

According to Martin (1992, 2002) an organizational culture can be viewed simultaneously from three different perspectives- integration, differentiation, and fragmentation.

“At any point in time, a few fundamental aspects of an organization’s culture will be congruent with an Integration perspective- that is, some cultural manifestations will be interpreted in similar ways throughout the organization, so they appear clear and mutually consistent. At the same time, in accord with the Differentiation perspective, other issues will surface as inconsistencies and will generate clear sub-cultural differences. Simultaneously, in congruence with the Fragmentation viewpoint, still other issues will be seen as ambiguous, generating unclear relationships among manifestations and only ephemeral issue-specific coalitions

that fail to coalesce in either organization-wide or subcultural consensus. Furthermore, individuals viewing the same cultural context will perceive, remember, and interpret things in different ways” (Martin, 1992, p. 168-169).

The three perspectives and their supporting dimensions, utilized to describe organizational culture, provide a useful framework in this study for participants’ reported perceptions about their departmental culture, which will be described later. However, Martin’s framework also offers potential categories for the ways participants described how their lecturer role integrated with their social identity. I will focus first on categories that describe internal perspectives about being a lecturer. Then I will focus on categories that describe the lecturers’ perspectives about departmental cultures.

Understanding Internal Perspectives

I utilized Martin’s (2002) labels of the three organizational culture research perspectives (integration, differentiation, and fragmentation), but reframed the supporting dimensions to reflect a micro-level, internal culture. The “relationship among cultural manifestations” was defined according to how professional development time was applied and described the relationship between a lecturer’s social identity and his or her formal role as a lecturer. This dimension reflected relationships among professional manifestations. The “orientation to consensus in a culture” was defined as consensus between one’s formal role and self-identification statements. This dimension focused on whether a participant identified as an educator or a disciplinary researcher. And “treatment of ambiguity” was defined as how the lecturer described conflicting perspectives about career opportunities, if those arose. Applying these definitions to the perspectives that lecturers shared, three types of lecturers appeared to emerge from the

data: lecturers with an integration perspective, lecturers with a differentiation perspective, and lecturers with a fragmentation perspective.

Internal integration perspective. A lecturer with an internal integration perspective might express homogeneity between professional manifestations of his or her formal role and social identity by engaging in research about teaching or other pedagogically-oriented activities for fulfillment of professional development expectations. When presenting at conferences or attending sessions, teaching in the discipline tends to be a focus. He or she also tends to make statements such as, “I am a teacher” or “I’m a microbiology educator” when asked about self-perceptions. Lecturers with this perspective also express no ambiguity about holding a lecturer appointment for the rest of their career, and express a desire for promotion opportunities within their teaching-intensive position.

Internal differentiation perspective. A lecturer who expresses a differentiation perspective will express an inconsistency across professional manifestations. For these lecturers, one’s formal role as a lecturer is inconsistent with his or her social identity resulting in a professional identity that is conflicted by simultaneously belonging to two distinct subcultures, such as lecturers and aspiring tenure-stream faculty members. A lecturer with this perspective will also choose to engage in disciplinary research to fulfill professional development expectations, if given the option. Conference presentations, whether attending or presenting, are focused on disciplinary research. When self-identifying as a professional, these lecturers will refer to their discipline or disciplinary specialization, as in “I’m a historian.” Finally, in this study, lecturers with a differentiation perspective viewed their lecturer position as a temporary one not as a final

career option, similar to Chait and Trower's (1997) aspiring academics. While there is some ambiguity in this perspective, the ambiguity seems to focus on whether a professional association with the label of lecturer will limit current or future academic career opportunities. Lecturers who primarily have a differentiation perspective express clarity, rather than conflict, about professional development aims and future career goals. However, those aims and goals are focused on acquiring a tenure-track research-intensive appointment.

Internal fragmentation perspective. When a lecturer holding an internal fragmentation perspective makes self-identifying statements about his or her professional affiliation, there may be a reluctance to identify as a teacher or disciplinary educator. An example of this was when Helen reluctantly identified herself as a teacher and then commented that she felt sad that teaching was her role. Conferences may also create internal conflict since choices need to be made between attending research-orientated presentations or those that are pedagogical in focus. A lecturer with an internal fragmentation perspective may also describe professional development efforts that focus on teaching, but express a preference for research activities. Finally, when considering one's future as a lecturer, irreconcilable tensions between one's current position and one's desired position are described.

Both Gwen and Allan expressed some internal ambiguity when they shared how professional colleagues and graduate school mentors expressed disappointment in their acceptance of these lecturer appointments. However this ambiguity originated from external, rather than internal, perspectives. Overall, these lecturers described feeling satisfied with being a lecturer and being a lecturer seemed to mirror their social identity

indicating an integration perspective; however, mentors suggested feeling disappointment with this career choice. Based on the findings of this study, responses by colleagues and mentors to one's formal role may impact the way a lecturer perceives his or her professional value and may also influence the direction of his or her professional efforts. Other lecturers expressed no ambiguity about their futures, but did differentiate their current formal role from their preferred one and these participants appeared to hold a differentiation perspective. The table below provides an overview of these three internal perspectives.

