

# “I expect to be engaged as an equal”: collegiality expectations of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members

Nathan F. Alleman<sup>1</sup> · Don Haviland<sup>2</sup>

Published online: 22 September 2016  
© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2016

**Abstract** Nationally, non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) represent the new majority. Efforts to move the full-time NTTF role from expendable labor to sustainable professional position have led to improvements in policy and working conditions at many institutions. Still, the profession broadly has just begun to grapple with the implications of this shifting labor market on aspects of the profession traditionally reserved for tenure system faculty, such as collegiality. In this qualitative study we use Bess’s (High Educ Handb Theory Res 8:1–36, 1992) framework of structure, culture, and behavior to analyze the collegial expectations of 38 full-time, NTTF members. Participant accounts point to a desire for parity despite differentiation, and highlight the fundamental contradictions of a professional virtue that requires the independence of faculty for it to be fully expressed.

**Keywords** Non-tenure-track faculty · Collegiality · Departmental leadership

## Introduction

Although tenure-track faculty positions continue to be the idealized instructional employment form, this employment type is no the longer norm. Indeed, by some estimates two thirds of all faculty positions in the USA now are non-tenure-track (Kezar 2012b). This employment trend has emerged as institutions have sought monetary, personnel, and academic flexibility, further facilitated by a combination of environmental opportunity and necessity (Baldwin and Chronister 2001; Cross and Goldenberg 2009; Kezar 2012a, b).

---

✉ Nathan F. Alleman  
Nathan\_Alleman@Baylor.edu  
Don Haviland  
Don.Haviland@csulb.edu

<sup>1</sup> Baylor University, One Bear Place #97312, Waco, TX 76798, USA

<sup>2</sup> California State University, Long Beach, USA

In the past decade, researchers and practitioners have sought to shift the view of NTTF to that of a resource to be nurtured rather than a threat to tenure, academic freedom, self-governance, academic autonomy, and collegiality (Kezar and Sam 2010). Scholars have increased calls to support the non-tenure-track position as an alternate and sustainable career path that no longer treats these faculty members like a professional underclass (Baldwin and Chronister 2001; Kezar 2012a, 2013; Kezar and Sam 2010; Kezar and Maxey 2015). Waltman et al. (2012) suggest that while full-time NTTF enjoy teaching and the professional flexibility the role offers, they lament the uncertain terms of employment and limited respect and inclusion from colleagues. Similarly, Levin and Shaker (2011) suggest NTTF exist in a dualistic world, satisfied by the work of teaching but frustrated by limited agency and respect in the workplace. Others have found that significant variations exist in the expectations of NTTF in terms of whether they desire a voice in governance and other participatory roles (Hearn and Deupree 2013). Understanding these issues and expectations is made all the more urgent because this shift in faculty roles seems likely to continue, with implications for workload distribution, service expectations, and the status and influence of the faculty collectively (Kezar and Maxey 2015).

Findings from these studies point to the isolation, exclusion, and limited self-determination of NTTF, raising questions about positive relationships, mutual respect, and autonomy—ideas often associated with collegiality. Collegiality is a term used often as a measure of positive faculty culture, and it is viewed as foundational to faculty work (Bess 1992); however, it generally remains a poorly defined and operationalized concept and is particularly so for NTTF.

In a profession marked by the ideal of faculty autonomy and the reality of disciplinary atomization, achieving common purpose and shared goals through fiat is understandably unpopular. Collegiality, rooted in Weberian organizational theory, combines a commitment to rational, inclusive governance with trust in colleagues, resulting in a system whereby faculty freely subordinate (but do not relinquish) their autonomy for the collective good (Bess 1992; Mangiardi and Pellegrino 1992). In this sense, collegiality, rather than simply a form of professional civility, is a means to an organizational end (shared goal setting and governance) in an environment particularly resistant to management by control. This system, historically and culturally, has developed under the assumption of a tenure-normative system. The importance of this is more than tradition alone: Participants are protected from the spurious actions of colleagues or administrators in part through access to grievance processes and participatory governance. What this system means for the collegial expectations of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members who have been professionally socialized into the academy but are hired under different terms than their tenure system colleagues is the subject of this paper. Specifically, the research question guiding our inquiry was: How do full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members define collegiality, and what are their expectations of it?

## Collegiality

The concept of collegiality, as a widely held faculty value, has been linked to a variety of positive individual and organizational outcomes. Collegiality is a key element in establishing an attractive place to work and in creating an employment setting that faculty value (Boice 1992; Rice et al. 2000; Tierney and Bensimon 1996). Collegiality may also contribute to institutional commitment and a desire to stay (Barnes et al. 1998) and may result in reduced stress and increased professional satisfaction (Bode 1999). Despite these virtues, many new faculty members find the lack of collegiality to be one of the most

disappointing aspects of the profession (Sorcinelli and Austin 1992) and are typically surprised by the rare occurrences of collegial interaction and collaboration (Bode 1999; Rice et al. 2000).

