

A STUDY ON THE CHOICE TO ACCEPT A FACULTY
POSITION AT A FOUR-YEAR, NON-TENURE
GRANTING UNVIVERSITY

by

PHILLIP ANDREW WYNNE, JR

KARRI A. HOLLEY, COMMITTEE CHAIR
DAVID HARDY
FRANKIE LAANAN
CLAIRE MAJOR
JEFREY NAIDOO

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Higher Education Administration
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2019

Copyright Phillip Andrew Wynne, Jr. 2019
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

Earning tenure is a prestigious, professional achievement for faculty in higher education. The number of tenured faculty, open tenure positions, and newly created tenure positions within higher-education has declined since the 1970's. A reduction in governmental funding to higher education since the Great Recession of 2008 caused higher education tuition to rise in the decade since and put further constraints on institutions' ability to pay the salaries of tenured and tenure-track professors. Because of the downturn, higher education institutions frequently hired contingent, non-tenured faculty to fill the departmental void of the depleted tenured faculty. Institutions in some states have completely eliminated the option of tenure for faculty. One state responded to the rising costs of education by creating a new academic institution (identified here as Mosaic University), which is a four-year, state university that does not offer tenure. Research suggests similar institutions may continue to open, but currently, there is no information regarding why faculty cease the search for tenured positions to work at a non-tenured institution. The study uses qualitative methods to answer the research question, why do credentialed faculty choose to take a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university? The qualitative research is designed as an explanatory case study and uses semi-structured interviews with full-time faculty of Mosaic University. The researcher analyzed the response data using the descriptive coding method to identify themes related to faculty experiences which affected their choice to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university.

Participants identified previous socialization experiences which instilled in them a passion for teaching and service to academic institutions as a professor, the lack of other job

opportunities, and the opportunity to create the organizational foundations of the institution, as reasons to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting university. The results of the study were used to craft recommendations for the policy makers of future, newly created, non-tenure institutions, which include suggestions to implement consistent contract renewal practices, establish structured plans for development of faculty within the institution, market the opportunity to work in a flat employment system, and develop a mentorship program between experienced and new faculty.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to first and foremost thank my wife and life partner, Julia. Without her guidance, support, and unflinching belief in me, I would never have found the path which led me to where I am in now; which is a man who understands, undoubtedly, he is more a more fortunate person than all that have come before him.

I want to thank my strong family unit, of my mother and sister, who have always been the firm hand on my back pushing me up when I am falling; and especially my father, who has been my hero and moral compass for the last 33 years.

And finally, I want to thank the friends who are also my family. Smith, James, Elizabeth, Tommy, Neil, and Kealey; yours are friendships which laid the foundation for my acceptance into the program. Mike, Ray, Kyle, Cristina, Allison, Austin, Dayna, Phillip, Sean, and Jarod; yours are the friendships that helped me finish.

Thank you to the University of Alabama; the University of Alabama College of Business for funding my studies; Dr. Chapman Greer for her support during my dissertation; Dr. Jeff Naidoo for his friendship and endless support; the University of Alabama Higher Education Program; Dr. Karri Holley for her years of guidance and mentorship; my committee for their participation; and The Mosaic Company and my colleagues, especially Joyce Grogan, for taking a chance on an unproven doctoral-student and instilling within me an invaluable wealth of professional skills, while exercising the patience and understanding I needed and would have not received from another company to complete my doctoral degree.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
Problem Statement	7
Primary Institution of Study.....	8
Purpose of the Study	9
Research Questions.....	11
Significance of Research Study.	12
Theoretical Framework.....	15
Limitations	20
Delimitations.....	24
Operational Definitions.....	24
Conclusion	26
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	28
Literature Review Purpose.....	28
Gap in Literature Related to Non-Tenure Universities and Faculty.....	29
Review of the Tenure in the Expanding Higher Education Landscape	30
The Academic Employment Landscape	40
Adverse Employment Characteristics of Contingent Positions	52
Characteristics of Contingent Faculty.....	67

Examining Non-Tenure Track Faculty Through the Lens of Socialization	72
Conclusion	83
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY	86
Restatement of the Research Questions	87
Setting of the Research	87
Social Sciences.....	95
Research Methodology and Design	99
Explanation of Methods	100
Positionality	105
Conclusion	106
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS	107
Introduction.....	107
Collection Process.....	107
Findings.....	110
Undergraduate Experience.....	114
Graduate Experience.....	121
Opportunity and Characteristics of Mosaic University	130
Experiences with Mosaic University and Suggestions for Other, Non-Tenure Institutions.....	154
Conclusion	163
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION.....	165
Introduction.....	165
Discussion.....	165
Areas of Divergence	180

Conclusions.....	183
Recommendations.....	185
Implications for Future Research.....	191
Recommendations for Higher Education Policy Makers and Stakeholders.....	193
Conclusion	194
REFERENCES	196
APPENDICES	229
Appendix A.....	229
Appendix B.....	231
Appendix C.....	232
Appendix D.....	233
Appendix E.....	234
Appendix F.....	237
Appendix G.....	238
Appendix H.....	239

