Full Time, Non-Tenure Track Faculty, Service, and Organizational Commitment

Nathan Alleman
Baylor University

Cara Cliburn Allen
Baylor University

Don Haviland
Long Beach State University

Abstract: *Recent studies have shown that service is a common function for some non-tenure track faculty despite the fact that it is often not contractually required. This qualitative study sought to understand the role of organizational commitment to service behaviors. Findings reveal that the relationship of organizational commitment to service behaviors was in part an outcome of institutional culture and departmental behaviors. Concluding, this study problematizes the assumed ubiquity of the non-tenure track as second-class citizen narrative, suggesting a more complex picture is needed given the service engagement and organizational commitment experienced by some NTTF.*

Keywords: non tenure track faculty, service, organizational commitment.

Nathan Alleman is an Associate Professor of Higher Education at Baylor University.

Cara Cliburn Allen is a Doctoral Candidate in Higher Education Studies and Leadership at Baylor University.

Don Haviland is the Department Chair of Educational Leadership and the Executive Director for the Center for Evaluation and Educational Effectiveness at Long Beach State University.

Introduction

Service, as one of the central features of the faculty life, is also the most neglected, particularly among faculty at research universities who may see it as a distraction from their focus on research (Reybold & Corda, 2011; Sandmann & Fear, 1995; Ward, 2003). Researchers decry the lack of faculty engagement in service (Rice, 1986; Ward, 2003), even as other writers observe that the shifting labor context toward more contingent faculty (Kezar, 2012, 2013a) and governance practices toward administrative managerial approaches (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004) is reducing the pool of faculty available for service (Lawrence, Ott, & Bell, 2012). However, this description does not recognize that at many institutions non-tenure-track faculty members (NTTF) are expanding rather than reducing the body of faculty involved in service activities (Alleman & Haviland, 2016).

Over the past half century, non-tenure-track faculty have proliferated as a labor segment, increasing from 22% of faculty in 1969, to 57% in 2013 (Finkelstein, Conley, & Schuster, 2016). However, this proliferation has done little to increase role clarity: Levin and Shaker (2011) note that non-tenure-track faculty occupy a liminal space, lacking the independence and autonomy typically reflective of tenure system faculty but occupying a professional role different from supervised laborers. Consequently, studies of contingent faculty satisfaction highlight their enjoyment of teaching and student interaction but note their frequent frustration with institutional policies and co-worker behaviors that treat them as second-class citizens (Hearn & Deupree, 2013).

In part, conceptualization of the role of non-tenure-track faculty has historically been formed by the impetus for their hiring, which has included providing institutional flexibility and financial relief, covering gaps in teaching assignments between tenure system appointments, and accessing expertise in emerging areas of professional practice (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Cross & Goldenberg, 2009). However, service was seldom expected to be part of their function, unless it was a specific part of their contractual obligation. Policies related to non-tenure-track faculty were created to give institutions maximum flexibility logistically

and financially, which typically meant minimal financial and professional investment in non-tenure-track faculty (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Such practices were driven by institutional needs and occurred with little awareness of accompanying systemic changes, such as altered hiring patterns and reconstituted departments (Cross & Goldenberg, 2009). Consequently, faculty and administrators conceptualized non-tenure-track faculty primarily as either an opportunistic or a problematic development: a faculty sub-set that could be administratively controlled, thereby threatening the tenure system and the quality of academic delivery. The outcome, from this view, was a reduction of the pool of tenured faculty expected to engage in service (Cross & Goldenberg, 2009). Concurrently, many institutions put into place policies that restricted the membership or voting rights of NTTF on committees, while collective bargaining agreements at some institutions released them from the requirement of service participation (Kezar, 2013a).

In all of these decisions, the experiences or actual contributions of non-tenure-track faculty were seldom considered (Kezar & Sam, 2010). However, contemporary scholars have shifted the conversation from a focus on the contingent status of non-tenure-track faculty as disruptive and problematic, to an emphasis on the contributions and commitments of NTTF, including to service (Kezar & Maxey, 2015). These recent efforts have focused on institutional practices and policies that support non-tenure-track faculty through professional development opportunities, governance participation, and collegial inclusion (Haviland, Alleman, & Cliburn Allen, 2017).

Consequently, although the proliferation of non-tenure-track faculty have often been described as a drain on the capacity of the tenure-line faculty body to complete needed service (Maxey & Kezar, 2015), recent evidence suggests that many non-tenure-track faculty are actively involved in service, even outside contractual requirements (Levin & Shaker, 2011). Thus, service represents an important arena where the profession-wide negotiation over the function and legitimacy of non-tenure-track faculty is played out. Understanding why those non-tenure-track faculty who electively engage in service choose to do so is then one

important step in the profession-wide struggle to re-conceptualize contingent faculty in ways that honor both their value and their differentiated role (Haviland et al, 2017). In this paper we investigate what the concept of organizational commitment (OC) reveals about the service behaviors and motivations of full-time, non-tenure track faculty (hereafter, NTTF), and what the organizational commitment of NTTF might mean for their position within institutions and the academy broadly.

