Contingent Faculty Performing Scholarship and Service: Examining Academic Labor and Identity at a Public Flagship University

Sarah Bartlett Wilson
Northern Virginia Community College

C. Veronica Smith
University of Mississippi

Sarah Bartlett Wilson (she/her/hers) is an Associate Professor of English (NTT) at Northern Virginia Community College (Alexandria) and was an Instructor of Rhetoric and Composition at the University of Mississippi from 2015 to 2019. She previously taught as an instructional staff member at Trinity Washington University and as an adjunct at Georgetown University, the Catholic University of America, Milligan College, and East Tennessee State University. She teaches first-year composition as well as basic writing and advanced research writing. In addition to contingent labor issues in higher education, her research interests include composition pedagogies, multimodality, critical reading, and research ethics.

C. Veronica Smith (she/her/hers) is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Psychology at the University of Mississippi. Prior to her current tenure-track appointment, she was a contingent faculty member and held the rank of Instructional Associate Professor. She had previously worked as contingent faculty at the University of Delaware, Rowan University, and Drexel University. She is a social psychologist whose research falls into three main areas: (a) The role of the self and motivation in people's close relationships, including friendships and romantic and sexual relationships, frequently through the lens of Self-Determination Theory, (b) situational and individual/personality determinants of perceptions of daily experiences, including social interactions and sexual interactions, and (c) the influence of sex, gender, and sexism on social perception and interaction.

Abstract

The faculties of many colleges and universities in the United States are comprised of rising numbers of instructional contingent faculty who are ineligible for tenure. Although these positions generally do not require scholarly or service activities because their primary focus is teaching, the extent to which these faculty members still choose to perform like tenure-line faculty, with at least some kind of balance of teaching, research, and service, is understudied. The current study attempted to address this omission in the literature by collecting data from contingent faculty members at a public flagship university (N = 176) about their engagement with scholarly and service activities. A majority of the respondents (63.1%) had engaged in at least one scholarly activity and in at least one service activity (69.9%). This study adds to our understanding of the lived experiences of contingent faculty and concludes that a majority of these faculty members are, at least in part, building an academic identity based off of traditional expectations and activities for tenure-line faculty.

Contingent faculty—those part- and full-time professors and instructors off the tenure track who are often called non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty—are not newcomers to higher education in the United States. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) reported that 55% of faculty in 1975 were in contingent positions ("Trends"). Since then, hiring trends have continued to tip toward NTT positions; in 2006, Jack H. Schuster and Martin J. Finkelstein noted that "the *majority* of new full-time faculty hires continues to be appointed *off* the tenure track" (xvi), and Adrianna Kezar prefaced her 2012 collection, *Embracing Non-Tenure Track Faculty: Changing Campuses for the New Faculty Majority*, by stating that 75% of faculty hires on college campuses were in NTT positions (x). The consequence of those continued hires has, naturally, been a continued increase in contingent faculty on campuses across the country. Indeed, the national data collected in the past decade confirm that trend. For instance, a United States Government Accountability Office (GAO) report published in 2017 includes Department of Education data showing that "about 70 percent of postsecondary instructional positions nationwide" were contingent positions in 2015. Similarly, the latest data from the AAUP indicates that 73% of U.S. faculty in 2016 were off the tenure track ("Data"). An argument that Schuster and Finkelstein made back in 2006— "Contingency reigns" (xvi)—is thus even more true today.

While contingency may reign, our understanding of contingent faculty is still far too underdeveloped as academia maintains an internal

and external focus on tenure-line faculty. One frame that may be helpful in increasing our understanding of the seemingly ever-expanding group of contingent faculty is the concept of positionality. Introduced by philosopher Linda Alcoff in 1988 in her exploration of women's identities, positionality "makes her identity relative to a constantly shifting context, to a situation that includes a network of elements involving others, the objective economic conditions, cultural and political institutions and ideologies, and so on" (433). Thus, for Alcoff "being a 'woman' is to take up a position within a moving historical context and to be able to choose what we make of this position and how we alter this context" (435). An exploration of contingent faculty members' positionality could offer a number of important revelations about this group of higher education laborers. John S. Levin and Genevieve G. Shaker's 2011 study of full-time NTT faculty at three public research universities began this important work "to place our population within their figured worlds with respect to the status and roles accorded to them" (1465) and found that "the figured world is characterized by dissonance" (1473) because "the work [in the classroom] is satisfying but the conditions [at the university] are not" (1480).

As former contingent faculty members at the University of Mississippi, we know that dissonance all too well. Contingency may reign, but it did not reign in ways that mattered to us as NTT faculty. We met each other in 2016 when we were both in contingent positions, working as what the university (still) disdainfully calls "support" faculty—a term that situates us as separate and unequal to "regular," tenure-line faculty. We worked together closely as part of the Task Force for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and Shared Governance, which began as an exploratory committee in the Fall of 2016 with a goal of including contingent faculty in university governance. Until a successful vote by tenure-line faculty occurred in August 2018 as a direct result of our task force's efforts, NTT faculty were the only group on campus excluded from shared governance.[8] Our lived experiences illustrated many of the issues that contingent faculty face in their professional lives, and our task force work was part of our response to the social injustices that we saw and experienced on our campus as NTT faculty.

---

[8] At the University of Mississippi, NTT faculty do not include graduate students who are the instructors of record for their courses. Those student-instructors are considered *students* first, and they are represented in shared governance by the Graduate Student Council. As of the 2017-2018 academic year, there were about 600 NTT faculty (excluding graduate students) at the university, which represented roughly half of the faculty (Wilson). It is important to note, however, that some of the studies and materials cited throughout this piece include graduate instructors in their data concerning contingent faculty, such as the GAO and AAUP reports.

This study, which grew out of the work we did together on that task force, seeks to examine to what extent contingent faculty on our campus engaged with the kinds of scholarly and service activities more commonly associated with tenure-line faculty. As our tenure-line colleagues and administrators repeatedly questioned the commitment of NTT faculty to our fields and disciplines and to our campus communities, our interest in the scholarly productivity and university service records of contingent faculty grew. Because we wanted to assess the positionality of our university's NTT faculty, we needed to investigate the full context of their labor, which, importantly, included contexts beyond the classrooms where most analyses of contingent labor focus. Following Laurie A. Finke's conclusion in her study of faculty collegiality that "the set of practices or performances that we collect under the term 'collegiality' is at once totally global and hopelessly local" (122), we determined that NTT faculty identities and experiences are similarly global—in that they add to the national discussion of the general contexts within which contingent faculty work—and local—in that they are tightly bound by the specific contexts in which they exist. The research questions this study asked about the participation rates of contingent faculty in scholarly and service activities provide one of the first sets of what we hope are many data collections across the country around contingent faculty's academic activities outside of the classroom. Our experiences as NTT faculty members at the University of Mississippi were, as Finke framed it, "hopelessly local," but this study is our attempt to provide important local data that can inform our more global conversations around contingent faculty labor and their often-overlooked contributions to scholarship and service.

