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This qualitative phenomenological dissertation explored The Departmental Work Lives of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty (FTNTT) at two public four-year universities located in the Southeastern region of the United States. This study is based on interviews with twelve (FTNTT) faculty members representing departments traditionally associated within the College of Arts and Sciences. This study found FTNTT faculty participants highly credentialed and reasonably satisfied in their positions. This study adds the descriptor heterogeneous to FTNTT faculty members’ job roles, work environments, daily engagements, and work experiences and contradicts existing literature that finds FTNTT faculty positions to be resource deficit and administratively non-supporting.

Literature surrounding FTNTT faculty, Agency Theory, and the concepts of Agency of Perspective, Agency of Action, and Action of Avoidance informed this study. This study extended Agency of Action to include intentional, strategic behaviors of inactions (coined within this study as Action of Avoidance) toward the departmental contexts of policies and practices concerning discipline, employability, employment longevity, and personal FTNTT faculty career trajectories.

Agency Theory, Agency of Perspective, Agency of Action, and Action of Avoidance, as identified by the researcher, emerged as strong frameworks used by FTNTT faculty to construct behaviors to successfully navigate long-term careers under short-term conditions.

Based on FTNTT faculty responses, this study outlines policies and practices that are perceived as supportive or non-supportive. Policymakers may use this data to inform strategies for improving support among FTNTT faculty members.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

“Excuse me, [Mr. President], but the faculty are not employees of the university. The faculty are the university!”

Isidore Rabi

In the 1950s, Dwight D. Eisenhower, then President of Columbia University, was invited to speak at a ceremony honoring Isidore Rabi, a distinguished Columbia professor and Nobel Prize winner for his work on the atomic bomb. In his short speech, Eisenhower commented on how it was always good to see an employee of the university get recognized. Without hesitation, Rabi interrupted Eisenhower and said, “Excuse me, sir, but the faculty are not employees of the university. The faculty are the university!” (Academic Anchor, 2012). Today, faculty and administrators voice the same sentiments when they refer to faculty as the ‘heart of the university,’ hoping to illustrate the important role that faculty play in institutes of higher education.

Tenured faculty have historically served as the “authority structure of the university” (McPherson & Schapiro, 1999, p. 86). However, the allocation of tenure is decreasing in light of social, political, economic and technological changes (Bland, Center, Finstad, Risby, & Staples, 2006; Chait & Ford, 1982; Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007). In light of these shifts, this study focuses on academic faculty who are employed full-time as university faculty, but lack the benefits of tenure. This dissertation employs a qualitative, phenomenological approach to assess the departmental work lives of full-time non-tenure track faculty.
This study derived its data from interviews with 12 FTNTT faculty members split across two regional, four-year universities. Though not deliberately chosen for the length of their current employment, the emergent sample had the effect of illuminating issues that pertain to FTNTT faculty employment longevity.

Bess and Dee (2012) contend, “The diversity [differences and nonconformists] of human society demands attention to the uniqueness of individuals and to the ways in which they are involved in organizational matters” (p. 892). This study specifically leverages FTNTT faculty participants’ personal voices to deduce the essence of their departmental work experiences. In this case, the term *essence* encompasses the exploration and description of what constitutes FTNTT lived work experiences, as well as the researcher’s interpretation of how the lived work experiences influence FTNTT faculty within the organizational structure of their university department. For the purposes of this study, “structure consists of the rules and resources that may constrain or enable action, where these constraints have ‘differential malleability’ (Archer, 1982, p. 462). Structure includes any policies or practices that may influence FTNTT faculty career choices, participation, or opportunities for advancement within the departmental organization.

Numerous professional/personal/social experiences occur on campuses today because of the inconsistencies in institutional policies that either include or exclude employees based on their employment contracts and, by extension, whether their role features research, teaching, or administrative roles.
The following sections detail the background and purpose of the study, statement of the research problem, definitions of key terminology, research question and spirit of the study, assumptions, significance and rationale of the study, and summary.

**Background of the Study**

Over the past three decades, America’s universities have seen dramatic changes in several of their operating procedures. One major shift involves the composition of university faculties—namely, the remarkable increase in faculty hires who are not eligible for tenure (hereafter referred to as NTT faculty). Case in point: In 1969, 97 percent of full-time faculty members held appointments that were tenure track-eligible (FTTT faculty hereafter) (Benjamin, 2003, p. 18). In other words, only 3% of full-time faculty members held appointments that were non-tenure track-eligible (FTNTT faculty). By 2009, however, the percentage of FTNTT faculty on college and university campuses had risen to 18.8% (Benjamin, 2003, p. 18). This change speaks to a dramatic “redistribution” of faculty jobs (Flaherty, 2016). As a study conducted by the TIAA Institute points out, overall faculty numbers have grown about 65% in the last 20 years, with the greatest gains (115%) made by part-time non-tenure track faculty (PTNTT) faculty. However, FTNTT faculty or contract appointments grew by 84%, even though there was only a 31% increase in the number of full-time faculty (Flaherty, 2016).

The rise in NTT faculty members reflects fundamental fluctuations in the demographics and working environment of institutional and departmental faculty. Pragmatically, university administrations value the flexibility inherent to hiring NTT faculty as needed to address shifting student enrollments and course demands. If the class taught by a FTNTT or PTNTT faculty member is cancelled, the FTNTT position can be
more easily eliminated. By structuring NTT faculty contracts in this way, institutions can minimize their overhead.

At the same time, university campuses benefit from a diverse faculty who serve as mentors and role models, representing the “epicenter” of the college or university (Flaherty, 2016). However, NTT faculty appointments are disproportionately concentrated in certain groups. For instance, “the overall trend leans slightly toward racial and ethnic minorities being overrepresented in NTT faculty positions” (Kezar & Maxey, 2012, p. 52). This gap seems to be sluggishly closing. In 1993, the ratio of FTNTT faculty appointments between Caucasians and underrepresented minorities was 10 to one, but dropped to seven to one by 2013. At the same time, other reports find that female hires are twice as likely as their male counterparts to be employed off the tenure track (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Women’s distinctly lower appointments to tenure-eligible positions can be tied to multiple explanations, such as the heavy societal pressure on women to balance their personal and professional priorities. As a household expands with children, women devote significantly less time to research, whereas the time that men devote to research actually increases (Gappa et al., 2007, p. 73). If women have children under six, they are 50 percent less likely to be appointed to a tenure track-eligible position, and 20 percent less likely to complete the tenure probationary time lines (Gappa et al., 2007, p. 73).

Conventionally, FTNTT faculty hires are primarily assigned teaching responsibilities and largely for undergraduate classes (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Gappa, 2000). But their positions increasingly include “varied roles, types of appointments, and responsibilities as teachers, researchers, and clinicians” (Gappa, 2000,
Because these changing positions represent new academic work responsibilities and appointments, they are blurring the line between tenured and non-tenured faculty (Altbach, 1999; Bland et al., 2006; Boyer, 1990; Musselin, 2005). By requiring NTT faculty to do more advanced work without the security of tenure, universities risk losing their ability to attract the best and brightest academic talents and professionals to their campuses. New graduates seeking a long and satisfying career in academics will be drawn to campuses that can best assure the benefits associated with a tenured career (i.e., guaranteed academic freedom, guaranteed autonomy, full access to necessary resources to pursue academic and research interests, opportunity for advancement, and a sense of job security associated with a traditional tenured position in higher education) (El-Khawas, 2008; Henkel, 2000; Musselin, 2005).

This problem is compounded by the lack of universal definitions for full-time faculty (TT and NTT) and part-time (PTNTT) faculty among university stakeholders (Kezar & Sam, 2010; Tam & Jacoby, 2009). The existing literature uses almost 50 different titles to describe NTT faculty (Kezar & Sam, 2010). New Mexico’s Report on Part-Time Faculty Compensation and Salary Survey states that “there [is] significant variance in the meanings and use of the terms ‘part-time’ and ‘full-time’ faculty between institutions” (Tam & Jacoby, 2009, p. 2). One of the more commonly used descriptors, particularly in the U.S. and Canadian literature, is contingent. In 2012, the U.S. Department of Education’s 2009 Fall Staff Survey identified 1.3 million faculty (75.5% of all faculty) employed in contingent positions off the tenure-eligible track, either as part-time (PTNTT) or adjunct faculty members, full-time non-tenure-track faculty members (FTNTT), or graduate student teaching assistants (Coalition on the Academic
Workforce, 2010). Eagan and Jaeger (2008) similarly used contingent faculty to encompass “graduate assistants, postdoctoral researchers and other types of faculty who are not on the tenure-track” (p. 41). Umbach (2007) refers to contingent faculty as “tenure ineligible positions” (p. 92). The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) (1986) reports contingent faculty can be labeled using eccentric or unorthodox titles (p. 14a). The varying use of labels to identify faculty hired full time, but not on a tenure track, remains a practice on university campuses today. This pattern also extends to European researchers, who often use the terms ‘temporary’, ‘fixed-term’, or ‘non-permanent’ in lieu of ‘contingent’ employment (Connelly & Gallagher, 2004).

Although the definition of full-time non-tenure-track (FTNNT) faculty would appear axiomatic, there are ambiguities at its core. For instance, FTNNT faculty employee classifications may or may not include specialty positions within the university – such as graduate student employees, postdoctoral fellows, or librarians – even though many of them participate in research and teaching roles in either full-time or part-time positions (Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2010). Furthermore, the employment contracts for FTNNT faculty vary according to university and discipline (O'Meara, Terosky, & Neumann, 2008, p. 61). Such contracts are commonly written for one- to three-year durations (Gappa, 2000). Contracts, once expired, may be renewed, extended, or eliminated. Some contracts might have a one-year term and a limited number of renewals, or a two- to three-year term with no options for renewal. Meanwhile, some FTNNT faculty members can serve as full-time employees for several years—even decades—yet remain classified as temporary employees (AAUP, 1986).
Statement of the Research Problem

In a context of constrained resources and high demands, institutions must identify the environments that enable faculty to thrive in their roles (O’Meara, Kaufman, & Kuntz, 2003). As Gappa et al. (2007) argues, “any efforts to support faculty must acknowledge and respond to changes if all faculty members are to contribute at the highest possible level to the work of their institution” (p. 323). Policies and practices that do not support FTNTT faculty members can create a culture of faculty division, which in turn threatens the department’s affirmative culture, the students’ learning environment, and the campus as a whole. However, this effort is complicated by the fact that different groups make sense of policy in different ways (Mills, 2007, p. 185). Thus, there is a need to understand how FTNTT make sense of not only their work engagements and departmental work environments, but also students’ learning environment, the departmental microstructure, and the university’s macrostructure.

Without taking policy input or feedback from FTNTT faculty, administrators cannot wholly know whether new or existing policies are supportive (Kezar, 2013, pp. 21-22). By relying merely on their own academic schemes, administrators risk making assumptions about NTT faculty that can lead to misconceptions and unsuccessful policies that constrain, rather than support, employees’ work experiences. Flawed policies can, in turn, negatively impact faculty performance, student outcomes, and the university as a whole.

Current research links increased faculty satisfaction, performance, and retention with supportive working conditions, which are particularly influential at the department level (Bland et al., 2006; Clark, 1987). At the same time, “the most important dimension
that has been largely unexplored is faculty within a given department” (Lee, 2004, p. 604). Without department-specific research, we cannot know how FTNTT faculty are represented in a given department within the university (Clark, 1987). As such, Lee (2004) calls for “more in-depth qualitative inquiry into the different perspectives that comprise the departmental culture,” which can help us understand how “institutional and disciplinary forces are manifest in particular departments, and also identify other relationships that might help to shape departmental values and opinions” (p. 617). More knowledge about departmental forces can ultimately help administrators generate policies and practices that inspire positive faculty behaviors.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to explore the departmental work lives of full-time non-tenure track faculty. I began this study with the intent to address three domains – personal work expectations and engagements (individual), work policies (departmental), and perceived departmental cultures (social). These three domains were promoted in the work of Blackburn and Lawrence (1995).

My goal was to explore the real occurrences and essential nature of FTNTT faculty members’ departmental work lives (Magrini, 2012). To this end, I aimed to observe, record, and interpret FTNTT faculty member’s ‘lived experiences’ through vivid and detailed descriptions (Magrini, 2012). As a FTNTT faculty member for eight years, I have a personal drive to understand this topic and a unique perspective to lend to this research. Specifically, I am familiar with FTNTT faculty routine practices, terminology and jargon; such a working knowledge assisted me in gleaning deeper insights from
participant interviews and any relevant document reviews. At the same time, I recognize that the presence of prior knowledge and assumptions mandates that I approach this work with an open mind and complete transparency.

**Definitions of the Terminology**

This document will use the following terms and acronyms: tenured or tenure-track (TT) faculty; part-time non-tenure track (PTNTT) faculty; full-time non-tenure track (FTNTT) faculty, and non-tenure track faculty (NTT encompasses both PTNTT and FTNTT faculty). When data disaggregation allows, this review gives special attention to FTNTT faculty.

Additionally, this study abides by the following terminology and defines the terms as such:

*Full-time tenure track faculty* describes those employees of an institution of higher education who hold full-time, tenure-track appointments that require professional participation in the processes of teaching, research, and scholarly service (AAUP, 2013).

*Full-time non-tenure track employee* represents a person employed full-time by contracts that are either “renewable without limit or of fixed duration with limited renewals” (Gappa, 2000, p. 83).

*Constraints* are policies and practices that serve as a barrier to FTNTT faculty in conducting their work (Kezar, 2013, p. 3).

*Policies* are formal structures that have been created to delineate more favorable employment conditions or alter existing ones (Kezar, 2013, p. 6).
Practices are behaviors, often informal, that reflect an institution’s mindset and norms in concrete forms (e.g., treatment at meetings) (Kezar & Sam, 2011). Practices may or may not support policies and are closely associated with the culture of an organization.

Supports are policies or practices that help FTNTT faculty conduct their work lives (Kezar, 2013, p. 3).

Engagement refers to the attentive processes that people use to varying degrees—physically, cognitively, and emotionally—in their work role performances, which have implications for both their work and experiences (Kahn, 1992). In recording FTNTT faculty experiences, I also considered the context in which FTNTT faculty are employed, the tasks performed by FTNTT faculty, and the motivation(s) driving their performance(s).

Tenure is a “continuous appointment until resignation, retirement, termination for disability, dismissal for cause, or expiration of the recall period in the event of layoff” (AAUP, 2013). Hutchens (2011) adds that tenure represents a contractual arrangement that allows a faculty member to enjoy a “continuing employment relationship with his or her institution absent extraordinary circumstances” (pp. 1444-1445).

Research Question and Spirit of the Study

The following four quotes embody the spirit of this study, which is also reflected in the main research question: What is the essence of the departmental work lives of FTNTT faculty?
• Becher (1989) states “the ways in which particular groups of academic organize their professional lives are intimately related to the intellectual tasks in which they are engaged” (p. 1). As FTNTT faculty tasks increasingly include non-traditional models, FTNTT faculty are faced with the challenges of organizing their professional lives to accommodate their work-life balance.

• El-Khawas (2008) advocates for research to “explore how academics in different roles make sense of the opportunities and constraints they encounter” (p. 31). Policies assumed by administrators to be supportive may or may not be considered supportive by the faculty member. Without understanding the perspectives of FTNTT faculty, administrators may unknowingly implement policies that negatively impact faculty performance.

• Faculty members value equitable access to resources necessary to do good work, and need to feel respected by those with whom they work (Gappa et al., 2007). FTNTT faculty members must be equipped with the resources needed to perform their work in a collegial environment that is affirmative to all faculty.

• “One of the most fundamental questions that scholars need to answer about NTTF (from their own perspective) is how they experience their work lives” (Kezar, 2013, p. 3). There is scant research on FTNTT faculty members themselves—a gap this study aims to address.

This study does not make claim to a formal hypothesis, nor seek to determine or predict causal relationships. As a qualitative endeavor, it includes open-ended interview questions intended to illuminate descriptions of the FTNTT faculty experiences and does not reduce the raw data to scores or measurements (Moustakas, 1994).
Assumptions

Prior assumptions relevant to this study are:

- Humans form meanings based on their experiences; in turn, our social experiences shape the way we see and assess our experiences (Berger & Luckman, 1966; Kezar, 2013).
- Humans beings are capable of having an accurate understanding of their own experiences. These complex experiences can occur within the dynamics of the work environment, and require rich and descriptive details to in order to properly delineate (Kezar, 2013, p. 8).
- Humans can make sense of their experiences and can knowingly express themselves about said experiences (Dukes, 1984).
- “Faculty performs better when they are in an environment that they perceive is supportive” (Kezar, 2013, p. 4). In contrast, “Faculty performances are lessened when they perceive their environment to be non-supportive (Bettinger & Long, 2004).
- Time is a valuable commodity; as such, humans will give priority to those things that they value most. Research indicates that there is not a linear relationship between time and productivity (Kelly & McGrath, 1985).

Significance of Study and Rationale

Hatch (2002) advises dissertation researchers to contribute to the “current conversation about what’s important in their field” (p. 222). This study aims to identify the supports and constraints that FTNTT faculty find important within their departments.
and lived work experiences (Blumburg & Pringle, 1982). In doing so, this study follows increasing calls from educational researchers to investigate NTT faculty in order to understand the impact of changing faculty demographics (Benjamin, 2003; Bettinger & Long, 2004; Bland et al., 2006; Blumburg & Pringle, 1982; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2004; Hoeller, 2014; Kezar, 2013; Kezar & Maxey, 2012). The magnitude of this change – in which traditionally tenured faculty are becoming significantly outnumbered by their NTT peers – justifies an exploration into FTNTT faculty members’ work lives.

This research has particular import for universities’ stakeholders. After all, “one of the main reasons for exploring NTT faculty is to be able to identify inequities and trends that are relevant for policymaking” (Kezar & Maxey, 2012, p. 51). Policies based on faulty assumptions or incorrect data can constrain faculty from reaching their maximum potential, both personally and professionally. FTNTT faculty’s negative perceptions of such policies can foster a work environment that prevents optimum performances, reduces student learning outcomes, and weakens both faculty and student retention (Bettinger & Long, 2004; Bland et al., 2006; Eagan & Jaeger, 2008; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2004; Gappa, 2000; Hoeller, 2014).

Indeed, existing research already underlines the connections between policies, practices, faculty job experiences, and job performances (Blumburg & Pringle, 1982; Gappa et al., 2007; Kezar, 2013). The type of appointment determines FTNTT faculty’s access to environmental factors that facilitate productivity, including rewards for productivity, clear expectations for continued appointment, required peer review, resources and participation in decision making (Bland et al., 2006, pp. 91-93). The existing literature shows a positive link between these productivity factors and faculty
commitment (Bland et al., 2006, p. 94), with a more negative working environment leading to less interest and retention among faculty.

Although FTNTT faculty perform their work in overlapping organizational networks, this study focuses specifically on the “intimate spaces where faculty live their professional lives [departments]” (O'Meara, 2010). In doing so, this study offers actual faculty members an opportunity to voice their perspectives on how administrators and policymakers can improve support for FTNTT faculty. Equipped with this deeper understanding of the overall ‘essence’ of FTNTT departmental experiences, stakeholders may be able to develop policies and structure workplaces in ways that support the valuable contributions of FTNTT faculty.

Summary

Bracken, Allen, and Dean (2006) urge academic researchers to continually question “what we define and accept as normal” (p. 7). The notion of university tenure, once accepted as normal, is now facing an insurgence of FTNTT faculty who require new definitions. In order for institutions to persevere and excel in pursuit of their missions, administrators must embrace and implement research-based policies and practices that properly identify and consider FTNTT faculty experiences.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

The following literature review served as the foundation of my study to explore the departmental work lives of full-time non-tenure track faculty. It increased my working knowledge of theories and concepts surrounding FTNTT faculty, and helped to broaden my thinking about FTNTT faculty issues. Specifically, this literature review examines literature germane to FTNTT faculty members and the experiences in their departmental work lives. This qualitative, phenomenological study sought to explore the departmental work experiences of FTNTT faculty members, whose academic careers are ineligible for a traditional tenure track appointment or the employment benefits associated with a tenured position.

This chapter is organized to present: background; current research, theoretical frameworks: interpretivism and agency theory, other frameworks considered for this study, current research, conceptual framework, other literature for review, and summary.

Background

Existing research has guided researchers to multiple theories, themes, sub-themes, connections, and extensions used to explore the impact of increasing NTT faculty employment (AAUP, 2013; Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Benjamin, 2003; Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2010; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2004; June, 2012; Kezar & Sam, 2011; Levin & Shaker, 2011; Ochoa, 2011; Schuster, 2003; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006; Street, Maisto, Merves, & Rhoades, 2012; Trower, 2001; Wilson, 2010). The proliferation of NTT faculty appointments is partially attributed to the decrease in state allocations to institutes of higher education, colleges and universities. As funds and
resources became scarce, administrators began to replace tenure-line appointments with cheaper NTT faculty salaried appointments.

Bland et al. (2006) states that “for the past 50 years, the majority of U.S. colleges and universities have shared a similar faculty appointment system” (p. 94). Most faculty were hired as tenure track, evaluated against a standard criteria, with promotion usually culminating in a tenured position (pp. 94-95). However, institutions of higher education have long had to adapt to changing economic, political, and social climates that affect the make-up of their student market and faculty.

In the wake of World War II, spurred by federal student scholarship assistance from the GI Bill, a growing number of veterans enrolled in colleges and universities. This massification of education created a need for more instructors to meet the expanding class enrollment numbers. From 1959 to 1969 – a number of students per faculty load rose from 9.6 to 17.8 and offered a first glimpse into the changing nature of university faculty (Holler, 2014, p. 17).

In 1975, 13% of university faculty members were FTNTT. Between 1975 and 1993, the number of FTNTT faculty appointments increased “88%, while probationary tenure track appoints decreased 9%” (AAUP, 1998, cited in Bland et al., 2006, p. 94). Between 1969 and 1998, full-time faculty would come to encompass 44.1% of hires in the health sciences; 32.6% in education; 22.2% in the humanities; 16.2% in social sciences; 24.0% in natural sciences; 17.9% in fine arts; 15.4% in engineering; 22.5% in agriculture and home economics, and 17.3% in business. Among all other programs, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty comprised 30.7% of all full-time faculty overall (Kezar & Maxey, 2013). The AAUP’s 204-2015 report claims that today [2015] “only 20.35
percent of instructional faculty are full time and tenure track” (Barnshaw & Dunietz, 2015, p. 13).

As universities began to diverge ideologically on whether knowledge should be disseminated via research or teaching, FTNTT faculty provided universities the benefit of "freeing tenure-track faculty for upper-division and graduate teaching and for research" (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001, p. 123). One way universities met their growing student numbers, and the professional needs of their tenured faculty, was to continue to increase the number of faculty positions that did not require the restrictive and rigorous nature of a tenured appointment. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1972) in fact suggested that colleges and universities consider appointing part-time or temporary faculty to offset the variables of student enrollment and faculty need. While “NTT faculty are not necessarily lower quality instructors or uncommitted to their work… they are provided less professional support and fewer resources for teaching” (Ott & Cisneros, 2015, p. 17). These alternative faculty appointments provide the institution the opportunity to offer a diverse faculty, while maintaining the flexibility to address economic changes and unstable student enrollments. FTNTT faculty members can be released on the basis of short-term or fixed contracts, which usually last one to three years. Also, Bland et al. (2006) noted, “Faculty salaries are the primary cost for most colleges and universities” (p. 95). FTNTT faculty salaries, being less than their TT counterparts, minimize the institution’s financial obligations (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Today, financial constraints in state allocations for public institutes of higher education reflect NTT appointments, which are more likely to continue to increase on university campuses (Gappa et al., 2007). The magnitude of this change – in which
traditionally tenured faculty appointments are significantly outnumbered by NTT faculty appointments – has galvanized this current study to explore the work experiences of the FTNTT professoriate.

**Current Research**

Current NTTF research has been driven by secondary data, or large-scale surveys usually completed by administrators, chairs, and department heads (Kezar & Sam, 2011; Kezar, 2013). Administrative conjectures, presented as research-based conclusions, are commonly conveyed by institutional and organizational researchers who use national quantitative studies as primary data sources. These studies contain responses predominantly completed by administrators, and are missing actual input from FTNTT faculty themselves (Kezar & Sam, 2011).

In fairness, researchers have recently made empirical contributions to the NTT faculty research gap (Feldman & Turnley, 2004; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Hart, 2011; Kezar & Sam, 2010; Levin & Shaker, 2011; Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, & August, 2012). Nonetheless, experiences of FTNTT faculty still “remain largely non-normative, and therefore, they are unlikely to have a sense of reality that is shared with tenure-track faculty and department chairs” (Kezar, 2013, p. 4). As a result of the scant research in regard to FTNTT faculty’s work experiences, it is more likely that FTNTT faculty’s views are misunderstood. Administrators and policy makers, making decisions without awareness or knowledge of FTNTT faculty issues, can produce policies and practices that prove to be non-supportive in the eyes of FTNTT faculty.
To add to the mix, the aggregation of PTNTT faculty and FTNTT faculty data is often the source of misconceptions surrounding FTNTT faculty issues and performances. Much of existing research does not distinguish between FTNTT faculty and PTNTT in their raw and/or analyzed data. “Surprisingly, little systematic NTT faculty research has been conducted by NTT faculty themselves, being sensitive to variation by full-and part-time status, institutional type and department or discipline” (Kezar & Sam, 2011, p. 50).

This study aimed to fill the gaps surrounding the experiences of FTNTT faculty. This study did not intend develop a theory or solve a problem, nor is it designed for social action per se. Rather, this study intends to provide administrators with qualitative data describing the work experiences of FTNTT faculty. A deeper understanding of FTNTT faculty and their work experiences will better prepare administrators and policymakers to create and evaluate policies and practices in order to produce an affirmative work environment for all FTNTT faculty members in their departments, encourage FTNTT faculty’s maximum job performances, and advance student learning environments.

**Primary Theoretical Framework**

A theoretical framework is “drived from existing theory (or theories)” and is used by the researcher to “apply theoretical constructs to their study” (Grant & Osanloo, 2014, p. 16). Theories significantly ground the connections upon which researchers recognize, accept, or reject existing or newfound ideas. Some researchers begin their qualitative research designs with a structured framework, others begin with a less structured theoretical framework. In some cases, the theoretical framework was identified as emergent during or after the data collection and analysis (Grant & Osanloo, 2014). The
fact there appears to be no universal theoretical tenets for the NTT faculty may account for theoretical inconsistencies found in current NTT faculty research literature.

Butin (2010) claimed there is “no obvious” way to look at or “respond” to any particular educational issue or issues (p. 58). Butin (2010) identified three main theoretical frameworks, each with a multitude of “related theories and strands” that are primarily used in educational research: 1) Positivism, 2) Interpretivism and 3) Critical Theory (pp. 58-59).

**Positivism**

Positivism looks at the world through a positive, scientific understanding of an issue and fosters the belief that, if viewed objectively and with proper variables, “one best answer” or solution for a problem can be identified (Butin, 2010, p. 59). Early positivists argued that through the “systematic application of human reasoning” one could discover the universal laws of human nature (Yanow, 2007, p. 407). Over time, the sciences and social science communities have replaced positivism with the belief that one can never be 100% sure of a correct answer; however, the probabilities for the truth can be enhanced by an approach pursuing the best research practice. This pursuit through enhanced probabilities is known as post-positivism (Butin, 2010, p. 60).

My study did not intend to propose one truth or one best answer to describe FTNTT faculty departmental work experiences. The purpose of my study was to explore the FTNTT experiences and was not intended to suggest a singular social action to correct an emergent FTNTT faculty problem. Therefore, I chose not to use a positivist theoretical framework for my study.
Interpretivism

Interpretivism does not accept the positivists’ belief that the world is “out there” to be discovered; instead, it integrates a cultural and anthropological view to see the world as an “ongoing story to be told” (Butin, 2010, p. 60). The interpretivists believe there is no singular truth; rather, truths are contextual and particular to the group or individuals of study. Therefore, interpretivists do not search for one answer, but only to “thoroughly document the perspective being investigated” (Butin, 2010, p. 60). Interpretivists are word-based, context-specific, “ontologically constructivist (rather than realists), epistemologically interpretivist (rather than objectivist)” and recognize the need for reflexivity on their part to shape interpretations and make sense of narrative data (Yanow, 2007, p. 408). Interpretivists use data constructed by participants, in context of the issue being studied, and can also use documents to clarify, confirm, or challenge a participant’s narrative.

At first glance, interpretivism appeared the best overall theoretical framework for my research purpose of exploring the FTNTT faculty and their departmental work lives. Interpretivism provides the exploratory tools necessary for interviewing and observing participants, as well as reading current research and university policies. Also, because the interpretive reporting mechanism is word based, it possible to accurately document participants’ narratives about the phenomenon being investigated. Also, my study was not driven by the desire for one, correct answer, but intended to accurately and honestly portray the experiences of FTNTT faculty and their departmental work lives.

To be comprehensive in my research, I also reviewed Butin’s (2010) third suggested theory (Critical Theory).
Critical Theory

Critical Theory is the most recent theoretical development and takes the drive for change as its impetus. Critical theorists question the neutrality of (post) positivism and interpretivism because neither theory considers the historical realities of how and why policies and practices were put in place. Critical Theory contends “Truth is linked to power”, and thus the key question is “Who benefits?” (Butin, 2010, p. 59).

My study focused on the experiences of FTNTT faculty, and aside from offering data to help policymakers in their decisions regarding this faculty group, it was not steepled in a drive for social action. Thus, Critical Theory did not fit the purpose of my study. As such, I remained committed to Interpretivism as a broad theoretical approach. However, I realized through committee discussions and further reading that this framework was too wide to satisfy the goals of my study. Therefore, I searched for another theoretical framework that would bring sufficient nuance to my study’s focus.

Agency Theory

The origin of agency theory (1960’s and early 1970’s) is rooted in the studies of economists, who explored risk sharing between individuals (agents) and principals (groups, organizations) who are set on accomplishing a particular goal or task (Rauchhaus, 2009). Jensen and Meckling (1976) defined agency as a relationship by “contract under which one or more persons (the principal(s)) engage another person (the agent) to perform some service on their behalf which involves delegating some decision making authority to the agent” (p. 6). According to Klein (1998), research has expanded the reach of agency theory from its economic roots to other fields such as law, organizational theory, sociology, and anthropology (as cited in Ahamad, Adi, Noor,
Soon, & Azizan, 2013, p. 260). Recently, faculty in higher education, professional
growth, and career management have been added to the list of researchers and agency
applications (Archer, 2009; O’Meara et al., 2008).

**Defining Agency**

O’Meara et al. (2011) defines agency as “taking strategic and intentional actions
or perspectives toward goals that matter to oneself (p. 2). O’Meara et al. (2011) further
expanded on the definition of agency to include intentional behavior, based on human
perceptions, that purposefully and tactically advance one’s goals (Campbell & O’Meara,
2014, p. 52). Elder (1994) included a sense of power over one’s work to agency:

Agency is “the temporally constructed engagement by actors of different
structural environments – the temporal-relationship contexts of action – which
through the interplay of habit, imagination, and judgment, both reproduces and
transforms those structures in interactive response to the problems posed by

The importance of understanding agency theory, and the supports that can be
provided to FTNTT faculty’s sense of agency, is paramount to deans, department chairs,
and colleagues who want to facilitate cultures in which FTNTT faculty members—
indeed, all faculty members—can meet their greatest employment potential and pursue
career goals. In addition, an understanding of agentic organizational structures can
“reveal concrete actions that can be taken to shape faculty agency, such as creating
supportive policies, mentoring opportunities, welcoming climates, and effective reward
structure” (Campbell & O’Meara, 2014, p. 51).
Agency Theory Obstacles and Career

Agency Theory is mostly associated in psychological and sociological studies in which an individual strategically moves to overcome a barrier or obstacle that may prevent them from obtaining their goal [usually associated with career advancement] (Elder, 1994). Obstacles can be individually or group defined as either social, sociodemographic, economics, health, and life-course and well-being (O’Meara & Campbell, 2011). Collectively, individuals can use agency as an instrument for assertive and/or non-assertive behavioral acts to monitor and modify the organization. My study focused on the individual agency of the FTNTT faculty member through their departmental work lives. The collective agency of any or all participants was outside the scope of this study.

My first thought was that agency theory may not be a good theoretical fit for my work. My study explored the experiences of FTNTT faculty members, who according to existing literature, did not have a systematic path for career advancement. Traditionally, ‘career goal’ implies a meaning of advancement – particularly career advancement. In academia, career advancement is most seen through the lens of a tenured or tenure-track position, or an administrative appointment. The concept of career advancement and FTNTT faculty seemed detached.

Through further reading, I began to re-think the goal of agency—not just as overcoming obstacles to one’s career advancement, but overcoming work experiences, that may or may not be obstacles, to judiciously and tactically navigate one’s career (Baez, 2002a; Campbell & O’Meara, 2014; Neumann, Terosky, & Schell, 2006). The FTNTT faculty literature is replete with examples of FTNTT faculty as a heterogeneous
entity, with different reasons for pursuing different possibilities of their employment (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995; Bland et al., 2006; Gappa et al., 2007; Hollenshead, Miller, & August, 2012; Kezar & Sam, 2010; O'Meara et al., 2008).

I reframed career advancement as a goal of agency to the goal of navigating one’s career. In this way, I confirmed my decision to use Agency Theory as my theoretical framework to explore The Departmental Work Lives of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty and specifically, the research question: What is the essence of the departmental work lives of FTNTT faculty?

Faculty Agency in Departmental Contexts

Kezar and Sam (2010) claim that organizational structures, particularly at the department level, influence individuals and their collective sense of agency (p. 4). Recent scholars offer new research that have observed the pivotal role department cultures play in faculty professional lives… and the departmental contexts that matter in faculty careers (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Bland et al., 2006, Campbell & O’Meara, 2014). Emirbayer and Mische (1998) claim that, in order to understand agentic factors, one must look at decision-making in the context of the whole picture - including the past, present, and future contexts.

Factors Shaping Faculty Agency

I considered Marshall’s (2005) broad interpretation of resources that affect faculty agency within this study. Marshall (2005) claims that “agency cannot be activated, without the necessary resources for doing so” (p. 68). Marshall (2005) took a broad interpretation of the resources that an individual must have to enact a sense of agency. For example, Marshall’s framework of resources can encompass social skills, social
stratification, power, intelligence, materials, self-efficacy and policies. In other words, resources are tools that individuals need to direct their sense of agency.

**Faculty Agency and Collegiality**

The social context where a person exerts agency also matters; a person might feel more agentic in an environment that is familiar or provides a sense of belonging (Marshall, 2005). Collegiality and respect can foster cooperation between all faculty members. Indeed, “relationships and networks are a critical aspect of professional growth (O’Meara & Campbell, 2011, p. 3). Faculty members who communicate and collaborate have a greater sense of value, belonging, professional growth, self-efficacy, and personal support. A supportive environment can activate and encourage a FTNTT faculty member’s sense of agency. In addition, after completing this section, I added social work environment to my running list of potential work environmental themes.

**Faculty Agency and its Relationship to Motivation**

Before completing my theoretical framework literature review, I studied the existing literature on Agency Theory and its relationship with motivation. First, I wanted to clarify, in my mind, the difference between Agency Theory and Motivational Theories. I wanted to focus on the what, rather than the why, of motivation. In other words, what experiences did FTNTT faculty have in their departmental work lives – and what influences did those experiences, supporting policies and constraints have on their work lives?

“drive out intrinsic motivation” (p. 1). Extrinsic motivators are considered to be any external rewards that nurture an individual to behave, based on these outside motivators (i.e., money, grades). Intrinsic motivators are considered to be any factors that nurture an individual to behave in a certain way based upon the internal drives to do so (i.e., competition, acceptance, fear of failure, joy in a favorite task).

Motivation theorists, with a psychological background and strong ties to intrinsic behaviors, counter Agency Theory and its ties to extrinsic motivators. Foss (2007) argues that there is no evidence that extrinsic motivators are “killing” intrinsic motivation, and further, that intrinsic motivation should not always be considered “good” (p. 1). Foss (2007) gives the example of an employee who is motivated to perform one part of a task, yet consistently incompletes another task that is found less desirable (p. 1). On the other hand, cognitive evaluation theorists argue that Agency Theory needs to incorporate a strong intrinsic factor.

It was not the intent of this study to enter the controversial dialogues in regard to intrinsic and extrinsic motivators; however, the concept of overcoming obstacles, policies and practices (as extrinsic rewards) and strategic maneuvers to navigate the precarious structural and contextual employment conditions established Agency Theory a solid choice for my theoretical framework. However, in order to complete my theoretical framework literature review, I felt compelled to take a closer look at motivational theories.
Secondary Theoretical Considerations

Motivational Theories

Historically, there has been a variety of theories over the exact nature of motivation. For the purposes of this document, motivation is defined as “the process whereby goal-directed activity is instigated and sustained” (Pintrich & Schunk, 1996, p. 4).