LIST OF TABLES

1.1 Private, For-Profit Institutions in Florida and Georgia for the 2015/16 Academic Year	6
3.1 Race and Ethnicity of Mosaic University Students	93
3.2 Gender of Mosaic University Students	93
3.3 Mosaic University Headcount by Major	94
3.4 Titles and Descriptions of Mosaic University Courses.....	95
3.5 Employees by Position Level.....	96
3.6 Mosaic University Faculty and Staff Demographics	97
4.1 Research Sample Size, Responses, and Participants	109
4.2 Previous Work Experience of the Participants.	140

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Tenured faculty positions in America are on a steep decline, and prospective faculty members can no longer expect to earn a tenure-track position upon completion of a Ph.D. program. Many factors led to the national reduction in tenure. The economic downturn led to a drastic decrease in federal and state financial support for higher education institutions (Mitchell, Leachman, & Masterson, 2010). Research and doctoral granting universities and institutions bore many of the funding cuts (Mitchell, Leachman, & Masterson, 2010). Universities and colleges responded to the reduction in financing by increasing costs of tuition for students (Long, 2004). In addition to tuition, expenses such as course fees, room and board, building fees, and other associated costs increased, and are passed on to the students as a cost of attendance (Singell & Stone, 2007; Martin, 2012). Future enrollment remains uncertain, but increase in cost to the student is expected (Marcus, 2014). Government funding to higher education has not matched the increase in institutional operational costs (Oliff, Palascious, Johnson, & Leachman, 2013). As a result, institutions opt to cut operational budgets to ensure sustainable viability (Martin, 2012).

One cost cutting measure related to decreases in funding is the institutional reduction of tenured and tenure-track positions (Kezar & Maxey, 2013). In the past, Ph.D. graduates have transitioned into tenure-track positions (Kezar & Maxey, 2013). As many as 45% of all

collegiate and university positions were tenured or tenure-track during the 1970s (Weissman, 2013). Recently, the number of available tenured positions dropped to around 35.5% (Kezar & Maxey, 2013). To adapt to the new economic environment, institutions increased reliance on less expensive faculty to fill the teaching void left by the shrinking number of tenured positions (Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, & August, 2012). The doctoral degree's historical value and purpose suggests most individuals earned such degrees to, at some point, become faculty members (Walker, Golde, Jones, Bueschel, & Hutchings, 2008). Tenure is considered a position of career success in higher education (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Evidence shows full-time faculty can provide increased benefits to student learning than adjuncts (Kezar, 2013), leaving the logical reason for the overuse of contingent and adjunct faculty traced to financial constraints. The decline in tenure positions, coinciding with difficulty of sustaining a livable wage as an adjunct faculty (Kezar, 2013) prevents prospective, doctoral holding instructors the opportunity for sustained employment in academia. In an effort to maintain a career in academia, prospective faculty take non-tenure track positions offered by institutions that eliminate the option of tenure (Levin & Shaker, 2011).

Many instructors in positions within the collegiate system, such as full-time professors, adjunct professors, and graduate students, now perform the duties previously assigned to tenured professors (Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, & August, 2012). In lieu of tenure-track positions, institutions offer renewable contracts which often allow administrations the right to terminate said contracts at will (Mallon, 2000). As stated by Curtis and Thornton (2013), institutions remove and replace tenure with renewable contracts to save money on faculty salaries and to provide the institution the ability to more easily remove a faculty member. Removal of a tenured faculty member is a costly, lengthy process and is cited as a driving factor

by non-tenure-granting institutions in the decision to remove tenure (Wetherbe, 2013). Some institutions choose to establish themselves as for-profit institutions, thus eliminating eligibility to receive government funding; they operate solely on tuition recovered from students (Leatherman, 1998) and implement systems which use almost exclusively non-tenured faculty members (Leatherman, 1998). An example of a such an institution is the widely known University of Phoenix. Though not in the specific form of establishing a for-profit institution, the attractiveness of establishing an institution which eliminates tenure has spread across public state systems, including the state of Florida (known as the Florida College System).

The state of Florida provides a current lens through which to view the successes and challenges of tenure removal. Florida is of note regarding state funding of higher education because Florida operates the Bright Futures Scholarship program, which offers free college tuition to qualifying students (Office of Program and Policy Analysis and Government Accountability 2004). Much of the Bright Futures Scholarship program is funded by the lottery within the state (Mayo, 2011). As such, Florida has been able to offset some of the loss of federal funding with the Bright Futures Scholarship program (Mayo, 2011). As will be discussed later, evidence suggests some states may follow the path of Florida and enact their own state-funded tuition programs (Mercer, 2018). Florida is home to the institution observed in the following case study. For anonymity of the institution and participants of the study, the institution is referred to as “Mosaic University”. Additionally, to keep the anonymity of Mosaic University, several sources will not be cited when discussing specifics of the institution. As stated, Florida provides a current lens through which to view the successes and challenges of tenure removal, as the state is home to many four-year, higher education institutions which do not offer tenure (Travis, 2016). For example, Mosaic University opened in 2012 and does not

offer tenure; Florida Gulf Coast University does not offer tenure (Travis, 2016); State College of Florida employs tenured faculty, but as of 2016, no longer made tenure an option to new hires (Johnson, 2016); and Nova Southeastern University no longer offers tenure to faculty, except in extenuating circumstances (Travis, 2016). Florida Gulf Coast's alternative to a tenure system is a renewable contract (Travis, 2016).