Literature Review

NTT Faculty Working Conditions and Job Satisfaction

Given the long history of contingent faculty in higher education, a number of studies have been conducted on the various working conditions that this ever-expanding faculty group faces. For example, both the typologies of NTT faculty—examining who ends up in contingent positions—and the employment models used to hire and (where applicable) retain NTT faculty have been examined (Baldwin and Chronister; Gansneder et al.; Gappa and Leslie; Gappa et al.). Various studies have also been conducted on the salary levels and other financial supports offered to contingent faculty. The GAO's 2017 report highlighted that NTT faculty at public institutions in North Dakota and Ohio with a primary focus on teaching were paid less than their tenure-line peers: 40% less for full-time and 75% less for part-time NTT faculty. This pay disparity is evident throughout

higher education (Discenna; Drake et al.). NTT faculty similarly receive lower (if not entirely non-existent) levels of professional development funding (Curtis and Thornton; Gappa and Leslie; Gappa et al.). Roger G. Baldwin and Jay L. Chronister noted the irony of the lack of professional development support for contingent faculty since it "is a fundamental requirement if faculty are to remain current in their disciplinary fields and continue contributing to the academic vitality of their institutions" (65). These working conditions undoubtedly impact contingent faculty's labor outputs. Indeed, a number of studies have found that taking courses from contingent faculty can negatively affect students; Kezar aggregated several studies, concluding that colleges and universities with higher rates of NTT faculty report both lower graduation rates and lower two-year to four-year transfer rates (Preface). Similarly, Randall Bowden and Lynn P. Gonzalez's 2012 findings painted a bleak picture:

> Overall, the results indicate that tenured and tenure-track faculty out-perform contingent faculty on all major items of teaching, research, and service. With few exceptions, contingent faculty can be viewed as less productive faculty members within the historical function of higher education to promote inquiry and advance the sum of human knowledge, provide general instruction to the students, and develop experts for various branches of the public. (5)

Perhaps unsurprisingly, then, overall job satisfaction levels appear to be lower for contingent faculty than they are for tenure-line faculty. Many full-time contingent faculty in Baldwin and Chronister's study indicated that they had "concerns about their status on campus" and repeatedly faced "condescending attitudes" from their tenure-line colleagues (139). Anna Drake et al.'s full-time NTT participants experienced "feelings of invisibility and exclusion, unclear perceptions and undervaluation by their colleagues, and the effects of leadership and leadership transitions on [their] roles in their colleges and departments" (1651). Another study, conducted by Levin and Shaker, found relatively high levels of job satisfaction in terms of full-time contingent faculty's teaching roles but much lower levels of job satisfaction in terms of their standing in the campus community, where the authors determined they faced "restricted self-determination and self-esteem" (1461). Indeed, Levin and Shaker, in examining contingent faculty's positionality, identified their academic identity as "dualistic at best": they saw themselves as "experts" in the classroom but as "subalterns" in the university (1479). Drake et al.'s findings concurred, indicating that full-time contingent faculty saw themselves as "particularly vulnerable" in how administrative turnover would impact their campus experiences (1653). Their study also found that inconsistent access to shared governance limited their participants' job satisfaction levels. That

inconsistent access was demonstrated by Willis A. Jones et al.'s 2018 study, which found that, as of 2016, 15% of the Carnegie Classification highest research doctoral universities did not grant NTT faculty any access to shared governance, with the other 85% offering a wide range of access, some of which, however, offered quite nominal opportunities rather than full shared governance access.

Measuring NTT Faculty Activities
Despite the uptick in studies and research on NTT faculty members' activities and efforts, general confusion still predominates about contingent faculty and their working conditions. For instance, in 2009 John G. Cross and Edie N. Goldenberg fundamentally misunderstood contingent faculty members' commitments to their positions:

> Faculty members on the tenure track face multiple responsibilities—teaching, generating cutting-edge research, performing university service, and mentoring graduate students. In combination, these obligations can lead to heavy workloads that require work on weekends and during the long vacation periods enjoyed by students and instructors whose responsibilities are limited to teaching alone. (75)

Even for those NTT faculty whose only work expectation is teaching, the need to develop courses, prep materials, and respond to students' submissions nearly always bleeds (often heavily so) into weekends and long breaks. Insightfully, Christine Cucciarre described contingent faculty labor as lacking a distinct shape, size, and scope: "The work that my colleagues and I do operates, in some ways, in the shadows of traditional tenured and tenure-track faculty; we are defined by what we are not. Our contours mimic theirs, but our shape lacks mass" (56). Those shadows often extend into the scholarly literature about contingent faculty, too, as Levin and Shaker argue that too much of that literature relies on information about NTT faculty that comes not from the faculty themselves but instead from administrators, tenure-line faculty, and others. With tenure-line faculty's work set as the norm in higher education, contingent faculty's work, which varies based on local job descriptions, campus policies, and institutional practices, can certainly look odd or wrong—if it is noticed at all. NTT faculty labor is, unfortunately, often overlooked or misunderstood.

A number of studies, nevertheless, have investigated NTT faculty members' research activities. Bowden and Gonzalez found that tenure-line faculty outperformed contingent faculty in all major indicators of scholarly activity. Schuster and Finkelstein found similar results in their study, but they also specified the following: "although research requirements have suffused throughout the four-year sector, the research function for the most part has been limited to the work of the regular, full-

time, core faculty and has largely been squeezed out of the workload of those holding contingent appointments" (325). This divide between tenure-line and contingent faculty, they noted, rests largely on the latter's appointments to teaching-heavy positions. Baldwin and Chronister similarly highlighted the teaching-focused roles many full-time NTT faculty officially fill at research universities while also noting that the actual work done by NTT faculty at four-year colleges often mirrors that of the tenure-line faculty, including research activities. In looking at these and other data, Bruce M. Gansneder et al. argued that their "findings suggest that traditional productivity measures are inadequate, and probably inappropriate, in judging either the quantity or the quality of the professional contributions of many full-time non-tenure-track faculty" (90). Overall, then, it appears that contingent faculty are engaging in scholarly activities, though it remains unclear to what extent and by what measures those activities can and should be judged.