Although collegiality as a concept has been connected to a range of positive benefits, its components are not well understood. Cipriano (2011, p. 15) argues that, “there has been much deliberation and outright confusion concerning the term collegiality.” Researchers who have described and defined collegiality highlight both the relational and the professional aspects of the concept. Gappa et al. (2005, p. 142) define collegiality as “opportunities for faculty members to feel that they belong to a mutually respectful community of colleagues who value their unique contributions to their institutions and who are concerned about their overall well-being.” This definition stresses elements such as respect, community, and appreciation, and it implies comfortable communication among faculty members.

The above definitions describe respectful relationships, appreciation for contributions to a common purpose, and value placed on collaboration to achieve that purpose. Indeed, as others have argued, collegiality is essential for successful faculty governance and cooperative participation (Mangiardi and Pellegrino 1992). Although each definition might be read to explicitly include all faculty members, the extent to which this concept might apply to an increasingly differentiated faculty workforce that includes NTTF remains a question.

### **Non-tenure-track faculty and collegiality**

Despite this theoretical and practical knowledge about collegiality, studies of collegiality have primarily focused on tenure system faculty with little direct consideration given to NTTF. Among a few exceptions, Kezar (2013) highlights the impact of departmental culture and leadership on policies and practices shaping NTTF collegiality experiences. Institutional type, academic discipline and field, and years of experience were found to be insignificant or minimally important, contrary to Baldwin and Chronister (2001). However, Kezar did not define collegiality and identified it only tangentially as one of a range of employment elements.

As alluded to above, researchers disagree about the elements of faculty life that most significantly impact collegiality for NTTF. Baldwin and Chronister (2001) argue that the role of NTTF on campus has much to do with the culture of the institution and the commitment of the individual member to engage. However, Gappa et al. (2005, p. 309) suggest that perceived status differences between NTTF and tenure system faculty may persist despite positive institutional policies due to the attitudes of tenure system faculty. Their recommendations highlight the importance of policies and norms for including all members of the faculty. Gappa, Austin, and Trice recommend that institutions “ensure that faculty governance policies, structures, and practices offer opportunities for all faculty to participate in roles appropriate to their experience and types of their appointments.”

Although few researchers of NTTF have addressed collegiality as a complete concept, aspects of collegiality have been investigated and demonstrate a need for further study. Morrison (2008) identifies a classification of causes for non-participation in faculty governance by NTTF, including exclusion by policy, by other faculty, self-exclusion, and exclusion as risk avoidance. Morrison notes that, “There is a scarcity of research indicating the extent to which non-tenure-track faculty are involved in faculty governance at any level” (Morrison 2008, p. 24). Baldwin and Chronister (2001) also explore faculty governance involvement at length. However, none of these analyses mention the trusting and relational aspects of the collegiality that Bess (1992) emphasizes.

## Conceptual framework

Although most definitions of collegiality identify important nuances of trust, relationship, shared purpose, and cooperative effort (Cipriano 2011; Gappa et al. 2005), James Bess (1992) offers an extensive conceptual explication of the meaning, function, and uses of collegiality. Bess argues that collegiality in higher education can be analyzed through three overlapping forms: *Collegial culture* (or c-collegiality) reflects local expectations of supportiveness and inclusive process that do not rely on the use of policy or formal power for protection. In this dimension, the focus is on a broad commitment to a common good and ideal, rather than social reciprocity. *Collegial structure* (or s-collegiality) includes access to grievance and governance systems, among others. Importantly, Bess argues that structure is never sufficient alone for collegiality; collegiality occurs when the structure is put to proper use through culture and behavior. *Collegial behavior* (or b-collegiality) is actions that reflect prosocial and trusting values that exceed typical workplace norms. Bess notes the symbiotic and interconnected nature of the three elements, arguing that collegial behaviors

...refers to the set of actions in which faculty and administrators engage as they fulfill the various institutional roles that are “shaped” by c-collegiality and s-collegiality. Hence, b-collegiality behaviors “emerge” out of the value and norm context of the culture and from the structure of collegiality. (p. 24)

Underlying these three forms, Bess (1992) identifies two foundational aspects of collegiality: a belief in rationality and a belief in trust in colleagues. Rationality includes the open exchange of information, a commitment to the principle that self-advancement best results from working toward the common good, and confidence in the authority of expertise over organizational status. Belief in the importance of trust in colleagues includes such aspects as a belief in the goodness of others and a willingness to behave accordingly without expectation of reciprocation, faith in the virtue and integrity of others in the organization, and confidence that personal and organizational problems may be revealed, generally, without reprisal. Although these sub-elements are not necessarily associated with trust generally, in the context of collegial relationships they represent a shared commitment to the advancement of professional others, both individually and collectively, which fits under the umbrella of trust. These final two factors may be areas where the differential experiences of NTTF are most evident, since NTTF may have parallel graduate and professional experiences to tenure system faculty but may be segregated or self-segregated based on their expectations associated with the terms of their employment.