Mosaic University came into creation from the annexation of a satellite, polytechnic campus of a larger state university in 2012. The larger university was also part of the Florida College System. Florida Gulf Coast expanded into a traditional university, with classes taught on campus, in 1999 (Florida Gulf Coast, 2017). The dates are of significance because they occur after Florida enacted the Bright Futures Scholarship program in 1997 (Office of Program and Policy Analysis and Government Accountability 2004). The Bright Futures Scholarship program increased college access to graduating high school seniors across Florida (Office of Program and Policy Analysis and Government Accountability 2004). From 1997 to 2003, the number of recipients of Bright Futures Scholarships jumped from slightly over 40,000 to 109,868 (Office of Program and Policy Analysis and Government Accountability, 2004). Florida residents' newfound access to college resulted in a drastic enrollment influx and required the Florida College System to expand institutional members' resources, such as classrooms, housing, faculty, and student services (Knapp, 2012; Wattenberger & Albertson, 2012). Increased enrollment also caused the Florida College System to create additional institutions to educate new students (Wattenberger & Albertson, 2012). Mosaic University and Florida Gulf Coast University are state institutions which benefitted from the expansion (Knapp, 2012).

The creation of new facilities exemplifies the logistical issues inherent with implementation of state-funded tuition programs to residents. Institutions will inevitably reach a

maximum number of students which can be reasonably accommodated until expansion is needed. Further proof of maximum accommodation is the 1996 expansion of the University System of Georgia, in which the Board of Regents gave State University status to multiple institutions to increase “scope of degree offerings, (and) scale of operations” (Ehrenberg 2007, pp. 110). Similar to Florida, the need to promote other Georgia institutions to State University status arose due to the implementation of the Georgia Hope Scholarship in 1993. The Georgia Hope Scholarship is also primarily funded through the state lottery (Gottlieb, 2013). The University of Georgia listed enrollment of 20,563 undergraduate students in 1993, and currently enrolls 27,547 undergraduates (University of Georgia Fact Book, 2017). The increase in students is 6,984 over the course of 24 years. Such enrollment increases require an expansion of administrative, structural, and instructional resources at the school (Martin, 2012). Georgia Gwinnett College opened in 2005, presumably in part to meet the educational demand of students now eligible to attend college (National Center for Education Statistics 2017b). Georgia Gwinnett College also does not offer tenure (National Center for Education Statistics 2017a).

State-funded institutions were not the only benefactors of the Florida and Georgia higher education expansion. Florida and Georgia expansion resulted in the creation of dozens of private, for-profit institutions to meet their student surplus (IPEDS Data Center, 2017a). Common private, for-profit institutions such as ITT Technical Institute, DeVry University, and Strayer University are either non-tenure granting institutions or do not report tenured employees (IPEDS Data Center, 2017a). The National Center for Education Statistics provided the following information regarding tenure within degree-granting, private, for-profit institutions in Florida and Georgia.

Table 1.1

Private, For-Profit Institutions in Florida and Georgia for the 2015/16 Academic Year

State	Number of Institutions in State	Institutions with a Tenure System
Florida	129	College of Natural Health Florida Coastal School of Law
Georgia	42	Atlanta's John Marshall Law School Savannah Law School

Between both states, there are a combined 171 private, not for-profit institutions. Within Florida and Georgia, a correlation emerges between the implementation of state-funded tuition programs and an increase in non-tenure positions. Verifiably, new institutions that do not offer tenure were created after both Florida and Georgia enacted free-tuition programs. Florida and Georgia use state-funded tuition programs to support state higher education systems (Mayo, 2011; Gottlieb, 2013) and offer a glimpse of what can happen at the national level, as other states enact programs to fund tuition for residents.

New York recently offered free tuition to qualifying students (Ezrati, 2017), and other states such as Arkansas, Hawaii, Indiana, Kentucky, Minnesota and Oregon also have forms of free tuition programs within the last two years (Mercer, 2018). Based upon the need for academic expansion after the implementation of the state tuition programs in Florida and Georgia, it is not unreasonable to assume other states, especially highly populated states such as New York (Friedman, 2017) and California (Bollag, 2017) would require similar expansion to meet the influx of state residents with newfound access to higher education. If these states find Floridian success of their tuition assistance program, understanding an institution which does not offer tenure becomes paramount for learning how non-tenure granting institutions succeed in recruiting, retaining, and developing faculty (Knapp, 2012). Research does not suggest that states and institutions enacting state-funded tuition programs create new tenure positions as

institutional academic programs expand (Glenn, 2016), and thus, Mosaic University becomes a benchmark institution to understand a credentialed faculty member's choice to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university.

