addressing issues associated with deteriorating faculty working conditions and their effect on college and university students in the United States.” In 2010, CAW resolved to help address the lack of data on contingent academic compensation and working conditions by surveying individuals employed in those positions. The questionnaire developed by CAW was distributed through multiple media by many of the coalition’s member organizations, and data were collected online from September through November 2010. Some twenty-nine thousand individuals responded to the survey, nearly twenty-one thousand of them employed in contingent positions. The responses to selected survey items will be tabulated in CAW’s forthcoming report on the data; the AAUP has played a leading role in preparing that report.

More than ten thousand part-time faculty members responded to questions in the CAW survey regarding their instructional workload, compensation, institutional support, and demographic characteristics. When the data are tabulated, they will present a much more complete picture of faculty compensation than has been possible for many years. We will be able to analyze differences in pay rates attributable to institutional sector (public, private nonprofit, or for-profit), institutional level (based on degrees awarded), and geographic region. They will enable us to quantify the super-exploitation of the individuals who make up the largest segment of the academic workforce. These data will serve as an important tool as we continue to challenge this exploitation and work in solidarity with our colleagues in the “academic precariat” to bring it to an end.

“THE 99%”
Since its beginning in fall 2011, the “Occupy” movement has changed the discourse on inequality in the United States. Focused initially on Wall Street and the excesses of the financial industry, the movement has broadened its focus to address other aspects of economic life, including higher education issues such as student debt and the price of tuition. College and university students and staff and faculty members have participated in Occupy activities at multiple campuses. One of the central arguments of the various Occupy movements has been that government policies, such as taxation and federal support for the banking and financial industries, have protected the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans at the expense of the rest of the population. This argument juxtaposes the suffering of the many, measured in continuing high unemployment levels and home-foreclosure rates, with record profit levels for corporations and the return of exorbitant salaries and bonuses for senior executives throughout the private sector.

A counterargument to the Occupy movement maintains that some of the wealthiest members of our society, the CEOs of major corporations, are “job creators” and need to be rewarded so that they will continue producing more jobs. Proponents of this perspective advocate for reductions in taxation and government regulation as incentives for job creation. Interestingly, one common characteristic of the CEOs of the one hundred largest US corporations (the Fortune 100) is that ninety-four of them are college graduates: forty-six from private institutions, thirty-nine from public colleges and universities, and nine from foreign universities. Sixty-four of the “job-creating” CEOs also hold graduate degrees, predominantly MBAs and law degrees. These CEOs benefited from the societal investment in higher education, in both public and private not-for-profit sectors. Entrepreneurs without college degrees, such as Rupert Murdoch, Steve Jobs, and Bill Gates, are the exceptions. Looked at from one perspective, the real job creators are the college professors who taught the occupants of the corner offices many of the skills they needed to ascend the corporate ladder, including those gained from courses in fields such as philosophy, English, and the fine arts.

The CEOs of these large corporations find themselves almost without exception in the top 1 percent of the US income distribution. Where do faculty members fit into that distribution? Table D shows the projected 2011 distribution of household cash income in the United States. It is broken into deciles, categories that represent 10 percent of the population, along with the top 5 and 1 percent. The percentiles shown are the income level corresponding to a given percentage of the population. Thus, the tenth percentile is the income level earned by the lowest-earning 10 percent of the population, the twentieth percentile is the level