At the Margins of University Work: The Influence of Campus Climate and Part-Time Faculty Status on Academic Values

Cassie L. Barnhardt and Carson W. Phillips

Abstract

Part-time and contingent faculty now represent the majority of instructional staff at colleges and universities in the United States. Yet few empirical studies have examined how this reliance on non-tenure-track faculty affects the cultural values of the academy. If part-time contingent faculty are now responsible for the bulk of teaching, how does their employment status affect the principles of democracy that colleges and universities seek to embody? This quantitative analysis examines how faculty's employment status (part- or full-time), perceptions of campus climate, and personal characteristics relate to academia's core organizational values of academic freedom, mission, and shared governance. Our findings show that part-time status has a negative influence on faculty members' engagement with academic mission and shared governance but a positive effect on academic freedom. Additionally, our findings suggest that the campus climate for inclusion plays a major role in sustaining the core values of the academy.

Colleges and universities have changed significantly over the past few decades. The organizational behavior and managerial practices within higher education have evolved in response to changes in market and societal pressures. Scholars overwhelmingly attribute these changes to the commercialization of higher education and the growth of academic capitalism, in which colleges and universities increasingly follow market-driven and entrepreneurial logic in an effort to maximize revenue (Kezar and Bernstein-Sierra 2016; Slaughter and Leslie 1997; Slaughter and Rhoades 2004). Henry Giroux (2014), as well as Derek Bok (2003), note that the commercialization and commodification of university activities is derived from neoliberal

ideology, which Wendy Brown (2011, 118) describes as submitting "all human activities, values, institutions, and practices to market principles."

The application of a neoliberal logic has profound consequences for the social institution of higher education. Neoliberalism holds that economic profit motivates organizational decisions and actions; therefore, the university positions managers as shareholders who can act without the advice or consent of other organizational members, students are valued for their ability to pay tuition, and faculty are valued for their ability to generate profitable research or to provide instruction at the lowest cost (Giroux 2014). Giroux writes that the enacting of the neoliberal model of university management "contradicts the culture and democratic value of higher education but also makes a mockery of the very meaning and mission of the university as a place both to think and to provide the formative culture and agents that make democracy possible" (17).

Following the market-based neoliberal approach to higher education, universities are expanding their employment of contingent and part-time faculty, whose hiring was originally pursued as a temporary solution to the rising costs of education, increased student enrollment, and decreased public support of higher education (Anderson 2007; Baldwin and Chronister 2002; Gappa and Leslie 1993; Rajagopal and Farr 1992). Gary Rhoades (2014) estimates that non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) now outnumber tenure-track and tenured faculty by almost 2.5 to 1, with adjunct and contingent faculty accounting for over two-thirds of the overall academic workforce in the United States (see also AAUP 2016). This increased dependence on contingent faculty, or the "new faculty majority" (Kezar 2012), is demonstrated by the use of part-time faculty whose precarious status accounts for 49 percent of all faculty positions (Rhoades 2013). Located at the bottom of the academic hierarchy, part-time and contingent faculty are frequently relegated to a status of "other" whose employment classification categorically constrains and restricts their behaviors and engagement in the educational environment (Baldwin and Chronister 2002; Gappa and Leslie 1993). As a result of this marginalization, part-time and contingent faculty members frequently express feeling that they are "powerless, alienated, invisible, and second-class" members of the campus community (Gappa and Leslie 1993, 180).

Scholars have long posited that an increased reliance on NTTF would have implications for the power and influence of faculty in shaping campus decisions (ibid.; Kezar, Lester, and Anderson 2006). Little is empirically known, however, about whether the academy's reliance on the new faculty majority has contributed to or undermined the preservation and maintenance of academia's core democratic values (Cross and Goldenberg 2003; Giroux 2002). At present, some indicators suggest that the neoliberal approach to managing higher education, exemplified in its reliance on a contingent faculty labor force, has greatly reduced the intrinsic value of high-quality, labor-intensive teaching (Giroux 2002). Therefore, it stands to reason that the near-normative organizational practice of using adjunct and contingent faculty is likely to influence other

essential characteristics of the academy as well (Birnbaum 1988; Selznick 1957). Moreover, we seek to understand whether faculty employment status affects how faculty experience academic freedom, support for the educational mission of their university, and how they approach engagement in shared governance. These characteristics of the academy (academic freedom, mission, and governance) amount to the specific cultural features that distinguish the university as a social institution from other organizational forms (Musselin 2006).

Background and Literature Review

Academic leaders who are in a position to make budgetary decisions about faculty lines are seldom exposed to evidence of how the structure of the academic labor force influences the cultural values of the academy. This essay examines how faculty members' employment status relates to the core values of the academy. While our review of the literature draws largely (but not exclusively) on sources from the US higher education context, the proliferation of non-tenure-track faculty is not unique to colleges and universities in this country. Higher education scholars in Hong Kong, the United Kingdom, Australia, and Canada have noted similar increases in the hiring of part-time and non-tenure-track faculty members (Chan 2010; Husbands 1998; Kimber 2003; Rajagopal and Farr 1992). Our focus aligns with the fact that the campus from which our data are drawn is located in a major metropolitan city in the United States.

Contingent and Part-Time Faculty

Some scholars suggest that contingent and part-time faculty now represent a permanent and integral part of the academic workforce (Rhoades 2014; Schuster and Finkelstein 2006). According to the US National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), the number of part-time non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) increased by over 614 percent from 1970 to 2015. Yet there remains a dearth of empirical studies that specifically investigate the experiences of part-time faculty (Husbands 1998). Additionally, despite contingent faculty constituting the new faculty majority, the myth persists that tenure-track faculty are the norm, and as a result administrative decisions are focused on the experiences of only 29 percent of the workforce (ibid.). In fact, one of the most long-term and intensive studies of American faculty, a study whose findings are used to drive best practices for organizational support of faculty development, focuses on the experiences of tenure-track faculty (Harvard University 2018). Campuses' motivations and justifications for their reliance on and employment of NTTF vary, but administrators frequently justify their use of NTTF by referring to the need to accommodate increased student enrollments, address demands for greater flexibility, and respond to budgetary constraints (Cross and Goldenberg 2009; Gappa and Leslie 1993). The economic benefits of hiring NTTF are particularly significant; Cross and Goldenberg (2003) estimate that NTTF cost about half as much per credit hour as their tenure-track counterparts. Others argue that the cost saving estimates associated with scaling up the use of NTTF for teaching tend to be overestimated, given the longer-term expansion of other costs associated with

fundamental changes in the faculty role and a larger shift away from a tripartite model of teaching, research, and service (Desrochers and Kirschstein 2014).[1] At best, the economic consequences of employing a large share of NTTF are deeply complicated and emphasize short-term savings rather than long-term strategy.