Problem Statement

Little research exists as to why a qualified instructor would elect to not pursue a tenure track position or engage in the search for tenured employment by accepting a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. The following dissertation contributes research to the lack of literature on the phenomenon, as the dissertation is an explanatory case study on Mosaic University, which is a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. The research uses semi-structured interviews with ten full-time faculty from Mosaic University between February and May of 2018.

Interview data which elicits common responses of both positive and negative experiences throughout the academic careers of the participants serves as robust data to use within human resource aspects of higher education institutions. Documenting and analyzing factors and experiences which influence a qualified candidate's choice to not to work at a tenure-granting institution will provide insight into improvement of the work-environment for both newly created non-tenure granting institutions and current tenure-granting institutions who increase the reliance on full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. The study presents findings which help stakeholders of higher education improve key areas within academic departments such as improved employee morale, improved productivity, lowered turnover rates, clearer plans of development, and more effective recruitment methods. The findings also provides useful experiential data to prospective doctoral candidates, in that the responses from a range of faculty

participants provide insight into potential experiences doctoral graduates may expect to encounter upon entering the academic job market.

Primary Institution of Study

The author previously discussed the effect of the lottery system on higher education in both Florida and Georgia. The author provides correlation, using Florida and Georgia as examples, that a state's implementation of state-funded tuition programs results in the expansion of higher education facilities within the state. Of the Florida and Georgia institutions discussed, Mosaic University is like few other institutions in Florida, Georgia, or America; which is why the institution necessitates inquiry. Mosaic University does not offer tenure, is a part of a state higher education system, and was created after the Great Recession of 2008. Mosaic University provides unique examination from a recruitment and staffing aspect, in that the Mosaic University 2015-2016 Accountability Report showed that Mosaic University received 1,700 applications for faculty positions. Such numbers show interest in the non-tenure granting institution, even though many tenured colleges in Florida have maintained their hiring of tenure-earning faculty. For perspective, the University of South Florida aims to hire 350 faculty members before 2022 (McNeil, 2017), and the University of Florida plans to hire 500 new faculty members before the end of 2018 (Dunkelberger, 2017).

The author cites these hiring initiatives to show the prospective faculty have opportunities for employment at tenure-granting institutions. Yet, the 1,700 applicants Mosaic University received indicates substantial interest in obtaining employment in an institution that does not offer the option of tenure exists. Important to note about Mosaic University is that the institution is classified as a university. The four-year, public university registers as a flagship institution of higher learning and research publication within the American Higher Education System (Stone,

Van Horn, & Zukin, 2012). Sufficient research exists that suggests for-profit institutions widely vary on concern for student retention and investment in quality faculty (Porter, 2014; Allen, 2013), and as such, data collected concerning the choice to accept a position at a for-profit institution would vary greatly from data collected concerning the choice to accept a position at a public, four-year, state university which does not offer tenure. This information suggests that Mosaic University is a valid representative for a case study on faculty's choice to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. The author provides a profile of Mosaic University in Chapter 3.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the case study is to better understand the choice of a credentialed faculty member to forgo the option of or continued search for a tenure position and accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. A case study is a research method which allows the researcher to observe and investigate a limited number of individuals, organizations, occurrences or objects, and assign meaning from the data to the larger field related to the inquiry (Tellis, 1997). A qualitative case study is identified by Gulsecen and Kubat (2006) as a useful tool of inquiry the field of education. Such a study requires qualitative research to provide an understanding of experiences applicable to participant's choice to accept positions at non-tenure-granting institutions (Cooley, 2013). The results of the study will provide the beginnings of targeted literature towards experiences and context behind the choice of accepting such a position. Understanding the experiences which drive credentialed faculty to non-tenure granting universities allows both newly formed non-tenure universities, and existing tenure-granting institutions to identify factors which may be under their locus of control to combat the loss of quality instructors, as well as create plans of action to adjust for the academic landscape in which

funding and support continue to decline (Oliff, Palascious, Johnson, & Leachman 2013; Flaherty, 2017).

Institutions lack a primary locus of control over the governmental funding they receive, and thus may choose to combat the loss of funding by eliminating high-salaried positions within the institution to meet budget restraints (Martin, 2012). Additionally, institutions may choose to eliminate the employment system of tenure, based upon non-monetary factors, such as negative perception of tenured faculty (Flaherty, 2017; Miller, 2017). Research suggests higher education institutions in states which enact tuition assistance programs will see an increase in the amount of non-tenured positions within the state (Travis, 2017; Mercer, 2018). Despite the aforementioned conditions, tenure has not been eliminated nationally, and tenured positions still exist for faculty. However, the possibility exists that faculty voluntarily turn away from tenure positions and actively search for non-tenured positions, specifically at public non-tenure-granting institutions.