Table 2 Internal Perspectives

Summary Table of Internal Perspectives	Relationship between formal role and desired professional activities	Consensus between formal role and social identity	Degree of conflicting perspectives about formal role and future career goals
Integration	Lecturer selects p.d. activities that enhance role performance	Lecturer makes self-identifying statements, such as, "I'm a business educator."	No ambiguity is expressed about retaining current teaching-intensive role as a future career goal
Differentiation	Lecturer engages in p.d. activities that enhance other role performances, such as research activities	Lecturer makes self-identifying statements, such as, "I'm a marketing researcher."	No ambiguity is expressed about leaving current role to attain a future career goal in a research-intensive role
Fragmentation	Lecturer engages in p.d. activities designed to enhance current role performance, but expresses preference for p.d. unrelated to role.	Lecturer makes conflicting statements, such as, "I'm a science educator, how sad" or "This is not the role I envisioned for myself."	Lots of ambiguity is expressed about whether to remain in current position or that one feels trapped in current role.

*p.d. – professional development

Perspectives about Departmental Culture: Sometimes a Mix, Sometimes a Match

I again utilized Martin's dimensions to categorize perceptions about how lecturers in this study described their departmental cultures, which is a more traditional use of these dimensions. The "relationship among cultural manifestations" was defined according to a perceived consistency between college-wide policies and departmental practices. This dimension also reflected perceptions about the perceived departmental value of teaching and research activities. The "orientation to consensus in a culture" was defined as collectivity-wide consensus about the role of lecturers in the department. This dimension focused on whether a participant perceived departmental clarity about his or her role. And "treatment of ambiguity" was defined as how the lecturer described conflicts within the department, including whether conflicts arose. Applying these definitions to perspectives lecturers shared about their departments, three categories of perspectives about departments emerged from the data: departmental integration perspective, departmental differentiation perspective, and departmental fragmentation perspective.

Departmental integration perspective. Lecturers who viewed their department with an integration perspective expressed clarity about their role in the department and perceived that there was consensus among departmental colleagues about the role of lecturers in the department. The task of teaching was perceived as important within the department and that importance was perceived as consistent among both teaching-intensive and research-intensive faculty members. Finally, ambiguities about the value of lecturers in the department were avoided. A lecturer could express an internal integration perspective about being a lecturer, but not hold integration perspective about his or her

department. In fact, only three participants in this study shared both an internal integration perspective and a departmental integration perspective; however, these participants also expressed a lot of job satisfaction. Participants with a departmental integration perspective typically dismissed ambiguities in their narratives. For example, when Isabelle shared perspectives about her department she communicated “the ideal of consistency, consensus, and clarity” (Martin, 2002, p. 98), which is the hallmark of an integration perspective. However, she also expressed a lot of frustration about not having representation on the faculty senate but attributed this issue to a university, rather than departmental, policy. Brenna shared an office with another lecturer, but attributed this sharing as a result of space issues rather than ambiguity about distinctions between tenure-stream and non-tenure resources. Lecturers described the policies and practices of these integrated cultures, in ways that Kezar (2013) would categorize as a learning culture.

Departmental differentiation perspective. Almost half of the participants described their department with a departmental differentiation perspective. A departmental differentiation perspective was suggested when participants described lecturers and research-intensive faculty as members of subcultures, subcultures having different levels of prestige according to occupational obligations. In these departments the benefits for lecturers and tenure-stream faculty were perceived as being inconsistent. Teaching-intensive lecturers were perceived as valued members of the department, but may receive less support or be viewed as less prestigious than research-intensive faculty. Although participants in this study perceived that their departments valued the teaching-intensive role that lecturers had in the department, some participants also perceived that

research-intensive appointments were held in higher esteem. This disparity generated some clashes between subcultures creating ambiguities about departmental policies. These ambiguities occurred only at the “interstices between subcultures” (Martin, 2002, p. 94), rather than within the lecturer subcultures.