A similar complication appears to have been uncovered around NTT faculty members' service contributions. Bowden and Gonzalez found a lower percentage of contingent faculty participated in service activities. Nevertheless, the GAO found that full-time contingent faculty had a wide range of responsibilities, including service to the university and/or scholarly communities to which they belonged, while part-time contingent faculty tended to focus more on teaching but sometimes completed service activities as well. The AAUP, meanwhile, argues that any service done by contingent faculty members is inherently problematic because they are "less likely to take risks" than their tenured faculty peers ("Background"). Beyond the global risk-taking issue, Drake et al.'s study of full-time NTT faculty at one public research university found that their participants were required to "excel" in at least two of the traditional tenure-line faculty activities (teaching, research, and service) if they were to earn promotion, but they were not consistently afforded access to service opportunities. These contingent faculty members therefore often found promotion implausible and faced working within an institution that functioned as if they were dispensable. Similar to the studies examining NTT scholarly activities, then, research has likewise demonstrated that service activities for NTT faculty are complicated in how and whether they can be both accomplished and interpreted.

A factor necessary to understanding NTT faculty members' scholarly and service activities is the degree to which contingent faculty members attempt to perform like their tenure-line counterparts—regardless of whether their job descriptions expect them to do that work. While some studies (e.g., Drake et al.) have indicated that at least some full-time contingent faculty members have a promotion ladder they can attempt to climb (as compared to nearly all part-time contingent faculty members), others (e.g., Baldwin and Chronister) found that their full-time NTT faculty participants have no such opportunity available to them. Baldwin and Chronister's participants, in fact, saw their lack of possible

promotion in the face of tenure-track promotion ladders "discriminatory, demeaning, and demoralizing" (49). Drake et al.'s descriptions of their contingent faculty participants are particularly discerning: "Despite constraints of structure and power dynamics, [full-time] NTT [faculty] make valuable contributions to the university, often invisibly" (1658) and sometimes go "to great lengths to prove legitimacy and earn recognition" (1651). These faculty members' attempts to make their invisible labor visible—to demonstrate their professional legitimacy—can be seen as performative acts. Judith Butler's foundational description of how gender is performed can shed some light on these acts: "because gender is not a fact, the various acts of gender create the idea of gender, and without those acts, there would be no gender at all" (522). Just as "gender is not a fact," faculty are not a fact—and neither are the activities they perform. The three main activities for faculty—teaching, research, and service—are thus constructs that have been developed over time by the cultures of higher education, and both tenure-line and contingent faculty continue to perform (or not) in those constructed roles. How all faculty manage these performative acts is complicated, but it is especially complicated for the NTT faculty whose roles and professional lives are less well defined overall and are thus generally defined against the standard of tenure-line faculty. As Levin and Shaker have argued, "Unease about their nontenure [sic] status becomes a barrier to their agency: The nontenure identifier is inescapable and overshadows the quality of their contributions" (1479-1480).

Importantly, Kezar has advocated defining NTT status "as another issue of diversity (another marginalized group)" within higher education ("Needed Policies" 21). Obscuring our understanding of contingent faculty even further is the tendency for NTT positions to be filled by faculty who are part of at least one other minority or disadvantaged group. The GAO report highlighted that gender is generally balanced across all faculty types but that women hold a higher percentage of contingent faculty positions than men. The report also indicated that salaries for contingent faculty are far lower than those for tenure-line faculty, which would suggest the possibility of at least more socio-economic insecurity for NTT faculty—if not different class positions entirely. In contrast, the GAO report detailed that racial and ethnic minority groups are fairly equally represented across all faculty types, though that percentage represents another minority: just 25% of faculty overall. NTT faculty therefore often face issues related to intersectionality, which is defined by Kimberlé Crenshaw as the theory that "many of our social justice problems like racism and sexism are often overlapping, creating multiple levels of social injustice" (4:54-5:05). These overlapping layers of identity impact contingent faculty members' abilities to perform their professional roles because, as Ijeoma Oluo argues, they "combine with each other, compound each other, mitigate each other, and contradict each other" (75).

Jaime Lester pointed out these intersections in her study of how female faculty performed their gender roles as part of their professional work:

> In addition to the impact of cultural definitions of gender roles, other aspects of their identities also impacted many of the gender roles that women performed. These women faculty members often discussed only their gender identity, and not their other intersecting identities. But in practice, however, they found that their other identities interacted with and impacted the way in which they do gender. (168)

The other lower-status positions that many NTT faculty occupy, then, impact how those same faculty perceive and respond to the professional second-class status that many NTT faculty describe as their lived reality (as in Baldwin and Chronister's findings). We therefore need more global and local data examining the extent to which contingent faculty perform traditional tenure-line duties, such as scholarship and service, when they are explicitly not in tenure-line positions.

Research Questions
As this review of the literature has demonstrated, there is a need for more research that examines contingent faculty and their experiences. Kezar has argued that "non-tenure track faculty are an extremely heterogeneous group when compared to tenure-track faculty—they have more diverse motivations for being a faculty member, approach the work differently, and may not see this position as their primary employment" ("Needed Policies" 25). That heterogeneity makes understanding NTT faculty and their activities difficult, but it is worth investigating as a means of changing their working conditions. Kezar has pointed out that campus changes result from adjusted policies, practices, and principles ("Needed Policies" 16-26), and she has also argued that data collection is a key factor in making those changes ("We Know"). This study's quantitative examination of contingent faculty members' scholarly and service activities is thus an attempt to add to both the local and global conversations about the roles NTT faculty perform.

The general assumption is that NTT faculty are teaching-focused and are not engaged in the other two traditional (tenure-line) faculty activities: scholarship and service. This assumption may lead to a perception that NTT faculty have abdicated their identity as full academics by no longer "performing" as others in the Ivory Tower do. Our study therefore attempts to answer the following questions related to these assumptions at the University of Mississippi, a public flagship university that, at the time this study was conducted, did not grant NTT faculty access to shared governance:

(1) To what extent are NTT faculty at the University of Mississippi engaged in scholarly activities?
(2) To what extent are NTT faculty at the University of Mississippi engaged in service activities?
(3) Is participation in scholarly activity associated with participation in service activity among NTT faculty at the University of Mississippi?

Method

The data for this study were collected during the Fall 2017 academic semester at the University of Mississippi. A list of all NTT faculty employed at the medium-sized, public university in the southern United States with an R1 Carnegie designation was obtained from the university.[9] An email invitation to an online survey was sent to all NTT faculty (N = 671) with a reminder email sent three weeks later. The survey was designed to assess NTT faculty members' professional and service activities both within their discipline and on campus. All research protocols and materials were approved by the university's Institutional Review Board, and the full survey instrument is available in the Appendix.