Seminal social studies on human motivation (Maslow, 1943) substantiate that monetary reasons are not always the driving factor related to an individual's choice. Such findings indicate the likelihood that a non-tenured granting university, and thus an institution with non-tenured faculty, has characteristics some credentialed faculty find appealing. The data derived from the following research study is used to craft best-practice recommendations for the recruitment, retention, and development of non-tenured faculty. Stakeholders in higher education can use the recommendations to adjust current behavior or practices which, perhaps, drive away credentialed faculty. Specifically, the institutions can adjust their own organizational socialization processes to recruit, retain, and develop non-tenured faculty.

Research Questions

The research question of the following dissertation asks: why do credentialed faculty choose to take a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university? The data collected from the study provides a discussion on the best practices for the recruitment, retention, and development of non-tenure track faculty. Within the context of the research, the experiences act to identify the reasons underlying an individual's choice (Guay et al., 2010, p. 712) to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. Full-time faculty and the human resources department at Mosaic University are the sample of the study. The study uses qualitative interviews to examine the participants' personal and professional socialization experiences which influenced the choice to accept a faculty position at the institution. To identify the specific socialization experiences of the participants in the study, the study additionally answers the following questions:

- a) What experiences as an undergraduate and graduate student positively or negatively influenced the participant's choice to continue a career in academia?
- b) What experiences as an academic employee positively or negatively influenced the participant's choice to continue a career in academia?
- c) How did the undergraduate, graduate, and previous employment experiences relate to the participant's choice to take a position at an institution which does not offer tenure?
- d) Based upon personal anticipatory socialization and organizational socialization experiences, what are the participant's suggestions for recruitment, retention, and development of non-tenured faculty?

Significance of Research Study.

Research on the issue of faculty accepting positions at a non-tenure granting institution is important for two reasons. First, the research findings spur growth in the literature regarding the newly present phenomenon of examining instructors who voluntarily remove themselves from the option of tenure but stay employed at a four-year, state public university which does not offer tenure. Second, if other institutions continue to remove tenure, the results of the study help policy makers such as Deans, Department Heads, and human resource departments regarding the best practices for recruiting instructors willing to take positions without tenure. The final research question, which is “What are the participant’s suggestions for recruitment, retention, and development of non-tenured faculty?” is slightly outside of the scope of the other research questions, as this specific question focuses upon the experiences at Mosaic University, rather than the previous socialization experiences which influence participants’ choices to take a position at Mosaic University. However, the author believes a great opportunity exists to gain additional perspective on successes and challenges of working in a four-year, non-tenure granting, public state university.

The author surmises that three specific issues arise with the increase of non-tenure track faculty in academia. The three issues are unique in that they affect both instructors and institutions. The first issue is that, the longer instructors are out of tenure-track level positions, the less likely they are to receive future tenure-track positions (Kezar & Maxey, 2013; Fields, 2007; Rodgers, 2013). The second issue caused by the rise of non-tenure track faculty in academia is that academia potentially loses the type of scholars needed in qualified stable academic leadership positions within institutions (Kezar & Maxey, 2013, Tuhus-Dubrow, 2013). Later in the dissertation, the author discusses the potential migration of qualified faculty

members from academia to private industry, due to their inability to secure tenure positions, and in some cases, even gainful employment. The third issue caused by the rise of non-tenure track faculty in academia is that, externally, institutions perceived to successfully exist without tenure provide the justification for stakeholders who lobby for education cuts and the removal of tenure. Proof of success, and thus, further support for the elimination of tenure in higher education institutions may lead to further, widespread education cuts by governmental leaders, especially those critical of tenure.

The recent decline in the amount of tenure-track positions is not the only reason faculty take jobs at non-tenure-granting institutions. In tenure granting institutions, research shows a disparity between the lifestyle afforded to tenured faculty members, as opposed to that of non-tenured faculty (Kezar & Maxey, 2013). Tenured professors earn higher salaries, teach lighter course loads, have greater selection of the materials used to teach their courses, and are more involved in administrative duties than non-tenure-track faculty (Kezar & Maxey, 2013). Potentially, such disparity in treatment has a significant influence on the choice to remove oneself from seeking tenured employment. The qualitative context of this study allows respondents to provide reasoning for if and to what extent the disparate conditional factors affect the choice of accepting a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state public university.

Research significance to policy makers.¶The findings of the study are critical for policy makers in higher education. The decline of tenure has and will continue to shape the selection strategy of both institutions and faculty. The present, external factors which affect hiring faculty will drive current and prospective academics to make difficult career choices in terms of continuing careers within academia. These choices range from continued work as an adjunct, accepting full-time, non-tenure-track positions, holding out for tenure-track positions to open,

and the discontinuance of a career in academia altogether. Gathering information from faculty who chose to work at non-tenure granting institutions is vital to understand how traditional four-year institutions can better attract the types of faculty they may inadvertently turn away. The rise in full-time, non-tenure-track faculty continues to create challenges that ensure institutional engagement with non-tenure-track faculty.

Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty numbers grew to an extent which drove the publication of many studies and reports regarding how to better engage full-time, non-tenure-track faculty within institutions (Committee on Contingent Labor in the Profession 2011; Kezar, 2010; Kezar & Sam, 2013; Schell & Stock, 2001; American Federation of Teachers, 2008). Common suggestions from the aforementioned research to administrations are to include non-tenure-track faculty in governance, treat non-tenure-track faculty as peers, allow non-tenure-track faculty opportunities for professional growth, and make non-tenure-track faculty a short-term solution. The research also shows institutions that did not implement the suggested principles contributed to job dissatisfaction within their full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. Faculty job dissatisfaction leads to poor work output, and in some cases, job resignation (Aronsson, Gustafsson, & Dallner, 2000). Maslow's widely accepted research on human motivation (Maslow, 1943) is applicable to the experiences of faculty in that, when applied to institutions, inference can be made that institutions that treat full-time, non-tenure-track faculty as second-tier employees diminish employee's self-fulfillment needs. Viewing the choice to either stay in or leave academia through the lens of Maslow's Hierarchy of needs provides a rational understanding as to the removal of oneself from academia due to insecurity, as well as a rational understanding of the desire to stay in academia in hopes of earning tenure to receive

security. What is not immediately clear is the reasoning behind the choice to remain in academia full-time but remove oneself from the opportunity to earn tenure.

Assumptions. ¶The author takes the stance that removing oneself from a tenure position to accept a non-tenure position is generally accepted as counter intuitive, due to the stature and job security provided by tenure. Additionally, the author also takes the stance that Mosaic University did not provide the only offer of employment for all faculty within the university. The author also assumes that not all participants may be truthful about their feelings towards tenure, and, as such, the author took great lengths to remove bias from the interview questions. A review of the pilot interview process prepped the author to be cautious of asking questions which prompt the promotion or degradation of tenure, relative to the response of the participant. Though with removal of bias, the author must make a few important assumptions about the responses of the participants. The author assumes responses may not be in-depth, as the participants, even though anonymously, may be hesitant to discuss their current place of employment. An inherent issue with using Mosaic University as the subject of the case study is that Mosaic University is a STEM-focused institution, which provides a probability that participants cite the opportunity to work at a science-based research institution an intellectually intriguing employment option. The protocol assumes participants will share stories regarding experiences related to their academic and professional journeys.

Theoretical Framework.

Socialization theory is the lens through which the author views the choice to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. The author presupposes that the need for employment is not the sole reason instructors opt to take jobs at non-tenure-granting institutions. Many seminal studies on human motivation (Adam's Equity Theory, 1963;

Herzberg's Two Factor Theory, 1964; McClelland's Human Motivation Theory, 1961; and Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, 1943) show that financial gain is not always the singular factor driving an individual's choice. High-paying employment options exist outside of academia for Ph.D. holding job seekers (Venkatraman, 2014), meaning that employment, and thus the financial gain and stability provided by employment, cannot be the only driving factor of a person to accept a job at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. Both personal and external influencing factors affect the choice of instructors to accept positions at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state public university, laying the theoretical framework of the study, which is socialization theory. Socialization is the process in which people observe the functions required to be proficient members of society (Cooley, 1902). Within the context of employment, organizational socialization is the process by which an employee becomes oriented into the responsibilities, duties, organizational function, and organizational roles within the employee's place of work (Feldman, 1981). Faculty experience organizational socialization as doctoral students as well as when hired into a new institution. The training, orientation, interaction with co-workers, indoctrination into cultural norms, and delegated responsibilities act as the faculty member's organizational socialization (Feldman, 1981).

In terms of requirements for employment into an institution, faculty positions are unique in that the positions require a graduate or terminal degree for eligibility of employment. Master's and doctoral programs in higher education act as the apprenticeship for faculty positions (Gardner & Barnes, 2007). Literature suggests that the graduate-school experience acts as the socialization, or training, of prospective faculty for the academic profession (Austin, 2002; Gardner & Barnes, 2007). Awarding graduate assistantships to graduate-level students is commonplace within higher education institutions (Austin, 2002). Graduate assistantships can

involve positions as a teaching assistant, research assistant, lower-level administrative role, or any combination of the three. The undergraduate and graduate-school experience initiates anticipatory socialization (Merton & Kitt, 1950) within the prospective faculty, in that, the graduate student does not directly experience life as a faculty member, but is in close proximity to faculty to form expectations of the requirements of the position (Bess, 1978). An individual's experiences learned through anticipatory socialization combined with the present organizational socialization into full-time employment as a faculty member within an institution establishes the values, beliefs, and attitudes towards working as a professor within higher education.

Organizational socialization is also the experiences which lead individuals to develop identity, skills, behaviors, beliefs, and ethics to function as a member of a societal construct (Chao, 2012).

Within the context of the study, the societal construct is that of a faculty member within an institution.