According to Martin (2002) researchers who take a differentiation perspective when studying culture either “emphasize the relatively harmonious relationship among subcultures” (p. 103) or “stress inconsistencies and conflicts between subcultures as different levels of an organizational hierarchy” (p. 103). I found that participants also tended to either emphasize harmony or stress inconsistencies. For example, Carol and Jeremiah emphasized the harmonious relationship between the distinct subcultures of lecturers and tenure-stream, while Gwen, Ethan, and Faith expressed frustration about some of the inconsistencies found at different levels of the department’s hierarchy. The tendency to emphasize harmony or inconsistency may be influenced by one’s internal perspective. For example, an internal differentiation perspective may be beneficial in a department perceived as also having a differentiation culture. Carol and Jeremiah did not express frustration about distinctions between subcultures, perhaps because they did not professionally identify as a lecturer. Lecturers, who hold an internal integration perspective in a department with a differentiation culture, may experience more frustration about conflicts between subcultures. Since the college-wide policies and practices are similar to those found in an integrated department, a differentiation culture would also be categorized as a learning culture according to Kezar (2013). Yet both departmental expectations, and these lecturers’ professional experiences, appear to be quite different from the expectations and experiences of lecturers with a departmental

integration perspective, as appear to also be true for lecturers with a departmental fragmentation perspective.

Departmental fragmentation perspective. Some participants expressed frustration and confusion about the role lecturers were intended to have in the department. Two participants described the role of lecturers in their departments in a way that fits primarily with a fragmentation perspective. Although both Kaleb and Leon expressed an internal integration perspective, they also described being in departments where the role of the lecturer was in flux so that ambiguities in relationships between colleagues and in the acquisition of resources were being constantly reassessed. “Fragmentation focuses on multiplicities of interpretation that do not coalesce into the collectivity-wide consensus characteristic of an integration view and that do not create the subcultural consensus that is the focus of the differentiation perspective” (Martin, 2002, p. 107). In these departments, tenure-stream faculty members were perceived to be divided about expressing respect for lecturers, in that some did and some did not. Yet because policies were similar regarding support provided to lecturers (i.e., hiring practices, professional development support, materials, leader behavior, and academic freedom and autonomy), Kezar (2013) could categorize these lecturers as having a department with a learning culture. Although the policies may have been similar for all the departments, the different perspectives about departmental cultures appeared related to different levels of job satisfaction. The table below provides an overview of the three departmental perspectives and their associated dimensions. Although my descriptions and the table below indicate that a department would only fit within one category, the reality is much more of a spectrum. Furthermore, as Martin (2002) suggests, perspectives about

an organizational culture could vary considerably depending on the interviewee's position within the organization. The categories are therefore social constructions of reality as it is perceived by the full-time non-tenure track faculty interviewed, rather than a picture of reality as viewed by all faculty members in the department.

Table 3 Departmental Perspectives

Summary Table of Departmental Perspectives	Relationship among manifestations	Orientation to consensus	Orientation to ambiguity
Integration Department	teaching and research activities are consistently valued	clarity throughout department about lecturer's role as integral to department	conflicts and ambiguity are not acknowledged as part of department culture
Differentiation Department	teaching and research activities are valued differently	clarity throughout department about lecturer's role as necessary, but not essential to department	conflicts may be part of department culture, particularly between subcultures
Fragmentation Department	teaching may not be valued or research activities are valued differently	practices regarding lecturer's role in the department are inconsistent	conflicts and ambiguity are part of the department culture

*based on Table 4.1 Complementarity of three theoretical perspectives (Martin, 2002, p. 95)

Job Satisfaction within Types of Departmental Cultures

Waltman et al. (2012) based their study of job satisfaction among non-tenure track faculty on Fredrick Herzberg's (1959) two-factor theory. Herzberg theorized that certain factors contributed to job satisfaction (motivators) while other factors contributed to job dissatisfaction (hygiene factors). Waltman et al. (2012) identified four factors of job satisfaction for non-tenure track faculty: employment terms (hygiene factor), respect and inclusion (hygiene factor), teaching and working with students (motivator), and flexibility and personal life (motivator). Basically, being able to teach and work with students, as well as having professional flexibility that supported having a personal life, contributed to job satisfaction and were motivating performance. The absence of secure employment terms, and not feeling respected or included in the departmental culture, contribute to job dissatisfaction and was not motivating.

Both Kaleb and Leon expressed job satisfaction with regard to three of the four factors described in the Waltman et al. (2012) study: teaching and working with students, flexibility and personal life, and employment terms. While departmental policies gave these lecturers opportunities to be included in committee work, confusion about the lecturer's role in the department contributed to their not feeling respected by departmental colleagues. Although satisfied with their positions as lecturers, they were also frustrated by their department's fragmented perspective about the role of lecturers in the department and the lack of respect that the confusion seemed to allow.