## Methods

Data collection for this qualitative study initially focused on both expectations for and experiences with collegiality. However, as we began analysis, it became clear to us that these were overlapping and yet distinct concerns, each deserving separate focus. Collegial expectations specifically speak to important mechanisms of professional socialization, associations individuals hold regarding what is and is not the purview of the NTTF role, and the anticipated treatment and involvement that results. In at least some cases, we identified expectations based on participants’ interpretations of experiences, so examining events and actions for what they reveal about expectations was an important aspect of

analysis. “Expectations” furthermore encompasses what the individual expects of the NTTF role, of treatment by colleagues, of institutional policies and culture, and of him or herself. Given that NTTF is a still emerging employment category, understanding the expectations NTTF have of collegiality is foundational to understanding their interpretations of experience.

Participants were 38 individuals with full-time faculty employment status. We specify full-time status since part-time faculty often have very limited availability to participate in shared governance, advise and mentor students, and generally develop a campus presence. As well, prior research (Baldwin and Chronister 2001; Gappa and Leslie 1993) has established employment type as an important and legitimate division.

This study took place at a private, religiously affiliated research university (Research University, or RU) and a public comprehensive university (Masters University, or MU) with a faculty union. Within these two institutions, we invited participants who had at least 3 years of teaching experience at that institution in one of four general academic areas (Professions, Humanities, STEM, and Social Sciences), including at least three faculty members from each area per institution to provide opportunities for patterns to emerge within broad fields and disciplines. At RU, exactly half of participants were male and half were female: three from Social Sciences, six from Humanities, six from STEM, and seven from the Professions. Sixteen of the 22 held terminal degrees in their field, and RU was the alma mater of seven participants. At MU, just three of the participants were female. Disciplinary distribution favored the professions: One was in the social sciences, two in STEM, one worked in the humanities, and 12 were in the professions. Ten of the 16 from MU held terminal degrees, and 11 had earned at least one degree from the institution.

### Data collection and analysis

We conducted interviews using a semi-structured protocol derived from our research questions and grounded in the review of the literature, as well as the conceptual framework based on Bess (1992). Interviews lasted between 50 and 120 min. Utilizing an interpretivist approach (Stake 1995), we used our conceptual framework and research questions to guide our inquiry and analysis. We sought patterns of experiences and sense making among participants that confirmed, challenged, or tweaked preexisting assumptions and models. Interview questions explored participants’ employment motivation and history, the logistics of their current faculty role related to teaching, research, governance, service, professional development, and evaluation, and how participants defined, anticipated, and ultimately experienced collegiality in and through those roles.

All interviews were audio recorded, transcribed verbatim, and imported into Nvivo 10 ethnographic software for coding and analysis. This process produced a set of broad descriptive and topical codes (Richards 2009) drawn from our conceptual framework and from our initial coding process, resulting in approximately 30 codes. Given our focus on the expectations of collegiality among NTTF, we proceeded with what Saldana (2013) calls a *process coding strategy*, and Richards (2009) refers to as *analytic coding*. We did so by reading through codes related to origins and expectations as well as codes formed around conceptual elements of culture, structure, and behavior. This “coding on” (Richards 2009, p. 106) process allowed us to explore different dimensions within specific codes (e.g., varied sources of the origins for conceptions of collegiality) and identify relevant exemplars.

## Trustworthiness

We employed multiple strategies to enhance trustworthiness (Lincoln and Guba 1985). During analysis, we conducted several inter-coder reliability checks and debriefings to promote accuracy, as well as “jottings” and memos to advance analysis. This information, as well as design issues, challenges, and decisions, was captured in research logs. We also engaged in multiple levels of member checking. Transcripts were shared with participants to allow them to identify issues of confidentiality and ensure accuracy. Additionally, early versions of this article were shared with select NTTF (both participants and others) as well as colleagues. To promote transferability, and to the extent allowed by space constraints, we have provided thick descriptions (Lincoln and Guba 1985) to allow readers to connect our findings to their own context.

## Findings

Participants identified three main dimensions of collegiality through their definitions and expectations: a sense of social engagement, ranging from the basic expectation of friendly greetings and acknowledgment to personal friendships with colleagues; working together toward a common goal; and having both formal and informal voice in their departments.

### Social engagement and inclusion

Reflective of Bess’s (1992) emphasis on trusting relationships and prosocial behavior, all participants (38 of 38) expected social engagement and inclusion to be one element of faculty collegiality. Participants’ comments about expected social relationships with departmental faculty typically described one of three levels of interaction: acknowledgment and interaction, involvement, or recognition as whole persons.

#### *Acknowledgment and interaction*

At the most basic level, most NTTF (31 respondents) expected civility and a willingness to acknowledge each other (greetings, friendliness, interpersonal interest). Participants saw those actions as foundational to collegiality. Such expectations represented a necessary first step, but certainly not the maximized expression of collegiality. Jennifer (MU) noted the importance of this fundamental expression of good will: “If you were to ask me how I would try to measure [collegiality], it would be those people that I know will stop and talk to me when I say ‘Hi’ in the hall.” Although such seemingly mundane interactions are easy to discount, social scientists have long recognized that regular patterns of greetings, personal inquiries, and other congenial expressions, or what Collins (2004, p. 8) terms “interaction ritual chains,” are significant contributors to a shared sense of purpose, to a positive social climate, and to an individual’s sense of importance (Collins 2004).