Several of the primary challenges faced by contingent and part-time faculty include just-in-time hiring practices, at-will terms of employment, and an increased reliance on using depersonalized curricular delivery and development models for educating students (Rhoades 2013). Adjunct faculty are often informed of their official employment with little time to adequately prepare and plan classes (Street et al. 2012). Furthermore, adjuncts are rarely compensated for course preparation (Rhoades 2013). Despite having taught for multiple concurrent semesters, adjunct faculty can be terminated at will, with limited or no due-process protections (ibid.). NTTF are frequently tasked with teaching already developed course content, which removes the level of personalization and academic freedom afforded to their full-time and tenure-track instructional counterparts (ibid.).

The evidence is not altogether clear about the educational effects of using NTTF. What is known is that NTTF tend to be concentrated in lower-division courses or those that students typically take during their first two years of college (Cross and Goldenberg 2003). Educational research also shows that the first two years of college are an important time for personal and intellectual development, and are crucial for retention and persistence in degree obtainment (Mayhew et al. 2016). Some evidence suggests that exposure to contingent faculty in courses has detrimental consequences on students, including observed declines in retention (Jaeger and Hinz 2008-9). Other scholars, however, have noted an increase in teaching quality among NTTF compared to tenure-track faculty members (Cross and Goldenberg 2003). Independent of an assessment of teaching quality, studies have demonstrated that contingent faculty spend less time preparing for classes, advising students, and hosting office hours (Baldwin and Wawrzynski 2011; Benjamin 2003).

In an investigation of how teaching strategies differ by employment status, Umbach (2007, 110) found that "part-time faculty interact with students less frequently, use active and collaborative techniques less often, spend less time preparing for class, and have lower academic expectations than their tenured and tenure-track peers." These differences do not necessarily mean that NTTF are categorically less capable teachers. Rather, the differences Umbach observed may be partially explained by contingent faculty members' labor/working conditions, which often include the lack of a physical space and reduced access to instructional support services (Haeger 1998; Kezar 2004a).

Labor conditions for NTTF are fundamentally different from the conditions experienced by tenure-track faculty. Specifically, contract renewal for adjunct faculty is often at the discretion of a singular campus administrator (an academic dean), which can severely limit this population's access to formal performance evaluations or other practices of review and due process in their jobs (Rhoades 2013). Furthermore, the employment ambiguity of NTTF and the corresponding administrative limits on full membership in (or

access to) the whole university stand out as antithetical to ideals of academic freedom and the concepts of shared governance that flow from them (Kezar and Sam 2013; Rhoades 2013). Without employment benefits parallel to their tenured and tenure-track counterparts, non-tenure-track faculty members' engagement and participation in organizational routines look quite different (Kezar 2012).

As a foundational tenet of the academy, shared governance refers to the inclusion of campus stakeholders in the "process of policymaking and macrolevel decision-making within higher education" (Kezar 2004b, 36). Their precarious employment status can exclude adjunct faculty from participating in formal governance structures, which effectively eliminates their input in shaping curriculum (Baldwin and Chronister 2002; Haeger 1998; Kezar, Lester, and Anderson 2006). In a comprehensive review of faculty policies at 183 institutions, Shavers (2000) found that only 7 percent of campuses granted voting rights to non-tenure-track faculty. Despite their exclusion, NTTF regularly express interest in participating in governance structures (Baldwin and Chronister 2002; Gappa and Leslie 1993). Furthermore, prior research suggests governance structures are increasingly understaffed, which suggests a growing need for greater involvement in academic governance among all types of faculty (Williams et al. 1987).

Though little scholarship exists that focuses on the direct link between working conditions and successful employee practices, constraints on "opportunities to perform" for part-time faculty (via time, work space, access to students, interactions with colleagues, and salary limitations) may affect job performance and contribute to a lack of institutional cohesion or sense of belonging (Kezar 2013). Scholars have long expressed concerns that the proliferation of non-tenure-track faculty would have serious consequences for the core tenets of the academy, particularly related to the weakening of academic self-governance (Cross and Goldenberg 2009; Gumport 2000; Kezar, Lester, and Anderson 2006). This study explores how employment status and faculty members' relative feelings of inclusion contribute to their enactment of academic values—academic freedom, mission, and governance.

Conceptualizing Employment Status and Academic Values

Birnbaum (2000) argues that relationships in the academy are critical to effective governance; he asserts this position on the basis that positive relationships help foster environments where individuals are encouraged to engage in ways that support the core tenets of the academy, such as sharing innovative and diverse ideas (see also Kezar 2004b). Prior work demonstrates that NTTF tend to be less satisfied with their relationships because their status in the organization is associated with a lack of an opportunity structure for interacting with departmental colleagues, and for experiencing the collegiality that would normally flow from such engagement (Ott and Cisneros 2015). Structurally, NTTF employment status confers lower organizational and professional prestige and economic security than tenure-track positions. It also systematically patterns contingent faculty members' microroutines in the organization, excluding them from campus office space,

resources, participation in curriculum committees, shared governance, and so on. Swidler (1986) posits that organizational culture is created and maintained through microroutines within an organization. Therefore, if one's employment status dictates a distinct set of organizational routines, then it is possible that such status also corresponds to a distinct cultural view of the organization and accompanying distinct views about the organization's core values and one's role in maintaining them.

Scholars have generally established that one's affiliation with a marginalized social identity (for example, one based on race, sexual orientation, or gender) produces categorically unique perceptions and experiences of one's work environment; in the context of universities, these variations generate differing perceptions of the campus climate (Hart and Fellabaum 2008; Rankin and Reason 2005; Renn 2010; Sandler and Hall 1986). While the bulk of the scholarship on marginalized social identities in the academy is based on demographic group differences, it is reasonable to extrapolate that any social status that confers marginalized participation, power, or prestige in the organization is also likely to evoke different perceptions of the work environment and campus climate. Across higher education, social identity is associated with distinct feelings about the campus environment; this pattern is evident across various campus groups—faculty (Sheets et al. 2018; Turner 2002; Victorino, Nylund-Gibson, and Conley 2013), students (Allan and Madden 2006; Pope and LePeau 2012; Reid and Radhakrishnan 2003), and administrative staff (Mayhew, Grunwald, and Dey 2006; Sandler and Hall 1986). For faculty members specifically, one's perceptions of campus climate have been shown to affect retention and overall personal well-being (Jayakumar et al. 2009; Lindholm and Szelényi 2008). Here, we seek to evaluate the relative effects of employment status on the core academic values of academic mission, governance, and freedom. In doing so, we assert that it is necessary to account for faculty members' perceptions of the organization. Kezar and Sam (2013) have noted the connections between the quality of the campus climate and the relative employment equity for NTTF. Therefore, any effects of differential employment status should be evaluated alongside employees' relative perceptions of equity and inclusion in the organization.