Respect and inclusion have been reported as factors that contribute to both job performance (Kezar, 2013) and job satisfaction (Waltman et al., 2012) of non-tenure

track faculty. Apparently, the chair's attitude toward non-tenure track faculty strongly influences collegial respect and inclusion of these faculty within departmental cultures. Kezar (2013) found that "differences in departmental culture seemed related to leadership by the chair- that is, whether they were supportive or not" p. 163). And in Waltman et al. (2012) they reported that, "across all institutions, department chairs appeared to have a central role in influencing the implementation and enforcement of employment policies regarding NTTF" (p. 425). However, findings from the current study indicate that the chair's influence appears limited to the enforcement suggested by Waltman et al., rather than influencing the culture as suggested by Kezar (2013). All of the participants in this current study reported the chair of their department as being respectful of non-tenure track faculty and inclusive when implementing departmental policies. Regardless, the two participants with a departmental fragmentation perspective did not perceive their departmental culture as a supportive environment. Findings from my study indicate that collegial respect could still be absent from the non-tenure experience, despite departmental policies and practices that support non-tenure track faculty. In this study the absence of collegial respect and inclusion appeared to reduce a lecturer's commitment to the department.

Of the 12 lecturers interviewed, three (Isabelle, Brenna, and Denis) shared both an internal integration perspective and a departmental perspective of integration. These three also appeared to be the most satisfied with their position. Yet Martin (2002) would argue that in cultural studies researchers with an integration perspective may be limited because with this perspective the researcher views "deviations from consistency, organization-wide consensus, and clarity ...as a problem" (p. 99). Ironically similar problems may

arise when lecturers, who perceive being part of an integration culture, are subject to policies or practices that causes the department to deviate from that supportive role.

According to Aselage and Eisenberger (2003) and Eisenberger et al. (2004) individuals who have perceptions of being supported should be positively biased about breaches to the psychological contract, defined as “perceived mutual obligations between themselves and their work organizations” (Eisenberger et al., 2004, p. 215). Positive bias was expressed by participants when discussing office sharing or lower salaries. Other events, such as not having representation on the faculty senate, were perceived as a breach of the psychological contract. It appears that lecturers, who feel a strong sense of organizational support, may also perceive that the psychological contract is being broken when denied representation on the faculty senate than lecturers who perceive a limited amount of organizational support. It may be that these breaches are particularly salient for faculty who hold an integration perspective for both their internal and departmental views. Martin (2002) extols the benefits of a fragmentation perspective because conflicts about policy and practices for various subcultures are made public. These ambiguities may be ignored or dismissed within the other two perspectives. A departmental fragmentation perspective may also provide protection against breaches in the psychological contract. Participants with a departmental integration perspective expressed assumptions about their status in the department, assumptions that those within a departmental fragmentation perspective were less likely to have.

Leon, who expressed primarily an internal integration perspective, but perceived his department as having a fragmentation perspective, described no expectation that he should be allowed to teach upper division courses; nor did he express frustration about

this limitation. However, lecturers who expected to be treated as a regular faculty member perceived voting and teaching limitations as problematic. Future research is needed to determine when perceptions of organizational support create a positive bias toward the psychological contract and when it may instead create a higher expectation of the departmental culture. However, of all the participants interviewed, Kaleb and Leon expressed the most frustration with their positions in these departments. While they both enjoyed their teaching-intensive position the lack of consistent practices and respectful colleagues in their departments seemed to diminish their job satisfaction.

Limitations

Before suggesting implications that could be drawn from this study, some limitations in this study should be noted. First, as has been pointed out previously, this study focused specifically on experiences of full-time non-tenure track faculty in a research-intensive institution. Full-time non-tenure track faculty make up a small percentage of the total non-tenure track population. Other researchers (Kezar, 2013; Waltman et al., 2012) have reported that full-time non-tenure track faculty tend to report departmental climates as being more supportive and inclusive than part-time, non-tenure track faculty report. Interviewing tenure-stream, full-time non-tenure track, and part-time non-tenure track faculty from the same department might provide data about possible correlations between faculty position and departmental perspectives and would help address this limitation. Also while participants, who were from the same department, reported similar perspectives about that department this study is not intended to offer a cultural analysis of any department despite borrowing from Martin's (1992, 2002) cultural analysis framework.

A second limitation is that both the data collection and the analysis were conducted by only one researcher, as is typical of a dissertation study. I applied some safeguards to address this limitation. As described previously in this chapter, when interviewing I asked for the same information in different ways. As described in the methods chapter, when analyzing the data from the interviews I coded the first four interviews twice, after allowing for a two week break after the initial coding effort. Finally, when synthesizing the created categories I relied on multiple sources in the extant literature to assist me in interpreting my findings. Although these preventative measures were taken, another limitation of this study is that intra-rater reliability was utilized over inter-rater reliability.

A third limitation to this particular study is that the internal perspective framework is specific to non-tenure track faculty with a teaching-intensive assignment in a research-intensive institution. The participants reported their perspectives within one particular situation. Two of the participants have moved over to the tenure-stream since this study was conducted and this move may have shifted their internal perspective as well. A longitudinal study focused on full-time non-tenure track faculty who expressed an internal differentiation perspective early in their career but did not attain a research-intensive position may also contribute to understanding ways that internal perspectives may shift.