The study focuses on the socialization experiences of faculty, as the author specifically examines a participant's lifetime interactions with higher education institutions to examine the choice for taking a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state public university. The author presupposes that the participant's anticipatory socialization and organizational socialization experiences directly influence the participant's decision to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state public university. Weiner (1985) states, in relation to socialization's role in influencing the choice to accept a position at a non-tenured institution, states that three principles arise when determining the placement of attribution to the influencing factors regarding choice: (a) locus, (b) stability, and (c) controllability. "Once a cause or causes are assigned, effective management may be possible and a prescription for future action can be suggested" (Weiner, 1985, p. 548.). Important to note is that, based on recent research (Kezar

2013), available tenure positions will remain scarce. The scarcity of tenure positions and rise in non-tenure positions within higher education drives the need to study the faculty at a non-tenure institution, such as Mosaic University, as developing effective plans for recruitment, retention, and development of non-tenured faculty becomes more important as tenure positions decline. Doctoral education provides anticipatory and organization socialization related to tenure, the tenure system, tenured instructors, and tenured co-workers. These experiences act as the socialization of the participants into academia and inevitably shape their view of tenured faculty and tenure systems within higher education. These early experiences with tenure shape expectations of future faculty employment. The qualitative study seeks to identify the anticipatory socialization and organizational socialization experiences which participants identify as reasons related to their choice to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state public university.

The research questions are crafted in a way to chronologically trace the participant's journey from student to faculty member to better understand participants' experiences, and thus choice to accept the position at Mosaic University. The author examines topics included in the literature review, such as experiences in graduate school, working as an instructor, and work within an academic institution. The study also examines if an institution which does not provide tenure simply employs faculty of a continuance commitment mindset (Allen & Meyer, 2007). Continuance commitment within academia means the Mosaic University employees would not pursue opportunities as faculty members in other institutions (Meyer & Allen, 2007).

However, research relating to the environment of academia indicates individuals harbor a deeper rationale, other than lack of alternative employment options, regarding the choice to accept a position at Mosaic University. For example, availability of non-academic jobs in

industry for people who hold advanced degrees (Smith, 2016) provides rationale which shows monetary need may not be the sole reason to take a job at Mosaic University. Additionally, Kezar's work (Kezar, 2011; Kezar, 2013) regarding the mistreatment of non-tenured faculty within higher education systems provides rationale for an individual to choose to remove themselves from institutions with tenured faculty. Essentially, data does not substantiate what may be the initial belief that an individual accepts a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state public university because the institution provided the only option of employment to the individual. Both sets of rationale make the study of the faculty at Mosaic University even more necessary in terms of identifying the choice of credentialed faculty to accept positions at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university.

Constructivist philosophical paradigm.¶The author takes the philosophical paradigm of a constructivist perspective in that the author contends the participant's "...development is driven by adaptation to environment" (Savickas, 2005, p. 147). Specifically, the choice to accept a position at a non-tenure granting university is based upon the learning process experienced by participants through their social and environmental interactions (Kukla, 2000). Specific to the participants in this study, the social interactions include interaction with family, students, professors, and co-workers within the environmental confines of school, higher education institutions, and the workplace. Within the context of both anticipatory socialization as a student and organizational socialization as an academic professional, individuals use observed and learned traits of the professoriate to influence their decision to take a position within a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university (Savickas, 2005). Individuals who make the journey to become a faculty are unique in that they experience both anticipatory socialization and organizational socialization occur within the same environment of a university. For the

participants they learn to navigate their transition from student to employed faculty within the similar confines of an academic institution.

In the terms of a graduate student's contemplation of becoming a professor, anticipatory socialization and constructivist perspective merge in what Savickas calls "career curiosity" (2005, p. 160). Career curiosity is when an individual internally reflects on "... the fit between oneself and the work world" (2005, p. 160). Additionally, the journey from reflection to actively pursuing the role of the professoriate is what Savickas calls "career confidence" (2005, p. 161). Related to the context of the study, the author's constructivist perspective assumes an individual will make concerted efforts to develop as a student while in school and training to become a faculty member; and then, once transitioned into the faculty role, the individual will strive to grow within the job construct (Fitzsimons & Finkel, 2010). Additionally, an individual, post-graduation, makes concerted efforts to transition from a student to a faculty member, and as a faculty member, makes efforts to continuously advance (Savickas, 2005).

Limitations

The study contains limitations in terms of sample population participation, lack of female representation in the study, and the uniqueness of Mosaic University. The study is limited to the ten faculty who agreed to participate. Additionally, as will be discussed in Chapter 3, Mosaic University employs a small number of female faculty. Only two participated in the research study. The author can only assume participants are honest during the interview; however, the credibility of the respondents is always a factor regarding data reliability in qualitative research (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000). These limitations are weaknesses within the report of the final data and affect the ability to generalize findings across a wide range of non-tenured faculty. Additionally, the author is the instrument of collection, and thus, is limited in reporting the data

by the extent of skill in qualitative analysis. Regardless of effort, propensity for human error is a danger in qualitative research (Mehra, 2001). The following section discusses in more detail limitations within the study.