A total of 176 faculty participated (a 26.2% response rate). The gender make-up of the sample included 96 female participants (54.5%), 63 male participants (35.8%), 2 non-binary participants (1.1%), and 15 participants who chose not to answer (8.5%). The racial composition of the sample included 135 participants who identified as white (76.7%), 8 who identified as Black (4.5%), 5 each who identified as Asian or Hispanic (2.8% each), 4 who identified as multiracial (2.3%), 2 who identified as other (1.1%), and 17 participants who declined to answer (9.7%). Participants indicated that they had worked in academia for an average of 10 years (SD = 8.51) with a range of 6 months to 38 years (n = 163) and had worked at the university for an average of 6.65 years (SD = 6.27) with a range of 6 months to 29 years (n = 163 and n = 165, respectively). Participants also indicated belonging to a wide range of disciplines, with the most common response being arts and humanities (31.3%). Full disciplinary representation data can be found in Table 1.

---

[9] According to the 2018 update to the Carnegie classification system, R1 universities are doctoral-granting universities with "very high research activity"; the R1 designation is the highest rank for institutions that offer doctoral degrees ("Basic Classification Description").

Table 1: Discipline Representation

	N	%
Arts & Humanities	55	31.3
Natural Sciences & Mathematics	19	10.8
Social Sciences	11	6.3
Business	8	4.5
Professional Schools	30	17.0
Education	23	13.1
Applied Sciences & Engineering	8	4.5
No Response	22	12.5

Results

Although not part of our research questions, we did ask faculty to report on their typical teaching load. The most frequent response was a 4/4 teaching load (n = 42, 23.9%), with a variety of other responses ranging from no teaching obligations (e.g., research faculty) to teaching obligations that vary from semester to semester (e.g., adjunct professors and contingent faculty whose primary duties on campus are administrative). At the University of Mississippi, a 4/4 load is equal to teaching 12 credit hours per semester, which is also what is considered full-time equivalent.

Scholarly Activities

To address Research Question 1—*To what extent are NTT faculty at the University of Mississippi engaged in scholarly activities?*—participants were asked to indicate if they had participated in any scholarly activities since being employed at the university. The list of 20 activities was taken from the university's annual productivity reports and reflects scholarly activities across the range of academic disciplines (e.g., patent applications, peer-reviewed publications, and commissioned artistic works) and can be found in Table 2. A majority of participants (n = 111, 63.1%) reported engaging in at least one scholarly activity. Among those who reported a scholarly activity, the number ranged from 1 to 11 activities with an average of 3.27 (SD = 2.22). The most frequent scholarly activities reported were (a) presenting work at an academic conference (n = 59, 33.5% of the total sample), (b) submitting an article for publication in a peer-reviewed journal (n = 44, 25%), (c) publishing an article in a peer-reviewed journal (n = 37, 21%), (d) applying for a grant (n = 37, 21%), and (e) serving in a leadership role in a professional organization (n = 36, 20.5%). At least one faculty member completed each of the 20 possible scholarly activities.

Table 2: Scholarly Activities and Campus Service

Scholarly activities engaged in since beginning employment at the University
Obtained a license or patent
Applied for a license or patent
Created/produced an art exhibit
Created/produced an audio production
Created a commissioned artistic work
Created/produced an electronic media project
Created/produced a film or video project
Obtained a grant
Applied for a grant
Written a book/monograph
Written a book chapter
Published an article in a peer-reviewed journal
Submitted an article to a peer-reviewed journal
Reviewed manuscripts for a peer-reviewed journal
Competed in a musical competition
Created a musical composition
Engaged in a musical performance
Engaged in a theater production
Presented work at an academic conference
Campus service engaged in since beginning employment at the University
Served as director of an honors college thesis
Served as reader of an honors college thesis
Served as director of a master's thesis
Served as reader of a master's thesis
Served as director of a dissertation
Served as reader of a dissertation
Served on a department search committee
Served on a university search committee
Served on a departmental committee
Served on a university-wide committee
Served as faculty/staff adviser for a student organization

Campus Service

To address Research Question 2—*To what extent are NTT faculty at the University of Mississippi engaged in service activities?*—participants were asked to indicate if they had engaged in any type of on-campus service. A list of 11 service activities were provided and included such items as thesis and dissertation committee service, search committee work, department and university committee work, and student organization

advising (see Table 2). A majority of participants (n = 123, 69.9%) reported engaging in at least one service activity. Among those who reported a campus service activity, the number ranged from 1 to 11 activities with an average of 2.92 (SD = 2.11). The most frequent service activities reported were (a) serving on a departmental committee (n = 95, 53.9% of the total sample), (b) serving on a search committee (n = 68, 38.6%), (c) serving as a faculty/staff advisor for a student organization (n = 53, 30.1%), (d) serving on a university-wide committee (n = 39, 22.1%), and (e) serving as a reader on an Honors College thesis (n = 26, 14.8%). At least one faculty member participated in each of the 11 service activities.

An additional question was asked of participants regarding their willingness to serve as faculty senators should representation be granted to NTT faculty. Of the 169 participants who provided an answer to this question, a majority indicated some degree of willingness, with 68 (38.6%) replying "yes" and 67 (38.1%) replying "maybe."

Scholarly and Service Activities

To address Research Question 3—*Is participation in scholarly activity associated with participation in service activity among NTT faculty at the University of Mississippi?*—a chi square analysis was conducted. A relationship was found, χ^2 (1) = 4.79, p < .05. More faculty reported engaging either in both a service and professional activity (n = 84) or in neither a service nor professional activity (n = 26) than those who participated in only one type of activity alone (service alone [n = 39], professional alone [n = 27]).

Discussion

The purpose of the current study was to examine the extent to which NTT faculty engage in performative acts of academia beyond teaching, specifically those of scholarship and service, in order to better understand the contexts of their working conditions. Based on our results, NTT faculty at the University of Mississippi appear to be quite active in both scholarly activities (Research Question 1) and service activities (Research Question 2). In addition, there is a link between engaging in scholarly activities and service activities, suggesting an adherence by NTT faculty to a traditional, tenure-line academic model (Research Question 3). These data suggest that, contrary to common perception, NTT faculty at our university have not abdicated a traditional academic identity but rather continue to perform as "faculty," at least as imagined for and performed by tenure-line faculty. These NTT faculty, then, tend to have a positionality that includes contexts often overlooked by administrators, tenure-line faculty, and others who perceive them as being solely teaching focused.