Implications

Based on Martin's (1992, 2002) cultural studies framework, Kezar's (2013) learning cultures study, Waltman's et al. (2012) job satisfaction factors, and perspectives

offered by the participants in this study, I suggest that both internal and departmental perspectives are important when examining job satisfaction and willingness to perform. Moreover, some of the willingness to perform extra teaching efforts may depend on the social identity of the individuals holding these positions as much as Kezar (2013) suggests that a learning culture does. In this study social identity was found to influence role-enhancing behaviors such as professional development activities. Furthermore, satisfaction with being a lecturer also appears to depend on one's internal perspective with a preference for teaching over research even when the policies and practices of a department are supportive. Therefore, a lecturer's focus on increasing teaching capacity, rather than research, may depend on role satisfaction within any departmental culture. The influence of internal perspectives about being a lecturer deserves more investigation. The preliminary findings noted in this study could provide a baseline for that research.

Participants who expressed the greatest satisfaction in their role were those who felt fully integrated into their department and expressed a sense of integration between their formal role and their social identity, categorized as departmental and internal integration perspectives. In this study only a few of the participants expressed an integration perspective at both the internal and departmental level. Lecturers who expressed an internal integration perspective about their role and the department had a tendency to view departmental colleagues and professional mentors as sharing their perspectives. These lecturers considered teaching-intensive faculty, both tenure-stream and non-tenure stream, as their reference group and expressed a professional commitment to demonstrating their capacity to teach. Although further research is needed to examine relationships between perspectives and performance, I suggest that these lecturers are

most likely to engage in both extra-role efforts (Kezar, 2013) and role-enhancing efforts (Waltman et al., 2012).

Participants in this current study, who perceived a departmental fragmentation culture, felt unsure of their inclusion in the department despite departmental policies that supported the capacity and opportunity to perform. These participants reported less job satisfaction than most of the other participants reported. Therefore, an important job performance motivator for these full-time non-tenure track faculty members may be a sense of respect and inclusion by departmental colleagues. Using the cultural category dimensions of respect and inclusion found in this study can assist faculty members, department chairs and other administrators, in addressing factors within the department that may be limiting the full performance capacity of all faculty members. Unexpectedly, participants who differentiated between their formal role and their social identity, yet had professional colleagues who reflected this perspective, expressed only slight dissatisfaction for their formal role. This lack of dissatisfaction may have been due to these participants experiencing social approval from their colleagues about not identifying with their formal role and, in this study, viewing this role as temporary.

The lecturers who expressed a differentiation perspective about their role and the department perceived that departmental colleagues and professional mentors also shared that perspective. This perspective supported their belief that they should be engaging in research-intensive activities as a major component of their professional development. Therefore, these participants tended to engage in extra-role efforts and role-enhancing performances that focused on research activities, not teaching. Since the extra-role efforts for these lecturers focused on disciplinary research, which has also been suggested

(Kezar, 2013) to be beneficial to one's teaching performance, further research is needed to determine the relationship between perspective and performance. This relationship may be particularly important since these participants viewed the role of lecturer as supported by the department, but also perceived it to be a temporary situation.

Participants who expressed the least satisfaction in their role were those who were confused about their role in the department leading to a departmental fragmentation perspective. In this study none of the participants appeared to express both an internal fragmentation perspective and a departmental fragmentation perspective. I propose that lecturers with both an internal and departmental fragmentation perspective would view their role as unsatisfying and would also perceive that their department lacked support for the role. Without job satisfaction factors or departmental culture support factors in place, these non-tenure track faculty may be the most likely to limit their extra-role efforts and find a position in another department or in another role when that option becomes available.

Conclusion

If the hiring of a lecturer is meant to increase the department's teaching performance, then examining how behaviors are influenced by departmental cultures is useful; however, consideration of internal perspectives may be equally important. The congruence of a lecturer's internal perspective, that is the relationship between social identity and a formal role, needs to be considered. Although examining this congruence is challenging, in this study I have suggested dimensions that could be useful to future

research in this area and suggested using Martin's (2002) framework for categorizing this internal perspective.

Utilizing Martin's organizational culture perspectives is also a useful framework for examining non-tenure track faculty member's perspectives about their department's culture. Using this framework has revealed the importance of inclusion and respect for this population. This organizational culture framework may be useful in considering the perspectives of tenure-stream faculty members about the departmental culture as well. Although this study suggests a possible relationship, more research is needed to determine if a relationship exists between a sense of respect and inclusion and one's willingness to perform extra-role efforts and engage in role-enhancing behaviors.