Methods

The campus setting for this study is a private and denominationally affiliated coastal university in the United States. The campus is of medium size, with approximately 11,000 students and 2,300 employees. The makeup of campus employees is quite diverse, with 53 percent identifying as white and 47 percent as nonwhite. By comparison, among degree-granting US public and private college campuses, average employee diversity is 76 percent white (Knapp, Kelly-Reid, and Ginder 2010). Notably, this campus's student body is also compositionally diverse, an indication of the university's fidelity to its stated mission to be diverse and inclusive. Data indicate that the campus is evenly split between white students (49%), and students from nonwhite racial and ethnic backgrounds. The percentage of Hispanic students constitutes more than one-fifth

of the total student enrollment, and the percentages of African American and Asian American students closely parallel the shares of these populations in the state where the campus is located.[2]

Under the leadership of the campus diversity officer (CDO), the university has been actively working to improve the overall campus climate for equity and inclusion of all campus members (faculty, students, and staff). These goals have been pursued, in part, through sustained assessment and evaluation of the campus climate, as well as systemic analysis of the relative equity for social identity groups. To investigate the specific experiences of faculty members, campus administrators and the faculty senate (the elected faculty governing body) together constructed a survey instrument with the research team to ensure that the survey reflected the local campus culture and ongoing campus efforts to promote equity and inclusion (Berquist 1992).

Sample and Measures

In the spring of 2014, all 1,149 faculty and instructors (across various employment status classifications in the human resources database) were invited to participate in a climate survey. This was a follow-up to a smaller-scale 2007 survey initiated by the CDO. Our survey respondents consisted of the campus's range of instructional human resource categories—clinical (5%), visiting (2%), adjunct (59%), and tenured/tenure-track faculty members (34%). The overall response rate was 33 percent, with 383 instructors consenting to the survey. The personal background characteristics (that is, sex, race, age) of the respondent group did not deviate significantly from the overall campus composition of the faculty population (comparing the sample to the population, it was 54 vs. 50.5% male, 72 vs. 63% white, 51.4 vs. 50 years of age). In our analytical sample (all cases with outcome data), we had complete information for five variables: sex, gender, age, years of experience, and part-time status. We utilized statistical tests to determine if there were significant differences between our analytical sample and the full sample collected; none were observed.[3]

The instrument was developed to assess faculty members' perceptions of organizational effectiveness, values, and climate using forty-two closed-ended attitudinal, behavioral, and demographic items. Specific clusters of items asked respondents about the effectiveness of leaders on campus, the role of the campus mission and priorities in their work, their professional work expectations and obligations, the campus decision-making and governance processes, and the campus climate for diversity and inclusion (Hurtado et al. 2008; Hurtado et al. 2012).

Variables

Our outcomes consisted of three factors with strong Cronbach's reliabilities that measured respondents' commitments to the academic mission of the university ($\alpha = .74$), their participation in academic governance ($\alpha = .88$), and their sense of academic freedom ($\alpha = .81$) (see Table 1). More specifically, the academic mission factor outcome included faculty responses regarding the extent to which the campus's "strategic

priorities resonate with my personal and professional values" and the degree to which one engages with the campus's "strategic priorities in my work on campus." Factor items reflecting faculty members' involvement with academic governance structures included their self-ratings of the degree to which "there are opportunities for me to participate in the decision-making process on campus" as well as the extent to which the respondent "participates in decision-making on campus." The academic freedom factor items reflected the overall climate for expressing positions and views on campus, including the degree to which "faculty feel safe to publicly express positions that differ from the official stance of the campus" and "feel free to publicly express [their] positions and views on campus." Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were generated using principal component analysis with varimax rotation (Kim and Mueller 1978). The three outcome measures were computed by calculating the mean score of the variables that comprised each factor. Notably, the values for the outcomes, on average, all corresponded to a value lower than 3, indicating that faculty members' level of agreement that they were able to engage with the academic mission (2.94), participate in shared governance (2.68) and experience academic freedom (2.38) in their work was less than "agree."

Independent variables included clusters for faculty members' individual characteristics, perceptions of campus climate, and employment status. Personal characteristics consisted of dichotomous variables for sex (male = 1), race (white = 1), whether one identified religiously with the denomination of the university (denominational match = 1), and whether one was an alumna or alumnus of the university (alumna/us = 1). These last two variables, denomination and alumni match, were selected based on prior organizational literature noting the positive influence of social identity and organizational identification, including one's alumni or alumnae affiliation (Edwards and Cable 2009; Mael and Ashforth 1992). Other individual characteristics included two continuous variables indicating one's age and the number of years one had been employed at the university.

We selected two independent measures to account for faculty members' perceptions of the campus climate regarding inclusion. Both measures asked faculty to indicate their level of agreement with a statement using a four-point, Likert-type scale from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (4). The statements included "[The university] work environment is welcoming towards me," and "[The university's] history and traditions reflect a long-standing commitment to equity and inclusion." The final independent variable, employment status, was measured dichotomously (part-time = 1, 28.7%; full-time 71.3%). Table 2 provides descriptive statistics for all variables.

Modeling

Our analytical technique involved generating several blocked linear OLS regression models. We standardized the outcomes, then ran a series of three blocks representing each of the clusters of independent variables (individual characteristics, perceptions of inclusion on campus, and employment status) to decipher the

relative magnitude of the effect of each cluster on the outcomes. Aside from our regression models, we ran significance tests to compare responses of part-time to full-time faculty (note significant differences in Table 2), calculated correlations between all variables, and examined the variance inflation factors (VIFs) to determine the suitability of our variables for regression (VIF values were all less than 1.5 and well within a suitable range) (O'Brien 2007).

Results

Table 3 presents overall model statistics (adjusted R^2), ΔR^2 values describing the changes in the variance explained by each block of the models, and standardized coefficients (β) for the independent variables.[4] Overall, the final model for each outcome explained a quarter to more than a third of the variance in faculty members' engagement with the academic mission (26.7%), shared governance (35.0%), and academic freedom (38.7%). With respect to examining the relationship between employment status and academic values, we observed that faculty members' part-time status has a negative influence on their engagement with the academic mission ($R^2 = -0.138$, $p \leq .05$) and shared governance ($R^2 = -0.352$, $p \leq .001$), but a positive effect on academic freedom ($R^2 = .113$, $p \leq .05$).