Our results examining Research Question 1 offer some new insights about contingent faculty's engagement with scholarly activities. Prior studies like those performed by Bowden and Gonzalez, as well as

Schuster and Finkelstein, showed that tenure-line faculty outperform NTT faculty in terms of the number of scholarly activities each kind of faculty completed. Our study did not include tenure-line faculty, so a direct comparison between the two groups cannot be made. However, our results do indicate that many of our campus's teaching-focused NTT faculty are doing research and/or creative work beyond their job descriptions. These results are somewhat similar to those of Baldwin and Chronister, who found that some of their NTT faculty participants in many ways mirrored their tenure-line counterparts in their research activities. A notable difference, however, between our study and Baldwin and Chronister's is that their insight about NTT faculty mirroring tenure-line activities came from examining NTT faculty at four-year undergraduate colleges, not NTT faculty at a research university. Indeed, Baldwin and Chronister found instead that contingent faculty at research universities were generally very focused on teaching. Our study, in comparison, suggests that contingent faculty at our research institution are, at least to some degree, mirroring their tenure-line colleagues' scholarly activities. A potential reason for this difference is that all faculty at the University of Mississippi, regardless of rank or status, fill out the same online annual productivity report form. The scholarly activity options on that self-evaluation form were built from expectations for tenure-line faculty. Nevertheless, some NTT faculty may come to believe, through their yearly self-assessment, that they are at least encouraged (if not expected) to complete the activities listed there. In other words, the university-wide faculty form may create the sense for contingent faculty that their participation in the included activities is necessary for their yearly contract renewals—even if those activities are not actually required for continued employment. The form itself puts NTT faculty in a bind to over- or under-perform their positions depending on the angle from which they are viewed.

One unknown factor in our study is the extent to which our NTT participants were supported in performing their scholarly activities. Since material resources are required to maintain most, if not all, scholarly activity, future research should examine this issue. What research does exist suggests that provision of such support is far from universal or even typical. For example, John W. Curtis and Saranna Thornton reported that, even at doctoral/research institutions (which ostensibly have substantial resources and place a high priority on research output), full-time NTT faculty are not fully supported in their scholarly activities: only 51.5% of these institutions provide contingent faculty with travel support to professional meetings, and only 42.8% allow them the ability to submit research grants with institutional support (14). At the University of Mississippi, available funding for contingent faculty's scholarly research is frequently determined by one's academic department or unit, and our conversations with colleagues across the campus, as part of our task force work, divulged a wide range of support—from little-to-no financial or

institutional support to support equal to what tenure-line faculty receive. Contingent faculty may also have a harder time applying for external funding, as they may not receive institutional support in navigating those processes and/or the external sources themselves may resist their applications based on the faculty members' contingent status. Further complicating matters here is that, beyond the financial constraints, the teaching-heavy loads of many of our NTT faculty mean that those faculty may be short not only on funding but also on time. Moreover, our contingent faculty may also lack private office space and/or sufficient (if any) lab space. The fact that a majority of our participants reported engaging in at least one scholarly activity suggests that they are engaged with their scholarly fields, no matter what is contractually required of them as NTT faculty or how their working conditions may impede those efforts.

Our results addressing Research Question 2 similarly cannot compare directly to Bowden and Gonzalez, who found that a lower percentage of NTT faculty participate in community or disciplinary service, since we did not include tenure-line faculty in our participant group. However, our results are in line with the GAO report, which found that at least full-time contingent faculty engage with a wide range of service activities. While we did not ask questions around motivations for performing (or avoiding) service activities, the AAUP has argued that a fear of job loss affects contingent faculty's service ("Background"). Drake et al.'s study also indicated that access to service opportunities was a problem for their participants, and our conversations with colleagues across campus during our task force work suggested that for contingent faculty there was little access to service at the university level, some access to service at the collegiate unit level, and differing access to service at the departmental level (where that access ranged from full to none). As with scholarly activities, the fact that a majority of our NTT participants had completed at least one campus service activity, with the average number of activities completed being nearly three times that amount, suggests that contingent faculty are generally engaged in their campus communities beyond their contractual obligations through service activities.

The data analysis related to Research Question 3, which demonstrated that our NTT participants are more likely to participate in either both scholarly and service activities or neither kind of activity rather than a single activity type, aligns strongly with the results of Drake et al.'s study. That study found that their full-time NTT faculty participants were engaged with research and service activities in an attempt to demonstrate their academic legitimacy through their research and service activities. Like Drake et al.'s participants, many of our campus's contingent faculty have a promotion ladder available to them. According to the University of Mississippi's "Faculty Ranks and Titles" policy, any faculty members hired into the following full-time categories have a promotion ladder available to them: Instructor/Lecturer/Senior Lecturer; Instructional, Clinical, or of Practice Assistant Professor/Associate Professor/Professor;

and Research Assistant Professor/Associate Professor/Professor. While the research ladder is reserved for NTT faculty whose primary responsibility is research, the other two ladders are teaching-focused, and faculty in those positions are expected to demonstrate a consistent history of both scholarly and service activities for successful promotion. Notably, however, unlike tenure-line faculty, contingent faculty in these lines are not required to go up for promotion. Indeed, some faculty in these positions do not attempt to attain promotion. This available choice may help explain the majority of faculty who perform either both or neither of the non-teaching activities. That is, our contingent faculty who have decided to not go up for promotion may never engage with either of these activities, and our contingent faculty who do plan to go up for promotion (or have already successfully been promoted) may engage with both activities. The latter group, through the promise of a better title and a small salary increase, are thus encouraged by the very presence of the ladder to work beyond their contractual obligations. In some ways, these faculty may mirror Drake et al.'s participants, who were determined to prove their legitimacy as academics through their research and service activities.

In many ways, then, the majority of our NTT faculty who participate in both or neither extra activities are performing (or not) their faculty roles as defined less by their own positions than by the traditional tenure-line faculty positions they do not have. This result aligns with Levin and Shaker's finding about positionality that, "in an institutional context, the norms of the institution provide a powerful shaper of behaviors, especially those of professionals" (1465). Since the historically dominant—even if no longer a numerical majority—tenure-line faculty group continues to drive all faculty's academic identity and performative acts, contingent faculty's actions are situated in contexts largely beyond their control.

Our contingent faculty participants also reflected prior research populations in that they were likely to belong to other minority or disadvantaged groups and thus occupy intersectional positions. Under a quarter of our participants identified as non-white, which mirrors national data from the GAO. A majority of our participants were women, which again reflects national data from the GAO as well as a 2017 report on our university by the Chancellor's Commission on the Status of Women; the report indicated that in 2015, women on our campus held 33% of tenured positions, 43% of tenure-track positions, and 55% of NTT positions. While we did not inquire about salary levels in our study, that same university report showed that the median annual salaries of our NTT faculty were far lower than their tenure-track counterparts in 2015: $51,096 for female NTT faculty and $63,569 for male NTT faculty compared to $72,942 for female tenure-track faculty and $78,849 for male tenure-track faculty. As Lester pointed out, the interplay of these various minority and/or disadvantaged identities impacts the performance of faculty, and it is likely that our participants' abilities to perform their

roles—whether as NTT faculty not interested in promotion or as NTT faculty interested in promotion—was similarly impacted.