Early theories of motivation were entrenched deeply in philosophy, focusing on the tension between volition/will and instincts. This focus stressed internal nature and discounted the role of learning (intrinsic motivation). For example, Freud (1966) believed the physical energy, or forces within the individual, were responsible for a person’s actions.

Later on, conditional theories of motivation became prominent under the influence of researchers such as Thorndike, Pavlov, and Skinner. These theories emphasized behavior, associating internal change with particular external stimuli. Deci (1975) believed that one’s intrinsic motivation varies directly with feelings of personal control (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Blackburn & Lawrence (1995) cites Bandura (1977) with the idea that “individuals have different sources of information to judge their efficacy level” (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995, p. 86). In extension, Blackburn & Lawrence (1995) credits Bandura (1986) with adding the application of self-efficacy (sense of ownership and control) to goal and achievement situations (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995, p.86).

More recently, Hollenshead et al. (2007) applied Maslow’s levels of hierarchy specifically to non-tenure track faculty (p. 11-14). Maslow’s theory of human motivation
describes four levels of need through which individuals can progress—from the lowest level, basic needs, to the highest level, self-actualization. Hollenshead et al. (2007) operated from the assumption that administrators should recognize the significant needs of faculty (safety/security, belongingness and esteem) in order to fulfill faculty expectations within their job positions and work environment. The premise is that a fulfilled worker is more productive, less likely to create conflict, and will have a positive assimilation into the organization.

Hollenshead et al. (2007) categorized “long term contracts, where suitable; transparent and equitable contract terms; and reasonable lengths of time for informing Non-tenure track faculty of their continued employment” within the human need for safety and security (Hollenshead et al., 2007, p. 12). Maslow’s level of esteem and respect included the human need for “professional development, in the form of time and resources for research and conferences; sabbaticals for long-term non-tenure track faculty; opportunity to develop and teach new courses and to collaborate on serving on committees; adequate, perhaps private, office space; opportunity to participate in departmental and/or institutional level governance; transparent recognition of their valuable contributions to their department; and the possibility to move to the tenure track level” (Hollenshead et al., 2007, p. 13). Self-actualization leads employees to peak levels of fulfillment and creativity; however, this highest level is more often the exception than the rule. Nonetheless, Hollenshead et al. (2007) contends that self-actualization is elevated when universities provide non-tenure track faculty with meaningful partnerships and reward their contributions (p. 13). Maslow’s Theory of Motivation and Hollenshead
et al.’s (2007) research certainly fit my study’s topic, but their comprehensiveness led me to continue my search for my own theoretical niche.

**Expectancy Theory**

The elements of Expectancy Theory seemed a possible fit for my theoretical framework. Expectancy Theory embraces motivation as a “function of ‘individuals’ subjective estimates of the probability of task success (expectancy) and of the consequences of their action” (value) (Vroom, 1964, p. 21). Vroom (1964) applied an expectancy model to research on the workplace (p. 22). Refinement of Vroom’s work led to the avocation that work environments should offer both extrinsic and intrinsic rewards in order to foster greater job satisfaction (Porter & Lawler, 1968). Job satisfaction, or the employee’s belief that the organization has provided needed support for him/her to perform his/her job, is linked to an individual’s positive job performance, which in turn contributes to the organization’s success (Bretz & Judge, 1994). I did not want my theoretical framework to be a narrow or singular approach; therefore, I ruled out expectancy theory and its link to job satisfaction. That said, I thought some strands of Expectancy Theory might be valuable to this study, so I continued to investigate further.

**Cognitive and Non-Cognitive Theories of Motivation**

In their book *Faculty at Work, Motivation, Expectation, Satisfaction*, Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) interviewed 120 faculty members from four college and university types to answer the primary question, “What motivates faculty?” Their work was based on both sociological and psychological theories of motivation (p. 282). Their study used a conceptualization of faculty role performance and achievement through the concept of productivity to answer their primary question. Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) reported
that self-knowledge and social knowledge are the “variables that most strongly predict faculty behavior” (p. 283). Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) defined self-knowledge as “an indicator of one’s understanding of self, of self-reference thought” (p. 16), which was easy to translate in terms of self-efficacy. Meanwhile, the authors defined social knowledge as “how individuals perceive the environment…including how others expect in the environment for them to behave” (pp. 16-17).


Cognitive Theories of Motivation

Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) identified four cognitive theories of motivation: 1) Expectancy Theory (i.e., faculty value work activities and expect that their job performances will lead to ‘desired outcomes); 2) Attribution Theories (i.e., individuals believe success is caused by the environment – and themselves); 3) Efficacy Theories (i.e., extension of attribution theory where only the individual relates to a specific task and its social context (whether resources are available)) and 4); Information Processing Theory (i.e., individuals process information situationally and in different ways) (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995, pp. 22-24).

Cognitive theories of motivations “assume that people make decisions about how to behave by subjectively evaluating the probability of “task success” (expectancy) and the consequences of their action’s “value” (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995, p. 21). In their study, faculty exhibited higher achievement when the “chances of failure or success were
equal” (p. 22). Bandura (1982) adds that expectancy leads to faculty’s self-directed behaviors [motivation] toward self-generated goals. However, Atkinson (1977) maintained that the intrinsic needs of faculty extend to the Environmental Work Environment to include situational needs.

**Noncognitive Theories of Motivation**

Noncognitive theories of motivation (i.e., internal needs and external incentives and rewards) can predict ways in which faculty will behave. Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) named three non-cognitive theories of motivation: 1) Personality and Career Development Theories (ontogenetic needs that guide behaviors at different stages); 2) Reinforcement theories (environmental stimuli causes a responsive behavior); and 3) Dispositional theories (individual needs can increase or decrease the stimuli’s effect on a responsive behavior). In general, administrators who meet faculty’s non-cognitive essentials encourage positive faculty behaviors. Weiner (1985) holds that success is caused by “factors both within in the individual and in the environment.” Weiner (1985) states that “every major cognitive motivational theorist includes the expectancy of goal attainment among the determinants of action” (p. 555). Weiner (1985) argues that individuals believe personal achievements are due to their own individual makeup and the environmental factors that surround their identity. These factors are causal and fluid, and may or may not be controllable.

**Socialization Resources Theory**

I expanded my readings to include another theory that often compliments Expectancy Theory: Socialization Resources Theory. The conceptual basis of Socialization Resources Theory (SRT) is the principle that the organization provides
needed and expected job resources, which include structure (e.g., pay, job security, opportunities, reward systems), interpersonal and social relationships (e.g., colleagues, supervisors, network), work organization (e.g., role clarity, autonomy), and details about the task itself (i.e., task significance, autonomy, performance feedback) (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Wanberg, 2012). This theory stands behind the principle that all new employees need and expect job resources to be provided to them by the organization. In other words, organizations must provide new employees with necessary supports to assimilate them successfully into a new organization and position.

My review found one dissertation in the literature that extended the framework of new socialization to FTNTT faculty who had been employed for three or more years at a 4-year university (Boyd, 2016). Boyd’s (2016) research used semi-structured interviews with FTNTT faculty employed at a large private doctoral university as his primary source of data. Boyd found, relevant to this study, that faculty extended their socialization through adaptations that spanned their employment. My study differed by university type, number of sites, and different university missions. Both university campuses included in my study were teaching intensive and public. Yet, because of the longevity of my study’s participants, I gave consideration to extending the concept of socialization to include employee adaptations over a period of time. The longevity employment range of my participants covered a period of 20 years. I decided the employment range variable for my participants was too large, problematic, and possibly unreliable. I ruled out this theory as a framework because of the new socialization factor.
Expectancy Valence Theory of Motivation

Widely cited in the literature, Vroom’s (1964) model measures motivation both conceptually and mathematically. Vroom (1964) suggested that motivation (an individual’s effort to perform an act) is the function of three measurements and is determined by the need stage (value) an individual places on the reward. The three function measurements are: 1) valence, 2) instrumentality, and 3) expectancy. According to Vroom (1964), valence is the function of desire for the reward. Instrumentality is the conviction that performance of the act will lead to the reward. Expectancy is the belief that, if enough effort is applied toward the performance of the act, one will be able to perform at an acceptable level (Vroom, 1964).

Vroom’s (1964) model, while influential, was not without shortcomings. Vroom’s (1964) model measured only the effects of extrinsic rewards. Galbraith and Cummings (1967) later questioned the predictive power of expectancy, stating “performance will vary directly with the valence of supporting behavior and the perceived instrumentality of performance for the attainment of supportiveness” (p. 10). Later, Vroom’s (1964) model was refined to consider intrinsic rewards (performing an act because of interest or satisfaction). I ruled out Vroom’s (1964) Expectancy Model, as my study did not include a measurement instrument for motivation or self-efficacy.

The Theory of Work Adjustment (TWA)

The Theory of Work Adjustment, which complements expectancy theory, recommends that organizations ensure that the new employee’s “knowledge, skills, abilities, values, personality characteristics, and expression of needs” match organizational attributes; the resulting “fit” will perceivably increase the chances for new
employee adjustment, positive performance, and job satisfaction (Bretz & Judge, 1994, pp. 32-34). I considered this theory to be impractical for my study. My study’s participants had already been through the recruitment and hiring process (although at this time, I was not sure what the recruitment and hiring procedure entailed). Also, because of employment longevity, my participants would have gone through the new employees’ orientation and adjustment period long ago (between six and 26 years prior).

FTNTT faculty work environment(s) and classroom experience(s) vary and are always evolving. Constructs within different colleges, departments, and disciplines make it very difficult to identify salient causes for an individual’s (faculty or student) motivation. Given all the above considerations, I earmarked Blackburn and Lawrence’s (1995) work on Individual Environments and Environmental Environments, and returned to my literature search for a theoretical framework.

**Social Identity Theory**

Social identity theory, long associated with organizational identity and behavior, posits that a person’s self-concept is a combination of *personal* identity, which encompasses personal traits (e.g., abilities, psychological traits, interests, religious affiliation, gender, and age), and *social* identity (salient group classifications), which together form a social identity (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). The theory assumes that one’s perception of status within a particular group can lead to performance and activities consistent with the identity that is traditionally associated with the group. If an organization overtly supports a group’s status as high in prestige, a person will define themselves in terms of the group’s established status (Ashforth & Mael, 1989, p. 21).
Professional Identity Theory

The literature generally acknowledges that professional identity is complex and constantly changing (Kezar & Sam, 2011). Henkel (2000) found that, when questioned, the majority of faculty considered the combination of research and teaching as what mattered most to their sense of identity; in other words, the discipline constituted the main source of faculty identity in academic self-perceptions (Henkel, 2000). Writing on this topic, Beauchamp and Thomas (2009) noted that “a clear definition of identity is not easily reached, but there is a general acknowledgement of its multi-faceted and dynamic nature” (p. 177). Beauchamp and Thomas (2009) added that faculty identity is continually shaped and re-shaped through the interaction with “others in a professional context” (p. 178).

The boundaries once confining FTNTT faculty to the primary role of teaching are expanding. Although FTNTT faculty members primarily serve within the role of instruction, other duties now extend to include non-instructional contributory functions to their departments and disciplines. Some FTNTT faculty members’ job roles are mixed between academics, coordination, and management.

My review included one dissertation that joined the theoretical frameworks of organizational theory and social identity theory, and whose topic was similar to mine. Cunningham (2014) conducted semi-structured interviews with FTNTT faculty members who held teaching intensive positions in a research-intensive institution. Cunningham (2014) used organizational culture and professional identity as frameworks for her study, which are also appropriate for my study. Relevant to my study, Cunningham (2014) in a comprehensive study, found that “the notion of tenure-stream as the only desired path to
being an academic is challenged by these faculty members’ understanding of their identities” (Abstract). Cunningham (2014) used a theoretical framework appropriate for my study; yet, I continued to search for a relatively untapped theoretical framework. However, after reviewing Cunningham (2014) and Social and Professional Identity theories, I added Professional Work Environment to my earlier earmarked themes and returned to the literature.

**Social Exchange Theories**

According to Kezar and Sam (2011), social exchange theory helps researchers to understand the behavior and experience of non-tenure track faculty (p. 20). Scholars often use sociological theory to document the lack of professional standing of NTT faculty in society. Research suggests that parents and taxpayers are demanding high-quality education and full academic experiences for their families and post-secondary undergraduates. Consequently, many in society think undergraduates can only achieve their full potential through contact with traditional, full-time, tenured faculty (Allen, 2013). As a result of this attitude, NTT faculty are, according to social exchange theories, seen as inferior faculty whose performances are a concern to institution stakeholders. Existing literature reports that NTT faculty are less committed to their institutions and have lower job performances (Connelly & Gallagher, 2004; Umbach, 2007). Social exchange theory and economic theory encompass the impact of employee commitment on faculty performances and, more broadly, on the organization. Because of my study’s exploratory nature, I did not want to assume a lack of professional standing of the FTNTT faculty; therefore, I excluded Social Exchange Theory from my consideration as a theoretical framework.
Economics Theory(s)

Kezar and Sam (2011) state that “most economic models are primarily used to understand the behavior and impact of non-tenure-track faculty members” (p. 20). The dominant premise is that the working conditions of NTT faculty will restructure the relationships between worker and organization (Kezar & Sam, 2011, p. 21). In other words, the less support that workers receive from their institutions, the less loyal they become, which in turn diminishes worker productivity. My study’s design did not incorporate a measurement instrument for productivity. FTNTT faculty members are traditionally not required to publish, offer service, or participate in scholarship; therefore, I decided the framework of organization and productivity did not seem the best theoretical fit for my study.

Dual Theory(s)

There is support for a new model that views NTT faculty as either a hybrid (dualistic) and/or managed professional (Levin & Shaker, 2011). This view blends sociological and professional identity theories, placing the NTT faculty’s role as one of a temporary professional instructional role. This provisional instructional role is often less noticeable than the role of administrators, researchers and/or tenured faculty within the hierarchy of the institution (Levin & Shaker, 2011, p. 1479). A diminished role can send negative messages of value to both faculty members and colleagues.

Shaker (2008) completed her award-winning dissertation on the essential features of the experience of being a FTNTT faculty member in an English department. Shaker (2008) conducted semi-structured interviews with FTNTT faculty members who were employed at three different public universities – all in English composition programs. For
her frameworks, Shaker used the dual labor market theory, as well as the discipline of English. Shaker found FTNTT faculty had non-traditional career paths, had heavy workloads and “underdeveloped promotion policies” (p. vii). Relevant to my study, Shaker found that “they [FTNTT faculty] opted to manage difficult components of their professional lives, rather than surrender their faculty positions” (p. vii).

The dual theory model posits a distinct employee hierarchal stratification system. This bifurcated system compares the positive benefits associated with the tenure track (i.e., job security, academic freedom, autonomy, governance), and NTTF’s institutional support deficiencies (i.e., higher workloads, unequal growth and reward opportunities, fewer benefits, lower pay, and professional privileges). Consideration of NTT faculty as a professional, or laborer, creates confusion within theoretical approaches to understanding NTT faculty. Should evaluations measure NTT faculty by the standards of a professional or of labor? The manner of reply appears to depend on considerations made about NTT faculty working conditions, employment opportunities, employment responsibilities, and attributes and characteristics as they relate to either sociological, psychological, economical, or labor relations theories. Dual market theory, dual theory and the discipline frameworks seem germane to my study. Indeed, research supports the wide use of economic models to study the dual nature of FTNTT faculty. However, I chose to continue my theoretical framework search for a theoretical framework less prominent in existing research. I did maintain the essential features and contextual focus of the discipline by focusing my study on similar departments in both universities in which participants were recruited.
Labor as a Framework

The link between academic capitalism and a neoliberal philosophy offers the rationale for treating NTT faculty as contingent laborers, as part of a larger movement to commodify and commercialize education through economic market principles. As Kezar and Sam (2004) stated, “various studies show how higher education has shifted in the last thirty years to operate more like corporations, employing cost-saving measures, using more hierarchical leadership and management, and displacing professional self-regulation with external accountability processes” (p. 27). Kezar and Sam (2011) argue that PTNTT faculty are treated as laborers while FTNTT faculty members are treated more like professionals (p. 38). At the same time, Kezar and Sam (2011) go so far as calling the “concept of academic capitalism to capture the behaviors of NTT faculty, are off the mark” (p. 1463). There is research to suggest that, due to some inconsistencies in the empirical data, economic theories may not be wholly applicable for studying NTT faculty (Connelly & Gallagher, 2004; Kezar & Sam, 2011).

Labor Relations Theory

Labor relations theories use interdisciplinary perspectives, combining economic, sociology, and political viewpoints to better understand and explore the relationships between the employee and the labor market. Labor relation theorists attempt to explain the landscape among labor unions and the administrative/management hierarchies.

Unlike other theories, which are more descriptive of psychological and sociological tendencies, labor relations theory explicitly calls for changes in labor dynamics based upon the prescriptive of how to get people involved, rather than “explaining why people get involved” (Kezar & Sam, 2011, p. 37). The purpose of my
study was not one of social change, only to offer knowledge that administrators could use to improve the departmental work policies and practices of FTNTT faculty.

*Laborers and Union Representation*

There is conflict within the research concerning faculty benefits and campuses with union representation. According to Gappa and Leslie (1993), “a variety of studies” seem to show that NTT faculty members receive better roles, contracts, working conditions, salaries, benefits and experiences on campuses that have labor unions and collective bargaining (p. 50). Similarly, Kezar and Sam (2010) point to studies showing that employment recruiting practices, as well as role definitions, are “more intentional and thoughtful on campuses with collective bargaining” (p. 50). Different studies indicate that collective bargaining provides opportunities for non-tenure track faculty to understand their roles more clearly (p. 57). In contrast, Hoeller (2014) reports there is “virtually no research at all on contingency faculty” (p. 4). Research on the topic of organized labor and the NTT faculty is missing in the literature, and could be used to inform NTT faculty of the positives and negatives of grassroots efforts by labor unions to push for membership and changes in the employment system for all NTT faculty. It is within these contracts that legal ambiguities are beginning to surface. Neither of the campuses on which I interviewed participants had labor union representation(s). Therefore, I did not feel this theory suitable for my theoretical focus.

*The Role of Contracts*

Existing research supports that faculty members’ relationship to their employer may be accurately reflected in their employment arrangement. This arrangement may be a loose oral understanding between employee and employer, or it may be an agreement
memorialized in a written contract. Whatever the method, such employment agreements are legal contracts and, as such, have been viewed through the prism of the law.

It seems a misconception by some stakeholders to presume there is a body of law for the sole purpose of construing employment of college professors or instructors. That is to say, the courts will bring relevant legal principles gathered from a review of labor law review legal issues surrounding NTT faculty. Courts will review every contract based on the contract’s expressed terms and on the imputed principles ascribed to each contract.

Hutchens (2011) suggests that contracts, whether written or oral, must comply with certain legal principles. These principles are venue specific: Each state has its own common law, statues, constitution and public policies. Additionally, all contracts must comply with the federal laws and constitution. Such principles are considered to be part of every contract. Colleges across our country have developed numerous contractual relationships for NTT faculty. The terms are tailored to fit the needs and employment philosophies of each institution. The spectrum of employment ranges from the “at will” employee to the full-tenured employee.

Many colleges believe utilizing contracts that give declared periods of employment with clear paths and methods for retention is the best way to retain and encourage quality faculty. These colleges offer one-year contracts with a clear path for a renewal for one year or multi-year contracts (Trower, 2000). Another approach is the “rolling” contract. Under a rolling contract system, a full-time faculty member is evaluated at the end of year, and, if a satisfactory evaluation is achieved, the contract is extended for another year.
Other colleges may not wish to promote NTT faculty. These colleges typically assign contracts on a year-to-year basis, with the general expectation that they will extended on an ‘as needed’ basis and only for a certain number of times. In this system, colleges generally offer ‘termination at will’ contracts with no promise of renewal. NTT faculty jobs are awarded based on the college’s per-semester needs (Hutchens, 2011).

There are four general types of contracts in terms of longevity. The first is employment *at will* contracts, which are the most common labor contracts. In this contract, employee and employer agree on the terms of the contract and, most importantly, they mutually agree that either party may terminate the contract at will. Contracts, oral or written, that do not mention the length of employment or do not, through practice or expressed additional terms, imply or state the length of employment are “at will” contracts. So, either party may terminate the contract without cause or a due process hearing. Caution must be taken upon termination of *at will* contracts that the cause not be mentioned. If an employer mentions the cause for firing an employee, the employer may trigger the need for hearing or a court proceeding to rebut any defamation of the employee (Bland et al., 2006; Gappa et al., 2007; Hutchens, 2011; University of Colorado, n.d.).

The second type of contract is the *termination at will or defined period* contract. These contracts outline the length of employment, but offer no mention of an extension or additional contract. During the period of employment, the employee may not be released without just cause and a due process hearing may be required. At the conclusion of the contract, the employee is released from further employment. Barring tradition or
additional commitment by the employer, the employee has no recourse to require the employer to sign the employee to another contract.

The third type of contract is the *continuing* contract. In this contract, the employer promises to re-employ the employee for set additional periods. The new periods of employment may have certain conditions to be met by the employee before the employee is rehired for an additional term. Traditionally, *continuing* contracts have a limited number of continuing periods. Employers may not fire employees within the contract period or during the continuing periods without just cause and a due process hearing.

The fourth type of contract is the *permanent employee* contract or *tenure*. This employment is for life (defined within the contract) and is thus the most coveted form of contract. Employees can only be fired for just cause and they may demand a due process hearing (Bland et al., 2006; Gappa et al., 2007; Hutchens, 2011; University of Colorado, n.d.).

Laborer contracts for all faculty members often include language, responsibilities, and compensation that may have been negotiated during the hiring process. Contracts can be customary or unique. Because of the variability in and personal nature of FTNTT faculty contracts, I chose to explore FTNTT faculty contracts through the interview process – and avoid any means that might exploit the contractual nature of the FTNTT faculty member, allow for personal comparisons, or instigate contractual challenges. Contracts are discussed in the semi-structured interviews and made a part of Chapter Four. For the above reasons, I refrained from looking at contracts as a theoretical lens.
After completing the sections of economics, dual labor theory, dual market theory, and contracts, I returned to my earmarked work environments: Individual, Environmental, Professional, and Policies and Practices Work Environments.

Grant and Osanloo (2014) assert, “Theories significantly ground the connections upon which researchers recognize, accept, or reject existing or newfound ideas” (p. 16). Becher and Trowler (2001) did not offer one single theoretical framework and suggested human experiences are “too complex to be amenable to the law like regularities to be discerned among natural phenomena” (p. 181). Consequently, choosing a theoretical framework was one of the most difficult tasks in my dissertation process, requiring a continual reflective process.

I offer here my conviction that Agency Theory, though not the only theoretical framework applicable to my study, is, to the best of my knowledge, the most fitting theoretical framework to support the spirit of my study. Agency Theory and its features apply to the theoretical constructs of my study and offers a theoretical guide for analyzing my data, namely the work experiences of FTNTT faculty as they experienced their departmental work lives (Grant & Osanloo, 2014, p. 16).

**Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework is a system of concepts, assumptions, and beliefs that support and guide the research plan (Grant & Osanloo, 2014, p. 16). The conceptual framework “lays out the key factors, constructs, or variables, and presumes relationships among them (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 440).
Agency Theory, as a framework for my study, offered the opportunity to explore two relatively new concepts associated with Agency Theory in higher education: Agency of Perspective and Agency of Action (Campbell & O'Meara, 2014, p. 56). “No studies have focused specifically on the role of departmental contexts on different expressions of agency [perspective and action]” (Campbell & O’Meara, 2014, p. 7). In general, and for the purpose of this study, an earlier definition of agency – “taking strategic and intentional actions or perspectives toward goals that matter to oneself” – best demonstrates the concept of agency of perspective and agency of action (Campbell & O’Meara, 2014, p. 53).

**Agency of Perspective**

Archer (2009) refers to agency of perspective as viewing one’s goal in grasp, assuming certain conditions are met [i.e., has a good job evaluation, does not make ‘waves’ at work, is always on time, remains collegial with colleagues…]. Agency of perspective includes a conditional element often perceived by the faculty member, based on the organizational contexts and departmental influences (i.e., policies, practices, and professional and cultural environment).

**Agency of Action**

Agency of action includes “any act undertaken in pursuit of a particular goal” [i.e., provides above and beyond service to the department, participates in committees, mentors new faculty, contacts chair for advice “how to”…] (p. 53). Campbell and O’Meara (2014) added that agency is the “human capacity for intentional behavior or the human capacity to perceive life situations in intentional and strategic ways to further one’s goal” (p. 50).
**Action of Avoidance**

Action of Avoidance is a concept term coined by this study. This study refers to a non-assertion of an action, to avoid a measured risk, as an Action of Avoidance (the concept of Action of Avoidance emerged within this study’s analysis). Action of Avoidance represents the intentional, strategic behavior of FTNTT faculty members to avoid actions, based upon their perceptions of job security risks and career trajectories. In other words, FTNTT faculty members who asserted their free-will not to act also exhibited agency via an action – of avoidance. Baetz and Hackett (1986) refer to assertion in their domain of agency, while Campbell and O’Meara (2014) described one element of the agentic process as “the exertion of will toward achievement of one’s goal. However, one tacit understanding is that the Agency of Action includes “taking actions” (p. 52). For transparency purposes, this study uses the term Action of Avoidance to represent the willful, strategic behavior of FTNTT faculty members to avoid actions, based upon a measured security risk to their employment longevity and career trajectories. For the purpose of this study, Action of Avoidance emerged as a variant within the conceptual framework of Agency of Action.

This study looked beyond Agency Theory’s economic origins toward the broader agency research literature that views the evolution of agency as a “complex domain of behavior” (Betz & Hackett, 1987, p. 229). This study explored the relationships between the organizations’ (universities’) operating policies and practices and the FTNTT faculty member’s espoused behavior, actionable behavior, avoidance behaviors and any averse behaviors as guided by the FTNTT faculty’s perception of the job assignment. In
addition, this study considered the assignment risk outcome assessment by FTNTT faculty members’ performance or non-performance on their academic career navigation. In particular, this study used Agency Theory as a framework to interpret the emergence of perceptions, skills, strategies, actions and non-actions that FTNTT faculty members intentionally championed by free-will or exhibited in regard to their academic careers and job security. This study embraced the early research of Betz and Hackett (1987), which branded behavior as an agentic factor that “created rather than simply responded to educational and career opportunities” (p. 300). This study also aligned with Terosky and O’Meara (2011) and Campbell and O’Meara (2014) in their use of the agentic element of intentionality in the behavior toward one’s career trajectory.
By choosing these variables to represent my conceptual framework, I will be in a position to contribute new data surrounding the departmental contexts and FTNTT faculty experiences that serve to support or constrain FTNTT faculty’s sense of agency. In order to focus squarely on Agency of Action or Action of Avoidance, I only included supports and policies that fell within the authoritative control of the university, department administrators, faculty colleagues, or FTNTT faculty themselves.

**Other Research Literature Accessible for Study’s Review**

The research literature regarding NTT faculty has grown significantly over the last two decades. For example, over 29,000 “new scholarly journals” were added to the existing mix of available research between the years 1978 and 1988 (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995, p. 294). Researchers appear to have accepted the reality that the
majority of colleges and universities hiring NTT faculty view their staff’s impact on higher education as a lasting legacy, not a passing trend. However, the literature has not yet comprehensively explored the benefits and positive effects of NTT faculty on higher education (Waltman et al., 2012, p. 413) and on higher education’s effect on NTT faculty.

O’Meara et al. (2008) reported 32 major books on academic faculty between the years 1984 and 2005. This growing strand, which included Finkelstein’s *American Academic Profession* (1984) as an early work, addressed issues such as: accountability, service, work performance, faculty rewards, senior faculty experiences, equity, diversity, and impact on student and faculty socialization (O’Meara et al., 2008 p. 13). These books primarily segregated faculty into a bifurcated system of tenure track faculty and non-tenure track faculty. Although other books have been written on contingent faculty, it was not until 2001 that Baldwin and Chronister (2001) investigated “all dimensions” of the full-time non-tenure track faculty (p. 2). The first book dedicated to discussing equity within the two-tier system was written by Hoeller (2014, p. 14).

A collection of existing journals, authored books, selected studies, and daily and weekly publications are produced and maintained by national, state, and professional organizations. As stakeholders, these organizations (e.g., AAUP, NEA, Carnegie, and AFT) have a continuous interest in current and innovative research literature surrounding non-tenured faculty members. These books and journals are joined by private and public databases to keep up-to-date on emerging FTNTT faculty knowledge and issues.
Databases

Institutional databases serve to gather data about faculty and are often used to address policy issues of local or internal levels including employment, institutional finances, equity, and faculty employment trends/patterns (Chronister & Creswell, 1996, p. 123). These databases act as “clearinghouses” for requested data and reports, and can provide valuable information for policy making, financial budgets, and accreditation practices.

National databases are utilized more than any other database, providing series and longitudinal studies on the national demographics, psychological profiles, and social profiles of faculty, plus changing working conditions. Two prominent references in these databases are The Series, from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and the annual data tape from the National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Systems (IPEDS).

Regional, state, or system-specific databases are designed to disaggregate national databases and assess the impact of regional and local conditions. Regional boards and data exchanges have compiled responses to specific point-in-time questions or policies, and have looked closely at faculty workload and productivity (Chronister & Creswell, 1996, p. 119).

Professional Organizations

National surveys indicate that data is generated and shared by professional organizations (i.e., the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the National Education Associations (NEA), the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), Adjunct Nation, and the New Faculty Majority (NFM), as well as discipline-specific
organizations (e.g., National Council Teachers of English, American Science Academy, etc.). The Chronicle of Higher Education and Inside Higher Education are web friendly to all interested stakeholders. The American Association of Higher Education (ASHE), established in 1969, conducts in-depth probes of contemporary and relevant higher education policies and practices. These reports are openly available and serve as a valuable resource to interested researchers.

Summary

This chapter’s literature review served as the foundation of my study to explore the departmental work lives of full-time non-tenure track faculty. Specifically, the review increased my working knowledge of theories and concepts surrounding FTNTT faculty. By completing this review, I widened my scope of issues surrounding FTNTT existing research, and narrowed my theoretical framework to two appropriate theoretical frameworks for my study. The first, Interpretivism, was determined to be too broad to stand alone as my framework. Through my search for a narrower framework, I confirmed that Agency Theory would be an appropriate supplement.

My probe into Agency Theory resulted in two new conceptual frameworks that have natural extensions for this study: Agency of Perspective and Agency of Action. Emerging later from this study, within the concept of Agency of Action, was the variant Action of Avoidance, as coined by this study to represent an intentional non-action based upon a participants’ calculated risk for job security and career trajectory.
In addition, I adopted four environmental work themes to guide the analysis of my data: Individual Environment, Professional Work Environment, Policies and Practices and Social Cultural Environment.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses the methodology that was used to explore the departmental work lives of full-time non-tenure track faculty and specifically answer the study’s research question: What is the essence of the departmental work lives of FTNTT faculty?

Existing literature lacks a delineation between FTNTT and PTNTT faculty. Although there is limited research comparing these two faculty types, there is even less research that specifically considers the experiences of FTNTT faculty (Feldman & Turnley, 2004; Gappa, 2000). As a result, current researchers call for investigations into FTNTT faculty members’ experiences (Benjamin, 2003; Bettinger & Long, 2004; Bland et al., 2006; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2004; Hoeller, 2014; Kezar, 2013; Kezar & Maxey, 2012). This study seeks to address this gap and disaggregate the NTT category by focusing only on the lived work experiences of FTNTT faculty members. In particular, this study gave a platform to the personal voices of 12 FTNTT faculty members—split across two regional, four-year, and teaching-intensive universities—in order to explore the essence of their personal work experiences within their departments. In terms of goals, this study aimed to:

- offer evidenced-based research that will identify the supports and constraints that FTNTT faculty find significant within their departments and their lived work experiences;
- explore how FTNTT faculty give meaning to their everyday work lives;
- identify ways in which administrators and policymakers can improve their support for FTNTT faculty employed on their campuses; and
- add to the scant body of knowledge surrounding FTNTT faculty.
The remainder of this chapter describes the study’s design and methods, encompassing such issues as the research setting, recruitment methods, ethical issues, data analysis, researcher’s role and trustworthiness.

**Research Design**

A qualitative inquiry and research design is the best method for this study, as it aims to *explore* a problem or issue in which we want to “empower individuals to share their stories” and “hear their voices” (Creswell, 2007, pp. 39-40). McMillan and Schumacher, (2006) further note that qualitative research seeks to *explore and describe* or to *describe and explain*. This study pursued the former approach in order to address the research question: *What is the essence of the departmental work lives of FTNTT faculty?*

In a qualitative design, the researcher must gather “multiple forms of data, such as interviews, observations, and documents” and then build “patterns, categories, and themes” by organizing data into “increasingly abstract units of information” of what the researcher “sees, hears, and understands” (Creswell, 2007, pp. 38-39). While seeking to make sense of voluminous data, qualitative researchers must nonetheless allow participants’ voices to “speak and carry the story through dialogue” (Creswell, 2007, p. 43). Upon this foundation, the present study sought to include all the attributes of good qualitative research: “rigorous data collection and analysis”; the use of a traditional qualitative approach; a “single focus and persuasive account”; a transparent review of the researcher’s personal role and ethical practices; the protection of participants’ anonymity; clearly debriefing participants about the study’s intent; properly storing all collected data,
and maintaining an open and unbiased approach to all collected information and considered interpretations (Creswell, 2007, p. 141-143).

**Phenomenological Approach**

Creswell (2007) describes five traditional models of a qualitative study: narrative, phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography and case study (pp. 120-121). The narrative model is the study of a single individual; ethnography is the study of members of a culture-sharing group or representatives; and case study is the study of a bounded system, process, activity, event, or program of multiple individuals. Creswell’s (2007) description of a grounded theory model – as the study of “multiple individuals that have participated in a central phenomenon”– seemed to fit my study’s intent, which is to assess multiple individuals who had shared in a central phenomenon (Creswell, 2007, p. 120). However, Creswell (2007) extends the grounded theory model to include the “generation of a theory or theories during the research” (p. 42). This study did not seek to generate or build a theory or theories of the emergent experiences of the phenomenon of FTNTT faculty in their departmental work lives. Thus, a phenomenological approach seemed best suited for this study.

The word phenomenon comes from the Greek _phaenesthai_—to flare up, to show itself, to appear (Moustakas, 1994). Thus the motto of phenomenology: “Zu den Sachen”, which means both “to the things themselves” and “let’s get down to what matters!” (van Manen, 1990, p. 184). Beginning with a philosophical approach by Husserl (1859), phenomenology has become an applied research approach for studying the phenomena of human experiences (Kafle, 2011). To this end, a phenomenological study not only
describes, but interprets the phenomenon or meanings of lived experiences through thick, detailed descriptions (Creswell, 2007; Grbich, 2007; Magrini, 2012; van Manen, 1990). True to form, this study aimed to explore, describe, and interpret emergent meanings regarding FTNTT faculty in order to derive the essence of their department work lives (Kafle, 2011).

The western tradition generally identifies and accepts three different approaches to phenomenology: Existential, Transcendental, and Hermeneutic (Kafle, 2011, p. 188). According to Kaiser (2009), “existential phenomenologists all share the view that philosophy should not be conducted from a detached, objective, disinterred, disengaged standpoint” (p. 188). Rather than encourage researchers to set aside their personal experiences, existential phenomenology advocates that reveal and integrate the researcher’s personal experiences in a way that is truthful and accurate (Warthall, 2006). I abstained from this approach because I did not seek to share my personal opinions or judge participants’ experiences as correct or incorrect; rather, my study sought to explore, describe, and interpret the “nature and significance of the experience, in a hitherto unseen way” (van Manen, 1990, p. 39).

Thus, my study relied on the other two phenomenological approaches—Transcendental (Moustakas, 1994) and Hermeneutic (van Manen, 1990). The former, which is based on principles identified by Husserl (1931), calls for researchers to set aside or bracket their experiences as much as possible in order to gain a fresh perspective on the phenomenon being studied (Creswell, 2007; Moustakas, 1994; van Manen, 1990; Warthall, 2006). Moustakas (1994) is credited with translating transcendental phenomenology into a viable qualitative research method that “provides logical,
systematic, and coherent design elements that lead to an essential description of the experience” (Moerer-Urdahl & Creswell, 2004, p. 19). This approach provides both textural descriptions of participants’ experiences and structural descriptions of participants’ contextual settings (Creswell, 2007). Textural statements encompass the significant statements and themes that reflect “how the participant experienced the phenomenon”, while structural descriptions reflect “the context or setting that influenced how the participants experienced the phenomenon” (Creswell, 2007, p. 61). I generated both types of descriptions in order to describe the overall ‘essence’ of the experience—and in this case, ‘essence’ represents my exploration and description of what the FTNTT faculty had experienced, as well as my interpretation of how said experiences influenced FTNTT faculty (Creswell, 2007).