Review of the Literature

Prerequisite to understanding faculty members' motivation for service is awareness that service is an umbrella for a great variety of activities (e.g., committee work, governance, applying disciplinary expertise to community issues, professional association leadership) that occur in a similarly diverse set of contexts (e.g., department, institutional, community, profession), all of which are shaped by professional socialization, institutional expectations, and variables of professional motivation and identity (Neumann & Terosky, 2007; Sheets, Barnhardt, Phillips, & Valdes, 2018). A clear definition of service is also elusive because of the various functions that it serves for individuals and organizations. Service can be conceptualized as a function of a department working together to achieve commonly-held goals (Alleman & Haviland, 2016), as the function of an individual who generates various forms of capital (social, academic, economic) by employing disciplinary knowledge to contexts where this insight is valued (Bourdieu, 1988), and as a function of the institution as a knowledge-generating enterprise that extends its expertise and resources to various audiences for social benefits (Sandman & Fear, 1995), among others. Thus, despite commonly cited sets of categories for service context, content, function, and motivation (Neumann & Terosky, 2007), service still defies simple definition but clearly represents a multi-modal, multi-functional element that encompasses aspects of obligation and opportunity for faculty members and institutions.

An additionally complicating element is that faculty members socialized and professionally prepared to research and teach are seldom equipped

with ways to think about and integrate service into their professional lives and goals (Reybold & Corda, 2011). Service, although generally expected of faculty depending on terms of contact, has been cited by researchers as infrequently rewarded and even tacitly discouraged, particularly for tenure track faculty members (O'Meara & Rice, 2005). Consequently, neophyte professors may enter the workplace with a disregard for service as a distraction from the "real" work of the academy. The peripheral value of service in tenure and evaluation processes furthers such perspectives (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

Despite expectations of participation, service traditionally has been an area where faculty exercise at least partial autonomy. As such, service has been presented as a professional obligation that faculty engage in for the good of the department, institution, community, or profession, akin to, or as an aspect of collegiality (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Such an approach often emphasizes academic citizenship and responsibility (Knight & Trowler, 1999). Although this may be an appropriate emphasis, the language of obligation has not resulted in a sea change of attitude toward service.

However, some scholars have shifted the emphasis from duty to opportunity (Burnett, Shemroske, & Khayum, 2014; Neumann & Terosky, 2007). Service holds the potential to generate intrinsic and extrinsic benefits for individuals and organizations, although the distribution of resulting resources may not be equitable (Reybold & Corda, 2011). One dimension of service as opportunity that scholars have noted, and indeed recommended (O'Meara, 1997), is the linking of disciplinary expertise or scholarship to service involvement (Boyer, 1990). Reybold and Corda (2011) define service using this approach, stating, "Regardless of the type of activity or time spent, service is an abstract concept best characterized as the application of disciplinary expertise through personal engagement which enhances the knowledge of institutional, local, and national communities" (p. 125). In this, Boyer's (1990) "scholarship of engagement," since taken up by others (Ward, 2003; O'Meara, 1997), is the most recognizable manifestation, tying not just the integration of disciplinary knowledge to service but the credibility of "scholarship" language as well.

Nevertheless, NTTF, despite constraints, do engage in service strategically. At variance with tenure system faculty who do service as an expression of established professional expertise (Lawrence et al., 2012), NTTF may engage in service to "carve out roles that increase their value" (Waltman et al., 2012, p. 423), as a form of agency in an environment where they are given little control (Levin & Shaker, 2011) and as a means by which to increase job security and access professional growth opportunities (Bergom & Waltman, 2009). Although this research offers important evidence that refutes presumptions that NTTF are not electively involved in service, these studies also illustrate that the service opportunities, both in variety and significance, are in some contexts at least benignly constraining, and at worst, exploitive. The historically disproportionate representation of women and racial/ethnic minorities in the NTTF ranks further increases the possibility that exploitive factors have a multiplicative effect (Finkelstein, Conley, & Schuster, 2016; O'Meara, Kuvaeva, & Nyunt, 2016). As a result, for NTTF and for many faculty members from marginalized groups, service represents the intersection of opportunity and exploitation (Guarino & Borden, 2017). Understanding better the impetus of NTTF service, given these two potential realities, is thus an important step toward understanding NTTF as the new faculty majority and what that might mean for the institutions that rely on their labor.

Conceptual Framework

Although the scholarship of engagement may help to explain the behaviors of some faculty for some types of service, other scholars have turned to the nature of the relationship between employer and employee to understand service motivations. Given the apparent disinterest in many forms of service by some tenure-track faculty traditionally tasked with it (Fairweather, 1996), and the rising numbers of faculty freed from service expectations by contract or departmental culture (Kezar, 2012), researchers have sought to understand why those who expend themselves in this way may choose to do so.

One approach to this question has been through the concept of organizational commitment (Lawrence, et al., 2012). Organizational

commitment (OC) is a concept that has received extensive conceptual explication across several fields, including organization and management, labor relations, business, and more recently, higher education (Cohen, 2007; Lawrence et al., 2012; Meyer & Allen, 1991). Organizational commitment is "the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization" (Mowday et al., 1982, p. 226) and "is most often understood to be an attitudinal orientation or mindset that reflects a person's sense of connection to and involvement in a particular organization" (Lawrence et al., 2012, p. 329).

Although scholars have made numerous attempts to distill OC down into its constituent elements (Etzioni, 1975; Kanter, 1968; Mowday et al., 1982; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986), the most widely used and replicated has been the work of Meyer and Allen (1991), who argued that OC can be thought of as having two approaches: attitudinal and behavioral. Attitude has to do with how people come to think about their relationship to the organization. For example, over time, policies and practices that promote work-life balance or the equitable treatment of individuals regardless of rank may contribute to the development of a positive perspective towards one's employer. Behavior has to do with how they become locked into certain organizations and what they do about it. Continuing this example, as a result of perceptions of fair and equitable treatment, an employee may desire to continue their employment, even to the point of accepting lower pay or other otherwise undesirable contractual terms.