#### *Social involvement*

A step deeper, *Social Involvement* implies a more extensive willingness to know and to be known resulting in symbolic and functional behaviors that reinforce those values and promote relationship development. Across both institutions, many NTTF (26 respondents)

described regular lunches on and off campus, annual holiday parties, and occasional social gatherings of subsets of department faculty as positive and negative indicators of collegiality. Anthony (RU) reflected on an experience early in his term of employment that established his expectations for future interactions. He cast this behavior as part of broader culture of inclusion in social activities:

When I got here 20 years ago, I didn't have to go knock down any doors and say "please ask me to go to lunch with you" or "please invite me into this conversation in the hallway or in the workroom." I felt like if I dared to walk down the hallway or dared to walk into the workroom...the circle would part and someone would say, "come on in"...

Anthony made it clear that he also bore a responsibility to engage his new colleagues, but he quickly developed the expectation of welcoming and reciprocation.

In many cases, these formal and informal events were clustered by employment type (NTTF versus tenure track). This clustering was sometimes a matter of convenience and culture; in others, they were acts of solidarity or exclusion. Kari (RU), who had entered as the only female in a department of veteran faculty, described how a recent spate of tenure-track hires had begun to change the departmental social climate:

They hired three guys on tenure track... They include the lecturers in it too...we have social meetings and now we have a wives club...we're kind of gathering up women who get together, including one who is an associate professor who's been coming along. It feels like it's coming together but it felt like kind of a cold atmosphere at first.

Kari's example highlights the sociological aspect of collegiality, as a group phenomenon that results in shared identity, rituals, membership criteria (young people, wives), and regular meetings. In this context, "involvement" and collegiality meant group affiliation both within and across employment types. In this regard, Kari's narrative suggests that collegiality is something she both expected to take agency in (helping to organize a wives club) and to experience the agency of others through ("cold atmosphere").

### *Faculty as whole persons*

The group formation Kari (RU) described in comparison to her prior experiences in the department contributed to her shifting sense of what she could expect of at least a subset of her coworkers. Her increased involvement with colleagues multiplied the links between her and others' social roles, such as wife and mother, adding to the dimensions of her life that were known and shared by these colleagues. Across our participants, the sense that one was known and appreciated in a multi-faceted way was not arrived at through any prescribed set or type of activities (15 respondents). However, for most participants who described this sort of bond as part of their expectation of collegiality, interactions in work contexts were supplemented by time spent together, often with families, outside the work context. In some cases, these relationships were deepened in times of personal crisis, when faculty members made extraordinary acts of giving or self-sacrifice that became part of the cultural expectancy. Joan (RU) described these acts as an expected function of the department (herself included) rather than isolated individual behaviors:

We had a lady here whose husband became quite ill and of course we made visits to her while she was tending to her husband. We never thought he would pull through,

that's how ill he was, and we made sure that she and her family had dinner on their table...

Although this kind of behavior may seem extraordinary, for Joan and some of the participants, full engagement in one another's lives was expected as a natural part of the faculty life.

### **Sense of communality**

Participants also defined collegiality and their expectations around it as a shared sense of purpose and belonging, fed by individual contributions to departmental purposes. The concept of *communality* captures the twin expectations of collective purpose and individual belonging that was a consistent theme among participants (34 respondents). Most NTTF expected that each individual would be valued for contributing something of worth that the whole was greater than the sum of the parts and that individuals would take on responsibilities to achieve group goals regardless of status or rank.

#### *Common purpose and collective effort*

Faculty defined collegiality as encompassing a sense that the department was collectively working toward something larger or bigger than individual status or rewards. Some described the collective goals in a general or abstract way (17 respondents). For example, Julius (RU), stated,

Good collegiality has to be based on cooperation, dedication to achieving the goals of the department, and the goals of the department are something that we have to agree on too, and we do.

Others spoke to the specific types of collective goals or mission their departments had. Often, though not exclusively, the collective goal had to do with supporting student learning and success. Carolyn (MU) defined collegiality as focused primarily on student success: "We care about each other's success and we work for our success but most importantly we work for student success and that to me is collegiality."

The NTTF felt collegiality meant that individual differences should be set aside for the good of the department's shared goals. Janise (MU), for example, used the metaphor of children and their toys to frame her analysis of her department as a place where shared goals are usually prioritized over individual preferences:

...just like anybody else each of us wants to have our toys set up just the way we want them. But I think, in general, I would definitely say that all of my colleagues want the best for our students. And I think we are united by this idea that we know that we want our students to be taken care of.

Melanie (RU) called attention to how a sense of common purpose should help faculty transcend personal differences

...there are certainly some things about people I work with that I don't like. But I would still say that we have a collegial relationship. That if we have a job to do, if we are working on a committee and we have a job to do we get the work done because it's part of what we need to do to benefit our students or benefit the school.