Our models revealed that the change in variance was greatest in block 2 for all three outcomes. That is, the extent to which faculty perceive the campus as welcoming and inclusive contributes most dramatically to how faculty feel about academic values. Faculty perceptions of the campus climate help shape how they experience academic mission, governance, and freedom far more than their employment status alone. Specifically, in block 2, which isolated the influence of the faculty members' perceptions of inclusion, we observed changes of $\Delta R^2 = .246$ ($p \leq .001$) for academic mission, $\Delta R^2 = .228$ ($p \leq .001$) for shared governance, and $\Delta R^2 = .352$ ($p \leq .001$) for academic freedom. Correspondingly, the campus perception variables had the largest coefficients in our models. The full models indicate that when faculty members felt that the campus is welcoming toward them, this view had a positive influence on their engagement with academic mission ($\beta = .308$, $p \leq .001$), governance ($\beta = .444$, $p \leq .001$), and freedom ($\beta = .565$, $p \leq .001$). Faculty members' perceptions of the extent to which the campus had an historical commitment to equity and inclusion was only significant in the academic mission model ($\beta = .268$, $p \leq .001$).

Faculty members' individual characteristics generated few relationships to the outcomes. Notably, however, a faculty member's alumnus status was negatively related to academic governance. That is, alumni were less inclined to feel that there are opportunities to participate in shared governance or to indicate that they actually do participate in shared governance. Regarding academic freedom, being male had a positive effect on academic freedom in block 1, but this effect dissipated after accounting for campus perceptions and employment status in the other blocks. Age emerged as having a positive relationship to academic mission in blocks 1 and 3 only.

Additionally, while not the focus of this study, it is important to recognize that women were more likely to be employed as part-time faculty at the campus in our sample, which supports Toutkoushian and Bellas' (2003) work that demonstrated the gendered nature of this precarious status. A more recent analysis further suggests that women and other individuals with marginalized identities constitute the majority of contingent faculty (Knapp, Kelly-Reid, and Ginder 2010). We contend that our sample is reflective of this broader pattern in having an outsized share of women and/or people with marginalized identities in the roles of contingent and part-time faculty. Close to the onset of more equitable hiring practices for women, Edwards (1994, 26) poignantly warned that the "feminization of academe may coincide with the larger impoverishment of the profession." It is possible that the second-class status of part-time faculty within the organizational structure may reflect gendered norms and further contribute to "accumulated disadvantages" (Clark and Corcoran 1986) for this group of women faculty (Acker 2006).

Discussion

Our findings reveal somewhat complicated dynamics with respect to how the normative labor structure in higher education contributes to the preservation and maintenance of the core academic values, such as faculty adhering to the university's mission, engaging in shared governance, and invoking academic freedom. Perhaps the most expected finding, based on prior literature, is the negative relationship between being part-time and engaging in shared governance. For many campuses, there is simply no opportunity structure for part-time faculty to participate in the formal mechanisms of shared governance, such as the elected faculty senate or executive committee (Kezar, Lester, and Anderson 2006). The campus in our study stands out as an exception to the norm because, in the semester preceding data collection, the campus faculty senate had changed its bylaws to add a handful of at-large senate seats that part-time faculty were eligible to hold. This change had not yet been enacted through an election.

With respect to upholding the academic mission, part-time faculty among our respondents reported being less able to engage with the campus strategic priorities in their work, or to see the campus priorities as resonating for them personally and professionally. Part-time faculty teach the bulk of first- and second-year general education courses, and may embody the university from the student perspective, given that classes are the essential student experience of the campus (Cross and Goldenberg 2003). Aside from the negative effect of employment status, only the campus perception variables and one's age were observed to have a significant (and positive) effect on the academic mission. Specifically, the variable measuring faculty perceptions of the university's historical commitments to equity and inclusion was only significant in the academic mission model. Our study suggests that future inquiries should seek to understand how faculty obtain or derive their impressions of the campus's historical legacy regarding equity and inclusion, and what exactly they learn or discover. Fittingly, organizational history is not always a positive or consistent story of inclusion. In higher

education this is especially true: campus histories are scattered with periods of relative exclusion before organizational efforts were pursued to enact greater equity and inclusion for previously marginalized populations. This dynamic is true with the campus in our sample, specifically with respect to expanding inclusion across racial and ethnic groups, and with respect to sexual orientation. Our study makes clear that the history of the campus has a discernible influence on the current learning environment; the faculty's understanding of the organization's past can amplify and promote the current academic mission. Rhetoric that implicitly (or explicitly) suggests that the learning environment is divorced or detached from the campus history is at best imprecise and more likely ignorant of the cultural legacy that continues to shape the current campus climate with respect to engaging strategic priorities and the campus mission in the teaching and learning environment.

Our finding related to academic freedom, that part-time status is positively associated with academic freedom, is interesting because it conveys a partial view on a complex construct. The means by which we operationalized academic freedom was particularly focused on freedom to engage in public speech on campus. Part-time faculty felt more at ease compared to their full-time counterparts in feeling free to speak out or to dissent. It is difficult to know what a necessary or optimal level of comfort with public speech is required to engender a robust climate for academic freedom. Of the three values we considered, the overall mean for academic freedom (2.38) corresponded to a typical response of "disagree" regarding faculty feeling safe to dissent and to publicly express their viewpoints. However, we also observed that strong feelings of inclusion on campus corresponded to feeling safe to speak out.

In thinking more deeply about academic freedom, we assert that perceptions of the discrete and tangible risks associated with public speech may be conceptualized differently based on employment status; future research might examine this in further detail. For a long time, faculty speech was linked to tenure, with tenure affording faculty due process before they could be fired for their speech. Part-time faculty do not have tenure protections and can be let go for reasons far more arbitrary than speech (such as decisions about course enrollment), so the risks associated with dissenting speech may not be the same. For example, if part-time faculty perceive themselves to be members of multiple campuses because they hold multiple teaching contracts (which is the case for some NTTF in our sample), they may feel free to discuss differences or discrepancies in how they are treated in those different environments. Also, it could be that relative feelings of collective deprivation or exclusion in the organization may correspond with part-time faculty feeling emboldened or desperate enough to speak out, or to dissent. This is the classic view of mobilization and collective action among aggrieved social identity groups (McCarthy and Zald 1987). At the time we collected our data, in fact, part-time faculty were involved in conversations to explore the possibility of forming a union (which was subsequently prevented by the National Labor Relations Board). The union discussions perhaps may be a limitation or a reason to interpret these data with a bit of caution. However, faculty at

public and private universities in the metropolitan area and across the state were also engaged in similar explorations of union affiliation, which suggests that this campus is not much of an outlier in its current context.