Conclusions and Further Research Recommendations

As this special issue asks us to reflect on social justice issues within academia related to positionality and intersectionality, it is worth noting that a majority of participants in our sample group indicated some willingness to participate in shared governance as faculty senators. This result suggests that a majority of our participants were willing to engage with a service activity that had, up to that point, only been filled by their tenure-line colleagues. The motivation for that willingness to serve within our sample group remains unknown, but a number of motivations are possible: some faculty may have believed such service opportunities were overdue for a group of faculty who had thus far been unjustly excluded from shared governance; some faculty may have seen it as an opportunity to demonstrate—indeed, to perform—their abilities as traditional academics (even as they were employed in non-traditional positions); and some faculty may have found themselves adopting both of these positions at once. In some ways, then, the very existence of the promotion ladder for NTT faculty creates an environment where those faculty are being asked to perform as traditional, tenure-line academics without offering them the same incentives in return (e.g., academic freedom and tenure). Allowing and/or asking NTT faculty to serve on the Faculty Senate is thus both necessary for their full inclusion in the campus community and contradictory to their job descriptions. At the same time, a university that does not offer opportunities for scholarly and service performative acts—or the supports necessary to their completion—reifies the second-class status that so many contingent faculty face.

A necessary direction for subsequent research is to examine more directly the desire of NTT faculty to adhere to or eschew their identities as traditional academics. Future research projects that contribute more local data to the national conversations could help everyone understand the complicated positions that contingent faculty occupy. The current study did not ask NTT participants why they did or did not engage in scholarship and service activities. Although we suspect that academic identity is a key factor driving these activities, their link to identity may take multiple forms. For example, an NTT faculty member may engage in these activities to maintain a traditional academic identity, perhaps serving as a source of legitimacy among their current colleagues or as a means by which they can obtain future employment as a tenure-line faculty member. By contrast, another NTT faculty member may embrace their identity as a contingent faculty member and see participating in these "non-NTT" activities as a way to disrupt the common perception of NTT faculty. Still yet another NTT faculty member may elevate their identity as a member of their discipline (e.g., as a sociologist, a writer, or a physicist) over their identity as a professor, thus explaining their activities regardless of the

presence or lack of incentives and resources provided by their institutions. Additional qualitative and quantitative studies on these motivating factors for contingent faculty's performative acts are therefore needed.

Furthermore, subsequent qualitative and quantitative research could also examine the relationships between contingent and tenure-line faculty at various institutions. For example, do the typologies of and employment models for contingent faculty at various institutions affect how individual faculty members both on and off the tenure track perceive their own academic identity and that of their colleagues? That is, how do the (fair and unfair) assumptions about various kinds of faculty members affect their academic identities? Similarly, does the presence (or not) of a promotion ladder for contingent faculty affect how tenure-line and NTT faculty view each other? Relatedly, in what ways does contingent faculty's access to shared governance influence campus culture? Finally, while this study did not focus on the part- or full-time status of its contingent faculty participants, how does the rate of that employment status—as well as the policies and practices regarding it—affect part- and full-time NTT faculty members' academic identity and performative acts of teaching, research, and service? All of these questions deserve special consideration as their answers will indicate what steps are necessary to build more just academic communities—both locally and nationally. Further, it is imperative that NTT faculty themselves be given an opportunity to reflect on and share their experiences both as members of the professoriate and as members of their individual disciplines in order for them and others in higher education to have a true understanding of the ever-evolving nature of academia. Contingent faculty members' positionality cannot be fully understood without their voices about their own experiences providing the foundation for that understanding.

These questions are even more important now as higher education faces both an uncertain future in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and important next steps in response to the Black Lives Matter movement. Contingent faculty, because they tend to have higher teaching loads and less job security than their tenure-line counterparts, will face increased burdens of reaching and supporting their students throughout this pandemic. Both *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (al-Gharbi; Zahneis) and *Inside Higher Ed* (Flaherty, "Next") ran pieces in the first few months of the pandemic that noted the increased precarity and burdens contingent faculty faced inside and outside their (perhaps virtual) classrooms. A number of schools have also announced and/or completed plans to lay off large numbers of their faculty as a budget-saving necessity in response to the Coronavirus, and these layoffs have largely hit both part- and full-time contingent faculty.[10] Given this turbulence, the specific contexts in which

---

[10] See, for example, the 30% cut of faculty at Missouri Western State University (Flaherty, "Not"), the 100 NTT faculty who lost their jobs at Northern Arizona University (Leingang), the announced cuts of adjunct positions across the City

still-employed contingent faculty's teaching, scholarship, and service activities take place in the coming semesters deserve additional detailed study.

Similarly, as academia reckons with its culpability in constructing and maintaining white supremacy, it will be imperative to explore the experiences of minority NTT faculty members with an intersectional lens. The experiences of these faculty have been and continue to be ignored even as Black voices in non-academic spaces are being elevated. The #BlackInTheIvory Twitter campaign currently seems to focus mostly on students' and tenure-line professors' experiences.[11] Similarly, the *Chronicle*'s 2019 collection of Black experiences in higher education, "Being a Black Academic in America," has pieces by nine tenure-line faculty members and one graduate student. It is imperative that minority contingent faculty be included in the conversations and research that take place in the continually evolving contexts of race, ethnicity, and academia in order to more fully understand those contexts.

By attempting to explore the detailed professional experiences in one particular location's context, this study has shown that a majority of contingent faculty at the University of Mississippi are performing scholarly and service activities that are traditionally associated with tenure-line faculty positions. Contingent faculty are, in fact, engaged with their fields and campuses and are finding ways to fill those professional roles even as their employment contracts may not require such activities and their working conditions may not support such activities. As the number of contingent positions continues to rise in higher education, it is essential that we better understand those positions—both their positives and their negatives. That understanding is necessary not only for the durability of higher education and the students it serves but also for the social injustices that contingent faculty have faced and continue to face in their local and global contexts. NTT faculty are often caught in a bind: they are essential yet disposable, important yet ancillary. Awareness and recognition of the contexts of their current working conditions and academic identities can help build better policies and practices for all faculty, the fields they cultivate, and the students and campus communities they serve.

Works Cited

Alcoff, Linda. "Cultural Feminism versus Post-Structuralism: The Identity Crisis in Feminist Theory." *Signs*, vol. 13, no. 3, 1988, pp. 405-436. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.com/stable/3174166.

University of New York system (Valbrun), and the 41% cut to lecturers at the University of Michigan at Flint (Flaherty, "Deep").

[11] For instance, Colleen Flaherty's *Inside Higher Ed* piece "'Botched,'" which references #BlackInTheIvory, explores the history of two Black scholars who were recently denied tenure at the University of Virginia.

al-Gharbi, Musa. "Universities Run on Disposable Scholars." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 1 May 2020, www.chronicle.com/article/Universities-Run-on-Disposable/248687.