Echoing this sentiment, Julius (RU) noted: “As long as you agree on what the department is trying to accomplish, you can overlook a lot of things.” Thus, NTTF expected that a sense of common purpose, often seen as a commitment to students, would help transcend individual personalities and goals.

### *Valuing individual contributions and capabilities*

If acknowledgment of a collective good was a defining aspect of NTTF’s expectations of collegiality, so too was recognition of the fact that individuals, and NTTF as a group, brought unique talents and knowledge that made them valuable contributors to the larger whole (23 respondents). Kari (RU) linked this expectation to recognizing each faculty member as a person so that they could be appreciated for their individual strengths and contributions. She pointed out the importance of,

...getting to know someone and appreciate them, getting to know what they can do to help the organization. It’s like being on a team together: not everybody plays the same position, but it’s helpful if you can respect what people get done.

Willie (MU) echoed this sentiment, saying he thought collegiality was, “...being able to see each other kinda as an equal team member even though you may be stronger in a certain area than someone else, you may have more experience than somebody else.” Both Willie and Kari highlighted the idea that each faculty member, including NTTF, should be seen as a unique contributor to the collective goals of the department.

Felicia (RU) emphasized that NTTF should be valued for their contributions, suggesting that not only should NTTF be viewed this way, but that they also should be *recognized* for their contributions. Implicit in her comments and those of others was the awareness of how rank and employment differences between NTTF and tenure-track faculty could lead to a devaluation of NTTF’s contributions. Felicia explained, “So, yeah, I just expect to be treated and celebrated as a person the same amount of respect I am willing to give someone else.” Felicia’s comments highlight a kind of “golden rule” approach, where expectations of the other are matched by expectations of oneself.

More specifically, some NTTF pointed to being recognized for leadership roles that they had assumed as a defining characteristic of collegiality. Susan (MU) acknowledged faculty rank differences but said colleagues needed to recognize the work she was doing was often work tenure-track faculty might be expected to do:

...I understand that that there is a difference and I embrace it.... But sometimes it’s like, really, you don’t have to be condescending sometimes. You’re putting me in a capacity of not only your equal in some cases, but even wanting me to oversee things that perhaps maybe it should be somebody else overseeing. But...I’m doing a good job, obviously, because you keep having me do it and it’s being noted that I’m doing a good job.

Broadly speaking, NTTF saw being both valued and recognized for their contributions as one dimension of collegiality. They expected their colleagues to treat them with respect, as human assets with talents, expertise, and value. Even if they were not doing precisely the same work as tenure-track faculty, they saw this work as making important and equivalent contributions to the larger goals of the department.

### *Willingness to pitch in*

The third and final dimension of communality for NTTF was the idea that everyone in the department should pitch into achieve the shared goals regardless of status or rank (23 respondents). Participants said this meant a willingness to share the load based on a desire for the overall success of the department. Ron (RU) pointed to the need for equal, or at least equitable, distribution of service responsibilities so that duties did not fall disproportionately on any single faculty member or group.

For Diana (MU), pitching in meant, in part, the chance to support others by, "...sharing ideas about education, about teaching, about, you know, what works best for students and how can we make this program better." She then explained the importance of learning from others but also of contributing your own knowledge for the ongoing betterment of the department. Diana's sentiments call to mind the sense of collective good discussed above.

Pointing out what she regarded as a problem in less collegial departments, Amy (RU) explained, "...there is no generosity of ideas, sometimes. When I think of generosity of ideas, I think the generosity of knowledge amongst peers." However, Maggie (RU) suggested a willingness to share ideas was a necessary but not sufficient aspect of collegiality. She recalled a time when a tenure system colleague had reached out to her with a helpful suggestion. When it was clear the idea would have required substantial extra work on Maggie's part, the colleague stopped short of offering the help. Maggie saw sharing ideas as only "...a small part of the collegiality; it has to be rolling your sleeves up and doing it yourself" if you are going to make a suggestion.

Pitching in also meant the willingness to assist colleagues—even if this was not always convenient. Multiple participants pointed to the importance of stepping up to take on tasks or schedules to support colleagues and the greater good. Willie (MU), for instance, described making peace with having a less desirable schedule some semesters because he recognized that it meant his colleagues might have more workable schedules. Willie also noted, however, that this was a process of give-and-take; although he made such a compromise for one semester, he had a more favorable schedule the following semester, suggesting a department culture of reciprocity.

Similarly, Joy (RU) and William (RU), pointed to times when they or others stepped in, sometimes on short notice, to help a colleague with a task when an unexpected need arose. William said, "If I've got a class that needs covered because I'll be out of town, my colleagues will pitch in and vice versa." In Joy's case, she was able to find a colleague to cover for her at an important meeting because of a last-minute obligation.

NTTF also described pitching in as supporting what colleagues cared about, even if this might not necessarily be a personal priority. Becky (RU) noted that she expected this of herself as a colleague even if others might not reciprocate. She explained, "I've learned that not everybody is going to support you in whatever your project is, but that doesn't mean I shouldn't be supportive of theirs because there could be that turning point."