Depending on employee's experiences and reasons for organizational membership, OC bonds may take one or more of three forms (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Affective commitment (AC) results when an employee perceives congruence between personal and organizational values, when the individual holds positive attitudes toward the organization, and when he or she wants to maintain membership as a result. The example given in the previous paragraph likely reflects affective commitment. Normative commitment (NC) results from a sense of obligation to the organization or from a general sense of duty. Although duty is often conceptualized as a virtuous inclination, in this formulation it reflects a

compulsion that the employee must or does follow often to his or her disadvantage or detriment. This form of commitment is the most difficult to identify confidently in analysis because the behaviors that result from a sense of duty may not reveal the underlying attitude of normative commitment. Continuance commitment (CC) results when the perceived costs of leaving outweigh the costs of staying. CC is often present when employment options are few or when the investment in a particular position is considerable enough that departure is unattractive. Again, in the above example, if the individual sensed that the institution was changing in undesirable ways, he or she may nevertheless continue in employment for some time because of the years invested already. In their frequently cited article, Meyer and Allen (1991) clarify that commitment forms are not mutually exclusive: "We believe it is more appropriate to consider affective, continuance, and normative commitments as components, than as types, of commitment" (p. 67). As such, to the extent that a faculty member is committed to their institution, that commitment is an amalgam of multiple kinds. Meyer and Allen (1991) noted that OC pertains to the ways that individuals are bound or bind themselves to organizations. Thus, OC may explain willingness or perceived compulsion to self-give beyond what is explicitly expected or what might be anticipated given the nature of one's employment status.

NTTF and Organizational Commitment

Faculty members hired on a contingent basis historically enjoyed little if any of the security and implicit organizational investment that is traditionally part of tenure-system positions (Cross & Goldenberg, 2009). The lack of clearly defined roles, dearth of professional development opportunities, limitations of contract length, and even prohibitions on contract renewal signaled an institutional disregard for the professional welfare of NTTF as a labor segment. Meyer and Allen (1991) argued that employees in such a relationship are likely to perceive that little investment has been made in them and behave in kind: "It seems reasonable to assume that employees' willingness to contribute to organizational effectiveness will be influenced by the nature of the commitment they experience" (p. 73). Consequently, employees who experience low levels of commitment from their employer and high

levels of employment insecurity are less likely to be committed to the mission of the institution and more likely to do whatever is required to secure continued employment (Levin & Shaker, 2011).

Taken together, positive forms of OC may seem largely irrelevant to the NTTF experience, yet recent scholarship suggests otherwise. Ott and Ciscernos (2015) found that NTTF had similar levels of OC (demonstrated via desire for involvement in governance) as pre-tenure faculty and higher levels of OC than tenured faculty, suggesting OC is a feature of NTTF life worth considering. Similarly, Kezar and Sam (2010) argued that "[e]ven though non-tenure track faculty members should exhibit less commitment, studies demonstrate that they generally have equal or more commitment compared to tenure track faculty members at both 2-year and 4-year colleges" (p. 8). Instead of reducing OC, Kezar and Sam (2010) argued that several factors may increase the OC of NTTF, including the internal orientation of faculty as professionals (Sullivan, 2004), graduate and professional socialization to professional expectations (Blau, 1999), and commitment to their discipline (Shaker, 2008). Thus, although the literature suggests that institutional commitment to NTTF may be uneven at best (Haviland, et al, 2017; Kezar, 2013b), recent research shows that NTTF are at least seeking, if not experiencing, some form of commitment to their employing institutions.

Methodology

In this study, we employed an interpretivist approach (Jones, Torres, & Arminio, 2014), which harnesses prior constructs (conceptual framework and the existing literature) to explore the lived experiences of participants. This qualitative study analyzed data from interviews with full-time NTTF about their service behaviors and the factors that motivated those behaviors. Participants were 38 individuals with full-time faculty status, working at two different institutions in the professions (e.g., education, law, business), humanities, STEM, and social sciences. We specified full-time status since availability to participate in shared governance, advise and mentor students, and generally develop a campus presence is limited for part-time faculty. Our

focus on full-time NTTF does not discount the potential applicability of institutional commitment to part-time NTTF. However, the variety of career motivations and plans, frequent disengagement in campus service, and variable centrality of the faculty profession to their identity (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001) legitimize our focus on full-time status.

The study took place at a mid-sized public comprehensive university (Master's University; hereafter, MU) that is unionized, and a private, religiously-affiliated, mid-sized research-university (Research University; hereafter, RU). The specific institutions were chosen because of the variety represented between them within the four-year context in the United States. Differences of control, mission, organizational structure and culture, and other factors between the two institutions increased the potential diversity and richness of experiences and responses. We invited participants from these institutions who had at least three but preferably six or more years of teaching experience at the institution, since institutional longevity provided opportunity for commitment to the organization to emerge. At MU, the disciplinary and field distribution of participants included: one from social sciences, two from the STEM fields, one from the humanities, and 12 from the professions for a total of 16. Only three of the participants at MU were male. Ten of the 16 participants from MU held terminal degrees, and 11 had earned at least one of their degrees from the university. The distribution of males and females within this study (24 females, 14 males) was circumstantial, based on the criteria defined above. At RU, there was an equal representation of males and females: three were from the social sciences, six were from the humanities, six were from STEM fields, and seven were from the professions for a total of 22. Twenty of the 22 held terminal degrees in their field, and eight had earned at least one of their degrees from RU.