Alternately, full-time faculty may have a stronger sense of organizational identification, where their personal self-worth is tied up in the public's positive perceptions of the organization, which could therefore reduce the likelihood that they deviate from the official position of the organization (Mael and Tetrick 1992). Further, it is important to note that academic freedom is enacted not only through public speech, but through scholarship and publication, as well as in teaching and in determining curricula and pedagogy. While this study identifies a relationship between employment status and academic freedom, there is much more to examine in the academic freedom domain especially.

Beyond employment status, our findings reflect the powerful influence of feeling included and welcomed. The magnitude of the effects of the faculty perception of inclusion variable is a clear signal that the relative quality of the campus climate, or positive feelings of inclusion, are profoundly influential in sustaining the core values of the academy. Campuses looking to advance their strategic priorities, have robust participation in shared governance, and cultivate freedom of speech would be wise to direct much of their energy toward improving the campus climate. Models for doing so have been elaborated for decades (Hurtado et al. 1999; Hurtado et al. 2012; Milem, Chang, and antonio 2005; Williams, Berger, and McClendon 2005), of which Hurtado et al.'s (2012) model of diverse learning environments stands out as the synthetic framework driving organizational practices associated with pursuing inclusion for marginalized social identity groups on campuses. Admittedly, the Hurtado et al. model is directed toward students' relative feelings of inclusion, but the general mechanisms of attending to the structural, psychological, behavioral, compositional, and historical dimensions of inclusion hold great promise for applications to improve equity and inclusion for faculty as well. Tangibly, extending Hurtado et al.'s model to improve inclusion of NTTF would require that the approach be multifaceted. Strategies adopted by the campus in this analysis included the provost commissioning a taskforce to understand the work and personal experiences of part-time faculty (data from this survey were shared with this panel), the faculty senate starting work on adopting policies to also formally represent contingent faculty, and the provost's and deans' offices began work on (a) establishing consistent course cancellation protocols, (b) identifying physical spaces for NTTF offices, and (c) identifying funds to assist contingent faculty in accessing teaching development resources on campus. While these approaches do not address all aspects of inclusion that Hurtado et al. articulate, they begin to respond to structural, psychological, and behavioral dimensions of inclusion that all universities could consider.

Conclusion

Goldstene (2015, 373) contends that restrictions on the academic freedom and autonomy of adjunct faculty

members "blunts the potential political power embedded in the very act of learning" and limits the capacity of students and faculty to critically examine existing structures and challenge the status quo. Likewise, we assert that the ramifications of silencing and excluding part-time faculty members in decision-making processes are immense and should not be overlooked. The consequences affect not only marginalized instructors but all organizational members—faculty, students, and staff (Mayer 2012; Meixner, Kruck, and Madden 2010). Umbach (2007) suggests that contingent faculty are more likely to produce better educational outcomes for students when their work is supported by their campuses. Other scholarly work has demonstrated that deans' values significantly affect organizational decisions related to the treatment and support of non-tenure-track faculty members, which suggests that working with academic deans may be an appropriate initial step in pursuing equity and inclusion (Gehrke and Kezar 2015).

Park (2011) alludes to the notion that some individuals contend that colleges and universities must simply embrace neoliberal management practices and the corresponding organizational changes - given the emerging realities of academic capitalism. We assert that if higher education is indeed undergoing permanent changes to its organizational functioning and routines, campuses must question how their failures to include the new faculty majority in the decision-making processes (and correspondingly notcompensating them for such participation) can hinder the essential academic characteristics of the university. In order to ensure that faculty of all employment statuses are contributing positively to the preservation and maintenance of the core values of the academy, campus members must feel free to express their positions and views on campus regardless of how these may differ from or support the official stance of the university.

Given the unlikelihood of a retreat from the widespread use of part-time and contingent faculty, higher education scholars, practitioners, and faculty should continue to interrogate how campuses operate in distinctive ways to shape the experiences of this ever-expanding class of instructors and the academy in general. Overall, our findings suggest that faculty's employment status and the campus climate for inclusion have real consequences for the preservation of academia's core democratic values.

Cassie L. Barnhardt is an associate professor at the University of Iowa in the Department of Educational Policy and Leadership Studies. She holds a secondary appointment with the UI Public Policy Center and is affiliated with the UI Center for Research on Undergraduate Education.

Carson W. Phillips is an institutional research specialist in the Office of Budget and Planning at the University of Michigan. Barnhardt can be reached at cassie-barnhardt@uiowa.edu, and Phillips can be reached at carsonp@umich.edu.

Notes

[1] Desrochers and Kirschstein (2014) conducted an analysis of high education costs and staffing patterns for the Delta Cost Project at the American Institutes of Research. In their analysis, the authors found that employment of part-time and graduate assistant instructors only kept pace with, or slightly lagged behind, student enrollment. Between 2002 and 2012 student services support positions have been increasing in the greatest proportion as

indicated by costs associated with salary expenditures. Desrochers and Kirschstein suggest that an increase in student services reflects the fact that activities that were once "under the purview of faculty have been centralized, to free up faculty time and standardize the types and quality of services provided" (18). Such an approach comes with additional costs, however, as expansion is associated with salary, benefits, and compensation. Moreover, increasing reliance on NTTF does not necessarily reduce costs; instead, it may redirect costs of supporting students onto other noninstructional employees providing complementary services to students (Schuster and Finkelstein 2007).

[2] According to US Census data (https://www.census.gov/en.html), of the state's population, 39.1% identify as Hispanic or Latino, 6.5% identity as black or African American, and 15.2% identify as Asian. Using NCES statistics (https://nces.ed.gov), 21% of the campus student population identifies as Hispanic or Latino, 6% identifies as black or African American, and 11% identifies as Asian.

[3] To compare the analytical sample to the full sample, we used Pearson chi-square and t-tests to explore whether differences emerged. We did *not* observe any significant differences for variables with complete population, sample, and analytical sample data. We also did *not* observe any significant differences between the overall sample and our analytical sample for the variables of race (p = .104), alumna/us status (p = .521), a measure denoting one's perception of whether the campus is "welcoming toward me" (p = .189), and how one perceives the campus's "historical commitment to equity and inclusion" (p = .930). A p-value of $p \leq$ .05 or, even more liberally, $p \leq$ .10 would suggest there were significant differences between groups—none of the observed p-values met these standards.