The other approach, hermeneutic phenomenology, involves both describing and “interpreting the ‘texts’ of life” (van Manen, 1990, p. 4). In short, this approach calls for the researcher to not only explore and describe, but also interpret the meaning of the phenomenon under study (Creswell, 2007; van Manen, 1990). In order for this process to be meaningful and insightful, Kleining and Witt (2000) argue, the researcher should be receptive to new data and willing to alter any personal preconceptions or biases that the data does not support. To this end, I approached this work with transparency, an open mind, and a deep reflection of any emergent differences between participants’ perceptions and my own. Any contrasts with my personal rational was respected and treated as part of my own transformational learning and professional growth.

To aid my reflection, I leaned on non-interview documents (i.e., policies, texts, emails, announcements) (Rubin & Rubin, 2012, p. 27). I also considered public and
personal experiences that may have contributed to any pre-conceived assumptions (Moerer-Urdahl & Creswell, 2004). In my review, I considered the human principles that may have played a part in the design and context of said documents or policies. Some of these ancillary documents were referenced by the participants while others were sought out by me personally, but they all served to imbue the responses with greater context and acknowledge the human principles at play.

In order to maintain focus and ensure that research questions were consistent in wording and execution, I created an interview guide. This guide is made a part of my Participant Consent Form (See Appendix A.) During the first four interviews, I referred to the guide often and largely asked questions in a chronological order; this afforded me an early sense of security. By the fifth interview, I developed a familiarity with the format that allowed the interviews to become more conversational and less chronological in order, while still featuring the same questions from earlier interviews. In these later interviews, I refrained from following the guide except to confirm that all questions had been covered.

**Researcher’s Role**

As a FTNTT faculty member for eight years, I am cognizant of the routine practices and terminology of FTNTT faculty. This familiarity with FTNTT faculty concepts and contexts afforded me an awareness of FTNTT faculty issues that emerged during participant interviews. Moreover, my experience with FTNTT faculty lingo helped me capture the central theme or essence of participants’ stories. I did not serve as a participant in this study; my only role was that of researcher.
Internal Review Board Applications and Approval

Institutional review approvals were secured from the following Institutional Review Boards: (a) University of Kentucky’s Institutional Review Board (IRB); (b) University One Institutional Review Board (IRB); and (c) University Two Institutional Review Board (IRB). No research was conducted before all three university IRB approvals had been secured. All the universities’ IRB approvals stipulated that digital data be password-secured and that research materials (digital and hard copy) be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the principal researcher’s office for six years.

Institutional Classifications

For the last 40 years, the Carnegie Classification System has been recognized as the leading framework for providing descriptions and comparisons among existing institutions of higher education. Institutions participate voluntarily in this classification, which permits the “analysis of attributes that are not available in national data” (http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/). In 2010, the framework was revised in accordance with secondary national data to reflect the following parallel classifications: (a) basic; (b) undergraduate and graduate instructional programs; (c) enrollment and undergraduate profiles; (d) size & setting; and (e) elective classification on community engagement. These classifications provide researchers with a variety of perspectives and collectively portray the current academic landscape of American universities and colleges.

A search of the Carnegie Classification’s website identified University One and University Two as similar. Indeed, looking up University One on the Carnegie website produced a list of other universities that included University Two, and vice versa. Both
universities are four-year, regional, coeducational, public institutions of higher education. To lessen the chance of identity disclosure, I combined both universities’ designated specific functions as posted on their web-pages. The specific university functions are: (a) high-quality instruction, scholarship, and service; (b) educating students for success in a global environment; (c) promoting faculty and student engagement in scholarship; (d) promoting diversity of people and ideas; (e) fostering innovation, collaboration, creative thinking; and (f) serving regional communities to improve the quality of life. Both institutions promote the integration of scholarship, teaching and service, and seek to advance knowledge in the respective subject areas (University One and/or University Two’s web page(s)).

Both universities offer general and liberal arts programs, as well as pre-professional and professional training in education and various other fields, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Both universities have distinguished records of educational service to the state in which they are located.

University One and University Two were selected because of their similarities in terms of their missions, student populations, classifications, proximity, and approachability. As an additional assurance of participants’ confidentiality, this study will not disclose the names and locations of the study sites.

**Participant Population**

According to University One and University Two’s respective websites, both have shown slightly positive trends in terms of employing FTNTT faculty. These figures indicate a strong trend for building full-time faculty at both universities.
Among the 359 full-time employees working at University One, 23% are FTNTT, 62% are tenured faculty, and 14% are non-tenured faculty on the tenure track. More than half of the faculty hold doctoral degrees. Only 21% of the teaching staff at University One are part-time, which is far below the national average of 49.4%; this may largely stem from the fact that University One does not allow graduate students to teach classes or perform teaching-related activities. The student to instructional faculty ratio is 18:1. This ratio may indicate University One has “more students split among the same faculty when compared to the national average of 14. This metric might be an indicator that University One’s larger class sizes may be the norm, especially in introductory courses”. The student ratio numbers may be of particular importance to FTNTT faculty members, who traditionally are assigned to teach undergraduate and introductory courses.

University One’s 2015-2016 Human Resource Faculty and Staff Survey does not distinguish between FTNTT and FTTT faculty; however, it does indicate the following departmental breakdown of FT instructional employees:
Table 1. *University One: Full-Time Faculty by College and Department (2013-2015)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College*</th>
<th>Department*</th>
<th>FTTT + FTNTT Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art, Humanities &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology, Social Work</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>Biology, Chemistry</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics, Physics</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: College and Department only reflect those relevant to the present study.

[Disclaimer: The previous section features cited material from the websites of University One. However, those citations have not been listed in full in order to protect confidentiality.]

**University Two**

Compared to University One, University Two’s faculty data was somewhat more problematic to determine. Data posted to the Office of Institutional Research was difficult to locate and outdated. The last posting for the Higher Educational Research Institutional Faculty Survey (HERI) was dated 2011.

Overall, the university has a total of 599 full-time employees, of whom 28% are non-tenured faculty on the tenure track; 56% are tenured faculty and 15% are full-time faculty who are not on the tenure track. The total number of FT employees with a doctorate or other terminal degree was 250 (72%). Eighty-five faculty members (25%) responding to University Two’s HERI listed a Master’s Degree as their highest degree obtained.
Like University One, University Two has the potential to build a strong full-time faculty. Part-time faculty only constitute 36% of University Two’s teaching staff, which is decently below the national average of 49.4%. The student to instructional faculty ratio is 15:1. This ratio, though slightly below University One’s student to instructional faculty ratio of 18:1, is still above the national average of 14.1. In parallel with University One, University Two does not allow graduate students to teach classes or perform teaching-related activities. The student ratio numbers may be of particular importance to FTNTT faculty members, who traditionally are assigned to teach undergraduate and introductory courses.

I requested and obtained data from University Two’s Human Resource Department that made it possible to determine the number of FTNTT faculty members separate from the TTT faculty (unlike in University One’s Table 1, where FTTT faculty and FTNTT Faculty numbers are aggregated).

[Disclaimer: The previous section and following Table 2 features cited material from the website of University Two. However, those citations have not been listed in full in order to protect confidentiality.]
Table 2. *University Two: Non-Tenured Faculty by College and Department* (2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College*</th>
<th>Department*</th>
<th>FTNTT Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art, Humanities &amp;</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Sociology, Social Work</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biology, Chemistry</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: College and Department only reflect those relevant to the present study.*

**Participant Recruitment**

I employed criterion sampling, purposeful sampling, and snowball methods to recruit participants who:

- Have been employed as FTNTT faculty members for a minimum of one year;
- Are employed at one of the two regional universities chosen for this study;
- Are employed within their University’s Department of Humanities, Department of Social Sciences and Behavior, Department of Physical Science, or Department of Natural Science;
- Volunteered to share “their stories”.

According to Creswell (2007), “criterion sampling works well when all individuals studied represent people who have experienced the phenomenon” (p. 128). The original intent of this study was to recruit people who had experienced the phenomenon of being employed as a FTNTT faculty member for a minimum of one year.
There was not a criterion to limit maximum number of years employed, nor to control participants’ age, gender, race, or ethnicity. The criteria were chosen with the intent of finding participants from a variety of career stages, job experiences, department organizations, professional interests and goals, as well as personal interests and intentions.

Indeed, all participants were employed as FTNTT faculty members by their respective universities and met all the original sampling criteria. During the course of the study, I analytically discovered employment longevity was significant to my sample; even though it was not included in my sampling criterion. The study’s participants had employment longevity ranging from 6 to 26 years, with a median value of 9.5 years (see Table 3).

Table 3. Participants’ Higher Education Work Experience in Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andie</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braidy</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brogan</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carey</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peyton</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toby</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wen</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Polkinghorne (2005) contends that “participants for a qualitative study are not selected because they fulfill the representative requirements of statistical inference but because they can provide substantial contributions to filling out the structure and character of the experience under investigation” (p. 139). Following this argument, I completed my study with the recruited participants and paid close attention to their references to any intentional acts, behaviors, perceptions, or influences that may be closely tied to longevity of service. However, I did not strive to achieve statistical equivalency from each department or university, or numerically balance the participants in terms of their departments or gender. My criteria for participant recruitment remained neutral to gender, racial, ethnic, and age.

I focused on whether each participant had experienced the phenomenon of being employed as a FTNTT faculty member at either University One or University Two, as well as on their employment longevity within the Department of Humanities, Department of Social Sciences and Behavior, Department of Physical Science, or Department of Natural Science. I considered the inconsistency of University One’s and University’s Two’s slight variation in labeling their University’s Colleges. I removed the College labels from the below table to address the variances by restricting the labels to identify participants’ departments. I avoided identifying the study participants’ disciplines in order to protect their confidentiality. In sum, there were five recruits from University One and seven recruits from University Two; three participants were male and nine were female. Participants represented the following departments:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Social Sciences &amp; Behavior</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Physical Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andie</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braidy</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peyton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brogan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table reflects the uneven distribution of this study’s participants across departments. This seems to be reflective of the situation at the state and national level, as research finds that university departments hire more FTNTT faculty in Math, English and Literature (Arts and Humanities) than in other disciplines (Gappa, 2000). Furthermore, the number of participants (n = 12) is in line with suggestions from other researchers: For a phenomenological study, Dukes (1984) recommends three to 10 participants; Creswell (1998) recommends five to 25 (p. 64); Morse (1994) recommends at least six participants (p. 225); Moustakas (1990) believes that one to 15 participants should be sufficient (p. 47). Not only would an overly large data set make qualitative analysis “labor intensive…time consuming…and simply impractical”, but there is commonly a saturation point, or “diminishing return to a qualitative sample”, whereby “more data does not
necessarily lead to more information” (Mason, 2010, pp. 1-2). During my thematic analysis, the saturation point appeared during the ninth interview; at that stage, I uncovered no new themes (Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006).

The snowball method proved most effective in recruiting participants who had experienced the phenomenon of FTNTT faculty employment. One of my colleagues had strong faculty ties from both universities, and served as my connection to five participants. A different colleague shared the following message, which resulted in one additional participant: “I have some names that may be interested in participating in your study. I can send an email if you like.” A third colleague assisted my efforts by sending the following emails to potential participants: “Would you be willing to talk to this doctoral candidate? X is a good friend of mine, and I would love to help her help someone out.”

By following up on these referrals, I successfully recruited another four participants. The final two participants, who were referrals, joined the study after I visited them personally.

**Ethical Issues and Confidentiality**

Due to the small number of total participants (n=12), the personal nature of qualitative research, and the risk of impermanent FTNTT faculty employment, I needed to consciously protect participants’ identities. However, as Kaiser (2009) contends, “maintaining respondent confidentiality while presenting rich, detailed accounts of social life presents unique challenges” (p. 1632). Carolyn Ellis’s 1986 book, *Fisher Folk*, offers an illustrative and landmark case in this regard. Ellis did not use participants’ real names,
but community members were nonetheless able to deductively reason and disclose participants’ identities. As the participants’ stories became known, the “relationships in the community were strained” and members of the community felt “betrayed and humiliated” by what Ellis had written (Kaiser, 2009, p. 1632). However, Ellis’ work ultimately helped to “[heighten] researchers’ awareness of how we describe our study participants in our published work and how easy it might be to identify specific people in research reports” (Kaiser, 2009, p. 1632).

In order to protect participants’ confidentiality, I designed my study in accordance with the literature base and prior studies. As the researcher, I personally transcribed all 12 participants’ interviews. In this way, I ensured that the data was not shared and remained in my possession. Furthermore, I disguised or removed any obtained information that might be considered damaging to a participant (Moustakas, 1994). This is in line with Kimmel, Smith, and Klein’s (2011) argument that the social contract (consent to participate) between the researcher and participants warrants “careful evaluation of the circumstances”; only as a last recourse should the researcher disguise or omit any information that might be considered damaging or inductively lead to a breach of confidentiality (pp. 247-248). I continually reviewed the document in search of any possible breach in participants’ confidentiality, and omitted data if it could not be altered without sacrificing the integrity of the study.

All participants were volunteers and signed a Consent to Participate in the Study form (see Appendix A). The study’s consent form states that the name of the institutions will not be revealed, and that all efforts, within the extent of the law, will be made to assure the participants’ confidentiality. Baez (2002) refers to this technique as the
“convention of confidentiality,” which is a means to “protect the privacy of all persons, to build trust and rapport with study participants, to maintain ethical standards and the integrity of the research process, and respondent confidentiality in qualitative research” (p. 42).

Participant Introductions

In order to protect participants’ anonymity, I have refrained from revealing their gender or exact age. However, all participants were Caucasian and ranged in age from ~30 years to 60 plus in years. In the sections below, I briefly describe participants’ basic credentials and backgrounds.

Credentials

The participants’ credentials – represented here by the highest degree(s) earned – demonstrate that the FTNTTF participants are highly educated and qualified for employment in higher education. All participants had completed either a Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, or Bachelor of Social Work degree. Three participants held a (non-terminal) Master’s degree; three others possessed two or more Master’s degrees; another two participants held a Master of Fine Arts degree. One participant possessed a Rank I Specialist degree. Two participants had completed their doctorate degree, and one had completed all coursework for a Ph.D., with a dissertation on the horizon.

Andie

Andie served as an adjunct at another state university before moving to the University. The move was instigated by a former colleague who suggested an opening at the University. Andie sent an application and received a one-year, non-renewable
contract offer. Andie considered this move a career advancement and an opportunity to pursue discipline interests and enrichments. Andie spoke enthusiastically about many jobs performed in several departments within the University. Andie appeared to be high energy. Our interview was interrupted twice by other colleagues soliciting advice with an existing situation, which Andie willingly offered.

**Braidy**

Braidy’s spouse was offered a TTF position at the University. The move, first considered to be a temporary one, turned into positions of longevity for both spouses. Financial considerations and locality issues altered Braidy’s original plans to return to professional school. After a position opened up in the department, Braidy submitted an application and received an offer. Since becoming employed, Braidy has held a variety of responsibilities outside the classroom. Braidy’s daily schedule, like other FTNTT faculty members, includes large demands on both personal and professional time and energy. Braidy has served in several instructional and non-instructional capacities within different departments.

**Brogan**

Brogan was interviewing for another position (TTF) at another university before taking the position as a FTNTT faculty member at the present University. The NTTF position came with a higher salary, better benefits, an opportunity to continue scholarship and a more prestigious location, all of which factored into the final decision to accept University Two’s offer of employment. Later, contractual limitations with University Two forced Brogan to work at a different university for several years until a new FTNTT position opened, at which point Brogan was contacted and offered their current job.
Carey worked in several capacities at the graduate level, and at the present university, before being offered a position as a FTNTT faculty member. Circumstances opened for a tenure line position, but Carey was asked to serve as an adjunct and “placeholder” for a “couple of years.” The University Department is still in transition from TTF buyouts and trying to “think through what sort of TT positions they want and so forth.” At present, this position requires both instructional and managerial/administrative duties. Carey believes the position was offered because of his/her expertise and past work experiences, and because “nobody else wanted the job.” Carey likes the position and expects to continue in the dual role until a final decision is made concerning the position’s status.

Chris received both a B.A. and M.A. degree from University Two. After graduate school, Chris transitioned from a student to a PTNTT faculty member. The PTNTT faculty position evolved into the present position of FTNTT faculty lecturer. Chris has business interests and responsibilities outside the University. However, Chris would like to eventually move into a full-time TTF position. Chris is collaborating with a tenured colleague in a research project instigated by the department.

Gerry was commuting between two part-time adjunct positions at two campuses before being offered a FTNTT faculty position. Gerry has a variety of rich background experiences and has achieved recognition for extended enrichment programs in the field. Through an administrator and faculty network, Gerry heard of a FTNTT opening at the
University. “The idea of teaching five classes did not seem overwhelming. And I didn’t have to travel anymore to the two locations. That was an advantage to me.”

**Murphy**

Murphy held multiple adjunct jobs at multiple campus sites before taking a placeholder position at the University. Murphy received a Master’s degree from University Two. A position opened when one of the TTF members left for an administrative position. Like Carey, Murphy was offered a position as a FTNTT faculty lecturer as a “placeholder”: “I was asked if I would be interested in holding this position until they could hire someone to fill the place.” A failed search extended the position and led to the department hiring Murphy, “even though they had never had a lecturer in the department.” As a result, Murphy has expanded job responsibilities, including summer student retention projects. Murphy considers the summer position to be a coordinator position, rather than an instructional position, due to having more relationship to management than a traditional instructor role.

**Peyton**

Peyton comes from a varied background that includes different employment sectors. Peyton “fell” into the position by chance: While taking academic interest courses by choice, Peyton was approached by the Chair of the Department who said, “We really need some adjuncts badly. Will you consider teaching some classes for us at night?” Peyton agreed, and now serves as not only a FTNTT faculty member, but also as a mentor and student organization advisor “because I was asked (by the students).”
Shelby

Shelby was searching for a teaching position in the school district in which the University is located. Proximity to the job was a priority for Shelby due to their family and spouse’s profession. Shelby had served as an adjunct for a few years at the University when the Associate Chair approached and said they had a full-time position open: “The Associate Chair encouraged me to apply, I did, and that was seven year ago.” Shelby is active in community service and is well established in the field. Shelby is readily available to mentor new faculty and remains active in research. In particular, Shelby collaborates with a tenured colleague in a research project that has spanned the past two years.

Taylor

Taylor came from a successful business background. A life decision offered Taylor an opportunity to return to academic interests, including discipline seminars at some prestigious universities. The focus on academic interests, a long-unfilled goal, had allowed Taylor to become part of a large network of colleagues pursuing similar interests. Like Gerry, Taylor had been commuting between two part-time adjunct positions at two different campuses. Taylor was teaching a total of nine classes each semester. After two years, “a position opened up here at [the present University]. I was asked if I would like to go full-time. I said, ‘Yes.’”

Toby

Toby’s dream job is to teach at the university level. Toby originally worked in a strict administrative environment that included managerial responsibilities. By chance, during a positive collaborative work assignment, Toby connected with a faculty member
at the present University. When a FTNTT member position came open (a one-year contract), the colleague suggested Toby as a “good fit.” Toby submitted an application and an employment offer followed on “very short notice.” Toby did not regret the decision to move to the University. Toby voluntarily serves on several committees and considers committee participation to be an informal part of job performance that contributes positively to the required annual evaluation.

Wen

Wen, like Braidy, moved to the University because of a spouse’s TTF appointment and began working at the University shortly after the spouse became employed. Wen was working in another capacity in another department before being offered a position as a FTNTT faculty member. Wen attributes past work experiences and discipline expertise as the reason for the offer of FTNTT faculty employment. Like Braidy, Wen has held a variety of job responsibilities, including many that have reached beyond the instructional classroom.

Data Sources and Collection

The primary data sources for this study include a set of 12 in-depth interview transcriptions, my reflection journal, my field notes (observations), my ongoing discourses with selected (not all) participants, member checks, and relevant public documents. As the researcher, I was the primary data collector.

Interview Process

To ensure my compliance with interview protocols, I followed McNamara’s (1990) eight principles to prepare for interviews: (1) choose a setting with little
distraction; (2) explain the purpose of the interview; (3) assure participants of the study’s confidentiality measures; (4) explain the interview’s format; (5) inform participants of the interview’s length; (6) offer to share my contact information for later use; (7) ask for any questions before beginning the interview; and (8) ask for permission to record the interview. McNamara’s (2009) eight principles, combined with my interview question guide, helped to encourage participants to fully engage in the discourse. Before beginning the interviews, I read existing research on issues surrounding FTNTT faculty members. These readings increased my comfort level with the topic, ensured my use of proper terminology, informed my interview questions, and augmented my familiarity with potential topics that could have emerged during the interviews.

I conducted one face-to-face, in-depth interview with each FTNTT faculty participant. Each interview lasted approximately one hour. Interviews focused on how the interviewee “understands what they have seen, heard, or experienced” of the FTNTT phenomenon (Owen, 2014, p. 9). All interviews were recorded using both a digital recorder and an iPhone 6. Four interviews were conducted off-campus and eight interviews were conducted in the participants’ campus offices, as per participant preference.

I personally transcribed all interviews, assigned a password-secured number tag to a copy of each participant’s digital recording, and then deleted the recordings from the iPhone 6. The iPhone was primarily used as a back-up recording device in the case of technical problems involving my portable digital recorder. I maintained all digital recording and assigned a password-secured number to each recording. I selected unisex names from the Internet and randomly assigned them to each numerical tag. The assigned
numbers and matching names are stored in a locked cabinet in my office. From the point of assignment, I have only used the assigned pseudonyms to work with and present participant data.

In my quickly written reflection and field notes, I included descriptions of displays that I found indicative of the departmental environment (i.e., pictures, posters, brochures, notes, office hours posted in the hallway, office space, and the interviewees’ office location in relation to other faculty offices). I also included my first impressions of the structural surroundings of each participant’s office area. These unstructured written texts afforded me the freedom to record any abstract ideas or concepts. Later on, I referenced these documents when consolidating written records into concrete interpretations (Watt, 2007, p. 84). For example, I considered first impressions, office surroundings, and unexpected visits from other faculty members to be revealing of participants’ work habits, organizational methods, and collegiality within the department. Collectively, these unstructured and impromptu descriptions were aligned with the structured writing texts to “convey an overall essence of the experience” (Creswell, 2007, p. 60).

Data Analysis

Qualitative data analysis “probes the intentions, motives, meanings, contexts, situations and circumstances of action” (Glesne, 2011, p. 35). In short, this inquiry is designed to facilitate the emergence of knowledge and complexities surrounding FTNTT faculty’s everyday experiences in their departmental work lives.

Personally transcribing the interview narratives verbatim was invaluable during my data analyses. By transcribing each recording, I became more familiar with each
participant’s statements. This familiarity created a vivid mental image of the context surrounding the interview. Forming a schematic recollection of the interview environment aided my recollections of the participants’ body language, tone, mannerisms, and vocal inflections.

After completing the transcriptions, I photocopied a second set and literally cut relevant verbatim statements and tried to derive units of FTNTT faculty experiences from them. I took caution to ensure that all statements were correctly paired with each participant’s number. The pieced interview responses were placed in folders marked “Responses to Interview Question number (1-12).” However, this activity was time-consuming and proved futile, as the folders were too bulky and unmanageable. Therefore, I changed my approach. To complete the data analyses, I worked from hard copies and completed digitally transcribed documents for each participant.

My literature review guided me in extracting common codes, consistent phrases, and expressions among the participants (Kvale, 2007). This study’s claims and findings are deeply rooted in the “analytic strategy” of comparing and contrasting these repeated narratives and consistent concepts, which aims to uncover “commonalities, differences, patterns, and structures” (Seidel & Kelle, 1995, pp. 55-56).

Codes and Categories

Guided by my research question, I searched for repetitions, patterns, similarities, and differences in the interviews. I identified similar terminology and reoccurring phrases and then worked to simplify or reduce the concepts into codes or categories (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996, p. 28). Thirty-one codes emerged from the transcripts:

- Academic Freedom
- Career Development
- Professional Development
- Professional Growth
Table 5. Example of Working Document Data from Transcribed Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Statements</th>
<th>Codes/Categories</th>
<th>Themes/Theoretical Framework(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I want to do my Ph.D., and it’s time, but teaching five classes…it’s not a good time.”</td>
<td>Time – work load</td>
<td>Organizational Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Life Balance</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Life got in the way – We had children. It [not pursuing terminal degree at this time] was a decision we [self and spouse] made.”</td>
<td>Time/family caregiver</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Life Balance (Male)</td>
<td>Expectancy Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I’ve stepped back, I don’t get anything for that.”</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Expectancy Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>Organizational Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 illustrates the reduction process I used to manage the data. First, I typed the interviews into transcripts, which were then used as working documents to identify significant narratives. I derived significant narratives from the emergent patterns of codes and categories. Next, I classified codes and categories according to theories that were
prominent in the literature review, specifically by examining the central theme of a theory and looking for the best fit. Each of the codes was written on an index card to help me search for generalities, relationships, variables, and “theoretical coherence in the data” (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996, p. 47). This exercise helped me make more sense of the data, identify conceptual concepts, and generalize statements, ideas, and non-overlapping abstracts from the 12 interviews.

Admittedly, creating the codes and categories was more difficult than anticipated. I quickly realized that “codes and their segments can be nested or embedded within one another, can overlap and can intersect” (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996, p. 36). However, because “coding schemes that are too detailed can be equally problematic,” Coffey and Atkinson (1996) advise that researchers use of “degrees of generality” in order to avoid losing “important contextual information, as well as segments’ meanings” (p. 38). I made final category decisions based on my answer to the following question: “Where does this concept most likely occur in the existing literature?” Using this method, I narrowed the 31 codes to seven categories.

Simple Frequencies

I used Microsoft Word to calculate the number of times the categories occurred within the study’s working documents. Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) caution that a higher number of conceptual occurrences does not signify a “measure of its potency” (p. 279). However, the frequency count provides a rudimentary measuring tool that can aid in identifying reoccurring patterns and themes (see Table 6).
Table 6. Simple Frequencies of Reoccurring Categories in Raw Data Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clustered Coded Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time, Longevity of Service, Job Security</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department, Policy, Practice, Governance, Power</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality, Culture, Marginalization</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Load, Work Life, Experiences</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation, Employment</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Freedom, Autonomy, Career Development, Evaluations</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectancy, Value, Rewards, Motivation</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 reveals a high individual number of occurrences for the codes time, longevity of service, and job security. The high reoccurrence of these individual categories suggested a possible relationship or anomaly that merited additional analysis. As I continued analyzing the data, I began to record any additional emergent references to this cluster, finding a strong connection between longevity of service and job security.

Further review of the research literature shed light on the identified frequency connection of longevity of service to job security and a shared reciprocal relationship with job satisfaction (Curry, 2003).

There are differences between the way contingent and permanent employees, as well as contingent employees themselves, react to their jobs (Feldman & Doerpinghaus, 1992; Feldman, Doerpinghaus & Turnley, 1995; Feldman & Turnley, 1995; Feldman & Turnley, 2001). This study’s participants exhibited distinctiveness in their intents and strategies to navigate job security and employment longevity, under contract conditions considered less than secure or impermanent. Specifically, this study identified three agentic sub-groups within the 12 faculty participants: 1) FTNTT members who were
satisfied in their positions and chose to intentionally navigate their careers for the purpose of perceived job security; 2) FTNTT faculty members who paralleled the first group in their satisfaction and actions, but expressed a personal desire to alter their present FTNTT faculty status; and 3) FTNTT faculty members who intentionally chose to avoid navigation of their careers for the purpose of job security.

Themes

After I completed my first round of reading the transcribed recordings of the participant interviews, I completed my second readings of the literature review, theoretical framework and interview questions. I made arrangements (e.g., face-to-face, phone, campus mail, and email) with participants to ask for feedback, as well as probe for clarity, sequence, elaboration, and coding accuracy. I used participants’ ongoing feedback (member checks) in order to ensure accurate accounts of their experiences within the narratives and ascertain the validity of the synthesis. I invited participants to ask questions, suggest revisions, and/or clarify any misleading conclusions (Djuraskovic & Arthur, 2010). Maxwell (2013) refers to such ‘member checks’ as respondents’ validations, intended “to lessen the misinterpretation of their self-reported behaviors and views” (p. 126).

Being a FTNTT faculty member myself, I made a particular effort to “bracket my beliefs, values, predispositions and prior assumption in designing, conducting and analyzing this study” (Schwandt, 2007, p. 4). I did not include or interject any of my personal beliefs or experiences into the data analysis and repeatedly reviewed my notes to avoid using any findings that represented any personal partialities that I may have jotted down that represented any personal agreements or disagreements with any participants’
comments. I deliberately tried to present detailed accounts of interviews and conversations with the participants, using details and descriptive language that emphasized participants’ voices rather than my own.

From the themes and codes, I constructed a disciplined synthesis of individual experiences and an inductive, whole-group synthesis of shared common themes. This study’s interpretive accounts reflect the participants’ language, words, tone and voice, which are essential to the study’s quality and trustworthiness. All participants were welcomed to review the finished synthesis for the purpose of code-recoding (Key, 1997).

Finlay (2009) supports the view that any knowledge is “contingent, proportional, emergent, and subject to alternative interpretations” (p. 17). Thus, I sought advice from a trusted colleague, experienced in decoding, when I encountered ambiguities or discrepancies in coding or validating the themes.

**Data Analysis Conclusion**

I sought to narrow the 31 identified codes into consistent themes, mainly by unifying codes that seemed similar or related. I believe the four themes in Table 7 represent, to the best of my knowledge, an accurate and honest account of the FTNTT faculty work environment that emerged during this study.
Table 7. Sorting the Identified Codes with FTNTT Work Environment Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTNTT Themes</th>
<th>Coded Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Practices Work Environment</td>
<td>Department, Discipline, Policy, Practices, Governance, Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Work Environment</td>
<td>Workload, Work Life, Experiences, Flexibility, Professional Development, Professional Growth, Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and Social Work Environment</td>
<td>Collegiality, Marginalization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, to identifying three emergent agentic sub-groups within the 12 faculty participants, this study found that FTNTT faculty considered their job longevity a valuable instrument for measuring job security; the greater their job longevity in career age, the greater their sense of job security.

**Summary**

This chapter described the study’s research design and methods as a qualitative inquiry. Specifically, I used a phenomenological approach to explore, describe and interpret the experiences of 12 FTNTT faculty members, employed at two different University campuses. The chapter discussed the research setting, recruitment methods, ethical issues, data analysis, researcher’s role and trustworthiness.

The following Chapter Four relates the researcher’s findings and, through shared excerpts from interview transcripts, gives voices to the 12 FTNTT faculty participants.
The findings reflect my continued exploration of the departmental work lives of full-time non-tenure track faculty and my efforts to respond to the study’s research question: What is the essence of the departmental work lives of FTNTT faculty?
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

The purpose of this study is to explore *The Departmental Work Lives of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty*. The study sought to descriptively and accurately answer the question: *What is the essence of the departmental work lives of FTNTT faculty?* To this end, Chapter Four provides researcher-selected excerpts of relevant and significant narratives generated by the 12 FTNTT faculty participant interviews. This chapter embeds the participants’ transcribed narratives within the following sections: context of the study; emergent themes FTNTT faculty departmental work environments (i.e., Policy and Practices, Individual, Professional, Cultural and Social), sub-sections on the work environment and the chapter summary.

This chapter creates continuity with Chapter Three by revealing specifics about the participants’ narratives. Participants’ story lines are presented in consideration of the work of Yanow (2007), who argues that the interpretive perspective should include a wide variety of ways in which data can be interpreted—some more story-based, others more policy-based. My study included a combined effort to interpret both policy and practices (logos); pathos (participants’ passion) and ethos (ethics).

Yanow (2007) describes a “narrative analysis” as the interpretive perspective of presenting and analyzing participants’ stories in line with an argument or point of view (p. 412). In other words, participants’ stories are developed and organized more in line with point of view rather than as “stories with a beginning, middle and end” (Yanow, 2007, p. 421). Although my study was not designed to argue a particular point, or endorse a particular social action, it did explore FTNTT faculty from different departmental work viewpoints. I chose the narrative analysis method of presenting participants’ narrative in
line with a viewpoint (in my study’s case, environmental work themes). I based my decision to use the narrative analysis method on my resolve to emphasize both narrative logos (logic to aid policymakers), as well as the narrative pathos (tenor) of the participants’ story lines. It is my intent that this narrative organization gives continuity throughout the dissertation and sets the stage for the detailed discussion and analysis of participants’ narratives in Chapter Five.

Before placing the participants’ accounts within a particular environmental work theme, I read the transcripts several times. This was necessary due to the conversational nature of the interviews, which may have allowed participants’ accounts to overlap with multiple work themes and concepts. I determined placements by focusing on the absolute best fit, but nonetheless ensured that all participants’ voices be heard.

The interviews represented eight university departments: half at University One and half at University Two. More specifically, five interviews were conducted within University One’s Department of Humanities, Department of Social Sciences and Behavior, Departments of Physical Sciences and/or Departments of Natural Sciences. Seven interviews were conducted within University Two’s corresponding departments. A total of eight interviews were completed in campus offices; four interviews were completed off-campus.

**Context of the Study**

People make meaning and form their sense of reality based on their experiences and social contexts (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Blumer, 1969; Kezar, 2013). In order to glean insights from these findings, it is helpful to establish the immediate context in
which this study’s data were collected. During the four weeks of this study’s data collection, speculative rumors were beginning to circulate on both university campuses that warned of potential and substantial cuts in the state’s budgeted appropriations for higher education. At the time of data collection, the state legislature, which regulates both universities, had just began to communicate the state’s impending budget cuts for higher education.

Several weeks after I had gathered this study’s data, the President of University One implemented a five-day unpaid furlough for all faculty. The mandated furlough involved five of this study’s participants. The reason for the furlough was tied to the impending budget cuts from the state’s funding for higher education. University One’s Office of Institutional Research shows that approximately 31% of the university’s operating revenue came from state appropriations (University’s One’s Office of Institutional Research, 2014-2015). Specifically, the President of University One stated:

As you know, the university is facing a significant budget challenge – both in the current fiscal year and in planning for the 2016-2017 fiscal – due to the declining enrollment and to the proposed cuts to higher education that were included in the governor’s 2016-1018 budget. To address this cut, I plan to impose a five day unpaid furlough for all unrestricted employees – including faculty and staff (University One’s President, 2016).

Although this mandate affected some of the study’s participants, I did not collect additional data after this e-mail.

A similar situation occurred for University Two, which derives approximately 29% of its operating revenue from state appropriations (University Two’s Office of
Institutional Research, 2015-2016). The President of University Two sent the e-mail below to all university faculty, including seven of this study’s FTNTT faculty participants. Like before, the email was sent after I had completed the seven participant interviews and thus I did not seek additional data; however, I have included the e-mail to highlight the financial climate that may or may not have been subliminal to participants and their state of mind.

The state’s House and Senate have each presented versions of the state budget and as one lawmaker described the variances, “The gulf between the two sides can be measured in miles. Higher education is caught in the ebb and flow of this legislative tide and the result is tremendous uncertainty for all public institutions (University Two’s President, 2016).

It is unknown what impact, if any, the e-mail would have had on participants’ responses if they had known about it at the time of the interviews. Similarly, it is difficult to ascertain what effect, if any, the uncertain nature of the budget had on participants’ responses. Financial budgetary constraints are not new to higher education. Moreover, FTNTT faculty are routinely hired under a contingency umbrella, which allows, but does not guarantee, contract renewal for a short period of time (usually one to three years). Consequently, the uncertainty of continued employment is not a new perception for those employed in a FTNTT faculty position. Thus, it is difficult to know for certain whether participants considered their employment security to be a routine level of risk or a heightened concern.

Four of the twelve participants – each from University Two, representing different departments – specifically expressed cognizance of potential impending financial
constraints and possible employment releases. Toby was concise and resolute about potential budget deficits and the threat to employment: “It scares me. I’m always on edge, fearful, one year that they will just come in and say, you are gone.” Later in the interview, Toby expressed:

Well I feel very lucky to be in this department and in this job, the one thing that always is the not knowing year to year. Will I get to come back next year? Will my position be cut because of a budget cut? That instability. They can get rid of you very easily if they wanted to. The Chair always says, we think you are doing great and we want to keep you here as long as we can, but that doesn’t mean that one day the budget cuts will…it is the year to year instability that bothers me.