The central component of pitching in was the expectation that most faculty members should see themselves as unified coequals in the experience of working toward a common goal. Karen (MU) described a collegial department as "...a place that you feel like you're a member....you feel like you belong and you have like minds together." The NTTF saw collegiality as defined by a common reciprocity, where individuals both offered help and *were offered help* based on need rather than status. As Jake (RU) said,

I think here people don't care so much about status or degrees they hold.... People don't care. People aren't going to flaunt their status or education or whatever. Everyone realizes that everyone else is a valuable aspect of the whole....

Embedded in Karen's and Jake's comments is a sense of team and membership, and the idea that each faculty member, regardless of role or status, should be both willing to contribute and be respected for what he or she brought to the department.

## Voice

Finally, NTTF (26 respondents) defined collegiality in part by the extent to which they did or did not have a voice; they wanted to be regarded as someone who had, and was seen as deserving, input. They consistently described the importance of formal venues for voice (e.g., access to meetings) as critical for having input into decisions that would directly affect them—such as the hiring of colleagues, the appointment of a chair, or the selection of a textbook. However, they also recognized and valued informal venues that validated their sense of professional voice and belonging overall as important to creating a collegial environment.

### *Voice in decisions*

A key expectation of collegiality for the NTTF was the opportunity to have a voice when decisions that would affect them were being made (24 respondents). Multiple participants described the importance of being involved in decision-making and their frustration when they were not. Lamenting limited input into decision-making in his department, Ron (RU) said, "I'm expecting more when it comes to the say in what we do." Similarly, Charles (RU) recalled a non-collegial a time when:

They'd [tenure-track faculty] vote but lecturers couldn't vote. We were expected to carry out the work that was decided on. They'd say, "This is the policy and the lecturers are going to do and compile all these reports" and stuff. So, I think in that respect in this department and how other departments run, it's very unfair.

The examples above highlight the expectation of voting as a venue for gaining a sense of voice that NTTF defined as part of collegiality. Although most participants recognized the legitimacy of some limitations on their voting rights (e.g., on decisions regarding tenure-track faculty), having broad and equitable voting rights was a defining aspect of collegiality for many.

Having input into hiring decisions was also an important part of how the NTTF defined collegiality. Participants consistently pointed to the expectation that they should have a say in hiring the colleagues with whom they would work. Andrew (RU), who was in a department with an even number between NTTF and tenure-track faculty, argued that it was critical for NTTF to have a say in, "...the hiring of fellow lecturers, people we have to work with shoulder to shoulder." Gregory (RU) pointed out that this expectation was even more important when the NTTF might hold some level of responsibility, as he did for the undergraduate program in his department. He explained,

If they're going to depend on the lecturers to teach a large percentage of the student population, then why should we not have that kind of power? If I'm going to be held responsible for undergraduate programs, why would I not have a voice in who's going to be the lecturers that work with me?

Sadie (MU), whose department did not allow her to vote on any hiring decisions, registered her protest by choosing to skip meetings at which those decisions were made.

### *Professional voice*

NTTF (14 respondents) also described having their voice sought out and valued as another important aspect of collegiality. Fundamentally, it reflected a sense of value and recognition, connecting the theme of voice to the concept of communality. Participants described the importance of having their voices sought out on an informal basis, and it was often chairs who took on this role. Andrew (RU) noted that his chair would seek out his input (and that of others) even in tenure-track hiring decisions, collate that input, and present it as an aggregate portrait of how those without a vote perceived each candidate. Lilly (RU) described a similar experience,

While I don't get an official vote, I think that my comments and feedback within that are valued. I'm ok with that. Some people, some lecturers are very offended by that...It doesn't really doesn't matter to me because at the departmental level my thoughts and opinions are appreciated....

These kinds of informal pathways for input were important for the NTTF as a way to influence decisions but also as a sign of their value and legitimacy in the department and were often part of an emerging expectation of indirect participation.

Even more broadly, however, many NTTF spoke about the professional give-and-take of ideas with colleagues as a key element and expectation of collegiality. Perhaps the central element of these conversations was being heard, which for the NTTF indicated they were valued as someone who had something to offer. Mo (MU), when asked to define collegiality, said, "It means to me that other professors are willing to listen to you. To engage in daily conversations with you." Diana (MU), echoed this sentiment, defining collegiality as a sense that, "...I'm hearing you, I'm listening to you. I don't agree with you, whatever it might be, but I respect you as someone who is an expert in what you do." In her statement, Diana linked a sense of being heard with a sense of respect for professional expertise and knowledge. For the NTTF, collegiality was defined in part by the opportunity to engage colleagues in substantive conversations, to participate in shared problem-solving, and to learn from, as well as to be learned from, on matters of professional expertise or experience.

## **Discussion**

If there is a meta-theme of collegial definitions and expectations in this study, it is that FT NTTF members expected to be valued and respected as an equal member of their academic community, a finding that echoes and supplements prior research (Hearn and Deupree 2013; Levin and Shaker 2011; Waltman et al. 2012). This sense of worth and respect was evident from the most basic expectation that they be greeted and acknowledged in the hallway (and the corresponding sting when they were not) to expectations that they have a voice in decision-making and be seen as a valued contributor to the shared goals and purposes of the department. Although these expectations were extended to both tenure system and fellow non-tenure-track faculty, they were most often fulfilled in their experiences with other NTTF, and more likely to be unfulfilled in the relationships with tenure system faculty.