1. [4] The proportion of the variance explained ranges between 0 and 1. As such, a change (denoted by ⧠) in the effect size (R^2) could be ⧠R^2 = .25, which conveys that 25% of the variance in the way someone responds to the outcome is explained by the variables included in the block. If the overall effect size for all blocks is R^2 = .26, then .25 explained by a single block of independent variables accounts for almost all of the variance explained by the full quantitative model.

References

AAUP. 2016. "Higher Education at a Crossroads: The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession." *Academe*, March–April.

Acker, Joan. 2006. "Inequality Regimes: Gender, Class, and Race in Organizations." *Gender and Society* 20, no. 4: 441–64.

Allan, Elizabeth J., and Mary Madden. 2006. "Chilly Classrooms for Female Undergraduate Students: A Question of Method?" *Journal of Higher Education* 77, no. 4: 684–711.

Anderson, Valerie. 2007. "Contingent and Marginalised? Academic Development and Part-Time Teachers." *International Journal for Academic Development* 12, no. 2: 111–21.

Baldwin, Roger G., and Jay L. Chronister. 2002. *Teaching without Tenure: Policies and Practices for a New Era*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Baldwin, Roger G., and Matthew R. Wawrzynski. 2011. "Contingent Faculty as Teachers: What We Know; What We Need to Know." *American Behavioral Scientist* 55, no. 11: 1485–509.

Benjamin, Ernst, ed. 2003. *Exploring the Role of Non-Tenure Track Instructional Staff in Undergraduate Learning*. New Directions for Higher Education, vol. 123. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Berquist, William H. 1992. *The Four Cultures of the Academy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Birnbaum, Robert. 1988. *How Colleges Work: The Cybernetics of Academic Organization and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

———. 2000. *Management Fads in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bok, Derek. 2003. *Universities in the Marketplace: The Commercialization of Higher Education.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Brown, Wendy. 2011. "Neoliberalized Knowledge." *History of the Present* 1, no. 1: 113–29.

Chan, Joseph. 2010. "The Use of Practitioners as Part-Time Faculty in Postsecondary Professional Education." *International Education Studies* 3, no. 4: 36–45.

Clark, Shirley M., and Mary Corcoran. 1986. "Perspectives on the Professional Socialization of Women Faculty: A Case of Accumulative Disadvantage?" *Journal of Higher Education* 57, no. 1: 20–43.

Cross, John G., and Edie N. Goldenberg. 2003. "How Does University Decision Making Shape the Faculty?" *New Directions for Higher Education*, no. 123: 49–59.

———. 2009. *Off-Track Profs: Nontenured Teachers in Higher Education.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Desrochers, Donna M., and Rita Kirschstein. 2014. "Labor Intensive or Labor Expensive? Changing Staffing and Compensation Patterns in Higher Education." Delta Cost Project, American Institutes for Research, Issue Brief, February.

Edwards, Jeffrey R., and Daniel M. Cable. 2009. "The Value of Value Congruence." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 94, no. 3: 654–77.

Edwards, Mary G. 1994. "The Decline of the American Professoriate, 1970–1990." *Anthropology of Work Review* 15, no. 1: 21–28.

Gappa, Judith M., and David W. Leslie. 1993. *The Invisible Faculty: Improving the Status of Part-Timers in Higher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gehrke, Sean J., and Adrianna Kezar. 2015. "Supporting Non-Tenure-Track Faculty at 4-Year Colleges and Universities: A National Study of Deans' Values and Decisions." *Educational Policy* 29, no. 6: 929–60.

Giroux, Henry A. 2002. "Neoliberalism, Corporate Culture, and the Promise of Higher Education: The University as a Democratic Public Sphere." *Harvard Educational Review* 72, no. 4: 425–64.

———. 2014. *Neoliberalism's War on Higher Education.* Chicago: Haymarket.

Goldstene, Claire. 2015. "Designed to Fail: Adjunct Faculty and the Fight for Education." *WorkingUSA* 18, no. 3: 367–75.

Gumport, Patricia J. 2000. "Academic Restructuring: Organizational Change and Institutional Imperatives." *Higher Education* 39, no. 1: 67–91.

Haeger, John D. 1998. "Part-Time Faculty, Quality Programs and Economic Realities." In *The Growing Use of Part-Time Faculty: Understanding Causes and Effects*, edited by David W. Leslie, 81–88. New Directions for Higher Education, no. 104. San Francisco: Wiley.

Hart, Jeni, and Jennifer Fellabaum. 2008. "Analyzing Campus Climate Studies: Seeking to Define and Understand." *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 1, no. 4: 222–34.

Harvard University. 2018. "Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education." Home page. https://coache.gse.harvard.edu/.

Hurtado, Sylvia, Jeffrey F. Milem, Alma R. Clayton-Pedersen, and Walter R. Allen. 1999. "Enacting Diverse Learning Environments: Improving the Climate for Racial/Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education." ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report 26, no. 8. Washington, DC: George Washington University.

Hurtado, Sylvia, Cynthia L. Alvarez, Chelsea Guillermo-Wann, Marcela Cuellar, and Lucy Arellano. 2012. "A

Model for Diverse Learning Environments: The Scholarship on Creating and Assessing Conditions for Student Success." Chap. 2 of *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, edited by John C. Smart and Michael B. Paulsen, 41–122: Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

Hurtado, Sylvia, Kimberly A. Griffin, Lucy Arellano, and Marcela Cuellar. 2008. "Assessing the Value of Climate Assessments: Progress and Future Directions." *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 1, no. 4: 204-21.

Hurtado, Sylvia, Jeffrey F. Milem, Alma R. Clayton-Pederson, and Walter R. Allen. 1998. "Enacting Campus Climates for Racial/Ethnic Diversity through Educational Policy and Practice." *Review of Higher Education* 21, no. 3: 279–302.

Husbands, Christopher T. 1998. "Assessing the Extent of Use of Part-Time Teachers in British Higher Education: Problems and Issues in Enumerating a Flexible Labour Force." *Higher Education Quarterly* 52, no. 3: 257–82.

Jayakumar, Uma M., Tyrone C. Howard, Walter R. Allen, and June C. Han. 2009. "Racial Privilege in the Professoriate: An Exploration of Campus Climate, Retention, and Satisfaction." *Journal of Higher Education* 80, no. 5: 538–63.

Jaeger, Audrey J., and Derik Hinz. 2008-9. "The Effects of Part-Time Faculty on First Semester Freshman Retention: A Predictive Model Using Logistic Regression." *Journal of College Student Retention* 10, no. 3: 265-86.