Gerry offered a more detailed perspective of university financial budget cuts:

It’s [budget cuts] a downer. I guess, because I go back to the movies, we try to see [the movies] with the Academy Award nominees. We saw Bridge of Spies with Tom Hanks. Wonderful movie. It based on a true story based on the exchange of a communist spy and an American fighter pilot. This communist spy knows that they want to put in the death penalty, and the public out roar is terrible. And Tom Hanks, says, “You don’t seem worried about all this” and the spy says, “Will it do any good?” And he keeps repeating that, “Will it do any good?” “Will it do any good?” So, acting out of fear is not going to do any good. Getting discouraged and focusing on it is not going to do any good until you actually hear the news. But it is discouraging when you know we have to make budget cuts and the first thing we hear is we are going into the classrooms and cut the teachers. Then we have an uproar, and then they don’t follow through. I think if they came to the
department and say, okay, we need to make some budget cuts, I don’t think the departments would cut personnel, I think they would be looking okay, we all are going to have to take a cut in professional development money. Or, if a person leaves, then we [the administration] says we are not going to replace this person now. We will hire that position back later. Trying to find other ways, rather than the top just saying we are going to cut faculty. School districts do that all the time, when there is going to be a budget cut. They go to the firing line of the teachers – which should be the one place where they should not go. Find other ways to save money, and try to work together until the hump comes back I feel like our department treats us as the heart, all the divisions have to cut 1% out of their budget, I think we could figure out a way to do it, without getting rid of faculty.

Shelby similarly offered:

I always hope the funding is continued, but there is that thought in the back of your mind that says, if they get rid of the FTNTT faculty (lecturers) what will we do? So, I’m kind of in between, when we were discussing another university that is considering cuts and furlough days. So, basically, we [spouse and I] had the discussion about having a backup plan in case they said one day your position is gone.

To the best of my knowledge, none of the participants were involuntarily dismissed from employment at any time throughout the course of this study. In any case, it is beyond the scope of this study to determine the influence, if any, that each university’s financial climate had upon this study’s FTNTT faculties’ interview responses and ultimately the outcome of this study’s findings. Clearly, at least in a few cases, some
participants had explicit thoughts prior to receiving university emails, evidenced by their contributed comments about this topic which implied at least some type of emotional impact. Nonetheless, this study’s interview data does not validate causation or degree of impact, other than the emotional and financial terrors of a mandated furlough (after data collection), and the expected fears associated with possible unemployment.

**Emergent Themes FTNTT Faculty Work Environments**

Analytical notes were used to manage the scope of data collected, as well as to classify themes and identify patterns (Glesne, 2011, p. 76). This study organized data into four (4) key department environmental FTNTT faculty work themes that emerged from the participants’ own words:

- Policy and Practices Work Environment
- Individual Work Environment
- Professional Work Environment
- Cultural and Social Work Environment

As mentioned in Chapter Three, one could argue that the 12 transcripts could be narrowed into a different set of themes based on alternative interpretations. However, these four themes represent, to the best of my knowledge, an accurate and honest account of this study’s findings.

According to Blackburn and Lawrence (1995), studies of faculty work performances have a tendency to lean toward “properties of either the individual or the environment” (p. 15). However, the authors simultaneously indicate an interplay between individual and environment properties, with the latter serving as “features of a situation –
such as intellectual resources, institutional norms, or physical plant – that can constrain or enhance role performance” (p. 15). In line with this logic, this study included faculty behaviors as an element of role performance; in doing so, I sought to consider both individual and environmental factors in unison.

The conversational nature of the interviews often resulted in associations between topics, categories, connecting themes and sub-categories. To denote category connections, I have presented some selected categories in clusters, which represent categories with unifying characteristics. In addition, I compared possible links to the essential core of the themes. In other words, I looked at the categories and asked myself the question, “Where is the best thematic fit? (Glesne, 2011, p. 187). For example, Table 8 includes the sub-sections that I identified for the theme Policies and Practices in the FTNTT faculty work environment. Although the subsections are listed in a linear display, they should not be considered in isolation, but rather as interconnecting:

- Departments
- Disciplines
- Governance
- Productivity
- Employment
- Reaction
- Power

By clustering those sub-sections, the theme “Policies and Practices” represents the shared experiences of FTNTT faculty members in regard to the work setting’s procedural characteristics, which individual faculty have little control over.
Policies and Practices Work Environment

For the purpose of this study, supportive policies are defined as formal structures that have been created to establish more favorable employment conditions or alter existing ones (Kezar, 2013, p. 6). This study considers supportive practices as behaviors, often informal, that reflect both supportive mindsets and norms, and applies them in concrete forms (e.g., treatment at meetings) (Kezar & Sam, 2013, p. 61).

Departmental barriers or constraints – whether those be structured policy, informal policy, inconsistent application of policy, or practice – may hinder or prevent faculty members from reaching their maximum job performances. Only a few participants identified any barriers or constraints that interfered with their job performance or academic interests. These included a lack of time due to heavy class workloads, banned participation in decision-making committees, scheduling conflicts with in-house professional growth workshops, and a lack of promotional opportunities.

Specifically, participants were asked, “Have you experienced any department barriers or challenges that prevent you from engaging in work activities?” Braidy offered:

BRAIDY

I don’t have enough time. Especially last fall, I think it was mainly last semester. I was teaching and prepping… I have a different type of schedule. So, if I wanted to do research, there is no way.
Compared to Braidy, Shelby assigned a more personal meaning to the term *barrier*:

**SHELBY**

I don’t think there has been any barriers. The only thing I can think of, but I don’t consider it as a barrier, is I think sometimes, because of our position, our voice is not as important in the decision making. Sometimes, lecturers are left out when it comes to some sort of things, sometimes we don’t even know if we are eligible to vote on something or not. Although, it was interesting when they recently did a faculty senate thing, they included lecturers, I wasn’t sure about that at first, then they sent an e-mail and we were. Obviously, that wasn’t just departmental, it was university-wide. But, most of the time, when they ask you to do things, it has to be a tenure track person.

Brogan replied, “No, I have not. There is nothing that the University or department has placed in front of me that does not allow me to do the things I need to do.” Toby agreed:

**TOBY**

I don’t feel like there has been any barriers to prevent me from doing what I want to do. Which is nice. I feel like this department (physical science) is pretty open in letting lecturers take on some work – take at it – the only things that I feel like as a lecturer that I get left out of are certain committees require you to be a TTF but these honestly, don’t have much to do with me, and I don’t care much about them anyway.

Participants’ responses to the concept of barriers or constraints for FTNTT faculty were surprising, considering the volume of NTT literature that is centered on this topic. This is
perhaps the first indication of a later sentiment, when participants described themselves as closer to TT faculty than PTNTT faculty.

Administrators are often unaware of policy constraints and their unintended impact on FTNTT faculty’s job performances. Policy constraints, even inadvertent ones, can hinder FTNTT faculty from making full contributions to their discipline, department, colleagues and student learning environment.

Policies have an enormous influence on the structural design and everyday management of university departments. Practices may or may not support policies and are closely associated with the culture of an organization (Kezar and Sam, 2013). Nevertheless, “different groups make sense of policy in different ways” (Mills, 2007, p. 185). For instance, seven of the 12 participants, representative of both universities, verbalized a vague understanding of formal policies, yet expressed more familiarity with departmental practices. For example, Shelby was “not sure of the policy that defined how many office hours we [FTNTT faculty] are required to maintain.” Shelby and colleagues agreed that three to five hours per week was the policy. In a later interview, Chris, from the same university, confirmed the practice of three to five hours as required office hours – but was unaware of the policy that stipulated the hours. Instead, other FTNTT faculty members had told Chris that three to five hours was the customary number of hours to distribute to students, place on syllabi, and use as posted office hours for other university documents or business. Regardless of the lack of a written source, the practice was to accept three to five hours as an office hour requirement.

My efforts to locate written departmental documents or policies to indicate FTNTT faculty required five office hours each week --or any stipulated number of office
hours for FTNTT faculty were unsuccessful. Neither the reviewed employee contract or faculty handbook stipulated the number of required office hours for FTNTT faculty members. Three to five hours appeared to be an arbitrary number agreed upon by faculty. Faculty from University Two indicated the five-hour practice was acceptable since other faculty members had listed five hours as the number of office hours served, and their faculty evaluations had been positive. The practice of three to five office hours per week for FTNTT faculty was acceptable based on the premise that other FTNTT faculty members’ had not experienced any type of challenge to the customary practice. The unwritten policy, yet customary practice, may have created FTNTT faculty members a pseudo-sense of security in regard to policy compliance. Policies that are not written can provide chairs the flexibility to change practices or policy interpretations at their discretion. These same unwritten policies can produce inconsistent implementations via practices that other colleagues may find inequitable, or unfairly implemented (Kezar, 2013, p. 29). For example, if an administrator tested the three to five hour office policy or practice, the FTNTT faculty member could view the inconsistency as discriminating as well as grounds for an informal or formal (legal) challenge.

Another important policy element is the concept of institutionalization, which Kezar and Sam (2013) claim to be uncommon in higher education. Institutionalization is defined as a type of change that is sustainable and embedded into the fabric of the institution (Kezar and Sam, 2013). This study corroborates Kezar and Sam’s (2013) claim that FTNTT faculty employment policies are not institutionalized, are subject to selected interpretations by both faculty and department chairs, and may be overridden by departmental practices. For instance, Carey, Shelby and Wen described experiences that
equated to departmental practices superseding what FTNTT faculty members thought were institutionalized policies. To illustrate: Carey was moved from a FTNTT faculty position to a staff position as a result of student enrollments and scheduling; although the position was still full-time, the reassignment came with additional responsibilities and no extra compensation.

**CAREY**

Eventually, I can’t remember how long ago this was, they needed me to go back to full-time because they did not have enough instructors and there were hiring freezes. Before, the administration had said the policy was if they kept you more than five years, they had to let you go through a tenure-process. I feel like I am really lucky to have this job because there was that five-year limit that just disappeared.

In a stricter environment, Carey would have been terminated according to the five-year tenure policy; however, Carey was grateful for the department chair’s flexibility in bypassing the process. Carey was unsure of the policy’s origin, and indeed, a review of University One’s website did not clarify the policy in question. The policy did state that instructors would be eligible for rehire if there was clear evidence of a need and they underwent a performance evaluation similar to tenured and tenure-track faculty. It is possible the ‘evaluation similar to tenured and tenure-track faculty’ and ‘tenure process’ accounted for the policy misunderstanding, or the policy only applied to a specific department. Nevertheless, for the purposes of this study, the policy’s origin remains unclear.
Shelby offered another example about the lack of policy institutionalization when referring to the teaching load: “Technically, the policy is to not teach more than one class, but I willingly did it.” In another instance, Shelby highlighted the confusion regarding FTNTT faculty’s participation in governance:

**SHELBY**

Sometimes we don’t even know if we are eligible to vote on something or not. Although, it was interesting when they recently did a faculty senate thing, they included lecturers, I wasn’t sure about that at first, then they sent an e-mail and we were. Obviously, that wasn’t just departmental, it was university-wide. But, most of the time, when they ask you to do things, it has to be a tenure track person.

Amidst Shelby’s confusion, University Two’s Policy and Regulation Library 4.6.10P does indeed have an established stance on this issue. The policy stipulates that all faculty, including lecturers and senior lecturers, are considered eligible to vote in faculty regency elections.

Wen faced a similar situation and found that the practice changed with a new department chair: “When I was hired on, we didn’t vote, and that was sort of understood. And as the department chair changed, we were treated more equally.”

In a similar vein as Foucault, who identified the micro-politics of everyday life that play out in social institutions, Peyton shared an example of what he considered a normal practice and policy transformed into politics (Bess & Dee, 2012, p. 573). A senior mentor in the department, Peyton pragmatically acknowledged that politics are instrumental in determining FTNTT faculty’s participation in leadership roles:
PEYTON

From a political standpoint it would not be good to have a fixed term instructor at the head of a committee that established policies and procedures for all general [discipline] courses. That [leadership] is always required to be a TT position, and a specific TT position within the department. That means there is no chance for any FTNTT faculty instructor in the department to take a leadership role. It’s always been that way.

In other words, Peyton accepted the policy – and related practice – as one that would not change. “From reviewing the university’s website, the policy seems to stipulate that instructors “may provide service on departmental committees”, but there is no indication that leadership requirements are restricted to a TT faculty member. I could not locate or obtain a written policy at the departmental level. Peyton did not expect the practice would ever change, and therefore, channeled energies into the classroom and served as an advisor to campus organizations – because he had been asked by the students’ to serve.

Departments and Disciplines

The existing literature claims strong interconnections between the departments and disciplines, faculty roles, work-life balance, faculty agency, faculty satisfaction, collegiality and departmental cultures (Campbell & O'Meara, 2014, pp. 49-51). In this study, FTNTT faculty participants mentioned such departmental supports as collegiality, funding for conferences, opportunity, and professional growth opportunities. The faculty members’ relationship with their chair also served as a form of support or non-support, based on whether or not they had a positive working relationship with the chair. The
majority of FTNTT faculty members described a very congenial, professional working relationship with their department chairs. If there was a dispute mentioned, the FTNTT faculty participants remained professional in their descriptions of the chair, usually citing the pressures the chair was under from the administration, or the chair’s positive bent toward scheduling flexibility.

**Discipline**

“The discipline is an essential identity to the professional lives of faculty members and is integral to the goal priorities and valued reward structures of all faculty” (Lee, 2004, p. 607). The disciplines of Mathematics, English and Literature regularly hire FTNTT faculty to teach core academic subjects (Gappa, 2000). This study interviewed six participants employed in the discipline of English and Literature, and three participants in the discipline of Mathematics.

Andie’s devotion to the discipline is evident from the extracurricular student enrollment program Andie developed and sustained for years. The program was designed to recruit students to a particular field of Humanities. Andie solicited and wrote external grants to sustain the program: “I am one of the largest grants in my college, not just our department, and they don’t give me any credit for that.” Andie highlighted the lack of department and institutional support for successfully implementing and retaining the program. Due to this lack of support, Andie no longer maintains the student event. Nonetheless, Andie initiated another cross-curricular studio program that provided students the opportunity for hands-on-experiences and job development opportunities. “The program had scheduling conflicts which was a bother for them [administration]”. Andie discontinued the second program for the same reason – a lack of sustainability
without department and institution supports. Andie explained how the lack of support affected his/her personal behavior:

I’ve stepped back. I use to be very active and have had journal publications, book chapters, and did a lot of conference presentations at state and national levels. But, this last year, I kind of said, you know what, I don’t get anything for that, and I’m not going to be applying for a tenure track job, so I am not going to put my time there.

Andie’s Agency of Perspective (agentic perspective) included the lack of recognition, reward, or “anything” for participation in conferences presentations and journal publications. As a result, Andie exercised Action in Avoidance by not pursuing these academic endeavors. This experience prompted Andie to expend job energy and interests in channels other than writing and presentations. The most valuable job Andie considers now is being a practitioner in the field and helping students become practitioners in the field, rather than student recruitment. Andie now devotes more time to the discipline and classroom instruction. Andie’s change in behavior, as a reaction to feeling a lack of support from the chair, aligns with Tien and Blackburn’s (1996) finding that faculty react and respond to what they perceive and believe an organization honors or values, as well as the agentic process (Agency of Perspective, Agency of Action and Action of Avoidance). It is unknown whether Andie perceived the increased instructional time would affect career trajectory or job security.

Andie expressed that the lack of support or credit stemmed, in their mind, from his/her discipline. Andie made reference to the belief that the department chair was not particularly fond of Andie’s discipline, and attributed the lack of recognition to the
administrator’s deep-rooted dislike for the discipline. Andie ruled out the possibility of a personality clash, and thus reasoned that the non-support derived from the chair’s dislike for the discipline, not a personality difference between the two.

Wen, like Andie, shared a similar experience regarding a chair’s attitude toward the discipline. Wen spoke highly of the department’s administrators, but told of a meeting with a past administrator from the institution: “We had a meeting with an administrator. The administrator came in and said, ‘well, you know, I don’t like [discipline] anyway.’” Like Andie, Wen attributed the administration’s professed dislike for the discipline as the chair’s motivation for decisions considered negative by the department. Wen reasoned that the administrator’s dislike for the discipline also explained the disregard for faculty feedback. “You know you don’t have voice when… [The administration dislikes the discipline].

Carey, Murphy, and Shelby considered their disciplines a positive, particularly for employment retention. Carey stated, “I think if they wanted to let me go, they could have let me go if they did not need me. Fortunately, they always needed me -- it may be the [discipline]. The [discipline] has helped keep me.” Like Carey, Shelby expressed the feeling that his/her discipline and experience was helpful with job retention: “There were only a couple of us who had experience teaching the course, and the two of us currently teaching the course are both lecturers. TTF has not taught it yet.” Shelby’s reasoning was grounded in the conviction FTNTT faculty members had become “experts” in this particular discipline and were thus a valuable resource to the department.
The discipline’s importance was revisited when Shelby was asked, “How do you think your department would describe your most important role you serve as a FTNTT faculty member, and do you feel the same way?”

SHELBY

Well, I’m trying to think, I would probably look at that from the niche of what classes I teach, sort of and so I think the fact I teach at different levels makes it valuable. Not everybody has the schedule available to teach those courses. The fact that I have worked in secondary education kind of helps with that a little bit. Currently I am one of the few that teaches a pilot class, it is kind of a specialized area, so of now, that I have completed professional training, and things so I can teach that. I think of as more specifically of those courses I teach, as beneficial to our department. I think that otherwise, it helps to have full-time faculty teaching freshman courses, I think that is well understood in our department and more so now, across campus, since the Provost is talking about the correlation between these courses and retention and graduation rates.

Ultimately, the discipline served to provide both positive and negative experiences for the participants. In any case, these experiences spoke to a shared connection between the professional lives of their disciplines and their sense of identity (Cunningham, 2014; Henkel, 2000; Lee, 2004).

**Governance and Departmental Committees**

Governance focuses on the political perspective of university decision-making—in this case, FTNTT faculty members’ participation in governance. “The structures of faculty governance, however, as well as AAUP policies on the subject, tends to assume a
faculty that is primarily full time and on the tenure track” (AAUP, 2013, p. 1). Not surprisingly, research indicates NTT faculty are more likely to be excluded from university governance than FTTT faculty. However, results are mixed. The 2013 AAUP reports that “a majority of institutions surveyed (n = 125) indicated 62.4% has policies to ensure academic freedom and shared governance rights for NTTF” (p. 2). The 2013 AAUP recognizes this finding was “unclear” and did not specify inclusion or enforcement policies (p. 2). Politically, inclusion/exclusion governance policies can create conflicts and potentially encourage competing power structures between TT faculty and NTT faculty. Decision-making processes are complex, and often viewed personally. FTNTT faculty members may feel more knowledgeable of issues surrounding FTNTT faculty employment, and vice versa for TT faculty members. Exclusions and inclusions on decision-making bodies can act as a two-edge sword. Exclusions from decision-making bodies may serve to create or widen the gaps within a hierarchical faculty system, while promoting a departmental culture of marginalization and/or competition. On the other hand, full inclusion of FTNTT faculty members in decision-making may promote collegiality and an affirmative culture for FTNTT faculty members. However, this same inclusion may be viewed less favorably by TT faculty who embrace the exclusion of the FTNTT member’s participation in decision-making bodies.

The study participants described wide-ranging and ambiguous governance experiences. Nevertheless, eight participants shared governance experiences primarily through two perspectives: decision making and/or voting privileges. To illustrate, most participants noted that participation in departmental committee decisions and governance voting privileges served as an outlet for their “voice”: 
TOBY

I think it’s the fact that I get to play such a large role in the committees, when we have conversations trying to make things better, I feel like they want to hear what I have to say.

Carey had mixed experiences when participating in decision-making committees:

CAREY

I use to [serve on committees] several years ago, before the new VP, I served on a couple of hiring committees, what disturbed me was that I was asked to be on the committee. Then, when it came time to vote, I was not allowed to vote because I was not tenured, or on a tenure track faculty line. And they said the policy is that only tenured or tenure track can vote. I don’t know if it was a university policy or departmental policy, but what is weird about that is years, ago, my first department chair let me vote. Or maybe he was just being nice and let me vote and didn’t count it. He would let me vote on anything. I asked him why he [the administrator] put me on this hiring committee if I wasn’t allowed to vote, and he said, this way I could get input. I told him, yeah, but I would have like to vote to have input.

The inconsistency in voting policy and practice sent mixed messages to Carey and other faculty members, seeming to promote inclusion while simultaneously forcing exclusion by denying the right to vote. By contrast, Braidy (University One) and Brogan, (University Two) had very different voting experiences compared to the other FTNTT faculty interviewed. Braidy serves in an official management role for selected
departmental matters, and was thus very knowledgeable of voting privileges and procedures for FTNTT faculty.

**BRAIDY**

We meet every other week, it’s a democratic sort of thing. They [chair and dean] make a lot of personnel decisions. We are given options, then we vote. We voted yesterday on an open position. I presented two options, and that’s what we are doing – equal vote.

When asked if there was a time Braidy remembered not being able to vote, Braidy offered, “no”. “As long as they are faculty, *not adjuncts*, no differentiation.” In other words, all FTNTT faculty, but not PTNTT faculty (adjuncts), were allowed to vote.

Brogan, appointed to a prestigious governance committee, talked about how political firestorms can be avoided by “kind of bowing to the TT person to allow them to disseminate more of the information. I was there more for supporting my colleagues.”

Brogan’s explanation for “kind of bowing to the TT person” is an example of Action of Avoidance. Brogan deliberately avoided the dissemination of committee information to circumvent any potential conflicts with TT faculty members, who may consider themselves as spokesperson, by virtue of their faculty status. Brogan’s service on the governance committee could be considered as Agency of Action, since his/her service was not required by contract, and Brogan considered the service as a measurement for positive job performance.

Since Brogan’s service to the Faculty Senate, the policy allowing FTNTT faculty to serve on the Faculty Senate has been rewritten to exclude FTNTT faculty. “I think it is a mistake.” Brogan added, suggesting instead that lecturers be given more say in these
decisions. Brogan expressed his frustration by saying, “I know they [lecturers] can visit, but there should be more recognition than just allowing them to sit in the meetings.”

Peyton, from the same university as Braidy, described what he/she considered to be a routine faculty meeting:

PEYTON

It is pretty easy to see that TT faculty and fixed term faculty and where they are because fixed term instructors will sit and listen and never say anything. TT faculty run the meeting and dominate the conversation to almost compete exclusivity...There is representation, about 40% of the committee are instructors, but you are always TT faculty top heavy and they are always in leadership. When asked if a decision defaults to TT faculty, Peyton replied: “Always, that’s stipulated in the department literature.” The departmental policies were not available to determine if the default was by policy or practice.

Brogan and Toby, both from the same department and university, considered the opportunity to participate in governance a departmental support, but also looked at their right to participate as the department recognizing the value of their position and performance. Brogan interpreted one’s participation in decision-making as a form of leadership, and further suggested that governance participation be considered in faculty evaluations: “Even though you are not evaluated on that [participating in governance] – formally anyway– that is something the university should probably think about.”

Toby, expressed participation in committee meetings gave FTNTT faculty a voice, and was a testament to the value of job performance. As Toby said: “I feel like the
people in the committee think I have something good to say, and I am doing a good job in
the classroom”.

Toby raised another issue associated with the inclusion/exclusion of NTT faculty
in governance activities. Do FTNTT faculty want to be included or excluded from
committee or governance participation? Toby placed a high value on commitment to
committee work and considered the opportunity to participate in decision-making
committees as a value. However, the constraint of not participating in governance, or
other meetings that were not germane to the FTNTT faculty position, was not upsetting.
Toby viewed this constraint as an opportunity to avoid attending meetings in which
he/she had no stake.

TOBY

I feel like as a lecturer that I get left out of are certain committees require you to
be a TTF but these honestly, don’t have much to do with me, and I don’t care
much about them anyway. So if I don’t want to be there for the graduate
curriculum meeting; [implied he/she did not have to attend] well, I have to do a
lot of committee work. The first years do a lot of committee work and a lot of
stuff you don’t get paid for. Every once in a while, you can do something that
might give you a reduced load, but, I’m on a ton of committees. I work lots of
breaks.

Committee work for FTNTT faculty usually came without monetary
compensation and reduced course loads were rare. Most study participants contributed to
committees, but did so for different reasons. All but one of the FTNTT faculty members
expressed that participation was not only enjoyable, but informally contributed to
performance evaluation and inclusion in decision-making. The concept that FTNTT
faculty members participated in decision-making meetings with the expectation of a
positive performance evaluation indicates the FTNTT faculty members’ perception of a
shared link between agency theory and job performance evaluations. FTNTT faculty
members overcame the context of committee exclusion to better their chances of a
positive job evaluation. A positive job performance would increase the chances of job
retention in their present positions. Positive job performance evaluations can also
enhance the chances of employability at another university if needed – or desired. Thus,
all but one participant exhibited Agency of Action by serving on non-required
committees to better their chances of a positive job evaluation. One participant did not
serve on committees and exhibited Action of Avoidance, even though he/she was aware
of the risk of a lower annual job performance evaluation.

Power

There is a debate in the existing literature about whether power stems from
structural characteristics or individual strengths (Bess & Dee, 2012; Welsh & Slusher,
1986). Andie recognized power as an authority measure, and likened authority to the
chair’s power. Andie viewed the chair as a gatekeeper to career paths, who plays a
significant role in evaluations of “what is good and what is not”: “The role of gatekeeper
– the person who determines who is allowed in a particular community and who remains
excluded - is a significant one in the terms of knowledge fields (Becher & Trowler, 2001,
p. 85). Interestingly, none of the study’s participants mentioned the knowledge or
academic prowess of the chairs. Instead, they all gave full attention to the chair’s power
as a gatekeeper, evaluator, and sometimes, policy-maker.
Individual Work Environment

The subsections for this theme include the following:

- Experiences
- Professional Development
- Professional Growth
- Productivity
- Workload, Work Life and Flexibility

These coded categories were clustered to represent the experiences shared by FTNTT faculty members in regard to departmental norms, which reflect those “framework situations that arise in individuals’ personal lives that can affect role performance” (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995, p. 17). The characteristics of these situations are usually fluid and, to at least some extent, under the control of the individual faculty member. Elements of departmental evaluations may or may not be present.

Experiences

Participants were asked the question, “In your conversations with other FTNTT faculty colleagues, what is your sense of how your departmental experiences compare with others? Do you think your experiences are typical?” The majority of participants answered this question with an “I’m not sure.” The isolation of their classrooms and their heavy workloads did not provide FTNTT faculty an opportunity to communicate with other departments. All but one participant suggested their experiences were probably typical. The one participant who suggested an atypical experience based his/her opinion on job tasks, which were unusual insofar as involving both administrative and classroom responsibilities.
Wen personalized the meaning of experience, rather than reflecting on other FTNTT faculty experiences:

**WEN**

I know that was one of the reasons I was hired because of my K-12 experience and my previous work with younger students and that level of content. But I was approved to teach this course, because of my experience leading up to this [new pilot program in physical science department].

**Professional Growth and Professional Development**

FTNTT faculty did not make any distinctions between professional development and professional growth. In the literature, professional growth depends on professional development. Professional development includes activities and events that enhance professional growth, the latter of which usually entails upward mobility in employment rank. To simplify and clarify participants’ responses, the terms professional development and professional growth are used synonymously throughout this work, even though each term has distinct characteristics.

This study did not support existing research that claims NTT faculty rarely receive access to professional development and other privileges. The literature says that if institutions do offer professional development participation to NTT faculty, it is usually rooted in organizational benefit and does not provide funding for NTT faculty members to travel for professional development or research (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Instead, Chris expressed that “[Professional Development] is a departmental requirement; whether or not it is in the contract, I don’t think so. But it is expected that any full-time employee has some form of professional development per
year.” Chris was correct. A professional development or professional growth requirement was not a part of University Two’s FTNTT faculty employment contract. Other participant interviews verified the belief that professional development was expected and valued by the department. Participants perceived professional development and growth as a departmental value, which would apply toward a positive job performance evaluation and lead to an increase in job security, or employability. As such, they were exhibiting an Agency of Perspective. Participant’s decision to willingly act or avoid professional development and professional growth activities would determine if they were demonstrating Agency of Action or Action of Avoidance.

However, Murphy offered, “it is very difficult to take the time off to do professional development if you do not have classroom support. To be gone for a week to a conference, you don’t have the flexibility in your schedule like a TT faculty member has.”

An early conversation about career goals and professional growth provided a seamless chance to ask Wen the unabridged support question, which identified the examples of departmental supports (i.e., opportunities to engage in professional service projects, research, or career goals?).

**WEN**

I would say all of those things. We have a new department chair, the one we had for the previous ten years, was very good about letting us do what we wanted to do and finding our strengths. If we wanted to attend professional development, or opportunities for research. For example, we have had several instructors get involved in research, if we want to do that. [They] would do anything that she
could to make the *opportunities* we wanted available to us, overall I would say, I haven’t had any obstacles if there was anything I wanted to do.

I also asked Wen to describe the policy about travel funds for conferences, and professional growth opportunities:

**WEN**

[Funding] is one of those things that we don’t get, personally. There is a pool that we can draw from in the department, and if there is something we want to do we apply to do it. Dr. X was always good about getting creative about finding places for money if we needed it.

When I asked Wen to clarify how funds were distributed, the reply was, “I think it is first come, first serve.” Further discussion revealed Wen’s comfort level with asking the department chair for support if funds were not readily available from the department travel funds: “I feel like the department would support it.” Wen further expanded the meaning of support to *collegiality* from departmental colleagues:

**WEN**

We have a great department. Here is an example, we are sort of transitioning right now. I sort of have my foot in two colleges right now. I needed to go to a conference last November, for this new thing that didn’t have much to do with this department. All I had to do was send out an e-mail, “I’ve got to go to out of state, and can anybody cover my classes? And in five minutes you have everything covered. So at the department level, we are very supportive in any endeavors, whatever.”
Meanwhile, Carey mentioned receiving “the same amount of travel and professional development funding [as TT faculty]. They [department administrators] are very supportive of that kind of thing.” Braidy concurred: “I have been supported. I have gone to three professional development conferences already. I think the chair is supportive and encouraging.”

At University Two, Shelby confirmed the receipt of conference travel funds, but was unsure of the amount allocated per FTNTT faculty: “We get a certain amount of funds for professional development funds, I think it is $500.00 a year, that’s allotted for conferences and travel.” A review of staff documents and the department’s record keeper confirmed that Shelby was correct. Brogan unknowingly confirmed similar policies in his/her department:

**BROGAN**

As you know we are limited in the PD money we get. In terms of $500.00 dollars just doesn’t go a long way. So we have to look for other sources of funding if we want to travel to a conference or participate in a conference. With that said, we had a session accepted for a conference, and the University has been extremely supportive to help me get there and back. I have saved my allocations money for three years, and this is the first conference that I am going to that is a pretty big deal.

Brogan was the only participant who explicitly linked the institution’s funding for professional opportunities as a sign of support and value from the department. In tandem, Brogan was one of two participants who spoke of a close relationship with the
institution’s administration. These claims may stem from the fact that Brogan was the only interviewee who had served as a member of a Faculty Senate.

Gerry (Humanities), Murphy (Social Science), Shelby (Humanities), Toby (Physical Science), Taylor (Humanities) and Brogan (Physical Science) also treated financial backing for conferences and the like as support. All six participants at the University Two—who hold FTNTT faculty positions in the College of Arts and Sciences, but within different departments—confirmed that their departments normally provide monetary support for professional growth opportunities. Also, those participants considered their attendance at professional conferences to be a form of professional development. As Gerry expressed:

**GERRY**

I like the fact they give us a small budget and I was able to spend my money and travel to Oxford for a week…I felt like the University was very generous to let me use my professional development money to do that, since I had never been over there. So that was good.

Gerry continued by linking the support of professional development funds with in-house professional development opportunities:

I think that we have some really good professional development programs; sometimes, I think it is difficult to come on a Saturday, after working all week, but I do think they have those programs. I thought the new faculty orientation was excellent…they talked a lot about teaching techniques. I’ve been able to be in several professional learning communities that I thought was helpful.
In other words, Gerry acknowledged the benefits of in-house professional development opportunities, but expressed frustration with the scheduling of events that did not consider the five-class workloads of non-tenure track faculty. Carey voiced a similar conflict at University One:

CAREY

The only thing, as far as participating, I think they would like for me to do more professional development, but a lot of the seminars, when they offer them are during my class time, and I can’t do them. It’s like they almost create them for staff.

Productivity

Participants referred to productivity in several ways: participation on committees, projects, new pedagogy, service projects, student services, mentoring and, as Chris said, “Getting things done.” However, in most cases, productivity was simply a byproduct of faculty participation.

The one exception was Andie, who referred to productivity as a product: “I’ve stepped back. I use to be very active and have had journal publications, book chapters, and did a lot of conference presentations at state and nationals. But, this last year, I kind of said, you know what, I don’t get anything for that, and I’m not going to be applying for a tenure track job, so I am not going to put my time there.” (This quote was used earlier to illustrate the influence of constraint and lack of employment opportunities on faculty behavior.)
Taylor said, “I don’t write as much as I would like to and I’ve got projects that I would like to research, but teaching five classes takes a lot of time. I don’t think lecturers are involved much in research because of the teaching of five classes.”

**Workload, Work life, and Flexibility**

Institutions have become increasingly ambiguous about the role differentials between tenure track and non-tenure track faculty (Kezar, Maxey, & Badke, 2014, p. 8). Typically, classroom instruction is the main responsibility of FTNTT faculty. However, Hollenshead et al. (2007) corroborated reports that the role expectations of FTNTT faculty are inconsistent and expanding: Despite their class workloads, such faculty “are now in some institutes being asked to advise and mentor students (63 percent), serve on committees (51 percent), conduct research and create professional products (27 percent)” (Kezar & Sam, 2010, p. 58).

University One’s policy is to reserve the titles of “lecturer” and “full-time instructor” for those NTT faculty who are brought on to address program requirements and teaching demands that exceed the current staffing capacity. University Two, meanwhile, extends the possible roles of FTNTT faculty beyond teaching responsibilities, noting that such appointments may entail “service, research, or administrative responsibilities” for a 5/5 load per spring and fall semester.

All study participants had a 5/5 semester load, but there was variation in the assignments that met the 5/5 requirement. The FTNTT faculty at both universities held job responsibilities that ranged from lab instruction, coordinating and managing lab programs, coordinating summer bridge programs, managing faculty schedules, splitting
assignments between departments and disciplines, classroom instruction, mentoring students, and advising student organizations. This list is not inclusive. Andie stated:

**ANDIE**

This past year, they decided to up our load to 5/5, with no additional compensation. They cut a position, because they thought they would make up the difference, we all said, did you look at the numbers, because we were pretty sure it wasn’t going to make up the difference. But our chair and dean worked some magical deal.

Andie’s words imply that the chair had the power and authority to make policy changes as needed without faculty notice or input. By contrast, the majority of participants expressed “feeling good” about their control of their work-life balance. Ironically, though, the majority of participants connected control over their work-life balance to the chair’s control over their schedule flexibility. As Toby explained:

**TOBY**

The chair is very family friendly, and the secretary I feel really tries to get everyone happy. The schedule doesn’t always work out the way I want, but I feel they do their best to support us with the schedules. Every semester you are allowed to ask for any classes you might like to teach, but, you may not get them, if you are low on the totem pole.

Other participants verbally acknowledged the hierarchy involved with scheduling, agreeing that the last person to be hired was especially vulnerable to job insecurity or less-than-desirable class schedules. That said, a few expressed contentment with their work-life schedules. Shelby appreciated the balance: “I think its [work life balance] is
fine. Typically, I set my classrooms the way that I want and I have the ability to work on in class and online venues, so I am fine.” Chris made a similar claim:

CHRIS

My work schedule gives me quite a bit of freedom. I also have a lot of creative freedom when deciding how to develop a class, and so, I feel that I have…how do I want to phrase that… I feel that the flexibility in my schedule allows me the freedom to do other things that I want to do in other areas.

Professional Work Environment

The subsections for this theme include the following:

- Academic Freedom and Autonomy
- Career Advancement
- Compensation
- Contracts
- Job Security, Longevity and Time
- Employment
- Evaluations and Value
- Motivation and Rewards

These coded categories were clustered to represent participants’ experiences concerning environmental work characteristics that were fluid, not within full control of the FTNTT faculty member, and generally entailed an element of evaluative feedback for the FTNTT faculty member.

Autonomy and Academic Freedom

At University One, all non-tenured faculty are supposed to be afforded rights of academic freedom and due process. University Two is less explicit, noting that “lecturers and senior lecturers… shall have faculty status.” This is the same status afforded to
tenured faculty, who are afforded academic freedom and due process, so the same should, by extension, apply to NTT faculty.

“Autonomy is an indication of the degree to which individuals feel personally responsible for their work, and thus they own their work outcomes” (Miner, 2007, p. 56). Chris felt he had a “great extent of autonomy in his classroom in regard to instruction.” The only barriers mentioned were department issues, curriculum and instruction defaults from the departments, and political and curriculum discussion within the department. Chris did not consider departmental issues to be an infringement on his classroom autonomy. Chris uses the default text to some extent, but claims to have “total autonomy” and “a lot of creative freedom when deciding how to develop a class.” Taylor voiced: “I feel like I have autonomy in the classroom – because I take it.”