Data Collection and Analysis

We conducted a single, semi-structured interview with each participant that lasted between 50 and 120 minutes. Although participant observation could have provided insights, we chose to rely on self-reported behaviors to capture the breadth of activities that observation

might have missed. Participants were asked about their journey into the faculty profession, personal and departmental expectations for service, relative voice and autonomy perceived in service activities, departmental collegiality, collaboration, participation, and support, and opportunities for mentoring, professional development, and advancement. We sought patterns of experiences and sense-making among participants that confirmed, challenged, or tweaked pre-existing assumptions and models of organizational commitment and service. All interviews were audio recorded, transcribed verbatim, and imported into Nvivo 10 software for coding and analysis.

To code and analyze the data, we implemented a two-cycle coding process (Saldana, 2013). For the first cycle of coding, we used Provisional Coding to determine whether or not participants were involved in service and if so, the types of service they were involved in and the motivations for their service behaviors, including organizational commitment as well as the emergence of new themes. Provisional Coding makes use of a list of codes generated before analysis based upon the literature review or the conceptual framework (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Saldana, 2013). We used a provisional list of codes based upon the literature for types of service: institutional, professional, and community (Blackburn et al., 1991; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Ward, 2003). In order to determine motivation for service behaviors, we used a list of provisional codes based upon the three-part organizational commitment conceptual framework in our study (Meyer & Allen, 1991). As we coded and analyzed the data, we "revised, modified, deleted, or expanded [provisional codes] to include new codes" that allowed for other motivations for service behaviors besides organizational commitment to emerge (Saldana, 2013, p. 144). As a result, we identified a set of non-organizational commitment motivations for service that did not fit the conceptual typology: service as opportunity for professional development, service as avenue for supporting student success, and service as a means for expressing and promoting one's personal reputation. Each of these alternate forms partially overlaps with forms of organizational commitment. However, we chose to code them into distinct categories to avoid over-simplifying everything into a form of organizational commitment.

For the second coding cycle, we used pattern coding to reanalyze the types of service and motivations for service behavior to identify meta-themes in the data (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Saldana, 2013). Pattern coding describes the researchers' process of examining previously established representative codes, and identifying emergent recurrent themes, based on frequency, emphasis, or other features (Saldana, 2013).

Ethical Considerations

Because of the nature of the participants' employment status as NTTF, we protected participant confidentiality through the collection and analysis process. We established a non-institutional email address to contact potential participants and invited them to use that address to contact us rather than their institutional email to eliminate possible exposure as participants. The interviews were conducted in private locations chosen by the participants, and participants were assigned a pseudonym before data analysis. Throughout the study, we have been careful not to describe or quote participants in ways that would lead to their identification and have chosen not to reveal departmental affiliations to protect the participants' identities.

Findings

This study sought to answer the question, "what does organizational commitment explain about NTTF motivation for service?" As a baseline to this question, accounts of service behaviors show near unanimous involvement: all participants at RU and all but two participants at MU were engaged in some form of service. In the following section we review the evidence for service in the three forms of organizational commitment (OC): affective commitment (AC), normative commitment (NC), and continuance commitment (CC). We then highlight several other non-OC areas that emerged from our analysis.

Service and Affective Commitment

The participant accounts of service that reflect affective commitment (AC), the most intrinsic of the three commitment forms, were

considerable in number (21 of 38). This is remarkable particularly given stereotypes that NTTF are primarily concerned with their instructional task and have little interest in further engagement with an institution that has made only a minimal contractual obligation to them (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). However, AC was unevenly distributed: 16 RU faculty members, but only five MU faculty members described AC bonds. Two sources of affective commitment predominated, with slight variations: alignment of personal values and commitments with institutional mission (frequently in reference to religious commitments) and a shared pursuit of student success that resulted in departmental-level interpersonal cohesion and group solidarity.

Alignment with institutional mission was a major theme, particularly at RU where ten participants cited the religious identity and purposes of the university as features that increased employment desirability and willingness to engage in service beyond what was contractually required. Melanie (RU), a faculty member in the professions, described this connection as "congruence" that resulted in opportunities to lead international trips with students. This shared sense of purpose meant that the service she enthusiastically engaged in and also supported the mission of the institution:

It's wonderful for me to be able to be a part of a university that takes its mission seriously, it wants to increase worldwide leadership and service, and I've been able to do my passion of international work. I've gone almost every year on an international trip on behalf of [RU] with students, with faculty.... we have the ability to have that congruence in our life.

In the context of a conversation about his relationship to the purposes of the institution, Ron (RU) described how a recent departmental policy change that gave him a vote on lecturer hires provided him with a way to leave a legacy that will outlive him professionally, increasing his sense of institutional connection through this formal governance process:

> … I'm getting old and one of the consolations to getting old is
> the idea that you are going to have an impact on the institution

> that outlasts you. For lecturers there are few places to do that, to nudge things, to make an impression. …now I'm middle-aged and I'm thinking of the future and now for example, when it comes to a lecturer hire I really am thinking about five years with somebody [before I retire], maybe more. I have a real strong interest in this, and I am aware of that strong interest.

In contrast to theoretical expectations that NTTF members have a simple exchange relationship with their employer, Ron's motivations suggested a desire to invest in ways that would positively shape educational outcomes throughout his career at RU and beyond it.

Liam, a lecturer at RU who received his PhD at the institution, recounted the alignment he perceived between his professional values, those of the university, and those of his colleagues, which resulted in a willingness to take on service:

> To me, the experiences I've had as a grad student and as a young lecturer were right in line with what I perceived that this university is all about, with respect to service, with respect to respect, with respect to commitment: fostering success, mentoring others, serving others.