This study has contributed to the ongoing conversation about departmental support of non-tenure track faculty to generate desired performances; however, many unanswered questions and concerns remain. While Kezar (2013) identified policies and practices that support teaching performance, the findings of this study suggest that the policies and practices may not be enough to create the perspective of an integrated departmental culture. A concern is the ethical dilemma of creating perspectives of an integrated departmental culture in order to increase the desire of faculty to engage in extra-role behaviors, a cultural model that is already common to tenure-stream faculty experiences. Instead of focusing on generating extra-role performances, an examination of the departmental policies and practices that are supportive of all faculty members in the department could be a useful and ethical next step.

Appendix A

Interview Protocol

*****Could you tell me a little about how you came to hold your current position at the [university]?

Graduate school? (Where, when finished, what areas?)

Previous faculty positions at other institutions? If so, why left previous institution?

How many years have you been at the [university]?

How many years have you been in your current position?

How were you recruited?

**** Describe your definition of career success, that is seven years from now how could you know that you are professionally successful?

**** How would you describe your role at this university?

**** What factors were involved in your decision to accept your current position at the [university]?

**** How would you complete this sentence: My name is (filling in with participant's name) and I am a _____. (if not clear) To what profession would you say you belong?

**** What experiences, if any, were you asked to participate in as part of orienting you to the institution and your department?

**** How would you describe the relationship, if any, between Academic Identity and Professional Identity?

**** What are the terms of your current contract with regard to evaluation and termination?

**** How might your tenured/tenure-track colleagues describe your role at this university?

**** How satisfied are you with your current role? Why is that?

**** What aspects of teaching at this institution align with your professional values?

What aspects contradict those same values?

**** What do you think the university expects from you in terms of effort?

Is this something you consider yourself skilled at doing?

****In what ways and how frequently are you evaluated?

****In what ways might your professional voice seem heard or is dismissed within your department?

**** How do express your professional voice within your discipline?

**** In what ways do you feel your experiences in graduate student, or other experiences, contributed to your identity as an academic?

****What does academic identity mean to you?

Thank you so much for taking the time to meet with me. Are there some things you'd like to talk about that we didn't? Anything you'd like to add to our conversation?

Appendix B

Invitation to Participate

Greetings,

My name is Kathryn Cunningham and I'm a doctoral candidate in the Department of Educational, School, and Counseling Psychology (EDP) in the College of Education at the XXXXXX.

I'm contacting you to invite you to participate in a study I am conducting regarding faculty members' perceptions of academic identity in their professional lives. My hope is that you'll agree to be interviewed as part of the study. Specifically, I'm seeking individuals who are full-time non-tenure track faculty members at the [university]. The research is meant to learn about the perceptions and experiences of this very important part of academe's workforce. Thus, participants will be asked questions related to how they came to their current positions, their perceptions of their department's climate with regard to non-tenure track faculty, how they think their professional circumstances align with institutional values, and what experiences they feel contribute to their identity as an academic.

You have been identified as someone who would be appropriate to include in the study. Individuals who agree to be part of the study will be asked to participate in an interview that will last approximately one hour with the potential of a shorter, follow up interview (or email contact) that would take no more than 30 minutes. Any professional presentation, report, article, etc. that may be presented/published that derives from the study will not personally identify any individual participant. You will also be asked to review and sign an informed consent form as part of the study as required by the standards governing human subjects research at the [university].

The interview will be conducted at a time and location that are convenient for you and you may terminate your participation in the study at any point.

I hope that you will consider participating in the study, and please do not hesitate to contact me, the Principal Investigator of the study, if you have any questions regarding the nature of the study.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Dehner Cunningham

Doctoral Candidate

References

- Aselage, J., & Eisenberger, R. (2003). Perceived organizational support and psychological contracts: A theoretical integration. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*, 491-509. doi: 10.1002/job.211
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review, 14*, 20-39. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1989.4278999
- Ashforth, B.E., Harrison, S.H., & Corley, K.G. (2008). Identification in organizations: An examination of four fundamental questions. *Journal of Management, 34*, 325–374. doi: 10.1177/0149206308316059
- Baldwin, R. G., & Chronister, J. L. (2001). *Teaching without tenure: Policies and practices for a new era*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Beijaard, D., Meijer, P. C., & Verloop, N. (2004). Reconsidering research on teachers' professional identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 20*, 107-128.
doi:10.1016/j.tate.2003.07.001
- Billot, J. (2010). The imagined and the real: Identifying the tensions for academic identity. *Higher Education Research & Development, 29*, 709-721.
- Blackburn, R. T., & Lawrence, J. H. (1995). *Faculty at work: Motivation, expectation, satisfaction*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bland, C. J., Finstad, D. A., Risbey, K. R., & Staples, J. (2006). The impact of appointment type on the productivity and commitment of full-time faculty in research and doctoral institutions. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*, 89-123.
- Blumer, H. (1986) [1969] *Symbolic Interactionism*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University.
(1998). *Reinventing undergraduate education: A blueprint for America's research universities*. Menlo Park, CA: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. <http://naples.cc.sunysb.edu/Pres/boyer.nsf/> [January 21, 2003].
- Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Braxton, J. M., Luckey, W., & Helland, P. (2002). Institutionalizing a Broader View of Scholarship through Boyer's Four Domains *Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bryant, A., & Charmaz, K. (Eds.). (2007). *The Sage handbook of grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Chait, R., & Trower, C. A. (1997). Where tenure does not reign: Colleges with contract systems. *Forum on Faculty Roles & Rewards*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Charmaz (2006) *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Curtis, J. W., & Thornton, S. (2013). Here's the news: The annual report on the economic status of the profession 2012-2013 (Vol. Academe). Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors.