Only one participant explicitly stated their autonomy was not supported by the department. Murphy’s account of non-autonomy is discussed in more detail under Chapter Four’s section on Marginalization.

**Academic Freedom**

In higher education, academic freedom has long been associated with tenure. The American Association of University Professors’ 1940 “Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure” delineated the three parts of academic freedom: 1) “Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results”; “Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject”; and (3) “When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline” (O'Meara et al., 2008, p. 136).
Trower (2000) reports that university academic freedom policy statements sometimes explicitly list New Faculty Majority (NTT faculty) employees, but they also use the term *all* faculty to imply the inclusion of New Faculty Majority (NTT faculty). The American Association of University Professors’ (1955) statement refers to “all probationary tenured teachers, as well as all others…” (Trower, 2000, p. 9). Trower (2000) insists that if an institute endorses the AAUP’s policy position, then said university should extend academic freedom coverage to New Faculty Majority (NTT faculty) (p. 9). Although study participants expressed departmental support for academic freedom, Chris summed up the prevailing sentiment best: “I believe the tenured position carries with it a greater degree of academic freedom, but it is not enough that I am stifled in the classroom.” Taylor similarly expressed departmental support for controversial issues that may arise in her/his particular discipline, “where almost anything goes.”

Murphy seemed to make an implicit distinction between academic freedom and classroom autonomy: “I have as much academic freedom as everybody else, but everything has to be approved. So I can make my own assignments, whatever, and develop class work and curriculum, but it still has to be approved before I can initiate it. So I don’t like that. It annoys me, but I do it because I do like my department. That’s a department culture thing.”

**Career Advancement**

I placed Career Advancement in this category (rather than within the Individual Work Environment or Policies and Practices categories) due to the issue of control. Certainly, individuals have control over the academic challenges and credentials they pursue – and complete – in order to advance their careers. This concept is likened to
Agency Theory, which claims that individuals who maneuver control over situational contexts, in order to advance their careers, display a sense of agency. FTNTT faculty academic credentials was an area that FTNTT faculty appeared less than committed to displaying a sense of agency. FTNTT faculty expressed an Action of Avoidance to enhancing their credentials – particularly to obtain a Ph.D.; even though participants expressed the importance of obtaining the Ph.D. for any forward career movements (Agency of Perspective). Various professional and personal factors entered into the equation to seek a terminal degree, or not to seek a terminal degree.

Several FTNTT faculty members expressed a desire to get their Ph.D.’s – at a more convenient time; therefore, the benefits of the Ph.D. did not appear to outweigh the personal time commitment necessary to complete the academic requirements. Also, the participants in this study were highly credentialed. Perhaps they felt a sense of self-efficacy and job satisfaction – without the need to pursue yet another degree? For whatever reason, none of the FTNTT faculty members, without a terminal degree, were presently working on their Ph.D. The lack of time and heavy class loads were constraints to continuing formal education; however, FTNTT faculty participants agreed that available faculty scholarships offered to FTNTT faculty to continue their academics studies was considered a support.

Peyton, for instance, recognized that personal degree choice(s) were willingly made (Agency of Action or Action of Avoidance). However, the credentials positioned him/her in a diminished light within the system: “I have three master’s degrees but it is the Ph.D. in the college system that is the Holy Grail. If you don’t have that in the college system, you are a second-class citizen.” In other words, the ‘system’ had total control
over the recognition – or lack of recognition – of multiple degrees. Because of Peyton’s lack of control in regard to systematic degree recognitions, Peyton’s response was placed under the Professional Work Environment theme.

Other participants, particularly those with Masters of Fine Art degrees, expressed a similar concern over the lack of recognition regarding their degree. Gerry, who held a MFA, also recognized the stigma associated with not having a Ph.D. or Ed.D:

GERRY

I still think there is something if you don’t have the Dr. in front of your name. For example, even though the recognition for a MFA isn’t as good as for a Ph.D. It goes back to examining what you had to do to get your degree.

Taylor expressed the feeling that “I have my MFA, so I think I can teach now.” However, later in the interview Taylor described the situation in which he/she was not allowed to teach particular courses (in their expertise) due of a lack of a terminal degree. Taylor had not only completed the MFA, but had received several awards within the discipline and had published in several reviewed journals. Taylor met non-recognition of the MFA as a terminal degree with “frustration.”

Andie shared a similar feeling:

ANDIE

Yes, it would be nice to have a TT position, but realistically, the MFA is a terminal degree, but there is not another degree associated with it; but the MFA is not recognized as a terminal degree. So we really have to go and get our Ph.D. It would be nice, if there was a development or recognition of that, yes, when we
got our MFA degree, it was a terminal track, we defended a thesis, it would be nice for that to be recognized as an okay degree to move forward – if you had the other credentials; but, right now, that isn’t it.

In line with this, Andie shared an experience that occurred right after he/she completed Ph.D. coursework requirements. With All But Dissertation (ABD) credentials, Andie was prohibited from applying for a position in which he/she was highly experienced and very interested. The chair that had supported Andie’s work toward a terminal degree was replaced by a new chair, less familiar with Andie’s work ethic and academic history. Andie voiced disappointment and regret:

I think that if my chair that I started this Ph.D. program under, if that chair had stayed, he probably would have made something happen and would have fought for me. He recognized the importance of the work I was doing, and the importance of my degree for that department.

With this statement, Andie linked self-identity with not only professional recognition within the discipline, but also the power of the chair to act as a gatekeeper to career openings.

**Compensation**

When discussing salary compensations, the participants focused their discussions on the term *equity*, but varied in their feeling about whether salaries were a support or a constraint. In the year prior, Shelby had received a small salary increase due to University Two’s move toward pay equity:
SHELBY

I think that [salary compressions] happens in any workplace, though. I think it is a concern, recently, when they did a pay equity discussion I actually got a small raise, it wasn’t much, but apparently, they discovered something that was based upon education, experience, I should get a little bit more, so that was nice overall. But, I would be interested to know if someone comes in new, if their salary was more than mine, especially since we will probably not be getting another raise for a while, it will probably a few years.

Brogan, also from University Two, had a deep knowledge of the salary history of the University:

BROGAN

There was one year, when they tried to get us up to benchmark, and they created a sub-standard benchmark, and then they set it so that if you had been in your position for 8 or more years, your salary would not go up. So basically, they compressed all the salaries, so people who had been getting good raises for good work, who had been here for 20 years, and had been a full professor, or associated professor for more than 8 years, they are seeing these colleagues get pushed up, and they had worked for that and they did not move up. That kind of frustrates me. We try to address as a University but don’t do a good job – compression salaries. I have brought to the tables …some lecturers hired out of school. I brought vast experiences more than some other lecturers that have been hired. That should count for something. It did at one time. But it has been lessened a great deal because of the compression of salaries, they tinkered with salaries, but
it wasn’t enough. There is no reason that someone with 10, 15, to 25 years within
the University that has proven themselves, should be making, that much more
than someone close together. The compression, while they tried to address it, they
didn’t do a good job, and they need to re-think it. This isn’t just with lecturers,
but also with TT faculty. Longevity and experience are not rewarded – and it
should be.

Asked to describe his/her ‘take’ on personal salary, Brogan added: “You know,
hasn’t that [salary] been somewhat of a floating situation? I thought there were changes
put in place. Maybe I should explore that…I don’t even think about it very much. Maybe I
should.” Similarly, I asked Murphy, “If another FTNTT lecturer were hired now, would
they come in at the same salary as you? Murphy responded, “Probably.” When I asked
how he/she felt about that, Murphy responded:

MURPHY

It’s not great money. I guess I would be okay with that. I don’t want anyone else
to make starvation money. That’s not realistic or nice, and I recognize even if I
wanted to put the work into a TT position, I could make more money, so I don’t
necessarily think the salary is a reflection….I mean, It is what it is.

Braidy likewise offered:

BRAIDY

I haven’t really looked at what other instructors are making – maybe I should
look. But, other instructors with their Ph.D.’s come in at a higher salary, than a
master’s person. Whether it is higher than mine, I don’t know. If I were to get a
Ph.D., presumably, you get an increase in salary. I’ve never looked into it because I didn’t want to take the time away from my kids to invest in getting the degree.

Though the literature is divided whether salary is or is not a motivator (support or constraint), the participants expressed little thought about their own salary or the salaries of their colleagues. At both universities, salaries are negotiable only at the time of contract hires or renewals. Interestingly, all participants had negotiated their class schedules with the chair, but none had negotiated their salaries. Fogg (2006) found that “institutional climate and collegiality were five times as important as salary in predicting job satisfaction” (p. A1). Though participants did not corroborate Fogg’s estimates, all participants saw their work environments as positive, and none expressed enough dissatisfaction in their position or salaries to justify leaving the university.

Contracts

FTNTT faculty were well aware of the job responsibilities outlined in their contracts. For most, this meant the stipulation of a 5/5 load, which requires the FTNTT faculty member to teach the equivalent of five courses during both the fall and spring semesters. The individual nature of contracts, and the complexities of contractual language, makes it difficult to describe their actual text. Instead, participants’ responses tended to focus on the structural nature of contracts. In other words, how did employment contracts influence the departmental work lives of FTNTT faculty?

FTNTT faculty members were well aware there is no contractual requirement for service, research or scholarship. Without hesitation, Shelby admitted that “[my contract] stipulates a 5/5/ load, with no requirement or service, research or scholarship.” Brogan added:
BROGAN

No, just teaching. We aren’t required to do any service. We aren’t required to do any of that. We aren’t required to do research. It doesn’t mean we don’t do service, and we might get into that question later, and the research I do on my own. They don’t expect anything from me in that regard.

When asked about the explicitly of job responsibilities on his/her contract, Braidy reply was: “Yes, it does. Because the job responsibilities for [management position] is attached to my contract as a fixed-term position.”

Participants’ responses vacillated most during the discussion surrounding FTNTT faculty and the terms of their contracts. FTNTT faculty members expressed their contracts as nine-month contracts, but were unable to identify the terms of notice or the conditions of renewability. Some made reference to nine-month contracts, that can be payable by choice, on a 12 month basis. Two participants had been hired on a semester-by-semester basis, and both felt that such arrangement was financially easier for the university than a 9-month contract. Another participant had been hired for a year, then changed to a semester-by-semester basis. Of course, contracts that are less than full-time are not eligible for university benefits.

University One’s website indicates that non-tenure instructors are eligible for rehire if they are not notified by May 1. Furthermore, instructors who have more than “three years of consecutive service will be given at least a 12-month notification of non-renewal.” As stipulations, the university requires that there is a clear need for the position and that the instructor has a positive performance evaluation. Similarly, University Two’s
website specifies that all non-tenured lecturers must be notified of “non-reappointment” by the end of the spring semester.

When I asked participants about such notification dates, Wen said: “I should know that, shouldn’t I? Probably 9 months; but I have the option to teach in the summer if I want, and I usually do. Our contracts have been revised to say no notice need be given. So it was intended to protect those that had been around for a while, but that was not the practice.” Wen added that a late contract renewal date is offensive to all: “When your dean calls you in in June, and tells you, we are eliminating your line from the budget, it has been a real slap in the face to instructors in general.” Wen claimed that any non-hiring notice day beyond May 1 “could be hurtful for applicants to academic positions elsewhere.”

Likewise, Murphy said, “If they fired me, it would probably be in May. I know they have told some people to take your stuff to the car – but those were extreme circumstances. But I would think it would be by the end of the semester.” Meanwhile, Toby laughed:

TOBY

I don’t know – I should know that. I mean it has the start and ends date, but I don’t know if it tells me by what time I will be notified. I should know these things. I know that every single year, it gets renewed, I don’t know if there is an interim, this is my impression, I obviously don’t read legal documents, my impression if I keep doing well, they will hire me back each year.

Shelby was unsure of the contract stipulations, but was convinced that some changes had or would be made to the present contracts:
SHELBY
I don’t know with the newer policies, there is supposed to be a certain time limit to notify me, so technically, I would have to know at least year in advance, or that what was in the policy handbook if you are a lecturer. They were discussing revising this in the faculty senate, but I don’t know if they have revised it or not.

Brogan, from the same University as Toby and Shelby, said:

BROGAN
Heck, I could be out of a job next year. I think mine is yearly renewable, is what they are. I don’t think there is any, once when you get to the point of being a Sr. lecturer, I don’t know, what they are – I probably should. It may be an appointment renewable for five years, but they are renewable every year. If you don’t perform well in the areas they expect from you, then you can be let go.

Which is how it should be after five years, I was told different things, one person told me I was on a permanent contract now, but I believe it is year to year.

Shelby had a contract change from a one-renewable contract to a multi-year contract. When I asked Shelby to describe the difference in terms of the contract, he/she relied on what she had been told by the department:

SHELBY
The difference is, I don’t think it specifies, but, I was told it opened up a continual line, before there was not a continual line, but did not have guaranteed funding, then it changed to a revolving line which is good for up to ten years [renewable]
The first three years didn’t count on my contract, because it was a yearly contract.
Peyton was more verbal than others about contract provisions, offering a historical brief of revisions and reasoning for the changes by the last two administrations:

**PEYTON**

Instructors were on ten year contracts, then they dropped it back to 3 year contracts. The President cut that, actually it was the President before him that cut that, to one year, basically for the convenience of the university so they could yea or nay, or with the fluctuation of students not bring someone back if they chose to. Technically, they don’t even have to notify me. According to the contract, once the contract expires on the last official day of the semester, you don’t work here. And in July or August, you get a letter saying they have renewed your contract. Until you get that letter, or don’t get a letter…you don’t know. Because the contract here says that our sole purpose here is to teach literally, the only function we are required to do is teach. We are not required by contract to serve on committees, we are not required by contract to participate in anything [service projects, research, or committees]

Peyton also acknowledged that the contract could not be renewed “at whim”:

“Three years is the maximum time you can teach as an adjunct, without offering you benefits – I believe it is a state law.” (For the record, I could not verify this as state law.)

Most FTNTT faculty contracts have instructional loads listed as the primary responsibility; however, some contracts include additional duties that are closer to the managerial and administrative. Confusion regarding employment responsibilities may or may not lead to faculty contractual disputes that end up in a costly legal system. In particular, the courts often account for discrepancies between faculty as laborers,
administrators, or management (decision-makers) when determining eligibility for faculty
labor issues (i.e., participation or non-participation in unions).

FTNTT faculty participants indicated that their positions wavered between
instruction and management. Braidy, Brogan and Murphy held positions that had
managerial responsibilities in addition to classroom instructional. When asked to describe
their responsibilities outside the classroom, Murphy replied, “Coordinator,” Brogan
replied “Coordinator and Management,” and Braidy replied, “Management.”

**BRAIDY**

I have an annual review. I just did it. And I split my time [classroom and
management] basically, it is not 50/50 but, about 60/40. Management. That’s a
coordination situation. People would not readily volunteer for that situation. That
required way more work than a 3 hour release time.

Braidy hinted that the split position entailed inequities and increased hours, yet
did not express dissatisfaction with the position itself. Braidy actually considered the
position as FTNTT faculty member as “lucky” when it came to decision-making, as the
job role could easily blur the lines between faculty and management. Because of these
two roles, Braidy was very conscientious of not only transparency in job performance,
but also of maintaining a collegial working relationship with faculty, departmental
authorities and institutional leadership. However, Braidy added:

I have some job security, because I fulfill a major and visible role for the
department. But I have no authority. The power differential – even if you are a
full tenured professor or in a management position, does not come with authority
over faculty. However, positions come with the management of decisions that affect faculty.

The blurring of job responsibilities can also create job positions that are blurred, not only by appointment contracts, but also by job descriptions. The distinctness afforded TT faculty may be in question when a FTNTT faculty member is appointed to a position that represents management, with daily managerial authority over potential issues concerning FTNTT faculty and TT faculty (ex., class schedules, class room assignments, office locations, meeting dates, meeting times, committee room assignments…). Though the managerial position may not have the power above or over a TT faculty member, by virtue of job responsibilities, they may encounter situations that grant them authority of a TT faculty. The potential distortions of power and authority between FTNTT faculty job responsibilities, which may hold authority over TT faculty academic clout, lends itself to a culture that is at best, precarious in affirming a collaborative, collegial, professional work environment [department].

**Recruitment and Employment**

“Recruitment policies varied across institutions and among departments within institutions” (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001, p. 37). This study’s participants shared a wide range of recruitment practices and considerations for employment. For some, the discipline was the employment motivator, while others considered the qualifications required of the open position. Participants also considered the convenience or appeal of an institution’s location, as well as personal factors, when evaluating an employment offer (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001, p. 37).
Qualitative data indicated the manner in which the employee was interviewed for hire sent mixed messages to the employee. A loose network for hire, with an informal and haphazard vetting approach, was perceived as either a positive or negative sign of the departments’ commitment to the employee. Negatively, a quick, loosely vetted, approach to hire could send the message to the applicant that the position could be filled rather easily – by almost anyone. Another perception was that a quick hire could simply mean the applicant was lucky and was in ‘the right spot’ when a quick decision was needed to fill a job vacancy. On the other hand, the same approach could be interpreted by the prospective employee as the administration recognizing them as a best fit for the position -- or a highly qualified person for the vacancy who needed little vetting. Or, recognizing them as a potential employee too good to let get away.

Most of the FTNTT faculty members had been recruited through a loose network, almost like hearing about the job “through the grapevine.” Others were recruited by administrators who were impressed with their work in other positions. One participant from University One highlighted the informality of their hiring process.

So she [a friend] told her boss, he called me up, and I was hired. And that was the way it was done. I think I did give him [the chair] a resume, but there was not a big application process. I did come in and talked with him, but I think he had already decided to hire me because I came in and walked out with books in my hands for classes I was going to be teaching.

Two other participants ended up in their jobs in the wake of a spouse’s employment at the university. Spouses had been offered TT positions, and the FTNTT faculty positions were made available shortly thereafter. As Baldwin and Chronister
(2001) note, “many institutions accommodate the employment aspirations of an accompanying spouse or partner in a two-career marriage or relationship…the ability to create positions is especially critical for colleges and universities that are geographically isolated” (p. 38). On the other hand, Shelby “had to reapply every year for the first three years for my position. The position was with full benefits. So, I also had to re-interview each time, then after that, I haven’t had to since then.” (Shelby has been at University Two for seven years.)

Brogan’s experience was quite different from the other participants: Whereas most of the faculty members gained their jobs through their departments’ informal hiring practices, Brogan underwent a full vetting by the department’s hiring committee. Granted, the vetting process was normative for this particular department.

**BROGAN**

I presented a lesson and met with a committee. It’s stringent. FTNTTF members participate in the process. Though it’s led by a TT Faculty member, two lecturers serve on the committee, with equal vote. The department gives it a collective thumbs up or thumbs down. So if there are five on the committee, 3 TT and 2 NTT, there are 5 votes, we perform all the interviews, meet with the candidates, no differently than for a search process for a TT person. This is a different department.

Brogan was proud that the department fully vetted all candidates for NTT positions. By insisting on a rigorous hiring process, the department sent a message that the position was filled by a highly qualified person who was expected to make valuable contributions to the department. On the other hand, haphazard recruitment policies and
practices could send the message that little value was given – or expected – from the new ‘hit or miss’ employee. An alternative theory is that the informal hiring process might suggest that the department is more lax and flexible, and willing to let people have their own space and grow in their roles. A new employee could also view the vetting process—rigorous or not—as a sign of impending departmental support. If the employment hiring practice was loose and informal, the participants’ reactions to their employment was varied. However, if the employment hiring practice was fully vetted, as for a tenure track position, one participant explicitly stated he/she took pride in the appointment process. Even though both employment practices could create a professional sense of value, it was more likely to occur when the employment practices were rigid, with formal guidelines. “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” (Kezar & Sam, 2011, p. 101). Cunningham (2014) states that the chair’s hiring power has a great deal of influence on faculty productivity. This study’s qualitative data did not indicate a causal relationship between the universities’ employment practices and job performances. Noted, the small participant numbers makes transferability of this finding problematic.

The hiring authority of the chair contributes most likely to this study’s findings that gives indubitable “power to the chair”.

Evaluations and Value

FTNTT faculty showed different understandings about their evaluation processes. For example, service was not required in any FTNTT faculty contracts; however, all but one participant indicated that service and committee participation affected their
evaluations. I considered this finding another example of Agency of Perspective. The FTNTT faculty member who performed service was not required to do so, but expected to overcome the impermanent nature of the FTNTT faculty appointment.

All instructors in the [discipline] department were involved in an evaluation program, which requires some time beyond what we technically are required by contract to do. “So the chair basically gives us a course release in the spring.” Peyton saw the course release as an honest conciliation gesture by the chair for the extra time commitment required of the FTNTT faculty during student evaluations.

When FTNTT faculty felt the administration was making an open effort to back FTNTT faculty, they expressed feelings of departmental support and positive job performance evaluations. All FTNTT faculty, except one, listed services or committee participations, professional development, scholarship or research on their annual evaluations (Agency of Perspective, Agency of Action, and one participant, Action of Avoidance). Though not required by contract, these actions were included on FTNTT faculty evaluations with the expectation of positive influences on their annual performance evaluations.

SHELBY

That service has always been noted in my evaluations. But, it is not required. I do it because I think anything you can do to justify them adding more years to a contract is a good thing, so I feel like that extra service helps with that evaluation. Definitely, that’s not my only motivation for doing it, I do it because I am interested in the work that I am doing. I always include it when I have to submit evaluation materials.
There was some uncertainty over whether committee participation was a part of annual evaluations. All but one of the faculty was willing to take the chance:

Yes, certainly, in your evaluation mention the work that you did, and if you did not do any, I don’t think there would be negative consequences, I don’t think they would give you a bad evaluation, but I don’t know of anyone who has been in that position.

Wen offered another view and recognized that the evaluation tool is a work in progress and undergoing revisions:

WEN

It is not a good evaluation tool. We are required to submit to that [service, committee participation] too, but we are only evaluated on teaching, not the scholarship or service. I guess it wouldn’t be comprehensive. Only what they would have done the last year. I think it is pretty fair, what I am trying to say is we are not going to get penalized for doing other things, because we were hired to teach.

Meanwhile, Toby’s narrative seemed to sum up the essence of the evaluation process:

TOBY

I don’t have any obligation, I know that I am not required to do it [committee participation]; but, the reason I do it is because I actually care what we are doing and I want to do it well, but if I didn’t care, or if I just really wanted to hang out and not do it; I think it would be frowned upon because the other lectures are the hardest working people you will find. They work their tails off and you would get
the reputation of being a slacker. I really enjoy my co-workers and I enjoy the committee work. All the lecturers seem to want to stay around because they like this work environment, and we all do a lot of committee work, partially by choice and partially by you would be frowned upon if you didn’t (Agency of Perspective, Agency of Action).

The one exception was Murphy’s account, which was tinged with frustration: “As a matter of fact, they augmented the evaluation process to make it more like what the TT faculty goes through, if we have to go through this, you do too.”

Chris, Wen, and Toby expressed that their discipline – and specifically, their class appointments – created value. Chris considered his appointment by the department to teach a new pilot class to be “a gesture of value to the department.” Toby was likewise offered an opportunity to teach a challenging pilot course: “Four of us got picked. I didn’t particularly want to do that, but if you get chosen for a hard class, or a pilot class, I also got chosen for the pilot of another program, then that lets me know I am doing a good job.” For Toby, these offerings reflected a level of recognition that is not always verbally expressed: “I don’t thing I’ve ever heard [the chair] say “you are doing a good job” except for the evaluation at the end of the year when he says,” you are doing a good job. The other 364 days a year, I don’t hear anything. It’s the inclusion.”

Wen voiced similar that job assignments indicated a job well done. “Lowest level students need a lot more contact in a personal relationship to pull them up to college readiness. I think that they have the department use the strongest lecturers.”

Gerry, Braidy, and Brogan highlighted the value inherent in the verbal recognition and attributes of their chairs: Brogan noted: “I think I am very much valued. My
chairman and my associate chair are always positive. I’ve been told they [faculty] value my position.” Shelby reasoned:

**SHELBY**

Well, inside conversations with the chair, formal and informal, evaluation periods always point out in formal write-ups that we appreciate what you are doing. Even in conversations they will ask me how I feel about it – rather than dictate something to me. They made a decision to cut back next year, he came to me and talked to me about it and gave the rationalization for the cut.

Policy checks from both University One and University Two’s websites indicated that FTNTT faculty evaluations are similar or equivalent to tenured and tenure-track faculty evaluations. However, FTNTT faculty’s perception was their primary evaluation was based on teaching or instructional performances, and anything else was considered “over the top”. The evaluation process may be a source of real ambiguity among faculty and administrators. FTNTT faculty are not evaluated by a Promotion and Tenure Committee, but usually by the chair.

**Rewards**

Schein (1992) sees the reward structure of an organization as a window into its culture, with different meanings assigned to different people based on perceptions of status and power. Titles of senior status came without reward or recognition. Most FTNTT faculty rewards came in the form of verbal recognitions reserved for the annual faculty evaluation form. Brogan effectively summarized the situation: “They bestowed upon me the name of Senior Lecturer, and that was it.”
Shelby is eligible for a higher-ranking title, but did not pursue the change in position title. Shelby chose not to complete the paperwork since there are no benefits attached to the change. Shelby maintains hope that there might be a possibility of additional pay or benefits attached in the future: “I don’t know if it is part of the potential merit based system or something, or one way to factor that in or not.” Chris similarly expressed: “There is little or no pathways for promotion of FTNTT faculty.” One participant with his/her doctorate said: “There’s never been a position for me to apply for. There is no such thing [promotion]. You are hired by contract to teach and we pay you this amount of money to teach the classes.” Peyton expressed that there is “no chance for moving forward. It is a de-motivator for some”.

Braidy voiced, “Tenure track is considered the promotion, and monetarily the expectation is the only way to increase your salary is with longevity or Ph.D.” Existing research echoes these sentiments, suggesting that university administrators should have promotional systems in place for FTNTT faculty that positively enrich faculty contributions to the campus (Feldman & Turnley, 2004; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Hart, 2011; Kezar & Sam, 2010; Levin & Shaker, 2011; Waltman e (et.al, 2012)

**Time, Longevity and Job Security**

All FTNTT faculty members expressed that one of their largest obstacles was simply a lack of time. Shelby considered the lack of time as “my biggest problem.” Carey agreed: “I don’t have enough time.” Brogan took a slightly different tact: “Because there are several lectures in this department, we are all engaged, so that takes time that we don’t get any credit for.”
Other studies have equated time with teaching and work load. Chris echoed this sentiment: “Teaching five courses a semester, and teaching 2 classes over the summer, takes quite a bit of time.” However, this type of workload in conjunction with the job’s contractual nature can be burdensome. As Kezar (2013) highlights, “five years was usually the point [faculty] began to see that the lack of support was not a passing phase, but a permanent aspect of their careers that would impact their ability as professionals” (Kezar (2013, p. 19). Such was the case with Gerry, who has been on the job for six years and is planning to take advantage of scholarship supports available to FTNTT faculty. Gerry plans on pursuing a terminal degree, even though Gerry has a Master’s Degree in Fine Arts. Gerry’s goal is to complete a Ph.D. and compose instructional texts for his/her field. Gerry anticipates this move will add job security to the present position, and add skills and expertise if needed to apply elsewhere [sense of agency, and employability].

Research has long considered job security – or the lack there of – an issue for FTNTT faculty. On this topic, Brogan offered:

**BROGAN**

Job security is a concern, but it probably is not written as much as it should be, but realistically if I am performing the same job as someone who has been here a few years, and there is 8 people between me and the job, and there is no difference in level of performance, that person as a Sr. lecturer should keep that position, if you have proven yourself years and years, and you have gotten a stamp of approval, if someone has only been here two years, then they better look at the people before me. So if there are budget cuts, there are a lot of people
before me that are going to lose their positions before me. Longevity better count for something. 

Wen, however, discovered that 10 years of longevity was not enough: 

**WEN**

I had one of the best years I had evaluations and service in relation to other instructors, and my position was eliminated. It came down to who had been here the longest. (I had been here 10 years). It was a longevity issue. I would have thought, but when push came to shove, I was here the shortest time, and I was here 10 years. So I asked how are you going to determine who to cut? The dean’s answer was longevity. The Chair said, “I’m not sure.”

**Cultural Social Work Environment**

The subsections for this theme include the following:

- Culture and Collegiality
- Marginalization

This theme encompasses the experiences shared by FTNTT faculty in regard to the departmental norms and structures that influence the nature of respect for FTNTT faculty and their colleagues. Culture also reflects those institutional values that advance the climate of the university campus as a whole (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995, p. 150). All individuals in a university share in the development of its culture.
Culture and Collegiality

Culture includes both the policies and practices of an organization, is abstract in nature, and reflects an organization’s values and ideas (Kezar & Sam, 2013, p. 61). Both external and internal factors help shape the departmental and university culture (Tierney, 1988, p. 3).

Carey readily linked the terms culture and support. Carey described a personal situation that arose that required an absence from the Social Sciences department. Carey, like all participants, had a work load equivalent to five classes, and the timing complicated the absence. Carey stated, “I had to miss the first week of school. I went to the Dean and told him the situation and that my family needed me.” Personal circumstances and complications necessitated that Carey extend the absence for several weeks. “So I had people to cover my classes for me, and I was able to do that. And, that’s one way they [colleagues] did support me.” Carey extended the meaning of support to acknowledge the flexibility of the administration to approve or disapprove of the leave: “The dean approved it so, fortunately, I was able to make it work.” In other words, Carey considered the cultural environment to be one that was supportive.

Like Carey, most of the participants verbalized a positive culture and collegial working environment within their departments. In fact, a number of participants were able to align their individual situations with three different cultural environments identified in the literature—collaborative/collegial, tight knit, and top down. Braidy (University One) aligned his/her situation with the collaborative/collegial culture, which “is characterized by faculty having input on decision making and two-way, open communication and relationships between faculty and the administration” (Kezar, 2013,
Braidy noted that “we [the department] meet every other week, it’s a democratic sort of thing.”

Brogan and Chris, meanwhile, espoused a tightly knit faculty culture, which is “characterized by regularly scheduled faculty communicative events, ongoing faculty communication in person or via teachnology, and strong value among faculty for interaction and communication” (Kezar, 2013, p. 24). Brogan added:

**BROGAN**

When FTNTT faculty positions were created, one of the fears was lecturers would become second-class citizens. I think they tried to make that as possible that it wouldn’t happen, to have the culture, and not allow that to happen. I think that the collegiality in this department is amazing when it comes to issues that affect the curriculum, of course, not promotion and tenure. We should never be involved in that.

Chris, from the Humanities Department at University Two, echoed: “I feel like I am part of the department which allows and also that creates that atmosphere which is needed to be creative and feel unburdened by certain things.”

Toby offered an isolated work incident that he/she believed reflected a top-down culture, which is where “Administration… made decisions with little input from faculty and had hierarchical communication and relationships between faculty and the administration” (Kezar, 2013, p. 24). Toby explained: “There was not a committee. Our department chair and one other person wanted it to happen. I did not feel very valued at all. Surprisingly, it was the first time in my 10 years here that it happened.” Toby was not pleased that this political culture had seeped its way into the department. Braidy
described a similar experience from several years prior, where a curriculum change was orchestrated without full support and vetting by the department. Braidy added: “They [the administration] changed the curriculum, it went through the committees, but [at that time] it split the department.”

Practices, whether or not they support policies, and are closely associated with the culture of an organization. Department chairs are particularly powerful in this regard, as they usually implement practices. As highlighted by Wen: “Our department is not really attached to the titles, that’s not true in every department on campus, but ours is particular, because the *chair sets the tone.*” Toby corroborated the sentiment: “I have only worked here under one chair of the department, and from my understanding, and it [culture] can change drastically from chair to chair.” Overall, the participants indicated that the chair has the power to ‘set the tone’ for the department’s culture, which can support or constrain faculty contributions.

**Marginalization**

Exclusion from a decision-making entity can lead to feelings of frustration and marginalization. The marginalized “may experience a disconnection between an allegedly empowering organizational design (which demands conformity and consensus) and work conditions that continue to silence alternative voices and perspectives” (Bess & Dee, 2012, p. 571). Two participants, who did not want to be identified on this point, echoed these sentiments. One said, “I think sometimes, because of our position, our voice is not as important in the decision making.” The other voiced feelings of frustration and marginalization when he/she described a meeting in which FTNTT faculty members had been ignored during a curriculum discussion. Administrators, with a few selected TT
faculty members, left the meeting, made a decision, and then returned to the meeting to inform the faculty of the final decision (top-down management):

[PARTICIPANT NOT IDENTIFIED]

We should have freedom of discussion, they not only excluded me, but they excluded others. I served on a couple of hiring committees, what disturbed me was that I was asked to be on the committee, the department chair asked me to serve on a new hiring committee. Then, when it came time to vote, I was not allowed to vote because I was not tenured. And they said the policy is that only tenured or tenure track can vote. I don’t know if it was university policy or departmental policy, but what is weird about that is another department chair would let me vote on anything. If I was put on the committee for input, I would have liked to have a vote.

This marginalized experience influenced his/her future decisions concerning committee service. When asked if he/she had served on a hiring committee since that meeting, the participant retorted, “Why serve if I can’t vote? If there is a faculty meeting where there is going to be a vote, I just don’t go the meeting – or I leave before the vote is taken. It [not being allowed to vote] gets me out of that [faculty meeting].”

Two other participants expressed frustration with the ambiguities of their voting experiences as FTNTT faculty committee members. The first participant claimed FTNTT faculty members were allowed to vote dependent upon the content and/or the context of vote. The second participant noted, “FTNTT faculty can vote on important decisions, like curriculum, higher education, those kinds of matter.” When asked to describe any experiences he/she had while serving on a voting committee, the participant stated that
he/she had never served on a hiring committee, but had served on a recruitment and retention committee – with full voting rights:

[PARTICIPANT NOT IDENTIFIED]

It’s kind of hit and miss. With retention and recruitment, they were fine with me doing it. I would never be on a hiring committee. Although, I have been encouraged to sit through the interviews and give my opinion if I thought the person was a good fit for the department, like an unofficial, official member.

When asked how he/she felt in that capacity, the participant acknowledged a feeling of awkwardness: “I didn’t like it.” The inconsistencies in voting privileges could be seen as a reflection of departmental discrepancies between policy and practice, with the resulting confusion acting as a constraint on faculty contributions. The literature on NTT faculty deals squarely with the issues of marginalization, exclusion, and hierarchy. However, participants’ described experiences were conflicting. Nine of the 12 participants reported not feeling personally marginalized; however, most had experienced isolated incidences of marginalized experiences, which they attributed to clashing personality traits rather than a lack of collegiality.

When Shelby was asked if he/she had ever experienced a real lack of collegiality, another point of view came to light. Though Shelby reported that he/she worked in a very collegial department and did not feel marginalized, Shelby attributed a sense of marginalization based on personal reflections: “I think it is instinct, maybe not even intentional. I think if there were more opportunities, in professional ways, it may help. So it is not a big thing – maybe it is intimidation on my part with their (TT faculty) knowledge, so they are more intimidating to me because of me and their knowledge.”
The reasoning behind the confusion became clearer as the interviews continued: Namely, FTNTT faculty members often associate more with TT faculty than NTT faculty when considering their working conditions, situations, and expected supports (Kezar, 2013; Logue, 2015). According to Kezar and Sam (2011), FTNTT faculty are treated more like traditional professionals, while their part-time colleagues are treated more like laborers (p. 38).

Case in point: Gerry and Toby did not personally identify with PTNTT faculty, but expressed a genuine concern for the treatment of PTNTT faculty members. Gerry relayed an incident in which he/she was moved during a meeting to defend PTNTT employees. Tenure-track faculty members suggested that adjunct or part-time faculty – who are required to attend in-house professional learning opportunities – do so without pay. As Gerry recalled: “TT faculty said, they should just do that because they love to teach. And I just jumped in and said, “Wait a second, adjuncts make nothing…I felt that was just asking too much.” Gerry felt that treating adjuncts as professionals “was an ethical issue.”

Even though Chris and Braidy did not share feelings of marginalization, they did remark upon the existence of a faculty hierarchy between TT faculty and FTNTT faculty. As Braidy commented:

**BRAIDY**

I feel like I am respected there have been times where, I take it there are a few individuals, and a few people who have this idea of professor and instructor they look down, so sometimes I do feel that, I am seen as lower.
Likewise, Murphy described the department collegiality as positive, but had nevertheless experienced a marginalizing (deskilling) episode. The deskilling of faculty members represents a “degradation of work processes in academe” (Rajagopal & Farr, 1992, p. 319). The assumption is that managers (administrators) seek to streamline costs and increase the efficiency of the work product (in this case, budget reductions and classroom efficiencies). The mechanization of the classroom threatens the instructor’s autonomy and marginalizes the work products of NTT faculty to the equivalent of de-skilled labor. As a result, NTT faculty take the position of a laborer to be managed, a vessel for instructional delivery, and something less than an expert (non-professional). As Murphy shared:

**MURPHY**

I have been teaching more than 10 years, which is more than some of the other professors who are tenured track, and I have been a professional person for 20 or more years, is that I have to have a faculty mentor. He has to approve all my syllabi before I can turn it in to my students. I don’t like that. It puts me in an apprentice type role and it keeps me in an apprentice type role. I would like to have more autonomy. I would not like to have to be quality controlled. There are certain things they won’t let me teach, they don’t want me to teach, so, there has been a certain amount of …I have had to sort of let some things go to stay in the position.