The shared purpose Liam described that is echoed at institutional and departmental levels introduces a second point of organizational commitment related to service: a shared departmental desire to see students succeed. Participants described the sense of collective purpose they derived through shouldering extra work, often in the form of advising, curricular reform, or service that occurred alongside colleagues for the good of their students. Willie (MU) articulated this as service that may increase his workload in the short run but would pay off in terms of improving student support and departmental functioning:

> It's not like "I'll do this for you…" but it's like "do this for me because it's going to help the students out." Great. I see your point. I agree with you. I'll fit that in there, and I know that I'm going to have to do some extra work but it's the betterment of

> the students and it's going to make things flow better for the students and also for us as a department.

Joanne (MU) discussed her enthusiasm for serving when it contributed to improving student services and to meeting departmental goals:

> So I feel that when I'm working with the students, when I'm putting on events, when I'm representing my department I feel great. Like, I go to all of the university events for advisors and I keep up to date with all the e-advising procedures that are being implemented. I like to attend anything I can.

However, Joanne followed this point by describing how her conditional inclusion in governance significantly affected her sense of belonging in the department and by extension, her interest in further involvement:

> So when they want me to be involved and they want me to have a voice or have power then I think, "Yes! This is my department!" …And when things happen when it's just tenure track or decisions are made… It's kind of like "If you consulted me I could have helped," and at that point I feel very disengaged.

Joanne's comments illustrate the contingent nuance of organizational commitment. Rather than something one simply *has*, OC is influenced by departmental culture and the behavior of colleagues. Kari, Lilly, and Melanie echoed Joanne's assertion that departmental openness to governance inclusion, be it on standing committees, hiring committees, or other functions, affected their sense of worth departmentally and by extension, their feeling that they belonged.

Nevertheless, this sub-set of NTTF participants described significant alignment of personal and professional values with their employing institution such that affective commitment resulted, and as a consequence, increased social bonding within their department (Meyer & Allen, 1991). The outcome was a desire to continue in their role and, for some, to expand their contributions because of the confluence of priorities that work facilitated.

Service and Normative Commitment

As motivation for service, normative commitment (NC), or commitment borne of a sense of obligation to an organization, appeared in participant accounts less frequently than affective commitment. Within this small group of respondents who exemplified NC (RU: 8; MU: 4), emphases focused on two sources of service compulsion: socialization, either life-long or professional, and trepidation regarding the tenuousness of their employment situation. Note that since forms of commitment are non-exclusive, some participants in this tally are included in other OC forms, and vice versa. About the latter, Kate (RU) described the ways normative commitment could be a feature of the NTTF experience, particularly for newer faculty:

> I do feel like, again as a young lecturer, we are kind of stuck, we maybe feel obligated to go above and beyond and perhaps that can serve somewhat – I don't want to say "abusive" – but I think someone can be taken advantage of in that position.

The sense of obligation that resulted in service behaviors reflected a variety of socialization mechanisms, including cultural or familial socialization: Becky (RU) suggested that she engaged in unrequired service because of the sense of loyalty instilled in her by her parents. Similarly, Carolyn (MU) noted her personal tendencies to say "yes" to service requests and a feeling of obligation and duty to help her department: "Our department is so small that if we are asked to do anything, it's like we have to do it…."

Others, such as Janet (RU) engaged in service behaviors out of a sense of professional orientation. Susan (MU) noted that she experienced dissonance between professional socialization to service and the reality of NTTF work. She struggled to articulate her irreconcilable service behaviors with the regular exclusion from governance that she experienced departmentally, settling on a vague sense of commitment to professional excellence: "I mean, I like – I love my job. I like where I work. I do. Like I said: I'm invested. I mean, because sometimes I want to pull my hair out and go 'Why did I do this?'" For Susan and others, a

sense of obligation was often intertwined with other forms of motivation, complicating their evaluation of situations and responses.

Service and Continuance Commitment

Although NTTF at both institutions expressed frustration at the lack of respect, voice, and equality of opportunity they experienced generally, relatively few faculty at either institution displayed continuance commitment (CC), or a perception of the costs of leaving outweighing the costs of staying, in relation to service involvement (RU: 5; MU: 4). However, where CC did appear, NTTF expressed it in one of two forms. First, at both institutions faculty participants spoke of taking on service as a way to increase their value to the department and decrease their expendability. Andrew (RU) described the outcome for contingent faculty with few other options: "What effectively happened is that for years a lot of the grunt work has rested on the shoulders of the lecturer core of my department." Karen (MU) relayed a similar experience when she was asked to do background work for a course that she eventually was required to teach, all against her wishes. She commented: "I would not complain because I knew better…". For the sake of preserving her position and her positive reputation in the department, Karen tolerated a violation of her collectively bargained rights.

Second, in something of a reversal, not participating in service was viewed by a few faculty participants as a way of increasing the likelihood of employment longevity. Susan (MU) was unsure whether she was allowed to vote on some departmental issues but for strategic reasons often elected not to:

> We don't vote. ...I just figured, you know, I'm a lecturer and I kind of know my position as a lecturer and I think that those are the decisions that should come from the tenure- or the core faculty. [Not voting] is how we last so long.

Almost exclusively related to governance participation, even when voting or committee involvement was permitted, some faculty members (most often from MU) self-silenced and chose not to assert their rights

because they were concerned that they would be perceived as troublemakers.