- Dukes, S. (1984). Phenomenological methodology in the human sciences. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 23, 197-203.
- Dutton, J.E., Roberts, L.M., Bednar, J. (2010). Pathways for positive identity construction at work: Four types of positive identity and the building of social resources. *Academy of Management Review*, 35, 265-293. doi: 10.5465/AMR.2010.48463334
- Eisenberger, R., Jones, J. R., Aselage, J., & Sucharski, I. L. (2004). Perceived organizational support. In J. A-M. Coyle-Shapiro, L.M. Shore, M.S. Taylor, & L.E. Tetrick (Eds.), *The employment relationship: Examining psychological and contextual perspectives*, (pp. 206-225). Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
- Fairweather, J. S. (2005). Beyond the Rhetoric: Trends in the Relative Value of Teaching and Research in Faculty Salaries. *The Journal of Higher Education* 76, 401-422. doi: 10.1353/jhe.2005.0027
- Fairweather, J.S. (1993) Academic values and faculty rewards. *Review of Higher Education*, 17, 43-68.
- Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). The study of academic careers: Looking back, looking forward. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 159-212). Netherlands: Springer Netherlands.
- Fischer, C. T. (2009). Bracketing in qualitative research: Conceptual and practical matters. *Psychotherapy Research*, 19, 583-590.
- Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1993). *The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E., & Trice, A. G. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's strategic imperative*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Glaser, B. G. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity*. San Francisco, CA: The Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1957). Cosmopolitans and locals: toward an analysis of latent social roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 281-306.
- Guba, E.G., (1981) Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. *Educational Communication & Technology Journal*, 29(2), 75-91.
- Henkel, M. (2005). Academic identity and autonomy in a changing policy environment. *Higher Education*, 49, 155-176. doi: 10.1007/s10734-004-2919-1
- Herzberg, F. (1965). The motivation to work among Finnish supervisors. *Personnel Psychology*, 18, 393-402.
- Howard, J.A. (2000) Social psychology of identities. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 367-393.
- Kezar, A. & Sam, C. (2011). Understanding non-tenure track faculty: New assumptions and theories for conceptualizing behavior. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 55, 1419-1442. doi:10.1177/0002764211408879
- Kezar, A. (2013). Examining non-tenure track faculty perceptions of how departmental policies and practices shape their performance and ability to create student learning at four-year institutions. *Research in Higher Education*, 54, 571-598. doi: 10.1007/s11162-013-9288-5

- Krefting, L. (1991). Rigor in qualitative research: The assessment of trustworthiness. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 45*, 214-222.
- Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology, 49*, 1-49.
- Kristof-Brown, A., & Guay, R. P. (2011). Person-environment fit. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 3-50). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person–job, person–organization, person–group, and person–supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology, 58*, 281-342. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00672.x
- Leahey, E. (2007). Not by productivity alone: How visibility and specialization contribute to academic earnings. *American Sociological Review, 72*, 533-561. doi: 10.1177/000312240707200403
- Levin, J. S., & Shaker, G. G. (2011). The hybrid and dualistic identity of full-time non-tenure-track faculty. *American Behavioral Scientist, 55*, 1461-1484. doi: 10.1177/0002764211409382
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lindholm, J. A. (2003). Perceived organizational fit: Nurturing the minds, hearts, and personal ambitions of university faculty. *The Review of Higher Education, 27*, 125-149.