Even though Murphy held a terminal degree, Murphy did not have complete autonomy in the classroom and was assigned lower-level classes. Murphy felt marginalized because of his/her employment status in conjunction with the department’s
practice of reviewing all syllabi and assignments before they can be distributed to students. Murphy made the decision to conform to the practice due to the perceived risk of unemployment, but not without frustration.

Summary

Chapter Four provided researcher-selected excerpts of relevant and significant narratives generated during the 12 participants interviews used to explore The Departmental Work Lives of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty. The study’s research question sought to descriptively and accurately illuminate: What is the essence of the departmental work lives of FTNTT faculty? To this end, the study identified and explored four FTNTT faculty environmental work themes (each with accompanying subthemes):

- Policy and Practices Work Environment,
- Individual Work Environment
- Professional Work Environment
- Cultural Social Work Environment

At this point, I reread all transcripts to verify quotes, ensured that all participant voices were represented, searched for any missing statements, and reviewed the classification of the codes and categories. To the best of my ability, this chapter represents an accurate account of this study’s semi-structured interviews. Chapter Five offers a deeper discussion of these findings.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

“So, hopefully, it won’t end.” - Murphy

This study offers first-hand qualitative evidence from a phenomenological research approach used to explore the departmental work lives of full-time non-tenure track faculty. FTNTT faculty members, from two different universities, representing departments within the Universities’ Department of Humanities, Department of Social Sciences and Behavior, Department of Physical Science, or Department of Natural Science participated in the study. A qualitative phenomenological methodology was best for this study’s exploration and provided the foundational design for this researcher to conduct semi-structured interviews, with the twelve FTNTT faculty volunteer participants. This study looked beyond Agency Theory’s economic origins and acted upon agency research literature that views the evolution of *agency* as a “complex domain of behavior” (Betz & Hackett, 1987, p. 229).

This study explored the relationships between the departmental operating policies and practices and the FTNTT faculty member’s experiences as demonstrated by faculty’s voiced perceptions and verbalized performance behaviors. In particular, this study used Agency Theory as a framework to interpret the emergence of perceptions, skills, strategies, actions and non-actions FTNTT faculty members intentionally championed by free-will or exhibited in regard to their academic careers and job security. Participant interviews, researcher observations, and relevant documents were used to explore the essence of the departmental work lives of FTNTT faculty.
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In particular, this study used Agency Theory as a framework to interpret the emergence of perceptions, skills, strategies, actions and non-actions FTNTT faculty members intentionally championed by free-will or exhibited in regard to their academic careers and job security. Participant interviews, researcher observations, and relevant documents were used to explore the essence of the departmental work lives of FTNTT faculty.

This study provided FTNTT faculty participants, through the power of their own voices, a platform to enter the literature conversations surrounding the phenomenon of departmental work lives of FTNTT faculty. This study also provided the researcher with a large volume of raw data necessary to explore, describe, analyze, interpret and develop a rich narrative description to better understand the FTNTT faculty experience (Tierney & Clemens, 2011). I used non-interview documents (policies, university websites) to check policies when appropriate and available, to clarify any confusions about policy and practices that I may have incurred, and to assist with my interpretations of the qualitative data.

I personally transcribed all interviews and carefully scrutinized the verbatim scripts to identify codes, categories, and patterns that participants identified as significant to their departmental work lives. I classified the codes, categories, and patterns, according to similar characteristics. Using this method, I identified four FTNTT faculty work themes: (i.e., Policies and Practices Work Environment, Individual Work Environment, Professional Work Environment, and Culture Social Work Environment). I considered other interpretations; however, I based my decision to use these four work environments on: 1) prior research from my literature review; 2) confidence in the conventions of my
interview guide (using open-ended questions to obtain raw data) and 3); my criteria
design (as objective as possible) for coded classifications. I decided these four themes
were the ‘best fit’ to describe the essential elements described by FTNTT faculty
participants significant to the context of their work lives.

In addition, three agentic sub-groups emerged within the twelve faculty
participants: 1) FTNTT members who were satisfied in their positions and chose to
intentionally navigate their careers for the purpose of perceived job security; 2) FTNTT
faculty members who paralleled the first group in their satisfaction and actions, but
expressed a personal desire to alter their present FTNTT faculty status; and 3) FTNTT
faculty members who intentionally chose not to navigate their careers for the purpose of
job security.

Research Question

The research question, within this study’s exploration, descriptively conveys the
complexities, nuances, and departmental milieu surrounding FTNTT faculty.
Specifically, the research question this study addresses is: *What is the essence of the
departmental experiences of FTNTT faculty work lives?* In addition, this study:

- Proposes ways in which administrators and policy makers can improve FTNTT
  faculty supports;

- Provides evidenced-based, qualitative research that will identify supports and
  constraints FTNTT faculty find significant within their departments;

- Offers essential elements FTNTT make meaningful; and

- Adds to the scant body of knowledge surrounding FTNTT faculty.
Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

Agency Theory was the theoretical framework of this study, under the broad framework of Interpretivism. My research used two new conceptual frameworks, derived from Agency theory: agency of perspective and agency of action. Campbell and O’Meara (2014) define agency as “taking strategic and intentional actions or perspectives toward goals that matter to oneself” (p. 53). Archer (2009) refers to agency of perspective as viewing one’s goal in grasp, if certain conditions are met. Agency of actions include any act “undertaken in pursuit of a particular goal” (Campbell & O’Meara, 2014, p. 53). This study coined the term, action of avoidance to represent faculty participants who expressed an agentic perspective and who asserted their free-will not to act. These participants were considered as exhibiting both the agency of perspective and an action – of avoidance. New to the literature, this study refers to the non-assertion of an action to avoid a measured risk (action of avoidance) within the contextual structure of an agency of action.

Interpretivists do not search for one answer, but only to “thoroughly document the perspective being investigated” (Butin, 2010, p. 60). This study did not intend to resolve a problem, develop or corroborate a specific theory for exploring FTNTT faculty. Qualitative studies are not intended to be generalizable, nor transferable; however, this study does offer policy-makers, decision-makers, and stakeholders empirical data to help “reach some sort of conclusion about what can be taken” from the study, in regard to their own campus contexts” (Tierney & Clemens, 2011, p. 21). To recognize this effort, this study gave reference to Agency Theory, in context to policies and practices that were controllable or changeable by administrators, policy-makers, or colleagues.
Existing research supports the importance of the relationship of discipline and departments (Becher & Trowler, 2007; Blackburn & Lawrence 1995; Clark, 1987; Gappa et al., 2007). The distinctiveness of each university’s mission; each discipline’s priorities, and each department’s culture were outside the scope of this study (Gappa et al., 2007, p. 135). The complexities of environmental changes, faculty demographics, the growing forces of accountability on higher education, and the external and internal influences to the universities, disciplines, departments, administrators, and faculties were considerations, but not this study’s emphasis. The focus of this study was the participants’ experiences within their departments.

Chapter Five represents an extension of this study’s findings through my discussion, as researcher, and is framed by interview responses, some new, but most previously offered in Chapter Four, and theoretical and conceptual framework(s). All participants’ interview response data was collected (raw), transcribed, and analyzed in regard to the research focus and research question as represented in the findings in Chapter Four.

This chapter’s discussion replicates the organization of the four previously presented major significant FTNTT faculty work environment themes (Chapter Four). This organization is intentional and aims to provide transparency, continuity, and facilitated my continued exploration and reflections of Chapter Four’s findings to benefit this chapter’s discussion. In addition, this reiterative organization method was intended to enhance the readability connection between Chapter Four findings, and Chapter Five’s discussion.
This chapter includes: Overview of the Study; Overview of Thematic findings from Chapter Four; the research question; discussion of the findings linked to the literature, representations of the essential elements responding to the four claims of this study: 1) explore ways in which administrators and policy makers can improve FTNTT faculty supports; 2) offer evidenced-based qualitative research that will identify supports and constraints FTNTT faculty find significant within their departments; 3) explore essential elements FTNTT make meaningful; and 4) add to the scant knowledge surrounding FTNTT faculty.

Quotes introduce most sub-sections. These quotes were selected and are offered as a “best fit” to represent the overall essence of the subsection. A graphic representation and discussion regarding this study’s link to the theoretical and conceptual framework is provided. Chapter Five ends with future recommended studies, implications, limitations, summary and a conclusion.

**Overview of the Study**

I began to search university faculty employed full-time on a non-tenured track (FTNTT) with confidence that I had a reasonable grasp of what stories FTNTT faculty members would tell. This confidence was grounded in the knowledge that I gained during the course of my studies, and the existing research surrounding FTNTT faculty, PTNTT faculty and TT faculty. The foundation of this research primarily presented existing narratives of constraint surrounding FTNTT faculty and PTNTT faculty.

I expected stories to be complex, some anecdotal, mostly negative, with intermittent expressions of common experiences. Overall, I projected the twelve
interviewed participants would share fear of job insecurities, disgruntlement, inequities, and narratives of marginalization that shadowed to some extent positive departmental experiences.

Over the last two decades, there has been a consistent narrative of constraint used to describe the negative culture and climate that non-tenure track faculty members encounter on most university campuses. My expectations for the most part considered the works of (Benjamin, 2003; O’Meara et al., 2008; Kezar & Sam, 2012, 2013; Long, 2004; Purcell, 2007; Umbach, 2007). Existing research frames NTT faculty in a deficit light as far as job satisfaction, commitment, engagement, and social integration with students and other faculty (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Benjamin, 2003; Long, 2004; Purcell, 2007; Umbach, 2007).

Purcell (2007) describes all non-tenure track faculty as:

“skilled, cheap, desperate, and delusional of meritocracy”, hanging in limbo waiting for something to break, for the door to open for their career to begin, moving in the shadows, providing indispensable service to the department and drawing little in return, trying feverishly to earn a tenure-track job, but they cannot know, and they have no control over, whether their limbo will end happily or tragically. (pp. 121-122)

These repressions (i.e., reduced support from administrators, poor working environments, work overloads, and less-than-equitable employment contracts) portray, if not create, a caste-like system, based upon employment status among faculty and administration. The tripartite system which includes TT, FTNTT faculty, and PTNTT faculty as a hierarchy, with TT faculty as the pinnacle, is prominent within the research
of (Benjamin, 2003; Kezar, 2013; Umbach, 2007). Deficit studies document low institutional supports applied to employment practices of NTT faculty in higher education (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Benjamin, 2003; Long, 2004; Umbach, 2007).

This study’s findings are in contrast to existing studies with a deficit bent for FTNTT faculty members. This study, through the participants’ voices, presents a different faculty perspective than highlighted within the literature of constraint. Overall, my study did not support the accumulation of negative research surrounding FTNTT faculty. In contrast to the studies of FTNTT faculty constraints, this study’s participants described a generally positive, working environment.

There are a few studies beginning to surface that reflect positive supports for NTT faculty, in particular FTNTT faculty (Holler, 2014; Kezar, 2013; Waltman et al., 2012). New stakeholder organizations are beginning to suggest best practices that may support reported deficit gaps between NTT faculty and TT faculty (AAUP, Coalition of Academic Work Force, and the New Faculty Majority). However, there still remains aggregated data that lacks distinguishing the work environment of FTNTT and PTNTT faculty and qualitative studies conducted by FTNTT faculty about FTNTT faculty experiences.

I was surprised and heartened by the positive accounts told by the participants. Participants shared narrative accounts of professional acceptance, supportive resources, opportunities for professional development and growth, job longevity, employability, and job satisfaction. They spoke of the positive dynamics of building a satisfactory career in a FTNTT faculty position that is mostly viewed in existing research as contingent or time-sensitive. In fact, FTNTT faculty participants interviewed had managed, under threat of
contingent employment, to carve out successful long-term careers. What had they experienced in their work lives that supported their career success and employment longevity?

First, I revisited the work environment and experiences of the FTNTT faculty to begin my discussion of the phenomenon of FTNTT faculty department work lives, experiences, policy and practices, constraints, and supports. I offer a graphic representation of my framework, Agency Theory, in particular the concepts of agency of perspective, agency of action, and action of avoidance linked to narratives presented in Chapter Four.

The conversational, inquiry design of the interview questions, and the free-flowing nature of the interview conversations, makes it difficult to segregate, or generalize, the overall lived experiences FTNTT faculty participants shared. For transparency and logistical purposes, this chapter presents the discussion of the essence of the lived experiences, in the order of the four work environments identified in Chapter Four: Policy and Practices Work Environment; Individual Work Environment, Professional Work Environment, Cultural and Social Work Environment. These four work environments should not be considered in isolation or exclusively, nor are they presented in any order of priority. The four work environments are a comprehensive representation of the lived work experiences of this study’s FTNTT faculty participants.

**Policies and Practices Work Environment**

For the purposes of this study, the Policies and Practices FTNTT Faculty Work Environment was considered to represent the experiences shared by FTNTT faculty
members in regard to departmental and discipline norms. Departmental norms and discipline norms were considered to be the procedural characteristics of the work setting of which the individual faculty member has little control and are under the procedural jurisdiction of university regulations.

This study’s thematic findings for FTNTT faculty policies and practices in the work environment found FTNTT faculty primarily expressed departmental supports as departmental budgetary policy and practices for funding for professional development. FTNTT faculty members linked these opportunities to attend professional development to their professional growth. In addition, FTNTT faculty identified personally and professionally with their discipline and expressed more knowledge about departmental practices than formal departmental policies. Departmental policies were most likely non-institutionalized and non-uniformly implemented. FTNTT faculty considered participation in governance and committees important to their professional esteem and performance evaluations. Also found was FTNTT faculty recognized the department chair, not the institution, as the power (gatekeeper) to hire and retain; policy, practices, supports, professional development, professional growth, career advancement, and career navigation.

**Discipline and Department**

“*Fortunately, they always needed me. It may be the [discipline]. The [discipline] has helped keep me.*” – Carey

“I feel like our department treats us as the heart.” – Gerry

Most FTNTTF members identified the discipline as one of the main sources of faculty identity and academic self-perceptions (Henkel, 2000). Disciplines also vary in
concentration of appointments and FTNTT faculty participants’ perceived job security. In mathematics, English and literature, the FTNTT faculty hires regularly teach full-time core academic subjects (Gappa, 2000, p. 78). All participants expressed a particular passion for their subject areas, including the motivation to teach within their areas of expertise. English literature and mathematic teachers were particularly vocal about their discipline, referring to their expertise in subject content. If FTNTT faculty members were not teaching courses in their areas of expertise, they expressed a sense of frustration. Murphy’s experience was telling and hit at the core of this discussion. Murphy had a terminal degree in another discipline, and a MA in the discipline in which he/she was employed. Murphy was employed full-time, but was not on a tenured track. “And so, I am not allowed to teach any of those classes, even though that is one of the things I have specialized in in graduate classes.” Murphy eventually gave in and quit asking to teach the course to avoid any conflicts within the department, “I teach whatever they want me to.” The willingness to teach “whatever they want me to” was indicative of the experiences of the FTNTT faculty members who had remained in their positions for over 6 years and up to 26 years. The flexibility to “teach whatever”, helped establish the FTNTT faculty member’s value as an employee and sustain their employment longevity. In doing so, the faculty members who “willingly taught whatever” exhibited agency of perspective, in that the perception was by teaching “whatever”, their employment would remain intact.

Murphy extended agency of perspective to include an agency of action to teach “whatever” in return for a good job evaluation and extended job security. Murphy also extended agency of perspective to include an agency of action, by approaching the chair
and asking if he/she could teach the course within their expertise. Most participants exhibited agency of action by willingly teaching ‘whatever they want me to’; one factor they contributed to maintaining their employment longevity (agency of perspective).

The majority of FTNTT faculty interviewed taught in the developmental courses or undergraduate courses with levels of 100, usually no higher than a 200 undergraduate course. One participant taught a 300 level course – by department request, and another taught at one 400 level course – by participant’s request. (The participant, by asking to teach a 400 level course, displayed agency in action.) Those who were teaching in their areas of expertise considered the flexibility to do so as a sign of valued performance, and departmental support (recognition of expertise). Participants perceived longevity as a value. Teaching in their disciplines was viewed as a sign of excellent job performance, increased employability, and sustained job security.

The literature generally acknowledges professional identity is complex and constantly changing (Cunningham, 2014; Kezar & Sam, 2011). The changing nature of FTNTT faculty roles influenced the way FTNTT faculty participants altered their professional identity with job tasks. FTNTT faculty classified their job tasks as either instructional (classroom), coordinator, managerial, or administrative. During the interviews, ten of the twelve participants communicated they gave valued meaning to particular job tasks (i.e., being assigned to pilot programs within their disciplines, administrative assignments, committee service, and participation in governance). Qualitative data reflects FTNTT faculty reframed their agency of perspective to these assigned tasks to represent a reward, display of confidence in their performance, documented value for their position, and/or another indicator for job security. FTNTT
faculty expressed any action by the chair or administration, which led to a perceived increase in job security, as supportive.

Henkel (2000) found, the majority of faculty considered the combination of research and teaching as “what mattered most to their sense of identity” (p. 184). Teaching was the task that mattered most to the participants in interviewed in this study. This was not surprising, since all FTNTT faculty members held a five/five class work load. Another reason faculty may have associated teaching, with a positive sense of identity, is that students “have little idea of the two-tier structure and accept you readily as a full faculty member” (Purcell, 2007, p. 135). It is within the sanctuary of the classroom that FTNTT faculty are given immediate membership as a full-fledged faculty member, without marginalization of appointment type and status. Acceptance as a full-fledged faculty member is immediate and without question (Purcell, 2007, p. 135). This study confirmed Purcell (2007) who claims students accept, at first class meeting, the FTNTT faculty as a full-fledged faculty member. Shelby confirmed recognition of the FTNTT faculty member, as a full-fledged faculty member, comes to play within in the very first class meeting. Full faculty recognition comes from the students’ initial acknowledgement of the faculty member. During the first class meeting, the student will usually address the FTNTT faculty member as ‘Professor’ or ‘Doctor’, regardless of the instructor’s employment status.

As an aside, an interesting question, for future study on FTNTT faculty identity would be, “Do you correct your students’ when they assume you are a full-professor? Or, when they call you “Dr.”? Why or why not?
Policies and Practices

Most universities have not formally and intentionally addressed policy and practices relating to the employment of their FTNTT faculty (Baldwin & Chronister 2001). Hollenshead et al. (2007) reported a national study of four year institutions have attempted to create some policies relating to FTNTT faculty. Kezar (2013) argued, “As of 2011, the landscape has changed and some campuses are working to implement policies for comparison studies of positive policies and practices in place for FTNTT faculty. We know little about these efforts beyond the broad survey data that documents the fact that some institutions are beginning to address these [NTT faculty] issues” (p. 573).

This study adds to the literature of Baldwin and Chronister (2001), Hollenshead et al. (2007) and Kezar (2013) and their discussion of FTNTT university policies and practices. However, this study ran counter to some elements of both Hollenshead et al. (2007) and Kezar (2013). Specifically, this study’s FTNTT faculty participants did not reveal or validate the institutionalization of new supportive FTNTT faculty policies. On the contrary, FTNTT faculty described policies communicated in loose, informational faculty networks. FTNTT faculty were unsure of the status of policies thought to be in revision stages. FTNTT faculty members did not have a clear understanding of questioned departmental policies, or practices.

Newer employees asked established employees to clarify departmental policies and practices; thus, opening avenues for information to be unreliable, miscommunicated or misunderstood. Departmental policies and practices, between new faculty members and established faculty members were generally communicated by word of mouth. The
FTNTT faculty participants in this study often served as resources and mentors to new NTT faculty members.

Although the NTT faculty communication system for policies and practices was loosely implemented, FTNTT faculty member participants described their department policies and practices as supportive. This description would indicate the informality associated with departmental policies and practices was not necessarily ineffective. This finding may have been impacted by the demographics of the participants in the study. The participant with the least amount of employment service was six years. The study’s participants had been employed in their departments for a range of six to 26 years. At this point of employment longevity, all participants in this study would be considered by a new employee to be a reliable resource for questions regarding departmental policy. Even though all interviewed participants had a working knowledge of policies and practices in the department, most expressed variations of uncertainty considering the specificity and origin of particular policy and practices. This lack of unwritten, or unclear departmental policies, could cause a trickle down of misinformation to all NTT faculty, eventually risking employment frustrations or job dissatisfaction.

Another interpretation carries both negative and positive connotations to the informal department communication channels for policies and practices. Although the shared information may be incongruent, established employees would not be as hesitant as a new employee to approach the administration or leadership to verify the policy or any misunderstandings. In turn, this informal communication network would open the channels for collegial and professional communication between new and established employees.
The Power of the Chair

“The Chair is very accommodating.” – Toby

“We have an outstanding Chair.”

“Their expertise is in our field, so they get it at a certain level.” Carey

As a result of unwritten policies, all participants transferred the power of decision-making, and day to day management operations (including employment hires and retention) to the department chair. All but one of the participants described their department chairs as supportive. (The one remaining participant did express support by the department chair in the area of class schedules.) Most participants viewed the chair as policy-maker, as well as a policy-enforcer. In addition, participants recognized the power of the department chair to be flexible, with the power to interpret policies as deemed necessary. The power of the chair to interpret policies, as they see fit, leads to inconsistencies in policy and practices within the department. One participant expressed department decisions were influenced by the chair’s openly expressed, “dislike for the discipline.” Another participant expressed the same verbalization by an administrator, “who didn’t like the discipline.”

Two other participants, each from different universities, favored changes in their job appointments as arranged by the department chair. Both appointments conflicted with the FTNTT faculty member’s expected departmental policy or practice norm – even though the conflict was positive in nature for the FTNTT faculty member. Neither employee exercised agency of perspective since the chair’s action was counter to the FTNTT faculty members’ expectation. Nor, did either FTNTT faculty member exhibit agency of action by asking for the re-assignments (Campbell & O'Meara, 2014).
Participants did not actively engage in an action to solicit a change on their behalf. However, both employees willingly accepted the new position; thereby, demonstrating an agency of action by teaching the new course(s). The chair’s actions, instigated only by the chair, benefited both participants, regardless of their perceptions of what the expected departmental protocol would be. In this case, though somewhat confused by the chair’s actions, the FTNTT faculty were pleased with the change, and considered the opportunity a supporting effort by the chair.

The lack of policy institutionalization had mixed effects on the expectations of the FTNTT faculty participants. Some participants learned to depend on the practices and considered the practices as pseudo-policy. FTNTT faculty were more knowledgeable of policy practices than policies. In other words, they expressed expectations of how a situation would be handled, without knowing if the expected action was actually a written policy. The majority of participants interviewed had placed faith in their department chair to ‘accommodate and support them – if possible’. Becher and Trowler (2001) would extend this power of the chair to recognize the significant role chairs play in “what is good and what is not” (p. 85). With this consideration, faculty had the potential – but not the power – to scrutinize whether a policy or practice was considered a positive or a negative.

FTNTT faculty policy reconstructions that participants mentioned primarily concerned daily management issues (i.e. support of professional development funds, flexibility in schedules, course assignments, and participation in governance). Most policies and practices mentioned by the faculty were implemented by the chair. Perhaps this has importance why the FTNTT Faculty members’ relationship with the department
chair of the department was significant. Also, it reasons that the one who implements the policies and practices would be considered as holding a position of power. Daily decisions are concrete and implementations are personal. Not surprising, qualitative data conveyed all participants recognized the Department chair’s position as one of power, which is also supported by existing literature (Becher & Trowler, 2001, p. 85).

**Governance and Departmental Committees**

“Sometimes we don’t even know if we are eligible to vote on something or not…

*If you want to attend – why should your voice be different or unheard?*” – Shelby

“The first years do a lot of committee work and a lot of work you don’t get paid for.” – Toby

“There are several lecturers in the department, we are all engaged, and so that takes time that we do not get any credit for.” – Brogan

According to the literature reviewed, existing research tends to support the structures of faculty governance and policies on governance assume a faculty member is eligible to participate in governance when they serve on full-time and tenure-track positions (AAUP, 2013, p. 1). Although there are mixed reviews, literature generally reports that NTT faculty are more likely to be excluded from governance than full-time TT faculty members (AAUP, 2013). The AAUP report recognizes discrepancies in the numbers of an informal survey of 125 university senate leaders (research and comprehensive universities) that reported: 67.9% exclusion of NTTF members from specific types of governance activities and 62.4% indicated their universities had policies to ensure shared governance rights for NTT faculty (AAUP, 2013).
This study is in contrast to the AAUP’s (2013) claim that 62.4% had policies to ensure shared governance rights for NTT faculty and supports the contradicting claims that 67.9% of NTTF members are excluded from specific types of governance activities. (AAUP, 2013). Eight of twelve study participants interviewed shared experiences in which they had served on governance-like committees. Only one participant had served on a governance (Faculty Senate) committee.

It is important to note that not all university committees are classified as governance. For example, service on appointed departmental meetings (ex., Curriculum and Instruction) does not constitute governance service. Governance committees (ex., Faculty Senate) are hierarchical in university appointment, decision-making and traditionally carry with service a high level of prestige. During participant interviews, governance and governance-like committees were discussed simultaneously, but not interchangeably. Reviewed literature connects the importance of shared decision-making opportunities to a supportive work environment for all faculty; however, participation in decision-making opportunities was not a “significant contributor to agency perspective or action” (Campbell & O'Meara, 2014, p. 68). This study contradicted Campbell and O’Meara’s (2014) finding. FTNTT faculty participants shared the participation in decision-making opportunities as intrinsically important to their professional identity. Agency of Perspective was exhibited when they FTNTT faculty participants expressed participation on committees was important to positive performance evaluations, which was linked to employment longevity and job security (Campbell & O’Meara, 2014; Foss, 2007).
FTNTT faculty participants articulated that although they were invited to serve on some committees, they were not considered an equal member -- because they were not allowed voting rights. Conversely, the eight participants’ explicitly shared negative experiences in regard to lack of full-participation with governance and governance-like committee rights and recognitions. Fully vetted members of the committees (departmental and Faculty Senate) were guaranteed complete voting rights. FTNTT faculty members were, more than not, denied voting rights. Only two participants reported equal voting rights. One participant served a departmental committee appointment and the other served a faculty senate appointment. During this interview, the participant shared, with chagrin, the university no longer allows FTNTT faculty to serve on Faculty Senate.

Qualitative data, from participant interviews, supports this study’s finding that FTNTT faculty interviewed assigned meaning to non-voting privileges as a symbol of marginalization. All eight participants, who reported committee experiences, explicitly stated that there was an element of prestige associated with service to the committee and explicitly stated their committee service was an avenue for good job evaluations and job security (agency of perspective). Faculty members also commonly expressed they felt like participation on committees, with full voting rights, ‘gives me a voice’ and is valued as supportive. FTNTT faculty members expressed they did not expect to be included in governance (agency of perspective), yet considered participation in governance important to their professional esteem. FTNTT faculty did not suggest they should be required to serve on governance committees, only that they be eligible to do so, if desired.
Three participants shared a lack of interest in serving on governance committees; since FTNTT faculty members, already under great demands, served without additional compensation or recognition. The three participants suggested they would rather not—for different personal reasons—serve on a governance committee. Nor, were some participants disappointed when not required to attend specific departmental or committee meetings. Participants also voiced their agency of perspective by expressing committee meetings could be an open door for disagreements with tenured-track colleagues, which could result in a less than collegial working environment (AAUP, 2013, p. 3).

These findings may or may not have been influenced by the career stage of the participants, and the simultaneous discussion of governance and department committee service (Feldman & Turnley, 2001). Participants with employment longevity, may not feel the pressures for service on committees that a newer employee may feel to participate in committees. Employees (new and established) may consider participation in committees an important part of their evaluations, which contributes to their agentic perspective. (This discussion is developed in the Chapter Five section, Evaluations.) On the other hand, employees with longevity, may be personally or intrinsically committed to their department and discipline. Future studies should distinctly separate FTNTT faculty service on governance, governance-like, and/or departmental committees.

Another interpretation for FTNTT faculty interest or non-interest in participation in scholarship, service, or research is consideration of the influence of the FTNTT faculty’s contract that does not require any of the above trilogy, all required of TT faculty. Though all but one participant served on committees, the reasons for doing so were intrinsic, or the perceived expectation to do so to enhance performance evaluations,
and job retention. Because of the perceived expectation that participation would enhance performance evaluations, FTNTT participants exhibited an agency of perspective. By actually taking the action to serve on the committees, FTNTT participants also exhibited agency of action (Campbell & O’Meara, 2014). This study adds to the discussion that the strategic and intentional behavior not to participate on committees, with full risk assessment, would be considered an action of avoidance.

**Individual Work Environment**

The Individual Work Environment, for the purpose of this study, was considered to represent the experiences shared by FTNTT faculty members in regard to departmental norms, concerning “framework situations that arise in individuals’ personal lives that can affect role performance” (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995, p. 17). Characteristics of these situations are usually fluid, and to at least some extent, under the control of the individual faculty member. Elements of departmental evaluations may or may not be present.

This study’s thematic findings in the individual FTNTT faculty work environment found that FTNTT faculty workloads are time intensive FTNTT faculty recognized work-life balance through the flexibility of schedule. The schedules were controlled by the chair. FTNTT faculty did not know if their experiences were typical or atypical. Professional growth was tied to participants’ credentials and professional development. FTNTT faculty are not as productive in research as TT faculty; research productivity is an opportunity to be seized, if not offered, and is initiated by personal motivations and collegial collaborations.
Experiences

This section portrays participant responses to the interview question which asked FTNTT to explain if they considered their departmental experiences, as compared to other colleague’s experiences, as ‘typical or atypical’. Specifically, participants were asked, “In your conversations with other FTNTT faculty colleagues, what is your sense of how your departmental experiences compare with others? Do you think your experiences are typical?” Chris, responded, “Typical.” I asked Chris to explain the reasoning for the response. Chris offered, “It is based on observations, indirect communications, and direct communications.” I asked Chris to describe the sources of the observations, and communications, and if those sources included other departments. Chris responded, “No, just this department.” Chris’s remarks showed the source of his response had been based on one department, and did not include comparisons with other departments. Therefore, I questioned the assessment of “typical” and considered the “typical” response an anomaly. The majority of participants’ responses were “not sure”. Brogan’s account best describes the explanations given by the “not sure” participants:

I am not sure about going across different departments. I probably should have had those conversations, but I am not exposed, we don’t have the opportunity to have those conversations. We pass each other in the hall, but I don’t think we have those avenues.

In retrospect, I realize FTNTT faculty have very little discretionary time, or opportunity for FTNTT faculty members to meet outside their own departments. This question was the least effective question in my interview protocol and will more than likely be deleted, or at least revised, in any future studies. The lack of time and restrictive
nature of the classrooms, made it unlikely for FTNTT faculty members to meet and discuss their experiences with faculty from other departments.

**Professional Development and Professional Growth**

“I have been involved in professional development for the last two summers, has helped me teach the new integrated courses. That has been vital to my job in the classroom.” – Chris

“When they offer professional development during my class time, I can’t do them. It’s like they almost create them for staff.” – Carey

This study contrasted the finding of Baldwin and Chronister (2001) and Gappa and Leslie (1993) that organizations do not usually provide funding for NTT faculty to travel for professional development or research. The literature suggests the lack of financial support for FTNTT faculty members sends a subliminal message that FTNTT faculty are not inclusive nor is the university responsible for FTNTT faculty professional development, nor for providing opportunities leading to FTNTT faculty professional growth (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

This study’s participants indicated that at least in their employment universities, the universities do provide opportunities for FTNTT to engage in professional development and travel. All FTNTT faculty participants verbally shared they had received support from the department for participation in professional development, including participation in professional development that included travel. FTNTT faculty participants expressed that the opportunity to participate in professional development opportunities, increased their employability, expertise, and enhanced job adaptability.
These perceptions, as voiced by participants, expressed an agency of perspective. This agentic perspective drove their agency of action (to ask for funding and participate in professional development (Campbell & O’Meara, 2014). In addition, within this study, if the participant had weighed the risks of not asking for professional development funding, they would have exhibited an action of avoidance.

Gappa et al. (2007) stated “Faculty members are most satisfied when they believe they are growing professionally” (p. 117). Although distinct in their own characteristics, professional development and professional growth, were linked during participants’ interviews. To distinguish, between professional development and professional growth, FTNTT faculty members and I discussed the two terms and agreed upon the distinction to consider participation in professional development opportunities as an avenue for professional growth.

FTNTT faculty members expected their department to financially support professional development opportunities for professional growth. All twelve of the faculty participants interviewed reported receiving some form of financial support from their departments to attend professional conferences. All faculty participants said that they consider attending a conference (professional development) as part of their professional growth. Professional growth was expressed as a potential avenue for positive evaluations of work performance. As in this case, and most cases, agency of perspective serves as a catalyst for agency of action (Campbell & O’Meara, 2014). During this study, agency of perspective was also recognized as a catalyst for action of avoidance. Subsequently, all of this study’s participants verbalized funding professional development as a supportive departmental policy and practice.
A negative issue was when the in-house professional developments and instructional classroom schedules were in conflict. Time constraints and class schedules regularly prevented FTNTT faculty from participating in in-house professional development opportunities. Therefore, this study’s finding suggests authority be given to the research of Lechuga and Lechuga (2012), which advocates university opportunities for professional development programs could be more efficient – if present professional development opportunities were re-examined to support the working lives of FTNTT faculty and NTT faculty (p. 88).

**Employability**

> Anything you can do to justify them adding more years to your contract, or making yourself more employable, is a good thing.” – Shelby

The concept of employability, rather than just employment, surfaced during the interviewees with eight participants. These participants included the importance of employability to their own employment (whether it be with their present university or another university) as important to their sense of well-being. “It is the company’s [university’s] responsibility to provide employees with the tools, the open environment, and the opportunities for assessing and developing their skills (Waterman, Waterman, and Collard, 1994, p. 87). In return, employees (faculty) will “dedicate themselves to the idea of continuous learning but also stand ready to reinvent themselves to keep pace with change” (Waterman et al., 1994, p. 88). Waterman et al. (1994) provides an example of agentic perspective, because there is an expectation, which in this case demonstrates the lead to an agentic action through change. Through this link, this study offers new to the
literature, the connections between agency of perspective, agency of action, action of avoidance, reciprocal relationships, and employability.

Literature supports evidence that a reciprocal relationship may serve as foundational elements for faculty job satisfaction and job security. Job security may come in the form of FTNTT faculty “employability, and work that is more meaningful and satisfying” (Curry, 2003, p. 12).

Participants’ qualitative accounts suggested the presence – to some degree --of a reciprocal relationship between eleven of this study’s participants and their respective universities. All participants voiced their department had a positive culture, and all but one participant expressed a positive working relationship with their department chairs. Qualitative data showed FTNTT faculty gave meaning to funding supports as a show of department value and recognition, and positive job performance.

One participant suggested a lack of reciprocal relationship with the department chair. This participant did not feel the organization supported their voluntary efforts to obtain in-house and outside grants, primarily designed for student recruitment and enrichment. As a result, the participant ceased their grant-writing labors and channeled energies to the classroom. In this case, their agency of perspective was the catalyst for changes in behavior. The participant channeled energies to other academic interests, but avoided past rigorous efforts to obtain out-side grants.

It is outside the scope of this study to determine the degree in which FTNTT faculty members and administrators shared a reciprocal relationship. However, the degrees and influence of reciprocal relationships between FTNTT faculty members and administrators, should be considered for future studies.
In another viewpoint, Gappa et al. (2007) includes adaptability and flexibility within the concept of employability and reciprocal relationships. This study found flexibility of schedules as one of the most important benefits available to FTNTT faculty. This finding adds validity to the suggestion that some degree of reciprocal relationship existed between the department chairs and this study’s participants. In return for the chair’s flexibility in assigning class schedules, NTTT faculty anticipated changes for class assignments and job tasks (agency of perspective). In addition, FTNTT faculty assumed responsibility for their own career paths. (An illustration of this assumed responsibility is included in an earlier discussion of FTNTT faculty members seizing the opportunity for research.) Another viewpoint gives consideration to the chair’s flexibility in class scheduling, by participant request. FTNTT faculty should be provided “opportunities to carve out a more satisfying work-life balance, remain current in their fields and develop or extend their skills” (Gappa, 2007, p. 282, 283). Consequently, a participants’ agency of action can best be nurtured in a work environment that includes a collegial and non-threatening work environment that allows participants to negotiate and discuss issues surrounding their work-life balance (Gappa, 2007).