American Association of University Professors. "Background Facts on Contingent Faculty Positions." *AAUP*, www.aaup.org/issues/contingency/background-facts. Accessed 23 Dec. 2019.

---. "Data Snapshot: Contingent Faculty in US Higher Ed." *AAUP*, 11 Oct. 2018, www.aaup.org/news/data-snapshot-contingent-faculty-us-higher-ed.

---. "Trends in The Academic Labor Force: 1975-2015." *AAUP*, Mar. 2017, www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/Academic_Labor_Force_Trends_1975-2015.pdf.

Baldwin, Roger G., and Jay L. Chronister. *Teaching without Tenure: Policies and Practices for a New Era*, Johns Hopkins UP, 2001.

"Basic Classification Description." *The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*, https://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/classification_descriptions/basic.php. Accessed 15 Feb. 2021.

"Being a Black Academic in America." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 18 Apr. 2019, www.chronicle.com/interactives/20190418-black-academic.

Bowden, Randall, and Lynn P. Gonzalez. "The Rise of Contingent Faculty: Its Impact on the Professoriate and Higher Education." *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2012, pp. 5-22. *Emerald*, doi:10.1108/17581181211230603.

Butler, Judith. "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory." *Theatre Journal*, vol. 40, no. 4, 1988, pp. 519–531. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/3207893.

Chancellor's Commission on the Status of Women. "2017 Pay Equity and Advancement Report." *The University of Mississippi*, https://ccsw.wp2.olemiss.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/49/2018/02/2017-Pay-Equity-and-Advancement-Report-v2.pdf. Accessed 24 Dec. 2019.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. "The Urgency of Intersectionality." *TED*, Oct. 2016, www.ted.com/talks/kimberle_crenshaw_the_urgency_of_intersectionality.

Cross, John G., and Edie N. Goldenberg. *Off-Track Profs: Nontenured Teachers in Higher Education*, MIT P, 2009.

Cucciarre, Christine. "Happily and Shamefully Non-Tenure-Track: Hypocrisy in Academic Labor." *College English*, vol. 77, no. 1, Sept. 2014, pp. 55-63, library.ncte.org/journals/CE/issues/v77-1/26073.

Curtis, John W., and Saranna Thornton. "Losing Focus: The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 2013–14." *Academe*, Mar.-Apr. 2013, pp. 4-19.

Discenna, Thomas A. "On the Limits of Performed Compliance: Jill Carroll and the Rhetoric of Entrepreneurial Adjuncts." *Communication Quarterly*, vol. 55, no. 4, 2007, pp. 467–483, doi:10.1080/01463370701668647.

Drake, Anna, et al. "Invisible Labor, Visible Change: Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Agency in a Research University." *The Review of Higher Education*, vol. 42, no. 4, 2019, pp. 1635-1664. *Project MUSE*, doi:10.1353/rhe.2019.0078.

Finke, Laurie A. "Performing Collegiality, Troubling Gender." *Symplokē*, vol. 13, no. 1/2, 2005, pp. 121–133. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/40550621.

Flaherty, Colleen. "'Botched.'" *Inside Higher Ed*, 22 June 2020, www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/06/22/two-black-scholars-say-uva-denied-them-tenure-after-belittling-their-work.

---. "Deep Faculty Cuts at U Michigan-Flint." *Inside Higher Ed*, 23 June 2020, www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2020/06/23/deep-faculty-cuts-u-michigan-flint.

---. "Next-Level Precarity." *Inside Higher Ed*, 10 Apr. 2020, www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/04/10/next-level-precarity-non-tenure-track-professors-and-covid-19.

---. "Not the Same University." *Inside Higher Ed*, 14 May 2020, www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/05/14/missouri-western-cuts-quarter-faculty-along-programs-history-and-more.

Gansneder, Bruce M., et al. "Who are the Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty?" *Teaching without Tenure: Policies and Practices for a New Era*, by Roger G. Baldwin and Jay L. Chronister, Johns Hopkins UP, 2001, pp. 77-113.

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

Gappa, Judith M., et al. *Rethinking Faculty Work: Higher Education's Strategic Imperative*. John Wiley and Sons, 2007.

Jones, Willis A., et al. "Shared Governance among the New Majority: Non-Tenure Track Faculty Eligibility for Election to University Faculty Senates." *Innovative Higher Education*, vol. 42, no. 5-6, 2017, pp. 505-519. *Springer*, doi:10.1007/s10755-017-9402-2.

Kezar, Adrianna. "Needed Policies, Practices, and Values: Creating a Culture to Support and Professionalize Non-tenure Track Faculty." *Embracing Non-Tenure Track Faculty: Changing Campuses for the New Faculty Majority*, edited by Adrianna Kezar, Routledge, 2012, pp. 2-27.

---. Preface. *Embracing Non-Tenure Track Faculty: Changing Campuses for the New Faculty Majority*, edited by Adrianna Kezar, Routledge, 2012, pp. x-xxiv.

---. "We Know the Changes Needed and the Way to Do It: Now We Need the Motivation and Commitment." *Embracing Non-Tenure Track Faculty: Changing Campuses for the New Faculty Majority*, edited by Adrianna Kezar, Routledge, 2012, pp. 205-12.

Leingang, Rachel. "Northern Arizona University Eliminates More than 100 Faculty Positions as Enrollment Outlook Darkens." *AZCentral*, 12 June 2020, www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/arizona-education/2020/06/12/nau-cuts-more-than-100-faculty-positions-enrollment-drops/5328571002.

Lester, Jaime. "Acting on the Collegiate Stage: Managing Impressions in the Workplace." *Feminist Formations*, vol. 23, no. 1, 2011, pp. 155–181. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/41301643.

Levin, John S., and Genevieve G. Shaker. "The Hybrid and Dualistic Identity of Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty." *American Behavioral Scientist*, vol. 55, no. 11, 11 Oct. 2011, pp. 1461-1484.

Oluo, Ojeoma. *So You Want to Talk about Race*. Seal, 2019.

Schuster, Jack H. and Martin J. Finkelstein. *The Restructuring of Academic Work and Careers: The American Faculty*. Johns Hopkins UP, 2006.

United States Government Accountability Office. "Contingent Workforce: Size, Characteristics, Compensation, and Work Experiences of Adjunct and Other Non-Tenure-Track Faculty." *Contingent Workforce*, Oct. 2017, www.gao.gov/assets/690/687871.pdf.

University of Mississippi. "Faculty Titles and Ranks." *The University of Mississippi*, 19 Feb. 2015, policies.olemiss.edu/ShowDetails.jsp?istatPara=1&policyObjidPara=11883237.