Our findings raise four important issues regarding Bess's (1992) collegiality framework as it applies to the expectations of NTTF participants in this study, and more broadly, to the fit of collegiality with differentiated faculty employment, an emerging concern in the literature (Ott and Cisneros 2015). First, Bess and the NTTF in our study both assert that collegiality should be based on expertise, not hierarchy. However, Bess offered his conceptualization of collegiality at a time when the expected structure of the faculty profession was still largely uniform and a full understanding of differentiation of faculty roles was only just emerging (e.g., Gappa and Leslie 1993). Thus, Bess does not directly address the implications of different employment types and generally assumes the commonality of membership in the tenure system as an underpinning for his conceptualization of collegiality. As expertise has become narrowly defined as scholarship, NTTF typically are not considered content "experts" and are thus tacitly marginalized (Rice 1986). Traditionally, the academy has tended to treat differences in employment roles as differences in employment importance. As a result, tenure-normative systems often deny collegial culture, structure, or behavior to NTTF whose employment importance is regarded as inferior despite equivalent degrees and highly valued expertise (Ott and Cisneros 2015). As a result, the profession must consider whether the "gold standard" of collegiality Bess describes, even if only an ideal, assumes terms of membership that exclude NTTF by definition and what needs to change to align expectations with experiences.

Second, and related, Bess (1992) argues that collegial culture is strong when concerns for shared interests and professional values supplant the need for each member to fully exercise their democratic participatory rights. So, perhaps a faculty member chooses to not exercise her (structural) right to attend every committee or department meeting to voice an opinion because she trusts the (cultural) values of the department to protect the best interests of the group and its members. Yet that right and expectation of attendance, which may be freely declined by the tenure-track faculty member, was often not even an option for our participants. The complication is that Bess's measure of cultural collegiality creates the expectation that NTTF give up or not fully exercise rights that they may not have due to their terms of employment. The question again, then, is whether collegiality, as Bess defines it, is even possible given the inherent power imbalance between those who have the option to entrust their rights to the group and those who do not.

Third, issues of power and comparative access to collegiality also undergird questions about which differences in collegial behavior, culture, and structure might and might not be legitimate in an era of differentiated faculty work. Some scholars have framed this conversation primarily in terms of fair employment practices (Hollenshead et al. 2007; Kezar 2012a). Participants in our study were split over which rights and opportunities reflected unjust systems or behaviors and which reflected different legitimate employment expectations. For instance, participants expected to be engaged with colleagues in sociable and friendly ways, if not as friends, and to be invited to departmental meetings. Inclusion in departmental social events, regular lunches, meetings that directly impacted the NTTF member, and hiring other NTTF were rights participants pointed to as expectations of collegiality. Yet a surprising number of NTTF expressed that exclusion from tenure-track hiring, for example, was not a collegial slight but a difference in employment terms only.

Participants' apparent acceptance of differences in collegial rights based on the hierarchy of employment type may signal their internalized acceptance of the tenure-normative system. Alternatively, it might also signal the development of new and more nuanced collegial expectations given the new structure of faculty work. Whether this is a healthy

state for departments, institutions, NTTF members, or students in the context of today's new faculty workforce is a question worthy of discussion.

Fourth, among the factors most central to ensuring collegiality, Bess (1992) and our participants similarly highlighted the preeminence of collegial culture, and to a lesser extent behavior, compared to collegial structure. Their reasons for this emphasis, however, varied in important ways. Bess (1992) was clear that fixing structures (policies that open meetings to NTTF, for example) alone is not the solution. Instead, policy must *reflect* behavior and culture. However, when culture and behavior are present and structure is not, collegiality is not operating in full measure.

By contrast, for many participants, collegial culture and behavior were lifelines in a sea of political uncertainty and structural variability, at least when positive culture and behavior were present. Their lack of long-term job security and their desire to contribute to shared departmental goals often made NTTF easy to exploit since they had dual incentives to capitulate to departmental asks and expectations. As a result, NTTF were often deeply dependent upon collegial culture and collegial behaviors (i.e., the “good will” of colleagues) to protect their rights, ensure their participation in departmental decision-making, and shield them from exploitation, even while the general lack of collegial structures meant they had little or no recourse should those rights be violated. The outcome was often also a shift in expectations away from structural participation and toward cultural inclusion.

### Comparative analysis

Although individual perspectives varied widely, we noted patterns that differentiated the two institutions. At RU, most participants expected the religious affiliation of the institution to matter, though the anticipated effect varied: for some it was a pointed sense that interpersonal treatment should reflect moral standards such as *Imago Dei*, or a recognition that each person is made in the image of God and is thus deserving of regard. For others, it produced a general sense of expected solidarity that the faculty have a collective purpose that should diminish differences of employment status. Although communality was present for some NTTF at MU, it occurred primarily at the departmental level.