In contrast, several participants from each institution described how their years of employment and accumulated value, in part through service, had allowed them to leverage that value and create change in response to undesirable policies or behaviors by threatening to quit. Sally (MU) described a series of frustrating events when senior faculty or administrators attempted to exploit her contingent status, and she began the process of departure, only staying at the intervention of colleagues:

> There was this big brew-ha-ha, and I was leaving. I was writing my letter of resignation and [a colleague] got really upset. I had known [the colleague] for a long time. We had worked together real closely, and I was done. I was just done. Again, for a second time.

This counter-example highlights how the same service expectations that can be leveraged against NTTF can be leveraged by NTTF in some circumstances when they have made themselves sufficiently valuable that other colleagues are willing to defend their position and role.

Other Reasons for Service

Faculty participants at both institutions, some of whom also aligned with forms of commitment already discussed, were also motivated by factors that were not related, or not directly related to the organizational commitment framework driving this study but provide insight about the factors that lead to service involvement. Thematically, these alternative motivations are diverse, but often these NTTF saw service as a use of time that was institutionally acceptable and, in that, afforded strategic professional or personal opportunities. For Jake (RU), Lilly (RU), and Maggie (RU), service presented avenues for professional development or for fostering new skills or interests, such as working with international education (Maggie) or learning new technology for a collaborative arts production (Jake). For others, service behaviors were motivated by perceived reputation. Liam (RU) noted how his years of experience in

the department meant that colleagues knew him and what could be expected of him:

> I guess it's just, you know, word of mouth and once your name is out there people will perceive that you take your responsibilities seriously and you do a good job and they ask again and so that's how it kind of happened. But there's never really a push from the department "you need to do more;" it's just something that I've just done.

As with most participants, in Liam's reflection were the roots of a variety of factors that converged and resulted in service behaviors, such as a supportive departmental culture where he was known and appreciated, his own awareness that he is the type of person who "does not know how to say no," and employment longevity that accumulated into a reputation of credibility, responsibility, and trust.

Service Commitment, Interrupted

Apparent alignment of values between individual NTTF and their institution that might have resulted in affective commitment (AC), in some examples failed because of barriers of organizational structure and policy, or individual behavior. For many participants, the "why do service?" question that arose from the dissonance between exclusionary treatment and service behaviors was answered by a desire to aid students. Joanne (MU) explained why she served on multiple departmental and university-level committees even though her department was clear that this was optional for her: "So my biggest concern was that knowing how communication works in our department that if I step down from this role [undergraduate advisor], the students are never going to know anything." Sara (MU) explained her frustration when she offered to take on the academic advisor role in her department, a function she was already informally filling, but was denied the title because of her contingent employment status: "Why would you not let lecturers share in the workload? Treat us like valuable people because I'm sorry, my degree is as good as your brand-new degree." In this case, although Sara's desire to serve students would appear to align with a student-

service institutional mission, either interpersonal prejudice or structural expectations disrupted an opportunity for behavioral and affective bonding.

Similarly, for other faculty participants their path to service was blazed despite departmental influence rather than because of it. Often, this resistance came in the form of committees NTTF could not serve on (Isabella, MU; Karen, MU), a lack of voice in departmental decision making (Jennifer, MU), or the lack of recognition or support for service despite extensive or high-quality efforts that were recognized by other entities. In this last case, several participants voluntarily took on service to the profession in the form of a state-wide juried competition (Isabella, MU) and regular speaking engagements at high schools around the state (Mo, MU). In the latter case, Mo received a state-level award for his efforts at promoting his field and yet received no reimbursement for his travel from MU. He also observed that although his colleagues respected his efforts, they were not similarly engaged in promoting the department or profession: "You know, when the paper goes around at the end of the year…I'm the only one who f***ing signs up all the time. I *am* the outreach committee." Consequently, service necessitated, for some participants, a high level of personal commitment to not only complete the work that service required but also to overcome various forms of organizational and interpersonal resistance.

Conclusions

Evidence in this study suggests that many NTTF do experience one or more forms of organizational commitment. However, Meyer and Allen's (1991) theoretical contribution also carries the reminder that two of the three forms of OC they name (continuance commitment and normative commitment), despite benefitting the organization, are usually detrimental to the employee. In this regard, service also represents another area of mis-match between NTTF as needed but expendable labor and institutions' structures to reward and advance tenure system faculty. Just as at times institutions struggle to support NTTF research (Haviland, et al, 2017), so some NTTF participants (notably, Isabella and Mo) had significant voluntary service to the community and the

profession largely ignored by their department. More than one participant asked, clearly exasperated, why their institution denied them recognition for or full access to service they wanted to do and in some cases were already doing. In some departments, deep-seated prejudices against the capacities and legitimacy of NTTF continued to persist and debilitate service contributions that could have otherwise been expressions of belonging for NTTF.

Nevertheless, an important caveat to affective commitment emerged that highlights the messiness of organizational commitment. Specifically, congruence of an individual's values with those of an institution does not necessarily signal organizational commitment. For example, although MU is a student-focused comprehensive institution and some participants described engaging in service out of a dedication to student success, these commitments were congruent and parallel but, at least in some cases, not inter-related. In other words, the convergence of values that should have resulted in affective commitment in fact did not. That affective commitment did not result was in part the product of militating departmental and institutional policies and behaviors that forestalled a sense of common purpose.

This two-site study reinforces how widely variable the institutional and departmental experiences of NTTF can be, related to the motivations for and experiences of service. Here, organizational commitment is a fitting lens: many RU and some MU faculty engaged in service because of personal congruence with institutional mission (AC), but departmental factors, both positive and negative, were more often salient to the service motivations of MU NTTF who were serving because of or despite departmental influence (NC or CC). Future studies need to take institutional context features into account in their assessment of NTTF service experiences.