- Martin, J. (1992). *Cultures in organizations: Three perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, J. (2002). *Organizational culture: Mapping the terrain*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Martin, J., & Meyerson, D. (1988). Organizational cultures and the denial, channeling, and acknowledgement of ambiguity. In L. Pondy, R. Boland & H. Thomas (Eds.), *Managing ambiguity and change* (pp. 93-125). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Maxwell, J. A. (1996). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach (3rd edition)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Meyerson, D., & Martin, J. (1987). Cultural change: An integration of three different views. *Journal of Management Studies*, 24, 623-647.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *An expanded sourcebook qualitative data analysis (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Morse, J. M. (2007). Sampling in grounded theory. In A. Bryant & K. Charmaz (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of grounded theory* (pp. 229-244). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Parker, M. (2007). Identifications: Organizations and structuralisms. In A. Pullen, N. Beech, D. Sims, & Palgrave (Eds.) *Exploring Identity: Concepts and Methods* (pp. 61-82). New York, NY: McMillan.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods (3rd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Petriglieri, J.L. (2011). Under threat: Responses to and the consequences of threats to individuals' identities. *Academy of Management Review*, 36, 641-662. doi: 10.5465/amr.2009.0087
- Purcell, M. (2007) "Skilled, Cheap, and Desperate": Non-tenure track faculty and the delusion of meritocracy. *Antipode*, 39, 121-143. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8330.2007.00509.x
- Randolph, J. J. (2009). A guide to writing the dissertation literature review. *Practical Assessment, Research & Education*, 14(13), 1-13.
<http://pareonline.net/pdf/v14n13.pdf>.
- Reybold, L. E. (2008). Practitioner-faculty dialectic: Balancing professional identities in adult education. *Journal of Adult Development*, 15, 140-147. doi: 10.1007/s10804-008-9045-8
- Rhoades, G. (1996). Reorganizing the faculty workforce for flexibility: Part-time professional labor. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 67, 626-659. doi: 10.2307/2943815
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698-714. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.87.4.698
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2012). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sandelowski, M. (1986). The problem of rigor in qualitative research. *Advances in Nursing Science*, 8(3), 27-37.

- Shaker, G. G., Palmer, M. M., & van note Chism, N. (2011). Understanding and supporting full-time non-tenure-track faculty: A needed change. In J. E. Miller & J. E. Groccia (Eds.), *To improve the academy* (Vol. 29, pp. 46-59). Hoboken, NJ: Jossey-Bass.
- Shore T. H., Tashchian A., Jourdan L. (2006). Effects of internal and external pay comparisons on work attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36, 2578-2598. doi: 10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00204.x
- Smythe, E., & Spence, D. (2012) Re-viewing literature in hermeneutic research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. 11, 12-25.
- Strauss, A. S. (1959) *Mirrors and masks*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Tajfel, H. (1978). Social categorization, social identity and social comparison. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 61-76). London: Academic Press.
- Theidwall, K., (2008). Nontenure-track faculty: Rising numbers, lost opportunities. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 143, 11-19. doi: 10.1002/he.308
- Tuma, N. B., & Grimes, A. J. (1981). A comparison of models of role orientations of professionals in a research-oriented university. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, 187-206.

- Umbach, P. D. (2007). How effective are they? Exploring the impact of contingent faculty on undergraduate education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 30, 91-123.
doi: 10.1353/rhe.2006.0080
- Van Maanen, J. (1977). *Organizational careers: Some new perspectives*. London: Wiley.
- Van Maanen, J. and E. H. Schein (1979). Toward of Theory of Organizational Socialization. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 1, 209-264.
- Waltman, J., Bergom, I., Hollenshead, C., Miller, J., & August, L. (2012). Factors contributing to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among non-tenure-track faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 83, 411-434.
- Watson, T. (2007). Identity work, managing and researching. In A. Pullen, N. Beech, D. Sims, & Palgrave (Eds.) *Exploring Identity: Concepts and Methods* (pp. 135-150). New York, NY: McMillan.
- Watt, D. (2007) On becoming a qualitative researcher: The value of reflexivity. *The Qualitative Report*, 12, 82-102. <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR12-1/watt.pdf>
- Wayne, S.J., Shore, L.M., & Liden., R.C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 82-111.
- Wolcott, L. L. (1997). Tenure, promotion, and distance education: Examining the culture of faculty rewards. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 11(2), 3-18.
doi:10.1080/08923649709526958
- Yin, R.K. (2011) *Qualitative research from start to finish*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Vita

KATHRYN DEHNER CUNNINGHAM

EDUCATION

Master of Science, Instructional Systems Design, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky, 2002. Academic focus: instructional technology, curriculum alignment

Bachelor of Arts, Elementary Education, University of Texas, Austin, Texas, 1989

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2014-Present

Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence, Associate Director

2005-2014

University of Kentucky, Center for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching
Educational Research Specialist

2002-2005

University of Kentucky, Teaching and Academic Support Center
Instructional Designer

COLLEGE TEACHING EXPERIENCE

2006-2012 Lecturer, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky

2002- 2005 Adjunct Professor, Bluegrass Community and Technical College,
Lexington, Kentucky

PUBLICATION

Anglin, G., Vaez, H., Cunningham, K. Dehner (2004). Visual representations and learning: The role of static and animated graphics. In D.H. Jonassen Editor *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (pp. 865-916). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.