MU's status as a unionized campus had primarily an indirect effect on collegial expectations and was most notable for its absence in conversations of collegial expectations. The bond, legally or otherwise, of faculty through collective bargaining seemed to do little to create an expectation of a collegial environment. The indirect effect may have been that, as Bess (1992) suggested, where recourse to structure is needed to assure collegiality, there collegiality is likely absent. As such, expectations of collegiality did not include reference to union reinforcement, though in some situations the lack of it resulted in interventions, such as when one participant was forced to develop and teach a MOOC summer course.

Finally, gender did not seem to have a differential relationship to collegial expectations and definitions. That is not to say that women faculty have not been overrepresented in NTTF ranks, or that their professional challenges have not been acute (Hollenshead et al. 2007). Yet, both male and female NTTF expressed that respect, social inclusion, and a voice in departmental matters were expectations they held for their faculty role. Female and male faculty alike experienced resistance to those expectations that varied in some ways, but that is not the focus of this paper.

## Conclusions

In aggregate, these conclusions bring to the forefront several underlying questions with broad implications. Is Bess's (1992) conceptualization of collegiality inextricably tied to the tenure system in ways that make it outmoded in this era of differentiated faculty work? Must collegiality look the same for all faculty employment segments, or can it be justly differentiated? If so, what would an updated version of Bess's conceptualization include or exclude? This sample of full time, and in many cases, long-serving NTTF were extensively relied upon by their institutions not only to deliver the bulk of undergraduate instruction, but also to anchor many undergraduate administrative functions as well, freeing tenure system faculty to pursue research and advise graduate students. Answering these questions is an essential step to ensuring sustainable careers for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members, and clarifying the changing nature of the faculty life as well.

## References

- Baldwin, R. G., & Chronister, J. L. (2001). *Teaching without tenure*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Barnes, L. L. B., Agago, M. O., & Coombs, W. T. (1998). Effects of job-related stress on faculty intention to leave academia. *Research in Higher Education*, 39(1), 457–469.
- Bess, J. L. (1992). Collegiality: Toward a clarification of meaning and function. *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, 8, 1–36.
- Bode, R. K. (1999). Mentoring and collegiality. In R. J. Menges & Associates (Eds.), *Faculty in new jobs: A guide to settling in, becoming established, and building institutional rapport*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Boice, R. (1992). *The new faculty member: Supporting and fostering professional development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cipriano, R. E. (2011). *Facilitating a collegial department in higher education: Strategies for success*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Collins, R. (2004). *Interaction ritual chains*. 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.
- Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1993). *The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E., & Trice, A. G. (2005). Rethinking academic work and workplaces. *Change*, 37(6), 32–39.
- 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.tiaa-crefinstitute.org/public/institute/research/advancing\\_higher\\_education/contingentfaculty0313.html](https://www.tiaa-crefinstitute.org/public/institute/research/advancing_higher_education/contingentfaculty0313.html).
- Hollenshead, C., Waltman, J., August, L., Miller, J., Smith, G., & Bell, A. (2007). Making the best of both worlds: Findings from a national institution-level survey of non-tenure track faculty. Retrieved from the University of Michigan Center for the Education of Women. <http://www.cew.umich.edu/sites/default/files/CEW%20Final%20Report%20PP34.pdf>.
- Kezar, A. (2012a). *Embracing non-tenure-track faculty: Making change to support the new majority*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kezar, A. (2012b). Spanning the great divide between tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty. *Change*, 44(6), 6–13.
- Kezar, A. (2013). Examining non-tenure track faculty perceptions of how departmental policies and practices shape their performance and ability to create student learning at four-year institutions. *Research in Higher Education*, 54(5), 571–598. 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](http://www.uscrossier.org/pullias/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/DELPHI-PROJECT_ADAPTING-BY-DESIGN_2ED.pdf).

- Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2010). *Non-tenure-track faculty in higher education*. ASHE higher education report (Vol. 36, number 3). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Levin, J. S., & Shaker, G. G. (2011). The hybrid and dualistic identity of full-time non-tenure-track faculty. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 55(11), 1461–1484. doi:[10.1177/0002764211409382](https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764211409382).
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Mangiardi, J., & Pellegrino, E. (1992). Collegiality: What is it? *Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 68, 292–296.
- Morrison, J. D. (2008). Faculty governance and nontenure-track appointments. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 143, 21–27.
- 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.
- Rice, R. E. (1986). The academic profession in transition: Toward a new social fiction. *Teaching Sociology*, 14(1), 12–23. doi:[10.2307/1318295](https://doi.org/10.2307/1318295).
- Rice, R. E., Sorcinelli, M. D., & Austin, A. E. (2000). *Heeding new voices: Academic careers for a new generation* (Vol. 7)., New pathways working paper series Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.
- Richards, L. (2009). *Handling qualitative data: A practical guide* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Saldana, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sorcinelli, M. D. & Austin, A. E. (1992). *Developing new and junior faculty*. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, No. 48. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- 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.