In light of the complex forces influencing NTTF service involvement, this study makes an additional and timely contribution to what we have come to expect from studies of NTTF. Namely, that several decades of research (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Bergom & Waltman, 2009; Kezar, 2013a) on NTTF has shown that NTTF have been institutionally,

departmentally, and even individually exploited due to their lack of organizational standing and leverage. However, in part due to this important scholarship, institutions have reformed policies, and individuals have worked at cultural and behavioral improvement (Kezar, 2012; 2013b). Although this work is far from complete (Kezar & Maxey, 2016), that some study participants described supportive departmental and institutional environments in which they could pursue service as a reflection of values congruence may suggest that change is underway.

What this and other studies are finding about these increasingly stable, institutionally-valued, professional NTTF positions problematizes the anticipated "problem." The story of at least some NTTF is not one of a professional life defined by second class citizenship, exclusion from decision-making, and the anti-social behavior of co-workers (though their experiences may still include such moments). Studies such as ours are encountering a far more nuanced and complex landscape where some participants fit the traditional marginalized archetype of the adjunct, while others experienced a closer alignment of goals and values with their employer in which commitment becomes possible because of civil, collegial treatment. In the former, service is a matter of professional survival; in the latter, service is a desirable avenue through which to pursue shared ends. To fail to deconstruct those apparently positive experiences would likely be to overlook the subtle and structural ways that even NTTF experiencing affective commitment are exploited, particularly among traditionally underrepresented groups. However, to *only* deconstruct the work lives of NTTF also misses the complexity of their affiliations, professional standing, and even the forms of power they generate as a result, as Sally's (MU) experience of threatening to leave her position illustrates. Indeed, as Waltman et al. (2012) highlight, the difficult intersection of valued opportunities and frustrating exclusion typifies daily life for many NTTF.

In conclusion, the urgency to understand NTTF service motivations and behaviors is twofold: first, that at the undergraduate level at RU and MU certain types of institutional service (advising, curriculum) had largely become the purview of contingent faculty in some departments (Haviland et al, 2017). This shift in service responsibility toward NTTF

holds significant implications for the future of participatory governance if NTTF are expected to shoulder the load of service in some regards but are routinely excluded from others (e.g., personnel decisions, departmental committees). Second, many NTTF sought belonging, expressed through service, to their departments and institutions whether due to socialization or mission attraction. Consequently, at its best moments, service behaviors represent a unique convergence of motivations that can benefit the individual faculty member and the institution as a point of professional development and contribution if and when faculty colleagues and administrators value and respect NTTF members' service investments.

References

Alleman, N. F. & Haviland, D. (2016) "I expect to be engaged as an equal": Collegiality expectations of full time, non-tenure-track faculty members. *Higher Education*, p. 1-16. DOI: 10.1007/s10734-016-0062-4.

Baldwin, R. G., & Chronister, J. L. (2001). *Teaching without tenure*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bergom, I., & Waltman, J. (2009). Satisfaction and discontent: voices of non-tenure-track faculty. *On Campus with Women, 37*(3).

Blackburn, R. T., Bieber, J. P., Lawrence, J. H., & Trautvetter, L. (1991). Faculty at work: Focus on research, scholarship, and service. *Research in Higher Education 32*(4), 385-413.

Blau, G. (1999). Testing the longitudinal impact of work variables and performance appraisal satisfaction on subsequent overall job satisfaction. *Human Relations, 52*, 1099-111.

Boice, R. (2000). *Advice for new faculty members: Nihil nimus*. Needham Hieghts, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo academicus*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* Carnegie Advancement for Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Burnett, P., Shemroske, K, & Khayum, M. (2014). Disrupting faculty service: Using technology to increase academic service productivity. *Administrative Issues Journal, 4*(2), p. 48.

Clark, B. R. (1987). *The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds*. A Carnegie Foundation special report. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Cross, J. G., & Goldenberg, E. N. (2009). *Off-track profs: Nontenured teachers in higher education*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Etzioni, A., (1975). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations*. New York: Free Press.

Elman, S. E. and Smock, S. M. (1985) *Professional service and faculty rewards: Toward an integrated structure*. Washington, D.C. National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

Fairweather, J. S. (1996). *Faculty work and public trust: Restoring the value of teaching and public service in American academic life*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Finkelstein, M. J., Conley, V. M., & Schuster, J. H. (2016). *The faculty factor: Reassessing the American Academy in a turbulent era*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Guarino, C. & Borden, V. (2017). Faculty service loads and gender: Are women taking care of the academic family? *Research in Higher Education, 58*(6), 672-694.

Haviland, D., Alleman, N. F., & Cliburn Allen, C. E. (2017). "Separate but not quite equal": Collegiality experiences of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members. *Journal of Higher Education, 88*(4), 505-528.

Hearn, J. C., & Deupree, M. M. (2013). Here today, gone tomorrow: The increasingly contingent faculty workforce. Retrieved from TIAA-CREF Institute web site: https://www.tiaacrefinstitute.org/public/institute/research/advancing_higher_education/contingentfaculty0313.html

Jones, S. R., Torres, V., & Arminio, J. (2014). *Negotiating the complexities of qualitative research in higher education: Fundamental elements and issues* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Kanter, R. M. (1968). Commitment and social organization: A study of commitment mechanisms in utopian communities. *American Sociological Review, 33*, 499-513.