Valbrun, Marjorie. "Lives and Livelihoods." *Inside Higher Ed*, 23 June 2020, www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/06/23/cuny-system-suffers-more-coronavirus-deaths-any-other-higher-ed-system-us.

Wilson, Sarah. "Statement on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and Shared Governance." *Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and Shared Governance*, 22 Feb. 2018, edblogs.olemiss.edu/nttfacultyandsharedgovernance/2018/02/22/signed-statement.

Zahneis, Megan. "The Covid-19 Crisis Is Widening the Gap Between Secure and Insecure Instructors." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 18 Mar. 2020, www.chronicle.com/article/Covid-19-Crisis-Widens-Divide/248276.

Appendix: NTT Task Force Survey

Thank you so much for participating in this survey of Non-Tenure-Track faculty! We are hoping this survey will help us understand who NTT faculty are and more about their experiences here at the University of Mississippi.

In which of the following professional activities have you engaged? (Check all that apply)

	In the past 3 years?	Since starting work at UM?	In your career?
Obtained a license or patent			
Applied for a license or patent			
Created/produced an art exhibit			
Created/produced an audio production			
Created a commissioned artistic work			
Created/produced an electronic media project			
Created/produced a film or video project			
Obtained a grant			
Applied for a grant			
Written a book/monograph			
Written a book chapter			
Published an article in a peer-reviewed journal			
Submitted an article to a peer-reviewed journal			
Reviewed manuscripts for a peer-reviewed journal			
Competed in a musical competition			

Created a musical composition			
Engaged in a musical performance			
Engaged in a theater production			
Presented work at an academic conference			
Served in a leadership role in a professional organization			

In which of the following mentoring activities have you engaged while at UM? (Check all that apply)
- Served as a director of an SMBHC (Sally McDonnell Barksdale Honors College) honors thesis
- Served as a reader for an SMBHC honors thesis
- Served as a director of a master's thesis
- Served as a reader of a master's thesis
- Served as a director of a dissertation
- Served as reader of a dissertation

In which of the following university activities have you engaged while at UM? (Check all that apply)
- Served on a departmental search committee
- Served on a university search committee
- Served on a departmental committee
- Served on a university-wide committee
- Served as a faculty/staff adviser for a student organization

In your department, are you…?

	Yes	No	Sometimes	I'm Not Sure
Notified of faculty meetings?				
Allowed to attend faculty meetings?				
Expected to attend faculty meetings?				
Allowed to vote in promotion decisions?				
Allowed to vote in tenure decisions?				
[Excluding promotion and tenure decisions] Allowed to vote in all departmental matters?				
[Excluding promotion and tenure decisions] Allowed to vote in some departmental matters? Allowed to serve on department committees?				
Expected to serve on department committees?				

Which types of courses do you typically teach? (Check all that apply)

- Graduate courses
- Introductory undergraduate courses (100- and 200-level)
- Undergraduate courses that meet general education requirements
- Undergraduate courses that are required for majors
- Undergraduate courses that are cross-listed with other departments
- EDHE 105/EDHE 305 courses
- Lecture courses
- Lab courses
- Traditional, in-person courses
- Hybrid courses
- Compressed video courses
- Online courses
- Other _____

What are your contractual teaching obligations?
- Not applicable
- 1/1 (meaning I teach 1 course in the fall and 1 course in the spring)
- 1/2 or 2/1
- 2/2
- 2/3 or 3/2
- 3/3
- 3/4 or 4/3
- 4/4
- Other/Non-traditional

  _____

Indicate which statement is most true of you.
- I regularly teach overloads
- I sometimes teach overloads
- I never teach overloads
- Not applicable

Are you expected to teach overloads?
- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

Which of the following degrees do you have? (Check all that apply)
- A Master's Degree
- A terminal Master's Degree (e.g., M.F.A.)
- A Doctoral Degree (e.g., Ph.D., ED.D.)
- A Professional Degree (e.g., J.D., M.D.)

Which of the following describes your employment status and title? (Check all that apply)
- Part-time
- Full-time
- Adjunct Faculty
- Visiting Faculty
- Acting Faculty
- Clinical Assistant Professor
- Clinical Associate Professor
- Clinical Professor
- Instructor
- Lecturer
- Senior Lecturer
- Instructional Assistant Professor
- Instructional Associate Professor
- Instructional Professor
- Assistant Professor of Practice
- Associate Professor of Practice
- Professor of Practice
- Research Assistant Professor
- Research Associate Professor
- Research Professor
- Artist in Residence
- Writer in Residence
- Other _____

For how many years have you been employed:
a. In academia (excluding assistantships but including residences/post doc positions)? _____

b. At the University of Mississippi? _____

In which department/unit is your primary appointment?
_____

Is your position funded by "soft money"?
- Yes
- No
- I'm not sure

In thinking about your gender, which of the following statements best describes you?

- I identify as female
- I identify as male
- I identify as both male and female
- I identify as neither male nor female
- Prefer not to answer

With which race(s) do you identify? (Check all that apply)
- White
- Black/African American
- Hispanic, Latino or Spanish Origin (e.g., Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Argentinian, Colombian, Dominican, Nicaraguan, Salvadoran, or Spanish)
- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Asian (e.g., Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Hmong, Laotian, Thai, Pakistani, or Cambodian)
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- Some other race or origin
- Prefer not to answer

Currently, Non-Tenure-Track Faculty are not represented on the Faculty Senate at the University of Mississippi. We are investigating options for representation. If we gained representation in the Senate, would you be willing to serve as a Senator?
- Yes
- Maybe
- No

Almost done! This last set of questions is designed to tell us about your attitudes toward your work here at the University.

Please indicate your agreement with each of the following statements.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

_____ I feel like I can make a lot of inputs to deciding how my job gets done.
_____ I really like the people I work with.
_____ I do not feel very competent when I am at work.
_____ People at work tell me I am good at what I do.
_____ I feel pressured at work.
_____ I get along with people at work.

_____ I pretty much keep to myself when I am at work.
_____ I am free to express my ideas and opinions on the job.
_____ I consider the people I work with to be my friends.
_____ I have been able to learn interesting new skills on my job.
_____ When I am at work, I have to do what I am told.
_____ Most days I feel a sense of accomplishment from working.
_____ My feelings are taken into consideration at work.
_____ On my job I do not get much of a chance to show how capable I
am.
_____ People at work care about me.
_____ There are not many people at work that I am close to.
_____ I feel like I can pretty much be myself at work.
_____ The people I work with do not seem to like me much.
_____ When I am working I often do not feel very capable.
_____ There is not much opportunity for me to decide for myself how to
go about my work.
_____ People at work are pretty friendly towards me.
_____ All in all I am satisfied with my job.
_____ In general, I don't like my job.
_____ In general, I like working here.