Kezar, Adrianna. 2004a. "Obtaining Integrity? Reviewing and Expanding the Charter between Higher Education and Society." *Review of Higher Education* 27, no. 4: 429–59.

———. 2004b. "What Is More Important to Effective Governance: Relationships, Trust, and Leadership, or Structures and Formal Processes?" *New Directions for Higher Education*, no. 127: 35–46.

———. 2012. *Embracing Non-Tenure Track Faculty: Changing Campuses for the New Faculty Majority*. New York: Routledge.

———. 2013. "Examining Non-Tenure Track Faculty Perceptions of How Departmental Policies and Practices Shape Their Performance and Ability to Create Student Learning at Four-Year Institutions." *Research in Higher Education* 54, no. 5: 571-98.

Kezar, Adrianna, and Samantha Bernstein-Sierra. 2016. "Commercialization of Higher Education." In *Handbook of Academic Integrity*, edited by Tracey Bretag, 325–46. Singapore: Springer Singapore.

Kezar, Adrianna, Jaime Lester, and Gregory Anderson. 2006. "Challenging Stereotypes That Interfere with Effective Governance." *Thought and Action* 22: 121–34.

Kezar, Adrianna, and Cecile Sam. 2013. "Institutionalizing Equitable Policies and Practices for Contingent Faculty." *Journal of Higher Education* 84, no. 1: 56–87.

Kim, Jae-On, and Charles M. Mueller. 1978. *Introduction to Factor Analysis: What It Is and How to Do It*. Vol. 13. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kimber, Megan. 2003. "The Tenured 'Core' and the Tenuous 'Periphery': The Casualisation of Academic Work in Australian Universities." *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 25, no. 1: 41–50.

Knapp, Laura G., Janice E. Kelly-Reid, and Scott A. Ginder. 2010. *Employees in Postsecondary Institutions, Fall 2009, and Salaries of Full-Time Instructional Faculty, 2009–10* (NCES 2011-150). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, US Department of Education. https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011150.pdf.

Lindholm, Jennifer A., and Katalin Szelényi. 2008. "Faculty Time Stress: Correlates within and across Academic Disciplines." *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment* 17, nos. 1–2: 19–40.

Mael, Fred A., and Blake E. Ashforth. 1992. "Alumni and Their Alma Mater: A Partial Test of the Reformulated Model of Organizational Identification." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 13, no. 2: 102-23.

Mael, Fred A., and Lois E. Tetrick. 1992. "Identifying Organizational Identification." *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 52, no. 4: 813–24.

Mayer, David M. 2012. "A Positive Lens on Organizational Justice: Toward a Moral, Constructive, and Balanced Approach to Reactions to Third-Party (In)Justice." In *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship*, edited by Gretchen M. Spreitzer and Kim S. Cameron, 316–24. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mayhew, Matthew J., Heidi E. Grunwald, and Eric L. Dey. 2006. "Breaking the Silence: Achieving a Positive Campus Climate for Diversity from the Staff Perspective." *Research in Higher Education* 47, no. 1: 63–88.

Mayhew, M. J., A. J. Rockenbach, N. A. Bowman, T. A. Seifert, and G. C. Wolniack. 2016. *How College Affects Students: 21st Century Evidence That Higher Education Works*. Vol. 3. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McCarthy, John D., and Mayer N. Zald. 1987. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements." In *Social Movements in an Organizational Society*, edited by M. N. Zald and J. D. McCarthy, 15–47. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Meixner, Cara, S. E. Kruck, and Laura T. Madden. 2010. "Inclusion of Part-Time Faculty for the Benefit of Faculty and Students." *College Teaching* 58, no. 4: 141–47.

Milem, Jeffrey F., Mitchell J. Chang, and Anthony L. Antonio. 2005. "Making Diversity Work on Campus: A Research-Based Perspective." Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Musselin, Christine. 2006. "Are Universities Specific Organizations? In *Towards a Multiversity? Universities between Global Trends and National Traditions*, 63–84. Bielefeld, Germany: Transcript Verlag.

O'Brien, Robert. M. 2007. "A Caution Regarding Rules of Thumb for Variance Inflation Factors." *Quality and Quantity* 41, no. 5: 673–90.

Ott, Molly, and Jesus Cisneros. 2015. "Understanding the Changing Faculty Workforce in Higher Education: A Comparison of Non-Tenure Track and Tenure Line Experiences." *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 23, no. 90: 1–25.

Park, Toby. 2011. "Academic Capitalism and Its Impact on the American Professoriate." *Journal of the Professoriate* 6, no. 1: 84–99.

Pope, Raechele L., and Lucy A. LePeau. 2012. "The Influence of Institutional Context and Culture." In *Why Aren't We There Yet? Taking Personal Responsibility for Creating an Inclusive Campus*, edited by Jay Arminio, Vasti Torres, and Raechele L. Pope, 103–30. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Rajagopal, Indhu, and William D. Farr. 1992. "Hidden Academics: The Part-Time Faculty in Canada." *Higher Education* 24, no. 3: 317–31.

Rankin, Susan R., and Robert D. Reason. 2005. "Differing Perceptions: How Students of Color and White Students Perceive Campus Climate for Underrepresented Groups." *Journal of College Student Development* 46, no. 1: 43–61.

Reid, Landon D., and Phanikiran Radhakrishnan. 2003. "Race Matters: The Relation between Race and General Campus Climate." *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 9, no. 3: 263–75.

Renn, Kristen A. 2010. "LGBT and Queer Research in Higher Education: State and Status of the Field." *Educational Researcher* 3, no. 2: 132–41.

Rhoades, Gary. 2013. "Disruptive Innovations for Adjunct Faculty: Common Sense for the Common Good." *Thought and Action* 29: 71–86.

———. 2014. "We Are All Contingent: Reorganizing Higher Education and Society." *On Campus* 33, no. 4: 2–4.

Sandler, Bernice R., and Roberta M. Hall. 1986. "The Campus Climate Revisited: Chilly for Women Faculty, Administrators, and Graduate Students." Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges.

Schuster, Jack H., and M. J. Finkelstein. 2006. *American Faculty: The Restructuring of Academic Work and Careers*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

———. 2007. "On the Brink: Assessing the Status of the American Faculty." *Research and Occasional Papers Series*. University of California, Berkeley, Center for Studies in Higher Education. http://escholarship.org/uc/item/1ch73352

Selznick, Phillip. 1957. Introduction to *Leadership in Administration: A Sociological Interpretation*, 1–28. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Shavers, Frances L. 2000. "Academic Ranks and Titles of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty." In *Policies on Faculty Appointment: Standard Practices and Unusual Arrangements*, edited by Cathy A. Trower, 110–40. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Sheets, Jessica K., Cassie L. Barnhardt, Carson W. Phillips, and Peggy H. Valdéz. 2018. "The Impact of Faculty Work-Life Factors on Faculty Service Morale." *Journal of Faculty Development* 32, no. 2: 53-65.