Subsequently, all participants, without any signs of hesitation, expressed the importance of flexibility in class schedules as a department support.
Research Productivity

“There isn’t enough time.” – Gerry

FTNTT faculty are not as involved in research productivity as TT faculty. This finding was not surprising since the time commitment for teaching a 5/5 load leaves little time for academic research. Also, this finding is consistent with the literature of (Bland et al., 2006; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Most of the current literature agrees that university policies and practices typically hinder the administrative supports and available resources for FTNTT faculty to participate, if so inclined, in academic research. Although FTNTT faculty has, by all rights, to participate in academic research and publications, heavy class loads, which usually are maxed at cap in student numbers, does not support additional time to participate in time-intensive academic projects, such as research.

This study adds to existing literature by sharing participants’ experiences in which FTNTT faculty members describe participation in research as an opportunity to be seized – if not offered. Qualitative data supports FTNTT faculty members who participated in research did so out of personal motivation, departmental request, or because of an opportunity to collaborate with TT colleagues. FTNTT faculty members verified TT faculty members held the role of principal investigator for all research projects in which FTNTT faculty were involved. Several reasons could account for FTNTT faculty members as co-researchers, rather than principal researchers. FTNTT faculty may be less confident of their research skills, less familiar with Internal Review Board procedures, and less committed to the laborious and time-consuming writing process. FTNTT faculty members are not required to produce research products for
review or publication. On the other hand, FTNTT faculty members, carrying a 5/5 class load, may not have the time necessary to take the lead on a research project, nor have necessary resources (time, funding, and office supplies) needed for an academic research project. And, FTNTT faculty contracts do not require scholarship, service, or research.

**Workload, Work life and Flexibility**

Faculty workloads were time intensive and met a 5/5 work load requirement. By contract terms, FTNTT faculty expected to carry time-intensive, full 5/5 loads for fall and spring semesters. FTNTT faculty members anticipated and relied upon routine negotiations with their department chairs in regard to schedule preferences. Through these negotiations, a positive work-life balance was met. The flexibility of assigned schedules was controlled by the department chair, who in all cases, was seen as cooperative and accommodating – if at all possible. FTNTT faculty members expressed flexibility in their willingness to teach different classes – as determined by department need. This discussion overlaps with the sections, Employability and Power of the Chair, but is reiterated because of the high significance all participants gave the concept of *flexibility and work life balance* and is in support of the research of O'Meara and Campbell (2011).

**Employment and Retention**

“I kind of just fell into it [employment].” – Peyton

In respect to existing literature, FTNTT participants described employment recruitment, employment decisions, and retention policies in a variety of ways within their departments and universities (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kezar & Gehrke, 2014). Qualitative data from this study supports decisions for contract
renewals were made by both committee and department chairs at the universities in which participants were employed. Job retention was determined in some departments, at each university by the department chair. The power for employment and release was attributed to the Chair of the department, not the Dean. Other departments, at each of the universities, relied on committees within the departments to make contract renewal decisions.

FTNTT faculty members shared different circumstances surrounding their employment (i.e., location, hit and miss, lucky, spousal appointment, colleague referral, last-minute opportunity). These incongruent means used to recruit and employ faculty adds to the literature of (Cross & Goldenberg, 2009; Kezar & Gehrke, 2014) who assert that decisions supporting increased hiring practices for NTT faculty members are made without consideration of supporting policies and practices. Based upon participant interviews, the policies for job recruitment, employment, and retention, did not appear uniform, or institutionalized within either university. Non-uniform recruitment, employment, and retention practices sent mixed messages to the participants. Most participants, who were hired under a haphazard employment system, reframed their employment to represent the administration’s recognition of their qualifications for employment. In other words, the FTNTT faculty participants reframed their haphazard employment as one in which the administration found them to be employable, and a ‘best fit’. On the other hand, the administration, hiring under a non-intentional employment plan, may create an imbalance among the faculty that is not in line with the departments’ faculty needs, causing a less than conducive working environment (Cross & Goldenberg, 2009).
This study adds to the literature of Cross and Goldenberg (2009), the more stringent the hiring policies or practice, the greater the perception of value FTNTT faculty assign to the position and the subliminal message that may or may not be sent to the faculty. In other words, a rigorous hiring policy or practice can send a message to colleagues that the employees hired to fill the position has passed an arduous employment process, and is qualified or worthy of the position. To illustrate, Brogan’s agency of perspective assigned value to a strict employment process in their department at University Two:

I presented a lesson and met with a committee. It’s stringent. FTNTTF members participate in the process. Though it’s led by a TT Faculty member, 2 lecturers serve on the committee, with equal vote. The department gives it a collective thumbs up or thumbs down. So if there are five on the committee, three TT and two NTT, there are five votes, we perform all the interviews, meet with the candidates, no differently than for a search process for a TT person. This is a different department.

Brogan equated the NTT hiring practices for the discipline was a formal process, much like the hiring procedure for a tenured-track position. In addition, Brogan acknowledged the full participation and voting rights of two NTT faculty members on the hiring committee.

Brogan’s hiring experience is in stark contrast to the other participants, who all acknowledged a less formal, random approach to their employment experiences. The assumption is that the person hired, without departmental vetting, has been employed to fill a position that may be less in value for the department. And, the employee has been
hired for a position that does not require faculty high credentials or academic stature. Employees who can be replaced on short notice may not be considered fully committed to the university or their employment positions.

In another slant, this study’s findings of inconsistent and informal hiring practices for FTNTT faculty members can also be added to the research of Bergom and Waltman (2009), who claim the dissimilar means to employ FTNTT faculty can send a message of job insecurity; whereas, the employee can be easily replaced.

**Professional Work Environment**

For the purposes of this study, the Professional Work Environment FTNTT faculty theme was considered to represent the experiences shared by FTNTT faculty members in regard to departmental norms environmental work characteristics that were fluid, not within full control of the FTNTT faculty member. This theme generally incorporated an element of evaluative feedback to the FTNTT faculty member.

This study’s thematic findings in FTNTT faculty professional work environment found: FTNTT faculty had mixed motivations concerning salaries; salary perceptions were usually shaped by home finances usually influenced by dual or single income earnings; recruitment and employment methods are unstructured; academic freedom and autonomy exists, but may not be equal to TT faculty supports; career advancement is tied to academic credentials and career navigation is linked to agency of perspective and employability. FTNTT faculty members’ evaluation criteria is dubious; recognition, promotions and rewards are sparsely given; job security is perceived secure by the budget, discipline and employment longevity. FTNTT faculty are well-versed in their
jobs responsibilities, which are extending into new venues; and changing job responsibilities adds to existing confusions of the legalities concerning FTNTT faculty contract terms.

**Compensation**

FTNTT faculty participants’ qualitative responses to the issue of compensation (salaries) were wide-ranging (as offered in Chapter Four). Home financial supports (i.e., single family income or dual family incomes) appeared to influence faculty responses. The greater the appeared income earnings usually projected by a dual family income, the less emphasis on salary. However, established FTNTT faculty members (through employment longevity) were empathetic to new FTNTT faculties’ low salaries. One reason given for the empathy was that new faculty, often had young dependent children at home, and could not meet the rising costs of family living.

Salary compression was an issue raised by several FTNTT faculty members, regardless of employment longevity. Mixed responses as negative, or neutral, makes it difficult to ascertain FTNTT faculty participants’ central meaning ascribed to salary. There were no positive responses from FTNTT faculty in regard to their salaries. One word that did appear consistent with discussion of salaries was the term, *equitable*. Equity was measured by the amount of work required in the position. FTNTT faculty members recognized higher salaries of the TT faculty members, but considered them fair in lieu of TT faculties’ extra efforts to obtain a terminal degree.

This study ran counter to August (2000) who reported *administrators* identified the employment issues they felt most salient to their Non-tenure track faculty as compensation. Nor did this study support (Fogg, 2006) who states that the institutional
climate and collegiality were five times as important as salary in predicting faculty job satisfaction.

**Autonomy and Academic Freedom**

Ten of the twelve participants expressed they held a guaranteed sense of autonomy within their classrooms. Chris, best portrayed FTNTT faculty’s essence of autonomy as “the creative freedom to decide how to develop a class” (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Wanberg, 2012). Taylor exhibited the right to autonomy, by the use of a text, other than the default text, in the classroom. However, Taylor was subjected to scrutiny by a TT faculty member for using a self-selected text. Taylor’s support by the chair, demonstrated by “talking with her about it”, was a sign of departmental policy and practices, as well as a sign of support for Taylor’s position. By talking with the TT faculty member, the chair sent the message that FTNTT faculty held the right to autonomy, as well as the full support of the chair. The responses by the TT faculty member, and TT colleagues to the chair’s action, remains unknown. However, the chair’s chance to clarify a departmental policy or practice or could have been viewed as a contention between chair, department, TT, and FTNTT faculty. Taylor’s tone indicated the matter was quickly resolved. Taylor did not offer any evidence of additional feedback or a chained reaction by either FTNTT faculty or TT faculty.

All but one participant expressed having a sense of academic freedom in the classroom (AAUP, 2013). Yet, a question remained as to the degree of academic freedom. Chris best portrayed the sense of academic freedom within the classroom by saying, “I have a creative freedom in my class when deciding how to develop a class.”
Murphy did not have a sense of academic freedom within the classroom (even though Murphy held a terminal degree). All syllabi, assignments, and texts had to be approved before Murphy could use them in the classroom or make distribution to the students. Murphy labeled this lack of academic freedom as a departmental act of *marginalization* (Kezar & Sam, 2011). In Murphy’s case, one person contributed to Murphy’s sense of marginalization. “‘It really chaps me… don’t get me wrong, I love my faculty, the person is a really nice person, but it puts me in an apprentice type role and it keeps me in an apprentice type role.”

Although Murphy expressed a sense of marginalization, earlier responses indicated a strong positive relationship with the faculty and consideration of the department chair as *supportive*. Murphy’s marginalization experience was textbook in description; however, the positive departmental culture and identification of the chair as supportive, could possibility place Murphy’s responses as an anomaly or outlier.

**Career Advancement and Credentials**

FTNTT faculty interviewed did not endure the rigors of a tenure process; yet, this study’s participants’ academic credentials are impressive. NTTT faculty participants’ credentials, represented here by the highest degrees earned, are inspiring. All participants had completed either a B.A. degree, B.S. degree, or B.S.W. degree. Three participants have a Master’s degree; three participants have two or more Master’s degrees; one participant has a Rank I Specialist degree; two participants have Masters of Fine Arts degrees; two participants have completed their Ph.D.’s, and one participant has completed all coursework for a Ph.D. The participant plans to work on the dissertation when other factors fall into place (i.e., family, time, and responsibilities outside the
university). Other participants included those not planning to obtain a terminal degree, and those that plan to begin coursework at a later time). Though FTNTT faculty members have not gone through the rigors of the tenure process, their completed coursework speaks to a level of competency, certainly within the requirements for the undergraduate courses in which most are assigned to teach.

**Evaluations**

“It’s just the way the system is, you have to do this above and beyond my coursework.”

— Gerry.

All participants, expressed an Agency of Perspective that extra performances would result in a higher evaluation. All participants, except one, was copious in reporting their extra-curricular activities, service, scholarship and committee participations. The participants’ commitments to perform ‘extra’ work was born from two sources. One reason FTNTT gave for serving in extra assignments could best be described as personal, or intrinsic. Some participants felt like attendance at the meetings makes me feel like my voice is heard” (Murphy). “I just enjoy going” (Shelby). The second reason given by FTNTT faculty for participating in extra work, aligns with (Curry, 2003) “A lot of people believe if they do work less they'll be seen as less committed, and in a shaky economy no one wants that.” (p. 48). FTNTT faculty participants were uncertain of the criteria for annual evaluations, but expected to have to go beyond their classroom performances in order to have a positive evaluation. The view that FTNTT faculty had to ‘go beyond their classroom performance in order to have a positive evaluation fits Campbell and O’Meara’s (2014) conceptual frameworks of Agency Theory.
Policies from University One stipulated evaluations to be ‘tenure like’ and evaluations from University Two were to meet the performance criteria for ‘faculty statuses’. Evaluations were formally written, although dubious, in their implementation. Some participants thought the process fair, others found the process designed to reflect the same measurements as TT faculty – even though FTNTT faculty were not contractually held to the same standards. Employee value was demonstrated by the department chair, usually in the form of verbal recognitions on the annual review document. This study contributes new to the literature, FTNTT faculty substituted meanings to their restructured schedules, changing job tasks, and employment longevity to represent value symbols for positive job performances. This study’s participants did not object to performance evaluations, but desired the evaluation criteria to be clearly stated and implemented.

**Recognition**

“I don’t think I have ever heard the chair say, ‘you are doing a good job’ except for the evaluation at the end of the year when the chair says, ‘you are doing a good job.’ The other 365 days a year, I don’t hear anything.” – Toby

This study supported existing research that claims FTNTT faculty members are unlikely to receive performance rewards or recognitions, other than through the formality required by annual performance evaluations. FTNTT faculty shared varying shades of verbal recognitions, but little signs of receiving a written evaluation – except on the annual evaluation form.

All faculty deserves to be recognized. It is a sign of respect and is considered one of the most salient FTNTT faculty employment issues (Campbell & O’Meara, 2014;
Lack of recognition can reduce faculty morale, lessen faculty job satisfaction, and lessen faculty commitment to the university and department, damage faculty’s overall performance work environment, which can negatively affect the student learning environment.

**Promotion**

“There is no promotion. You are hired by contract to teach and we pay you this amount of money to teach the classes and that’s the end of it.” – Peyton

“No [promotion]. I would have to get on the tenure track and that would require a Ph.D.” – Carey

This study’s qualitative data strongly supports the call for systematic promotional opportunities for FTNTT faculty (Feldman & Turnley, 2004; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Hart, 2011; Levin & Shaker; 2011; Waltman et al., 2012). Promotions can have the impact to show value to an employee, treat the FTNTT faculty member more like a professional, and may or may not serve as a performance motivator for some faculty members. As indicated by participants’ responses, the lack of promotional opportunities was accepted, but not positively embraced. Both genders, and all participants, expressed the need for a promotional system for FTNTT faculty members. The heterogeneous nature of the FTNTT came into play during this discussion. It appears there are intrinsic factors at play for faculty’s desire to be recognized, rewarded, or promoted. Even though a participant may or may not need – or even want – recognitions, rewards, or promotions for themselves, all participants expressed the need for a systematic promotional system to be in place. Employment longevity did not appear as an issue for seeking a promotion;
but FTNTT longevity was attached to conversations for the need to consider establishing formal, regular FTNTT faculty promotional opportunities.

**Job Security**

“So, acting out of fear is not going to do any good.” – Gerry

“Just give me job security!” – Toby

In the world of higher education, continuous employment or job security is traditionally represented by faculty appointment to a tenured position or a tenure-track position. Tenure or a tenure-track position in higher education traditionally represents the pinnacle or Holy Grail of faculty achievement. In the late 1970’s and early 1980’s federal age discrimination legislation was the precursor to the 1990’s removal of the mandatory retirement age for employees (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006, p. 185). “Since the end of mandatory retirement, faculty members increasingly stay on after age seventy” (Cross & Goldenberg, 2009, p. 55). This change in legislation added a new dimension to the concept of tenure and life-time employment. One effect of the new legislation was the increase in employment longevity and later retirement ages for tenured faculty. As a consequence of this effect, tenure began to represent “life-time employment (McPherson and Schapiro, 1999, p. 86). The term life-time employment” should not be taken literally. “Even tenure is no guarantee of a job for life. It doesn’t happen often, but institutions do have the power to dismiss tenured professors for financial exigency, program closure, or sustained poor performance” (Shing, 2012, p. 12). Merely being on the tenure track does not guarantee tenure. Tenured faculty must go through a laborious process and probationary period (usually seven years) before a tenured position can be granted. Yet,
traditional perceptions of ‘life-time employment’ continues to surround the tenured or tenure-track appointment.

FTNTT faculty participants’ agency of perspective reflected acceptance of their lessened chances for securing a tenured or tenured track position. Qualitative data disclosed a positive correlation between FTNTT faculty credentials and the chances of securing a tenured, or tenure track position; however, gaining additional educational credentials to enhance their chances for tenure was on the back burner for the majority of this study’s FTNTT faculty. Carey, a University One participant (employed seven years), explicitly expressed the desire to actively pursue a TT position. Chris, a University Two participant (employed 9 years), expressed a desire to move into a TT position, and would “actively pursue any opening”, but would not pursue a TT position anywhere except University Two. Toby, a University Two participant and the newest hire, six years) was interested in pursuing another B.A. Degree – in a different discipline. Toby, holds a M.A degree and explicitly stated, “I wanted to teach college, but I did not want a Ph.D.” Later in the interview, Toby reiterated “I want to do that [take advantage of faculty scholarship] but right now, my kids are young…but when the kids get bigger I don’t think I’ll go for a Ph.D., I think I might just work on a B. A. degree in something else I’ve always been interested in. Four others suggested, including the aforementioned participant, that they may work on a terminal degree – when the time is right. The heterogeneous and individual nature of FTNTT faculty members makes it impossible to generalize, or get a full-bodied sense of FTNTT faculty’s motivation to pursue --or not pursue --additional academic credentials or a terminal degree.
For personal reasons, one FTNTT faculty member actually chose a NTT position instead of the tenure-track line. Brogan had been offered a tenured position at another university that did not have the prestige associated with it that the present university of employment carries (agency of perspective). Brogan decided because of opportunities available at the university to take a non-tenured position instead of a tenured one (agency of action). in addition, the university that offered the NTT position had a “higher status, higher salary, and a better retirement plan. There were a lot different things that made me decide to come here (University Two).” Brogan’s decision to accept a NTT position over a TT position somewhat challenges the research of Cross & Goldenberg, (2009) who claim it is not uncommon for NTT instructors, who are offered TT positions, to decline the opportunity, because of geographical locations (p. 77). Although Brogan did not mention location as the primary reason for declining the TT position, the reference to “lots of different things” may have contributed to the distinction.

**Career Longevity**

Existing research shows that job insecurity in higher education report feelings of stress, anxiety, and depression, associated with their positions (AAUP 2014). However, in the current study, these FTNTT faculty members had *successfully* created long, satisfactory careers in a working environment that could be called tenuous at best. How could my participants’ stories differ from the negative constraints that dominated much of the existing literature surrounding FTNTT faculty? The odds are negligible that all twelve of my participants had anomaly experiences – and it was implausible to think all my participants represented outliers.
To expand my discussion, I returned to the transcripts of all participant interviews and began to look for shared goals or common threads surrounding my participants’ experiences concerning job satisfaction, job security, and employment longevity. I began to look at what my participants may have in common – other than being FTNTT faculty members? Did my study’s participants start their careers with similar professional goals? Were there common circumstances this highly credentialed group of educators, one by one, brought to their present employment status? Or, were all twelve of my participants just resilient? What did this group of FTNTT faculty members find meaningful to parlay FTNTT faculty term positions (usually one to three years) into as many as 26 years?

I turned to the transcripts with a new eye. I looked for a missing link. In the world of FTNTT faculty, the tenured concept of secure employment can be identified as job security. The transcripts made it clear that job security was the quest for faculty participants – not tenure. First, what did the FTNTT faculty member not say? None of the participants expressed a desire to not be re-hired, to leave the university, or to re-locate to another professional community. None of the participants expressed seeking employment elsewhere. Second, one goal shared by all FTNTT faculty participants, was and remains, their desire for continued employment or job security. Job security was the one element that all participants desired, and at best, expected. FTNTT faculty participants interviewed had verbalized the elements of longevity, and discipline to their expectation of job security (agency of perspective).

Qualitative data also suggested professional development and professional growth was important, for reasons of job satisfaction and employability. In other words, if one or all of the elements were present, FTNTT faculty harbored a sheltered sense of job
security or continuous employment to the existence of one or more of these elements (agency of perspective). Job security could also be reframed to another university, in the form of employability. If a job position opened at another university, the employee would retain employable credentials, making them an attractive new hire (agency of perspective). Job security and continued employment was referred to in our interviews as synonymous, and will be referred to as synonymous in this discussion.

I reexamined the interview data and literature to gain a better understanding of the identified elements, linked to job security. Specifically, by using a qualitative, phenomenological approach, this study adds new to existing FTNTT faculty literature three essential elements FTNTT faculty assigned as meaningful to job security: Discipline; Longevity and Employability (see figure below).
Figure 2’s Venn diagram represents the elements FTNTT faculty participants holistically identified as meaningful for job security during the interview process. All elements are overlap and should not be considered in total isolation. Gappa et al. (2007) associates job security with job satisfaction (pp. 116-117). The arrow represent Gappa et al.’s (2007) claim that a positive existing relationship exists between job security and job satisfaction (pp. 116-117).

Faculty agentic perspectives of job security can affect faculty performances and productivity in undetermined ways. Faculty, regardless of employment status, rely upon expected incomes in order to meet living expenses, family budgets, financial decisions, planned and unplanned financial encumbrances. Job security provides a release from the pressures of the need to stay familiar with potential new work opportunities --if individual contracts are not renewed. Job security releases the employee from the stress of possible unemployment positions, and allows faculty to concentrate on their preparedness for classes and professional opportunities – rather than expend time and
energy on a job search. Or, if there is persistent doubt of job security, FTNTT faculty members may be hesitant to commit to research projects, deep commitments to departments, serve on curriculum committees, or participate in departmental projects (agency of perspective would serve as a catalyst for agency of action or action of avoidance).

At the time of our interview, rumors were circulating about a decrease in state allocations to all state universities. A funding decrease could realistically lead to cuts in non-tenure track positions at both University One and University Two.

The want or need for continued employment or job security, was higher among some participants than others and for different reasons. The demographics of the FTNTT faculty members had a strong influence on the behaviors and expectations of the FTNTT faculty members interviewed. The ages ranged (estimating) from early 30’s to late 60’s. Younger participants expressed more concerns about job security than older participants. FTNTT faculty members responded according to their expectations and values influenced by the stages of their career development, personal interests, and personal financial backgrounds. If the participant had other financial means, they were less animated about losing their jobs than the participants who were single head of households or the “breadwinner”. Participants, who were at the end of their careers, or considered teaching as their second careers, expressed less fear of job loss. One participant, whose faculty position represented a second career, expressed concern about the newly hired faculty members, and the effect the fear of income loss had on their mental and physical well-being. Peyton contributed:
I love what I do, and it is money, but my kids are not going to starve because I lose this job. On the other hand, the young person across the hall that they let go, they had no income, so they hired them for one year and they were all hyped up and happy because they had this job and one year later they don’t.

Two participants identified their employment positions as *placeholders*. Placeholder, as a FTNTTT faculty typology. The placeholder position is one offered to an employee, with the provision the employee will willingly leave the position, once a qualified candidate is hired to fill the job opening. The *placeholder* positions evolved into long time positions for both participants hired as placeholders. However, the uncertainty and the psychology of being a placeholder, sent negative vibes to both faculty and colleagues. In other words, the status of placeholder sends a message of temporary employee to faculty and colleagues. If an employee is considered temporary, the department may be less inclined to embrace the faculty member as a genuine contributor, or full-fledged member. However, both employees, because of their longevity, experience, and expertise, expressed they considered the placeholder position as “theirs” and did not consider the position temporary (agency of perspective). The assumption shared by both participants was grounded in the longevity of their employment in the position and the lack of departmental efforts to advertise or fill the position with another employee.

**Service Longevity**

*Longevity better count for something.* – Brogan

Eight of twelve FTNTTT faculty participants shared agentic perspective with their perceived connections between longevity and job retention. Longevity was measured by
the time of service to the institution, not the department. The longer a FTNTT faculty participant remained employed at the institution, the greater the perception of job security, and the lesser concern for job retention (Agency of Perspective).

Within higher education, “On the average part-time faculty members spent 6.5 years at the same institution in comparison with 11.6 years for full-time faculty” (AAUP, 1993, p. 1). Hollenshead et al. (2007) reported the average duration of employment is “seven years for full-time non-tenure track faculty and 5.5 years for part-timers” (Hollenshead et al., 2007, p. 55). TT faculty members remain on the average of 19.5 years (Gappa et al., 2007). The average employment longevity of FTNTT faculty members in this study was 12 years. The median range for employment was 9.5 years. This study found FTNTT faculty gave meaning to longevity of employment to the institution as job security. Longevity of service was a token for job retention and job security and held powerful meaning to each employee in regard to job security as was framed within their agency of perspective.

Contracts

Eight of this study’s participants were unsure of the terms of their contracts and could not definitively express key conditions of their contracts. The confusion surrounding terms of employment contracts, and the insecurities surrounding job retention, combined to send mixed messages about the impact job security actually played on the daily roles and performances of FTNTT faculty. This finding was unexpected. I anticipated the FTNTT faculty members would be on heightened awareness when their contracts expired contracts. Earlier comments such as, “It is what it is” (Peyton) and “So, acting out of fear is not going to do any good” (Gerry) were precursors
to the lack of scrutiny unveiled in this study to FTNTT faculty and their contracts. However, when I asked for policy suggestions administrators could offer to be more supportive, this passivity did not preclude FTNTT faculty from suggesting changes to the contracts to represent more job security. One view is that FTNTT faculty may not be as concerned about the specifics of their job responsibilities, as they are about the employment time element – linked to job security. After all, FTNTT faculty participants have responded – and demonstrated --they will “teach what they want me to.”

Most FTNTT faculty members’ contracts are offered on a one to three year term – with no guarantee of renewal, or time extensions. Nine of the FTNTT faculty participants interviewed, suggested administrators and policy makers add a security feature in their contracts. Gappa et al. (2007) claims FTNTT faculty considers the terms of their contracts as employment security when they are awarded multi-year, fixed contracts or rolling contracts, with guaranteed notice of nonrenewal (usually three, five, or ten years). FTNTT faculty did not suggest fixed-term contracts as an alternative to tenure; only a formalized approach to job security.

**Cultural and Social Work Environment**

Cultural and Social Work Environment incorporates the experiences shared by FTNTT faculty in regard to departmental norms concerning the structural perspectives of the department that influence the nature of respect for FTNTT faculty – and their colleagues. *Culture* also embraces the concept of institutional values that advance the climate of the university campus as a whole (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995, p. 150). Organizations and all individuals share in the development of a university’s culture.
Collegiality represents the sense of belonging that a FTNTT faculty member may or may not sense, based upon the principles of respect and inclusion.

This study’s thematic findings of FTNTT faculty’s Cultural and Social Work environment found: faculty departments were identified as having a positive culture; FTNTT faculty members attributed isolated marginalized experiences to personality conflicts, rather than professional sidelining; and the department chair sets the tone of collegiality in the department.

**Culture and Collegiality**

“It’s the inclusion.” – Toby

Faculty participants intertwined the terms, culture and collegiality interchangeably indicating FTNTT faculty’s solid connection between the two -- even though they have distinctive qualities. Culture includes both the policies and practices of an organization, is abstract in nature, and reflects an organization’s values and ideas (Kezar & Sam, 2013, p. 61). Both external and internal factors help shape the departmental and university culture (Tierney, 1988, p. 3).

Collegiality is defined as “An opportunities for faculty members to feel that they belong to a mutually respectful community of colleagues who value their unique contributions” (Gappa et al., 2007, p. 142). Qualitative evidence suggested culture and collegiality served as catalysts for behaviors, perceptions, satisfaction, and performances. Eleven of the participants described their departmental cultures as positive. Nevertheless, eight of twelve participants voiced experiencing some episodic instances of marginalization.
This finding was in contrast to the negative constraints associated with FTNTT faculty employment (O’Meara et al., 2008; Kezar & Sam, 2010, 2011). My study did not support existing research that claims the predominant culture surrounding NTT faculty as negative. The vast majority of faculty departments were identified as having a positive culture and that the chair held the power to set the tone of collegiality and culture within the department. This finding may be attributed to all but one of the participants held their department chair in high regard. The positive relationship with the chair, set the cultural tone for the department – and as such, the participants’ lived work experiences within the department.

One factor that may have influenced faculty responses to identify a positive culture, even though they voiced marginalization experiences, was the work status and demographics of the participants. FTNTT faculty participants all held positions that were classified as non-tenure, or contingent. On the other hand, the participants may feel secure because of longevity and seniority within their positions. The elements of seniority and longevity, assigned by FTNTT faculty to job security, allowed FTNTT faculty the freedom to express the experiences of marginalization without fear of retribution. In contrast, it is possible the FTNTT faculty participants were apprehensive to identify their department culture as anything but positive for fear of retribution.

A different perspective surfaced when participant interviews suggested that more participants assigned the foundation of marginalization as the result of personality conflicts; rather than conflicts rooted in FTNTT faculty’s marginalized employment status.
Participants expressed catalysts for culture changeability was influenced in the administration (chair) or through individual personal, personnel, and/or professional experiences. All FTNTT faculty members identified their departmental cultures as positive; yet, within varying degrees. Through shared experiences, participants described the collegial culture as fluid. For example, one FTNTT faculty participant described a marginalization (deskilling) experience that was negative; however, he/she spoke highly of his/her colleagues and considered the departmental culture, positive. Only two FTNTT faculty members recognized their departmental cultures as inclusive to the point of non-distinction between FTNTT faculty members and TT faculty members. Comparison and contrast among departmental culture, policies, or practices, offer a worthwhile focus for future research studies.

FTNTT faculty tied their expectation of job security to the departmental culture. FTNTT faculty assigned a heightened sense of job security to themselves (agency of perspective) when they identified the departmental culture and collegial environment as positive. FTNTT participants’ engagement in departmental projects was perceived by faculty as valuable to the department and thus, added value to their employment. When FTNTT faculty considered the environment supportive, and the employee valuable, FTNTT faculty were more likely to expect the chair would make every effort to retain their employment (agency of perspective). On the other hand, if the FTNTT faculty member felt less than valued, or the departmental environment was less than congenial, FTNTT faculty expressed the sense that the chair would be less willing to make extra efforts to retain them as employees (agency of perspective). This study strongly buoyed the association of interactions between the department chairs and FTNTT faculty and the
strong influence the relationship between chair and FTNTT faculty has on the FTNTT faculty’s commitment and satisfaction to the department (Maynard & Joseph, 2008). Policies or practices by the chair that set the tone of the department working environment as positive, was expressed by all FTNTT faculty participants as a departmental support.

This study supports the claims the professional and organizational agentic perspectives of the study’s participants associated with TT faculty, rather than PTNTTF faculty (Kezar, 2013; Cross & Goldenberg, 2009; Logue, 2015). FTNTT faculty interviewed shared more in common, in terms of working conditions, with TT faculty than PTNTT faculty. Each of the participants interviewed were assigned well-lit, spacious, pleasantly furnished offices. Offices were not isolated to any far corners of campus but located in a central departmental location. Offices were equipped with current technology. Each office displayed names, and titles, outside office well-marked office doors. Participants articulated during interviews that they had access to plant resources and needed materials. The provision of resources, to complete their jobs, was considered to be a departmental supportive policy and practice. Participants considered the provision of resources, including access to copiers, administrative staff, and offices comparable to full-fledged faculty members. This acceptance contributed to the needs and well-being of FTNTT faculty and supports the works of (Kezar, 2013; Cross & Goldenberg, 2009; Logue, 2015).

Two of the participants verbalized a genuine concern and ‘sympathy’ for the night people – the PTNTT faculty members, who taught night classes, without an office, or access to supplies. References by FTNTT faculty to PTNTT faculty demonstrated concern for PTNTT faculty, which did not include themselves. Had they considered
themselves “one of them,” the concern would have been expressed in a way to indicate their dissatisfaction with these factors within their positions. References to those with less support clearly indicated disparities and a pure distinction between themselves and PTNTT faculty. Sympathy, not empathy, was expressed for the working conditions of the PTNTT faculty members – even though FTNTT faculty members and PTNTT faculty members all are classified within the same classification as non-tenured.

**Job Satisfaction**

All twelve participants voiced the desire to remain at their employment universities, signifying a positive sense of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction as used in this study, is best described as the by the emotional state that results when one feels that have done a good job, or have attained the wants and values associated with their jobs (Ali, 2009; Locke, 1975).

During the interview process, all twelve participant voices gave individual accounts of contingent faculty members who had carved out successful and satisfying careers ranging from six years to 26 years within a public university or universities. All twelve study participants had completed their longevity of service under the umbrella of employment positions designated as time-based. All full-time employment contracts were non-tenured track, fixed-term, contingent or non-permanent. None of the twelve FTNTT faculty members expressed job dissatisfaction to the point of expressing a desire or immediate plans to leave their present employment. However, this does not mean there was complete harmony and satisfaction within the study’s participants. Five of the participants expressed a future desire to obtain their terminal degrees. Had these individuals been completely satisfied with their positions, they may or may not have
considered the additional time and emotional efforts required to obtain a terminal degree to change their employment status.

Cross and Goldenberg (2015) report that research of NTT faculty do not “uncover low morale or job dissatisfaction and the levels of some aspects of job satisfaction appear to be comparable to or even higher than those expressed by tenured-track faculty” (p. 76). Extant literature identifies the link between job security and job satisfaction through diverse means. McClelland (1975) associates job satisfaction with three central needs: achievement, power and affiliation. Hackman and Oldham (1976) linked job satisfaction with skill variety, task significance, autonomy and feedback (cited in Gappa et al., 2007, pp. 120-121). Overall, this study’s FTNTT faculty participants spoke positively about their work, with “teaching, students, work-life balance, and departmental culture as clear links to job satisfaction. This study’s findings align with Gappa et al.’s (2007) claim that a positive existing relationship exists between job security and job satisfaction (pp. 116-117).

**Study’s Main Contributions**

“I don’t mind not being on the tenure-track.” – Gerry

“I work, I do my job, and do the best job I can.” – Braidy

This study found all FTNTT faculty participants believed the department functioned as the central core of the campus and served to house the FTNTT faculty’s heart and well-being for a fulfilling work/life balance. The thematic representations (i.e., Policies and Practices; Individual Work Environment; Professional Work Environment; and Culture Social Environment) and their sub-sections, illustrate the working conditions
that contributed to the nature of the overall essence of FTNTT faculty in their work lives.

This study’s qualitative phenomenological exploration uncovered the essence of FTNTT faculty participants as complex and heterogeneous in nature, with different academic career trajectories and goals. Job security and employability were more important than a tenured position – at this given time.

Findings from this study suggests FTNTT faculty participants navigated their successful career longevities using the concept of agency of perspective (agentic perspective), and agency of action (agentic action) within the framework of Agency of Theory (Campbell & O’Meara, 2014). This study coined the term, action of avoidance, to represent strategic and intentional acts of FTNTT faculty avoided, based on career security risk assessments, and differing agencies of perspective. For the purpose of this study, agency of perspective, agency of action, and action of avoidance, within the framework of Agency Theory, were recorded only in regard to policy and practices that could be changed, or were under the control of university administration or colleagues. This study is one of the first, if not the first, to explore Departmental FTNTT faculty work lives, by a FTNTT faculty member, through the framework of Agency Theory and the conceptual frameworks of agency of perspective, agency of action, and action of avoidance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency of Perspective</th>
<th>Agency of Action</th>
<th>Action of Avoidance</th>
<th>Controllable Policy or Practice?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoid conflicts by not asking to teach in area of expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑ Allow faculty to teach in area of expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Teach whatever they want me to teach” to remain employed</td>
<td>✔ Demonstrate flexibility in performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Job Responsibilities per administration and contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job evaluations improve job security via excellence</td>
<td>✔ Voluntarily participate on committees</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Explicit policy for evaluation criteria, fixed contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid committee participation to avoid conflicts with TT peers</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Establish supportive environment for FTNTT faculty participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in professional development enhances growth</td>
<td>✔ Voluntary participate in P.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Create authentic P.D. opportunities to support faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional growth enhances performance, security, evaluation</td>
<td>✔ Voluntary participate in P.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Contracts that explicitly state criteria for evaluations; policies that promote reciprocal relationships between faculty and department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability offers well-being and career navigation</td>
<td>✔ If employee alters behavior to improve skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Create policies that support all faculty career goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued learning helps re-invent self</td>
<td>✔ If efforts are made to improve learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Create policies that support all faculty career goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve work-life balance</td>
<td>✔ Ask for and negotiate flexibility in class schedules</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Establish practices that support work-life balance for faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going beyond responsibilities leads to higher evaluations</td>
<td>✔ If participates in volunteer responsibilities</td>
<td>✔ If deliberately avoids volunteer responsibilities</td>
<td>☑ Contracts that explicitly state criteria for evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a professional identity and “voice”</td>
<td>✔ Voluntarily attend meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Include all faculty in decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credentials tied to TT position</td>
<td>✔ If efforts are made for higher credentials</td>
<td>✔ If efforts for higher credentials are deliberately avoided</td>
<td>☑ Create policies to support faculty scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency of Perspective</td>
<td>Agency of Action</td>
<td>Action of Avoidance</td>
<td>Controllable Policy or Practice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity of employment equal job security</td>
<td>☑ If participant decides to stay employed</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Fixed-term contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments assignments reflect employee value</td>
<td>☑ Accept departmental assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Create policies, practices that reward and recognize value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved contract negotiation/terms</td>
<td>☑ Approached chair to negotiate</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Establish policies to increase faculty comfort with approaching chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in self-efficacy and own importance to student learning</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Create policies, practices that reward and recognize value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3. Agency of Perspective/Action and Career Longevity**

Figure 3 above reflects this study’s overall findings within the environmental work contexts, as discussed in this chapter. Agency of perspective includes paraphrases from Chapter Five’s discussion, based upon the interview findings in Chapter Four. The agency of perspective represents the expectation of occurrence based on completion of an action. In this study, the particular occurrence was tied to the FTNTT faculty members’ career navigation, which had resulted in longevity of employment. Agency of action represents the intentional actions taken to pursue a particular occurrence (career navigation). Action of avoidance represents the intentional avoidance of actions, based on agency of perspective, and the risk assessments for avoiding the perspective belief. Actions of avoidance appeared less than agency of actions. The demographics of the participants (nearing retirement) may have influenced this finding; nevertheless, opens the window of opportunity for future studies.