Kezar, A. (2012). *Embracing non-tenure-track faculty: Making change to support the new majority*. NY: Routledge.

Kezar, A. (2013a). Changing faculty workforce models. Retrieved from TIAA-CREF Institute web site: https://www.tiaa-crefinstitute.org/public/institute/research/dialogue/workforce-trends-and-issues

Kezar, A. (2013b). Examining non-tenure track faculty perceptions of how departmental policies and practices shape their performance and ability to create student learning at four-year institutions. *Research in Higher Education, 54*, 571–98. doi:10.1007/s11162-013-9288-5

Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (2015). Adapting by design: Creating faculty roles and defining faculty work to ensure an intentional future for colleges and universities. Retrieved from The Delphi Project web site: http://www.uscrossier.org/pullias/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/DELPHI-PROJECT_ADAPTING-BY-DESIGN_2ED.pdf

Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (2013). The changing academic workforce. *Trusteeship, 21*(3),1–12. Retrieved from http://agb.org/trusteeship/2013/5/changing-academic-workforce

Kezar, A., Maxey, D., & Eaton, J. S. (2014, January). An examination of the changing faculty: Ensuring institutional quality and achieving desired student learning outcomes. Retrieved from Council for Higher Education Accreditation website: http://www.chea.org/pdf/Examination_Changing_Faculty_2013.pdf

Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2010). Understanding non-tenure track faculty: New assumptions and theories for conceptualizing behavior. *American Behavioral Scientist, 55*, 1419–1442. doi:10.1177/0002764211408879

Knight, P. T. & Trowler, P. R. (1999). It takes a village to raise a child: Mentoring and the socialization of new entrants to the academic professions. *Mentoring and Tutoring, 7*(1), 23-34.

Lawrence, J., Ott, M., & Bell, A. (2012). Faculty organizational commitment and citizenship. *Research in Higher Education, 53*, 325-352. DOI 10.1007/s11162-011-9230-7.

Levin, J. S., & Shaker, G. G. (2011). The hybrid and dualistic identity of full-time non-tenure-track faculty. *American Behavioral Scientist, 55*, 1461–1484. doi:10.1177/0002764211409382.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, J. N. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1*, 61–89.

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Misra, J., Lundquist, J., Holmes, E., & Agiomavritis, J. (2011). The ivory ceiling of service work. *Academe, 97*(1), 22–28.

Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover.* New York: Academic Press.

Neumann, Y., & Finaly-Neumann, E. (1990). The reward-support framework and faculty commitment to their university. *Research in Higher Education, 31*(1), 75–97.

Neumann, A., & Terosky, A. L. (2007). To give and to receive: Recently tenured professors' experience of service in major research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education, 78*(3), 282-310.

O'Meara, K. (1997). Rewarding faculty professional service, New England Resource Center for Higher Education publications. Paper 17. http://scholarworks.umb.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1016&context=nerche_pubs

O'Meara, K., & Rice, E. (2005). *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

O'Meara, K., Griffin, K. A., Kuvaeva, A., Nyunt, G., & Robinson, T. (2017). Sense of belonging and its contributing factors in graduate education. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 12, 12,* 251-279. https://doi.org/10.28945/3903

O'Meara, K., Kuvaeva, A., & Nyunt, G. (2017). Constrained choices: A view of campus service inequality from annual faculty reports, *The Journal of Higher Education*, p.1-28.

O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. (1968). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 492-99.

Ott, M., & Cisneros, J. (2015). Understanding the changing faculty workforce in higher education: A comparison of full-time non-tenure track and tenure line experiences. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 23*(90), 1–28.

Padilla, A. M. (1994). Ethnic minority scholars, research, and mentoring: Current and future issues. *Educational Researcher, 23*(4), 24-27.

Porter, S. (2007). A closer look at faculty service: What affects participation on committees? *Journal of Higher Education, 78*(5), 523–41.

Rice, R. E. (1986). The academic profession in transition: Toward a new social fiction. *Teaching Sociology, 14*(1), 12–23. doi:10.2307/1318295

Reybold, L. E., & Corda, K. W. (2011). Faculty identity and the 'lesser role': Service to the academy. *The Journal of the Professoriate, 5*(1), 121-48.

Saldana, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Sandmann, L., & Fear, F. (1995). Unpacking the service category: Reconceptualizing university outreach for the 21st century. Continuing Higher Education Review: *The Journal of the National University Continuing Education Association, 59*(3), 110-26.

Shaker, G. (2008). Off the track: Full-time nontenure-track faculty experience in English (Dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington).

Sheetz, J. K., Barnhardt, C. L., Phillips, C. W., & Valdes, P. H. (2018). The impact of faculty work-life factors on faculty service morale. *Journal of Faculty Development, 32*(2). 53-65.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, states, and higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Sullivan, W. (2004). *Work and integrity*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. New York, NY: State University Press.

Thedwall, K. (2008). *Non-tenure track faculty: Rising numbers, lost opportunities,* New Directions for Higher Education, 143, 11-19.

Turner, C., & Myers, S. L. (2000). *Faculty of color in academe: Bittersweet success*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Waltman, J., Bergom, I., Hollenshead, C., Miller, J., & August, L. (2012). Factors contributing to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among non-tenure-track faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *83*(3), 411–434.

Ward, K. (2003). Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No 29-5.) San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2012). *Academic motherhood: How faculty manage work and family*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Zhou, Y., & Volkwein, J. (2004). Examining the influences on faculty departure intentions: A comparison of tenured versus nontenured faculty at research universities using NSOPF-99. *Research in Higher Education, 45*(2), 139–7.