Slaughter, Sheila, and Larry L. Leslie. 1997. *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Slaughter, Sheila, and Gary Rhoades. 2004. *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets, State, and Higher Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Street, Steve, Maria Maisto, Esther Merves, and Gary Rhoades. 2012. "Who Is Professor 'Staff' and How Can This Person Teach So Many Students?" Center for the Future of Higher Education Policy. https://feaweb.org/who-is-professor-staff-and-how-can-this-person-teach-so-many-classes.

Swidler, Ann. 1986. "Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies." *American Sociological Review* 51: 273–86.

Toutkoushian, Robert K., and Marcia L. Bellas. 2003. "The Effects of Part-Time Employment and Gender on Faculty Earnings and Satisfaction: Evidence from the NSOPF:93." *Journal of Higher Education* 74, no. 2: 172–95.

Turner, Caroline Sotello Viernes. 2002. "Women of Color in Academe: Living with Multiple Marginality." *Journal of Higher Education* 73, no. 1: 74–93.

Umbach, Paul D. 2007. "How Effective Are They? Exploring the Impact of Contingent Faculty on Undergraduate Education." *Review of Higher Education* 30, no. 2: 91–123.

Victorino, Christine A., Karen Nylund-Gibson, and Sharon Conley. 2013. "Campus Racial Climate: A Litmus Test for Faculty Satisfaction at Four-Year Colleges and Universities." *Journal of Higher Education* 84, no. 6: 769–805.

Williams, Damon A., Joseph B. Berger, and Shederick A. McClendon. 2005. *Making Excellence Inclusive*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Williams, Don, William Gore, Charles Broches, and Cynthia Lostoski. 1987. "One Faculty's Perceptions of Its Governance Role." *Journal of Higher Education* 58, no. 6: 629–57.

Tables

Table 1. Outcome Scales for Academic Mission, Shared Governance, and Academic Freedom

	Mean	SD	N
Academic Mission: Eigenvalue = 1.59, α =0.74	2.94	0.72	260
Campus priorities resonate with my pers. & prof. values	2.80	0.88	274
I engage with campus strategic priorities in my work on campus	3.04	0.76	268
Academic Governance: Eigenvalue = 1.80 , α = .88	2.49	0.85	297
There are opportunities for me to participate in the decision making process on campus	2.50	0.92	305
I participate in the decision making process on campus	2.49	0.89	297
Academic Freedom: Eigenvalue = 1.69 , α = .81	2.38	0.85	274
Campus faculty feel safe to express positions that differ from the official stance of the campus	2.28	0.93	283
I feel free to publicly express my positions and views on campus	2.50	0.90	291

Table 2. Measures and Descriptive Statistics for Variables Used in Analysis of Faculty Members' Relationship to Academic Principles

	Part-Time 28.7%	Full-time 71.3%	Overall mean	sd	N
Outcome Scale Variables					
Academic Mission	2.84	2.97	2.94	0.72	260
Academic Governance	2.00***	2.68	2.49	0.85	297
Academic Freedom	2.55	2.33	2.38	0.85	274
Independent Variables					
Male (1 = male, 0 = female)	45.3%	57.5%	54.0%		312
White (1 = white, 0 = nonwhite)	75.0%	71.3%	72.0%		292
Age (continuous variable ranging from 23 to 82)	51.8	51.3	51.4		292
Denominational Match (1 = match, 0 = no match)	26.7%	31.9%	31.0%		287
Alumni (1 = alum, 0 = not alum)	20.9%*	10.2%	13.0%		312
Years Employed (continuous variable ranging from 0 to 48)	4.97***	13.65	11.25	9.83	312
Welcoming toward Me (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree)	2.89	2.81	2.83	0.87	305
Historical Commitment to Equity and Inclusion (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree)	2.86	2.77	2.80	0.85	284
Part-time Dummy	28.70%	71.30%	0.29		312

Notes: ***$p \leq 0.001$, **$p \leq 0.01$, *$p \leq 0.05$, ~$p \leq 0.10$; the above statistics compare to the campus faculty population which is, 50.5% male and 49.5% female, 50 years old, 63% white, 11% Hispanic or Latino, 8% black or African American, 9% Asian or Asian American, and the remaining 9% comprised of identifying with other racial or ethnic minority groups or as multiracial or multiethnic.

Table 3. Linear Regression Model of the Effects of Faculty Employment Status on Academic Mission, Shared Governance, and Academic Freedom

	Mission (N = 234)			Governance (N = 254)			Freedom (N = 243)		
	Block 1	*Block 2*	*Block 3*	*Block 1*	*Block 2*	*Block 3*	*Block 1*	*Block 2*	*Block 3*
Individual Characteristics									
Male	0.051	-0.041	-0.048	0.063	-0.031	-0.049	0.157*	0.04	0.046
White	-0.064	-0.041	-0.033	0.027	0.047	0.068	-0.104	-0.078	-0.085
Age	0.150*	0.062	0.108*	-0.02	-0.089	0.027	-0.087	0.001	-0.037
Denominational Match	-0.040	-0.047	-0.047	-0.040	-0.021	-0.021	-0.006	0.030	0.030
Alumni	0.115	0.027	0.044	-0.128*	-0.197***	-0.154**	0.092	0.005	-0.009
Years Employed~	-0.057	-0.004	-0.081	0.153*	0.208**	0.012	-0.096	-0.027	0.036
Perceptions of Organizational Climate									
Welcoming toward Me~		0.311***	0.308***		0.458***	0.444***		0.562***	0.565***
Historical Commitment to Equity and Inclusion~		0.265***	0.268***		0.065	0.073		0.081	0.079
Employment Status									
Part-Time			-0.138*			-0.352***			0.113*
ΔR^2:	0.034	0.246***	0.014*	0.052*	0.228***	.093***	0.047	0.352***	0.010*
Adjusted R^2:	0.009	0.255***	0.267*	0.030*	0.257***	0.350***	0.024	0.380***	0.387*

Notes: β coefficients are presented. ~ variable standardized; ***$p \leq 0.001$, **$p \leq 0.01$, *$p \leq 0.05$, ~$p \leq 0.10$