I compiled and analyzed the Agency Theory data using analyzed data from Chapter Four and Chapter Five. All analyzed data was extracted from participants’ interviews (raw data). I selected entries, based on paraphrases, and combined data, in
order to present the analysis in a manageable format. Raw data entries would have been awkward – and lengthy.

Qualitative data showed FTNTT faculty participants were overall satisfied with their employment; aligned with Tenure Track Faculty more than Part-time Non-tenure track faculty; highly credentialed and uncertain of evaluation criteria and the specifics of their employment contracts. FTNTT faculty members described positive working relationships with their departmental chairs, who were viewed as holding power and authority; shared a professional and personal sense of identity with their disciplines; and associated job retention with their disciplines.

FTNTT faculty members valued departmental support through reciprocal relationships that fostered flexibility, professional development, professional growth, employability, and job security. FTNTT faculty participants reframed employment longevity to represent job security. One factor, all FTNTT faculty members shared was the suppositions of job security. Job security was significant to participants in various degrees and for different reasons. Qualitative data (interviews) suggested the degree of want or need for job security was influenced by career stages (longevity employed), personal interests, and personal financial backgrounds. This study identified three elements FTNTT faculty assigned as meaningful to job security: Discipline, Longevity, and Employability (see Figure 2).

This study found a connection between hiring practices and perception of employment value. The more stringent the hiring policies or practice, the greater the perception of value to the position. In other words, a rigorous hiring policy or practice can send a message to colleagues that the employees hired to fill the position has passed
an arduous employment process, and is qualified or worthy of the position. On the other hand, random hiring practices can have both positive and negative influences on FTNTT faculty’s perception of value. The positive perception is that the FTNTT faculty applicant is more than qualified, and thus hired quickly. One negative perception is that the position will receive little support from the department.

All FTNTT faculty participants held varying positions, equaling, by university standards, a 5/5 course load for fall and spring. All participants stated *time* was a constraint. Faculty expressed the 5/5 course load was time-consuming and functioned to prevent participation in work, life, and campus activities.

**Study’s Contributions to the Literature Surrounding FTNTT Faculty**

Supports considered essential by FTNTT faculty within their departments:

- Flexibility in working schedules
- Opportunity and funding supports to attend to professional development
- Reciprocal relationships with the department chair
- Opportunity to teach in areas of expertise
- Formal and informal recognition, rewards
- Opportunity for promotion
- Opportunity to navigate one’s career
- Guaranteed Autonomy
- Guaranteed Academic Freedom
- Collegiality within Discipline
- Collegiality within Department
• Opportunity and funding for scholarship to enhance credentials and professional
growth

• Opportunities and supports for conducting academic research – if desired

• Opportunities to participate as full-fledged voting member of decision-making
  committees (including governance)

• Opportunity to participate in decision making meetings and have ‘full voice’

• Contract terms to include fixed terms, and explicit evaluation processes

Constraints or barriers FTNTT faculty conveyed within their departments:

• Time

• Increasing workloads (5/5/)

• Difficult to participate in in-house professional development due to in-house
  professional development schedules

• Little, if no recognition or rewards

• No promotional systems

• Lack of support to develop extracurricular projects, course curriculums, and
  perform academic research

• Lack of guaranteed autonomy

• Lack of guaranteed academic freedom

• Lack of opportunities to participate as full-fledged, voting member of decision-
  making committees (including governance)

• Lack of voice in decision-making

• Lack of consistent hiring practices

• Lack of fixed-contracts
Lack of consistent or explicit evaluation procedures

Ways in which administrators and policymakers can improve support of FTNTT faculty employed on their campuses:

- Offer FTNTT faculty fixed contracts with defined terms of time, working conditions, and evaluation policies
- Develop policies for a FTNTT faculty formal promotional system
- Develop in place policies for rewards and recognitions
- Develop policies to support a reciprocal relationship between university, departments, discipline, and FTNTT faculty

How FTNTT faculty make meaning to their everyday work lives:

- FTNTT faculty exhibited Agency of Perspective at a higher frequency than Agency of Action in navigating their academic careers
- FTNTT track faculty participants reframed inner pressures to participate in service, scholarship, and research to increase job security
- FTNTT faculty participants reframed employment longevity to symbolic represent their value to the department, positive job performance (evaluation) employability and job security
- FTNTT faculty reframed new appointments, or new assignments, as a measure of value and expertise, job security and employability
- FTNTT faculty seized opportunities for conducting discovery research by collaborating with TT faculty (Agency of Action)
- Employment policy and practices can impact the value given or perceived, by department, colleagues, and FTNTT faculty
Eight overarching contributions of this study to the literature:

1. Identified a link between FTNTT faculty participants’ sense of Agency of Perspective and FTNTT faculty participants’ Agency of Action;

2. Identified a link between FTNTT faculty participants’ sense of Agency of Perspective and FTNTT faculty participants’ Action of Avoidance;

3. Identified FTNTT faculty, through their personal work experiences, assign different meanings to characteristics of their job experiences (i.e., longevity can be equated to job security; assignments to new job tasks can be equated to performance evaluation; appointment to governance can be equated to leadership; the discipline can be equated to job retention and value for the department.

4. Revealed the majority of FTNTT faculty members are unsure of the legal provisions in their contracts, particularly renewal dates;

5. Suggested new potential labor and contract issues concerning changing roles of FTNTT faculty and extended job responsibilities;

6. Established FTNTT faculty, personally motivated to participate in research, seized opportunities for support through their department disciplines and TT colleagues;

7. Identified a direct, and positive relationship between time (longevity of service) and job security;

8. Offered a side-line recommendation to endorse researcher re-visit the connection between FTNTT faculty and student learning.
Implications

This qualitative, phenomenological study increases the awareness and understanding of The Departmental Work Lives of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty by addressing the research question: What is the essence of the departmental experiences of FTNTT faculty work lives?

This study’s qualitative data supports a FTNTT faculty reciprocal relationship between department and faculty, as a win-win for all. The implementation of formal supportive policies and practices, to improve reciprocal relationships between FTNTT faculty and the department will assist FTNTT faculty in performance excellence, and employability, linked to the benefits associated with job security. Professional opportunities for research, participation in decision-making committees, participation in governance, collaboration, and continued learning improves FTNTT faculty’s perception of their marketability, or employability. FTNTT faculty linked career navigation to employability. A reciprocal relationship, supported by professional opportunities, provides the essential elements to create a work environment necessary for FTNTT faculty to make valuable academic contributions to their institution, college, department, and/or discipline.

This study’s extended insight provides administrators with empirical data to increase their awareness, and inform their decision-making to improve policies and practices that lead to an academic working environment that respects the contributions of all faculties. Faculty inclusions or exclusions based solely on appointment tracks, can lead to FTNTT faculty’s low morale, job dissatisfaction, less than optimal job performance, and increased costly employment turnovers. Policies and practices, whether
intentional or not, should not be used to hinder any faculty member from reaching their maximum potential. In addition, deeper considerations of the positive contributions made by FTNTT faculty can provide administrators with guidance on how to implement and expand faculty employment policies that support FTNTT faculty excellence, improve student-learning outcomes, and strengthen the university as a whole.

To support FTNTT faculty, university administrators need beyond tenure and provide alternate ways in which to distribute equities and reward structures that address specific employee expertise, individual professional goals, and proficient job performances.

This study backs Kezar’s (2013) challenge to institutions to conduct a self-analysis to identify institutional and departmental policies that impact non-tenure track faculty performance and student performances on their local campuses. This study, conducted on two different, but similar university campuses, recognized the heterogeneous nature of FTNTT faculty members who are driven by numerous and various motivations. These issues are significant “because they [NTTF] are such a large and essential portion of the higher education instructional workforce, their voices are important and should inform administrative policy decisions affecting campuses” (Waltman et al., 2012, p. 412).

FTNTT faculty voices from this study will increase awareness and understanding of FTNTT faculties’ multiple job roles, career goals, professional expectations, and personal dynamics. This extended insight can compare the values, beliefs, and cultures found within the academic department, which may or may not parallel the institution’s professed values, beliefs and cultures.
Revisions of contract terms of FTNTT faculty should be refined to support
FTNTT faculty’s connotations associated with multi-year and fixed term contracts, terms
of job retention, notices of job unemployment, and explicitly stated contract terms for
FTNTT faculty evaluations. Explicit terms, as identified by contractual agreement, leads
to job satisfaction, less employment anxiety for faculty, and reduced anxiety toward
employee evaluations. These contractual factors can help cultivate a more affirmative
working environment, for all faculty, at all levels.

Failure to provide FTNTT faculty opportunities for recognition, methods of
advancement, service, reciprocal relationships, work-life balances, job security and job
satisfaction will create a working environment which fosters FTNTT faculty’s low
morale and lack of both quantity and quality faculty productivity. This negative climate
will ultimately result in a loss of academic rigor for the university, by reducing the high
academic standards, and honored university missions, demanded in today’s competitive
academic market.

In addition, FTNTT faculty, dissatisfied with working conditions, will invite
lower levels of employee retention. Low levels of faculty retention increases the
university financial costs for new faculty recruitment, and training. The costs of
implementing one or more of the elements mentioned is far less than the potential harm
to the mission of the university if faculty are not secure and satisfied within their working
environment. Lack of supportive policies and practices for FTNTT faculty has the
potential to influence FTNTT faculties’ agency of perspectives, agency of action, and
action of avoidance, and lessen performances and productive outcomes for faculty,
students, departments, disciplines, and institutions of higher education.
Future Studies

Findings from this study suggest future studies are needed to provide creative, authentic and accessible institutional professional and personal growth opportunities for the FTNTT faculty. FTNTT faculty members considered attendance to professional development seminars and on campus professional development opportunities instrumental in their professional growth. Gappa et al. (2007) identified professional growth as one of five essential elements to work experience. Later, Gappa (2010) identified opportunity for professional growth as one of five themes that lead to job satisfaction (pp. 213-216). This study also found that FTNTT faculty tied the opportunity for professional development to their perception of professional growth, employability, and job security.

This study bolstered Lechuga and Lechuga (2012) recommended that “faculty developers and administrators may need to rethink ways to support faculty without depending upon an abundance of professional development programs” (p. 88). Research suggest professional development opportunities which lead to professional growth opportunities are available on employee campuses, but still remain unavailable to FNTT faculty. Reasons given by the participants for not attending campus professional development opportunities were: lack of time, scheduling conflicts, commitment and obligations of heavy teaching loads, risk assessment for avoiding professional development opportunities (action of avoidance), and professional development opportunities scheduled during regular class commitments. Steps should be considered how to best approach professional development scheduling conflicts on campuses, and
continue to provide supportive funds for FTNTT faculty in-house and travel professional
development opportunities.

**Agency Theory and Career Navigation**

Participants in this study communicated the need to make themselves essential
employees. FTNTT faculty expressed the need to increase and sustain employability
skills, in order to increase their chances for employment retention – not tenure.
Participants spoke of credentials, and the need to pursue a terminal degree – only if their
career goal was a tenure track position. The trend does not support the immediate or near
future potential for a tenured position for any of the participants interviewed. Even
though there were participants with their terminal degrees, no TT faculty positions were
available for participants’ applications, and no participants had a standing application for
a TT position at the time of their interviews.

All but one participant participated in departmental committees (not required),
service projects (not required), and a few indicated research projects (not required), for
various reasons, including making themselves “as attractive as I can be as an employee”
(Gerry). An ‘attractive employee’ was one who maintains their employment, or is
employable.

Career navigation by FTNTT faculty was complex, and heterogeneous in nature.
However, this study is one of the first studies to approach to the exploration of FTNTT
faculty – that of Agency Theory with the conceptual framework of agency of perspective,
agency of action, and this study’s coined concept, action of avoidance. This study
contributes new to the literature the link between agency of perspective, agency of action,
action of avoidance, FTNTT faculty and career navigation. One way to view these
findings is through the perspective of employee organizational socialization. According to Kramer (2010), Schein (1968) identified three positive outcomes that occur through socialization strategies used by organizations: 1) individuals can adopt the organizations’ norms and preferred behaviors; 2) individuals can adopt more innovative roles and change procedures to fit their personalities; or 3) individuals can be proactive and change the structure of their role (Kramer, 2010, pp. 73-74). It appears, even though FTNTT faculty participants, some with 26 plus years employment, still did not want to ‘rock the boat’ or exhibit strong proactive measures to change the structure of their roles (Kramer, 2010, pp. 73-74). Instead, FTNTT faculty participants adopted more innovative roles to fit their Agency of Perspectives – toward career navigation. Future studies could benefit from this study’s findings to extend research of FTNTT faculty’s efforts to navigate their careers.

**Job Security**

The importance of job security contributes to affirmative working conditions for all faculty. Some institutions that have committed to improving job security for their faculty developed arrangements to allow FTNTT faculty upward mobility within the non-tenure track. Contracts were extended from one to three to five or more years as faculty moved up the ranks. Research confirms the importance of contracts and their renewal terms. At institutions with clearly defined and longer contract terms, focus group participants have responded positively, saying that “it gives you some security” (Benjamin, 2003; Bergom & Waltman, 2009). Hollenshead et al. (2007) calls for categorization of “long term contracts, where suitable; transparent and equitable contract terms; and reasonable lengths of time for informing Non-tenure track faculty of their
continued employment. Gappa et al. (2007) claims, if satisfied, NTT faculty can maintain job security through multiple-year contracts, employability, or marketability (pp. 130-131).

**Contracts and Labor Issues**

Interviews conducted within this study generate a call for additional research concerning potential implications for FTNTT faculty in regard to changing job responsibilities, positions and labor laws. Most FTNTT faculty contracts list primary responsibilities as instructional. However, some contracts include additional duties that harbor on the edge of managerial and administrative. For example, 3 of the twelve faculty members interviewed held employment responsibilities outside the realm of the classroom and identified their tasks as managerial or coordinators. Two FTNTT faculty members served in positions that straddle the instructional and managerial and/or administrative line. Both FTNTT faculty members identified themselves as split between instructional and managerial time commitments. A third FTNTT faculty made reference to a “coordinating position that required a significant time commitment. Despite these duties and self-identifications, recent labor laws would not list them as managerial employees.

FTNTT faculty members were less sure of labor policies than in any other interview subjects. Contract reconstructions were most vulnerable to FTNTT faculty misconstructions. The majority of FTNTT faculty were unsure of contract notification terms and key contract clauses or renewal and evaluation(s). FTNTT faculty descriptions of personnel contracts were loosely delineated and discussed in undefined layman terms. The majority of participants shared they did not hesitate to negotiate with department
chairs concerning work schedules; however, only two participants revealed they had engaged in contract negotiations with their administrators. I suggest FTNTT faculty members felt more comfortable negotiating their salary, using everyday knowledge and language. Successful contract negotiations require an acute comfort level with the legal terminology within employment contracts. Most non-attorneys would have difficulty with contract negotiations and a full understanding of the nuances of legal terms.

There is mixed review and debate on the influence of unions on campuses of higher education. Union organization is difficult because of the diversity and distribution of NTT faculty on college campuses. Even though unions are thought to strong arm stronger contracts, higher wages, benefits, and job security, there has been little research on how unions affect the NTT faculty, the department, and the institution, and ultimately, student learning. Additional research is needed for future studies in regard to FTNTT faculty employment contracts, labor laws, and labor unions.

This study found that employment practices can influence the FTNTT’s faculty perception of value for the position as well as potential supporting value from the department. In addition, future studies should consider policies and practices to create systematic, employment practices to eliminate any inconsistencies or unintentional hiring practices in which FTNTT faculty members are employed.

**Reward Scholarship and Promotions**

More than two decades ago, Boyer (1996) suggested universities should adopt policies that honor and reward the scholarship (discovery, applied, integration and teaching) of all faculties (tenure, full-time non-tenure eligible and part-time non-tenure eligible). “The twentieth century saw the university change from a site in which teaching
and research stood in a reasonably comfortable relationship with each other to one in which they became mutually antagonistic” (Healey, 2005, p. 185). My study did not disclose any hostilities surrounding research; however, FTNTT faculty members spoke of the incompatibility of research and the typical FTNTT faculty teaching load of 5/5. FTNTT faculty members to participate in research is not prohibitive, but highly encumbered with classroom preparation, instructional hours and classroom management. The general consensus among this study’s participants was if they wanted to participate in research they could – but the time required for research was not supported or created within the organization of their job assignments. Future research should consider the viable agency of the FTNTT faculty and the contributions they can make to students, colleagues, departments, disciplines, institutions, communities, and support policies that allow for FTNTT faculty to be learners (researchers), themselves – and reward the continued learning process.

Career stages may influence FTNTT faculty and their Agency of Perspective, which in turn serves as a catalyst for Agency of Action or Action of Avoidance. Policy makers and stakeholders should consider the career stages of their FTNTT faculty members, and create supporting policies and practices concurrent to their faculty’s career trajectories and goals. This effort could create an environment of support for FTNTT faculty members and offer opportunities to enhance their performance(s), as well as nurture an affirmative climate for the department and university as a whole.

This study interviewed nine females, and three males. All participants were Caucasian. The topic of gender and/or ethnicities in FTNTT faculty members should be a priority for consideration of future studies.
Student Learning

“I don’t want to be negative, but I don’t care as much about my department evaluations – it is what my students come away with – that’s where I derive and give a sense of worth.” – Peyton

Peyton’s quote was one of the best statements to demonstrate the responsibility and concern FTNT faculty, in this study, gave their students. Even though my interview protocol did not mention questions about the student learning environment, each participant volunteered a professional and personal working concern for their students’ success. The responses that the participants’ expressed suggested they each believed they have an “appreciable influence on student learning” (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995, p. 90).

Faculty self-efficacy, demonstrated in the belief they [faculty] have “considerable influence on student learning is higher on four-year liberal arts college campuses (and community colleges) than on doctoral or research campuses (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995). Both university campuses, from which this study’s data were collected, are four-year teaching intensive, regional comprehensive liberal arts universities. Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) offer several reasons for this strong-self-efficacy belief by faculty members on liberal arts campuses: 1) teaching intensive universities are usually smaller than doctoral or research universities and offer more opportunities universities for teacher/student contacts; thereby improving student performances through more faculty contacts; and 2) doctoral and research universities may consider other factors, such as “student peers, readings and libraries” more influential to student learning and “faculty is less critical to student learning” (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995, p. 90). On the other hand,
teaching intensive university faculty (including my participants) would most likely consider instructional faculty critical to the student learning environment and process.

The topic Student Learning Environment is outside the scope of this study’s research question. However, it would be remiss not to mention Student Learning Environment in this document. There were no questions about student learning in the interview protocol; however, all FTNTT faculty participants interviewed made reference, at their own initiative, to their sustained interest in students and student successes.

During the course of my doctoral studies, and as a result of this study, I realize the scope of the topic in regard to student learning. Research is missing segregated data regarding the differentiated impact of PTNTT faculty and FTNTT faculty on student learning. Student learning in public institutions, community colleges, and liberal arts colleges have not been extensively studied. Studies on the impact of student learning and NTTF have been mostly conducted within research universities. Research links NTTF faculty and the student learning environment, however, extant research emphasizes curriculum and pedagogy used within the classroom environment. Studies need be conducted that identify the impact of FTNT faculty appointments, their working environment and student learning and performances.

**Study Limitations**

Faculty interviews were held with volunteer participants individually, at one place, and at one designated time. In other words, interview data collected was like a “snapshot in time” (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995, p. 320). Ideally, a longitudinal design would be useful to reveal changes in patterns, motivations, expectations, positions,
cultures, reward structures, and policy structures. A one-time interview, though in-depth, does not allow for the perceptions that are subject to change in response to a particular event. Only a longitudinal study would capture the changeability of the FTNTT faculty experiences.

Research literature on FTNTT faculty is ambiguous. Interests, motivations, experiences, perceptions, and values are wide-ranging and all-encompassing. The heterogeneous nature of FTNTT faculty members makes generalizations difficult and prey to researcher misconstructions. The common practice of both researchers and institutions is to combine FTNTT faculty with PTNTT faculty data. This amalgamation can make institutional data reports and conclusions dubious. This study concurred, “FTNTT faculty are an extremely heterogeneous group with different motivations, experiences, and backgrounds” (Kezar & Maxey, 2014, p. 51). This heterogeneity poses a challenge in data collection, disaggregation, and reporting (p. 51). Systematic research does not segregate collected data surrounding FTNTT faculty and PTNT faculty. Without segregation of data, assumptions and presumptions about FTNTT faculty will continue to persist, culminating in the perception that FTNTT faculty are a homogeneous mass rather than a diverse group of complex individuals.

With demographics in mind, this study’s participants represented an established faculty and did not include new faculty or FTNTT faculty with experiences less than 6 years. FTNTT faculty participants had already been assimilated into their departments. Kahn (2009) claims early career faculty members, with increasing autonomy, begin to develop and exercise their sense of agency, in particular toward academic teaching. Since most FTNTT faculty members are hired to teach, this appears relevant to my study.
However, the career stages of my participants makes it difficult to assess early career stage linked to FTNTT faculty’s sense of agency. The longevity of their employment may have been an influence in their assessment of lived work experiences. In addition, career stages may have undergone, or were continuing to undergo, changes in both trajectories and goals. In this same vein, the three sub-groups identified within this study’s participants represented three different career trajectories (i.e., FTNTT members who were satisfied in their positions and chose to intentionally navigate their careers for the purpose of perceived job security; FTNTT faculty members who paralleled the first group in their satisfaction and actions, but expressed a personal desire to alter their present FTNTT faculty status; and FTNTT faculty members who intentionally chose not to navigate their careers for the purpose of job security). Thus, this study’s agency perspectives, agency of action and action of avoidance, may be specifically identifiable to these sub-groups.

This study found FTNTT faculty participants linked employment longevity to job security. Though unintended, longevity of employment was a participant criterion that may have fostered a sense of job security, which in turn influenced the participants’ agency of perspectives toward policies and practices within their departments. Triangulation of qualitative data (field notes, interview transcripts, other documents and comparison of this study to other models), documents the efforts made for multiple strategies for validation to establish the accuracy of the information. However, research warns of the problems of conducting research on one’s own campus. This researcher had strong ties to one of the universities. Thus, this study embodies a vigilant effort to protect
the participants and myself as the researcher from risks associated with backyard research.

**Conclusion**

This study offers first-hand qualitative evidence from a qualitative, phenomenological research approach used to explore *The Departmental Work Lives of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty*. Specifically, the research question was: *What is the essence of the departmental experiences of FTNTT faculty work lives?*

Four themes emerged as significant to FTNTT faculty during this study:

- Policy and Practices Work Environment
- Individual Work Environment
- Professional Work Environment
- Social/Cultural Work Environment

This study’s qualitative data analysis, within the context of these four environmental work themes, adds collective knowledge to the existing literature in regard to constraints, supports and experiences surrounding FTNTT faculty in their work environments.

The use of Agency Theory as a theoretical framework allowed first time exploration with *The Departmental Work Lives of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty* through the conceptual framework of agency of perspective and agency of action. This study coined the concept term, action of avoidance to represent faculty intentional actions to avoid a behavior, based on job risk assessments to navigate their careers.
This study found that agency of perspective has a strong influence on this study’s participants’ agency of action and action of avoidance used to navigate their successful career longevities.

Although, a qualitative study is not designed for generalizations; other institutions with comparable faculty or similar employment policies may use this exploration’s data analysis as a medium for discovery on their own campuses. At best, this study could be used as a catalyst for new, coherent, and or institutionalized policy changes to support the work lives of FTNTT faculty, and thereby improve the quality of instruction and research at institutions of higher learning.

“For administrative leaders facing constant challenges, an energetic, diverse, and engaged faculty is their most important resource. Investment in the faculty and in the quality of the academic workplace becomes a college’s or a university’s most critical strategic choice” (Gappa et al., 2007. p. 5). If faculty are considered the heart of the university, or the university’s backbone, or the most ‘important resource’ it is imperative that university administrators take critical care to create policies and practices supportive of all faculty members. Failure to do so can create a campus environment that does not nurture the highest performances by faculty, students, and stakeholders. A non-supportive environment will be unable to compete in today’s competitive academic market, or sustain society’s traditional expectations for post-secondary’s high academic standards.

This study was not the dissertation I expected to write. I began this study with apprehension and expectation that the interviews would take a negative turn. The spirit of the experiences shared by this study’s FTNTT faculty participant told a different story. The goal of every technique is to “facilitate the flow of the investigation and aim toward
yielding rich, accurate, and complete depictions of the qualities or constituents of the experience” (Moustakas, 2001, p. 264). It is my hope that the reader will grant authority to the study, extend deference to differentiation, found as the heart of FTNTT faculty, and honor the multiple interpretative nature of the research, itself.

In a final thought, at one of my first dissertation meetings, I was asked what I had taken from recently read literature regarding FTNTT faculty. My response was to paraphrase a quote: “It is who we are and what we do” (Campbell & O’Meara, 2014). For whatever reason, this phrase has been a mantra within my continued drive to complete this work and serves to honor all “who are, and what they do.”
APPENDIX

A. Participant Consent Form

Consent to Participate in a Research Study

Exploring Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty in Their Work Lives

WHY ARE YOU BEING INVITED TO TAKE PART IN THIS RESEARCH?

You are being invited to take part in a research study about *Exploring Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty in Their Work Lives*. This phenomenological qualitative dissertation study is to explore the lived work experiences of FTNTTF at two public comprehensive four-year universities located in the Southeastern region of the United States. You are being invited to take part in this research study because you are employed at one of the two universities selected for participant recruitment in a Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty (FTNTTF) position in either the Department of Humanities, the Department of Social Sciences, or the Department of Physical or Natural Sciences. If you volunteer to take part in this study, you will be one of about twelve (n=12) people to do so.

WHO IS DOING THE STUDY?

The person in charge of this study is Pamela Jane H. Clouse (*Principal Investigator, PI*) of University of Kentucky, a doctoral candidate in the University of Kentucky’s Department of Educational Policy Studies and Evaluation. She is being guided in this research by Dissertation Committee Co-Chairs, Dr. Beth Goldstein and Dr. Jeffrey Bieber. There may be other people on the research team assisting at different times during the study.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY?

The purpose of this phenomenological qualitative dissertation study is to explore the lived work experiences of FTNTTF employed in either the Department of Humanities, the Department of Social Sciences, or the Department of Physical or Natural Sciences from two public four-year universities located in the Southeastern region of the United States.

By conducting this study, I intend to:

- identify supports and constraints Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty (FTNTTF) find significant within their departments and explore how FTNTTF make meaning to their everyday work lives;
- explore ways in which administrators and policy makers could improve support of FTNTTF; and,
- add to the scant body of knowledge surrounding FTNTTF.

ARE THERE REASONS WHY YOU SHOULD NOT TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?

No. A subject will only be excluded if they do not meet the following requirements:
• If the volunteer participant has not been employed as a Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty member for a minimum of one year at one of the universities designated as a recruitment site.
• If the volunteer participant is not employed at one of the selected university recruitment sites in either the Department of Humanities, Department of Social Sciences or the Department of Physical or Natural Science.
• If the volunteer participant will not willfully agree to share “their stories”.

WHERE IS THE STUDY GOING TO TAKE PLACE AND HOW LONG WILL IT LAST?

The research procedures will be conducted at either an on-campus or off-campus site designated by each of the volunteer participants. The university recruitment sites are located in Richmond, Kentucky and Morehead, Kentucky. The participants will meet with the principal investigator for one in-depth interview, not to exceed 90 minutes (potentially shorter), at a site determined by the participant(s). Participants will be asked to remain available for follow-up interview(s) clarifications. The total amount of time participants will be asked to volunteer for this study is not more than two hours. The available time frame for participants will be from the date of approval of this IRB application (estimated December or January, 2015) and extending through the end of this study. The study will end with the submission and conclusion of a successful dissertation defense (not to extend beyond December, 2016).

WHAT WILL YOU BE ASKED TO DO?

As the participant, you will be asked to designate a one-time location to participate in a one-on-one in-depth interview with the principal investigator. With your permission (as the volunteer participant), the in-depth interview will be recorded. During this interview, lasting no longer than 90 minutes (potentially shorter), you will be asked approximately 10 questions to represent your experiences as a FTNTTF member. The following list is representative of the kinds of questions I will ask during the interview:

Representative Interview Questions:
1. Tell me, how did you come to your employment here as a FTNTTF member?
2. Could you please tell me about a typical work day? What is the range of your responsibilities?
3. What do you think your department would describe as the most important role you serve as a FTNTTF member? Do you feel the same way?
4. What supports from your department have you considered helpful for your work? For example, opportunities to engage in professional development, service projects, research, or career goals?
5. Have you experienced any departmental barriers or challenges that prevents you from engaging in work activities? For example, professional development, service projects, research, or career goals?
6. In your conversations with other FTNTTF colleagues, what is your sense of how your departmental experiences compare with theirs?
7. How do you feel about your control over creating a satisfying work-life balance?
8. Can you describe a time that you experienced a real sense of lack of collegiality in your department?
9. How do you think your work is valued in your department? How do you know if your work in your department is valued or not?
10. What other particular issues concerning a FTNTTF appointment should a study of this sort explore? (I will have discussed the purpose of this study in a prior meeting or setting and again as we review the consent form at the start of this interview.)

If interview response clarifications are needed, you will be asked to participate in a follow-up conversation or conversations with the principle investigator. Potential follow-up conversations will last no longer than a total of 30 minutes. Conversation(s) will take place via phone, e-mail, or in person. Conversation(s) may take place any time after the one-on-one in-depth interview has been completed and before this study is completed (~December, 2015 – December, 2016).

All participants will be given the opportunity to examine themes and codes from their personal narrative for code-recoding (Key, 1997). No emergent themes from other participants will be shared for member check, only the emergent themes from the participant's personal narrative. Upon participant's request, the member check will be completed at a time and location designated by the participant.


WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS?

To the best of our knowledge, the things you will be doing have no more risk of harm than you would experience in everyday life.

WILL YOU BENEFIT FROM TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?

There is no guarantee that you will get any benefit from taking part in this study. Your willingness to take part, however, may, in the future, help society as a whole better understand this research topic.

DO YOU HAVE TO TAKE PART IN THE STUDY?

If you decide to take part in the study, it should be because you really want to volunteer. You will not lose any benefits or rights you would normally have if you choose not to volunteer. You can stop at any time during the study and still keep the benefits and rights you had before volunteering.

IF YOU DON'T WANT TO TAKE PART IN THE STUDY, ARE THERE OTHER CHOICES?

If you do not want to be in the study, there are no other choices except not to take part in the study.
WHAT WILL IT COST YOU TO PARTICIPATE?
You may have to pay for the cost of getting to the interview site and a parking fee.

WILL YOU RECEIVE ANY REWARDS FOR TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?
You will not receive any rewards or payment for taking part in the study.

WHO WILL SEE THE INFORMATION THAT YOU GIVE?
We will make every effort to keep confidential all research records that identify you to the extent allowed by law.

Your information will be combined with information from other people taking part in the study. When we write about the study to share it with other researchers, we will write about the combined information we have gathered. You will not be personally identified in these written materials. This study’s findings will be reported through a formally formatted dissertation document submitted to a sanctioned doctoral committee at the University of Kentucky. We may publish the results of this study; however, we will keep your name and other identifying information private. The name of the institutions selected for FTNTTF recruitment will be identified as “two public comprehensive four-year universities located in the Southeastern region of the United States”.

We will make every effort to prevent anyone who is not on the research team from knowing that you gave us information, or what that information is. All participants will be assigned pseudonyms by the researcher. Any potential identifying information that emerges during data collection that can be reported, without sacrificing the integrity of the study, will be altered to protect all participants. If alteration, in any form, cannot be done without sacrificing the integrity of the study, the data will be omitted.

Data collected will be coded, logged, reported, and secured in a manner to reduce the risk of breach in participant’s confidentiality and to diminish any identifiers that might link participants to their universities or departments. All interviews will be transcribed using pseudonyms. Data will be collected using paper records and computer technologies using coded pseudonyms, secured technology devices and sites. Records will be maintained in a locked file cabinet located in the researcher’s office. All records will be destroyed after three years.

We will keep private all research records that identify you to the extent allowed by law. However, there are some circumstances in which we may have to show your information to other people. For example, we may be required to show information which identifies you to people who need to be sure we have done the research correctly; these would be people from such organizations as the University of Kentucky.

CAN YOUR TAKING PART IN THE STUDY END EARLY?
If you decide to take part in the study you still have the right to decide at any time that you no longer want to continue. You will not be treated differently if you decide to stop taking part in the study.

The individuals conducting the study may need to withdraw you from the study. This may occur if you are not able to follow the directions they give you. If you wish to withdraw from the study, you should notify the principal investigator through e-mail or in person.
WHAT ELSE DO YOU NEED TO KNOW?

There is a possibility that the data collected from you may be shared with other investigators in the future. If that is the case the data will not contain information that can identify you unless you give your consent or the UK Institutional Review Board (IRB) approves the research. The IRB is a committee that reviews ethical issues, according to federal, state and local regulations on research with human subjects, to make sure the study complies with these before approval of a research study is issued.

WHAT IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS, SUGGESTIONS, CONCERNS, OR COMPLAINTS?

Before you decide whether to accept this invitation to take part in the study, please ask any questions that might come to mind now. Later, if you have questions, suggestions, concerns, or complaints about the study, you can contact the investigator, Pamela Jane H. Clouse at Jane.Clouse@eku.edu or by cell phone: 859-582-1583. If you have any questions about your rights as a volunteer in this research, contact the staff in the Office of Research Integrity at the University of Kentucky between the business hours of 8am and 5pm EST, Mon-Fri. at 859-257-9428 or toll free at 1-866-400-9428. We will give you a signed copy of this consent form to take with you.

_________________________________________   ____________
Signature of person agreeing to take part in the study          Date

_________________________________________
Printed name of person agreeing to take part in the study

_________________________________________   ____________
Name of (authorized) person obtaining informed consent          Date
B. IRB Certification Letter
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Pamela Jane H. Cloose
S Eastern KY University
201 Lancaster Ave
Case Annex 289
Richmond, KY 40475
Phone #: (859) 747-1153
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Institutional Review Board
To Office of Research Integrity

SUBJECT: Exemption Certification for Protocol No. 15-1101-X40

DATE: January 11, 2016

On January 7, 2016, it was determined that your project entitled, "Exploring Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty in Their Work Lives", meets federal criteria to qualify as an exempt study.

"**Data should be destroyed 6 years after the study is over.**"

Because the study has been certified as exempt, you will not be required to complete continuation or final review reports. However, it is your responsibility to notify the IRB prior to making any changes to the study. Please note that changes made to an exempt protocol may disqualify it from exempt status and may require an expedited or full review.

The Office of Research Integrity will hold your exemption application for six years. Before the end of the sixth year, you will be notified that your file will be closed and the application destroyed. If your project is still ongoing, you will need to contact the Office of Research Integrity upon receipt of this letter and follow the instructions for completing a new exemption application. It is, therefore, important that you keep your address current with the Office of Research Integrity.

For information describing investigator responsibilities after obtaining IRB approval, download and read the document "PI Guidance to Responsibilities, Qualifications, Records and Documentation of Human Subjects Research" from the Office of Research Integrity’s IRB Survival Handbook web page [http://www.uky.edu/irb/IRB-Survival-Handbook.html#PIResponsibilities]. Additional information regarding IRB review, federal regulations, and institutional policies may be found through ORI’s web site [http://www.orsc.hhs.gov/]. If you have questions, need additional information, or would like a paper copy of the above mentioned document, contact the Office of Research Integrity at (859) 237-9428.
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