Response rate. Chapter 4 details the data collection process of the research study. However, comment on the data collection process is needed for the purposes of providing more description with regards to the discussion on limitations of the study. Full-time faculty who carry the rank of “Assistant” and “Associate” professor are the faculty eligible for participation in the study. Ten participants are interviewed in the case study. Mosaic University listed 47 faculty as eligible participants. The author did not expect the number of null responses to the invitation to participate in the study. Some participants of the study offered varied theories for such a low response rate during the interviews. Three separate participants indicated they experienced a lack of faculty response and involvement when soliciting institutional wide communication or feedback at Mosaic University. Also, as will be discussed in Chapter 4, four participants responded to witnessing faculty quit Mosaic University. The low response rate for participation could be from faculty planning on leaving the institution, and thus, not wishing to take part in a study concerning the institution.

Per feedback from the pilot of the Interview Protocol, one pilot-participant stated they felt the nature of the entire study could be considered very sensitive, since participants are essentially asked to discuss both personal experiences from their past in addition to current experiences at their present place of employment. During a discussion concerning Mosaic University faculty demographics, one participant freely relayed that, because Mosaic University is a new institution, many faculty members are young and in their first full-time position. The participant deduced these younger faculty may be hesitant to participate in a study concerning their

involvement with their current institution of employment. The participant indicated that, per experience, some faculty would not take part in any study or activity they perceived may jeopardize their employment. The author's belief is that the turnover within the institution, coupled with the sensitive nature of the case study, affected the response rate.

Some participants gave what the author considered to be guarded responses when asked about experiences at a tenured and non-tenured institution. The author believes that, with the time allotted for questioning, each faculty gave responses which provide highlights and personal perceptions of their journey, rather than a detailed response of their journey to Mosaic University. Additionally, the author did not probe into participant's employer of choice, or "dream job", and whether not the participant is currently working at their employer of choice. Such a question, in the author's opinion, would likely not elicit a reliable response, as the participant may be hesitant to speak disparagingly of their current employer.

Institutional characteristics unique to Mosaic University. ¶The research study examines faculty at Mosaic University to better understand why credentialed faculty choose to take a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. The findings of the study allow for the creation of recommendations focused on providing best practices for recruitment, retention, and development of non-tenured faculty at both new and existing institutions. Though the case study's recommendations are meant to be applicable across all higher education, Mosaic University's STEM focused curriculum and facilities make the institution an outlier as compared to other interdisciplinary universities. Mosaic University can target STEM faculty with the lure of high-end facilities and equipment, funded by partnerships and research grants from private industry. As such, new, non-STEM driven institutions may or may not have the financing for

facilities comparable to that of Mosaic University's. Such facilities are, presumably, desirable to STEM faculty and may factor into their choice to accept the position at Mosaic University.

Mosaic University is currently the only institution of its kind. Of note is that the case study does not discuss with detail the financial aspects of the ramifications of starting a new institution, nor the potential costs of implementing said recommendations. Mosaic University listed revenue factors specific only to financing available by state programs with parameters exclusive to Florida, such as lottery funds and PECO funds. As such, the author cannot assume the available operating revenue of said new institutions is more or less than those of Mosaic University. However, the recommendations fall into categories related to efficient utilization of available human capital. The costs to develop the following recommendations will be the cost related to using qualified human capital within the institution to develop effective institutional plans of recruitment, retention, and development of non-tenured faculty.

Female representation within the study. Academia should represent a medium in which faculty are hired, promoted, and given leadership positions through the merit of qualification, achievement, and performance. Females represent 42% of all full-time faculty at universities (National Center for Education Statistics, 2018), but only 36% of the employees at Mosaic University. For the questions within the study, the author chose to use “umbrella questions” to create structure and chronicle experiences. The purpose of doing so allows for the Interview Protocol questions to be applicable to any faculty member, regardless of gender, race, or ethnicity. For example, asking about experiences during graduate school is a question which elicits a response from all participants, as, per the job requirements of Mosaic University, all participants would have completed some level of graduate school to teach at Mosaic University. However, each question is meant to elicit a response unique to each individual, as the graduate

school experience of a female might be different from a male. Simply put, Mosaic University does not have enough of a representation of female faculty to interview and create an effective plan of action with regards to attracting female faculty to new institutions. As such, the recommendations created from analysis of the findings act as general suggestions and best practices for recruiting, developing, and retaining non-tenured faculty for both future and existing state institutions without tenure systems.

Delimitations

The study is confined to examining the anticipatory socialization, organizational socialization, and socialization experienced by Mosaic University faculty which ultimately influences the individual choice to accept a position at Mosaic University. The study is delimited to interviews with ten individuals who are current faculty members at Mosaic University. The interviews take place between February 2018 and May 2018.

Operational Definitions

Listed below are operational definitions of terms used throughout the study. Important to note is that much research mentioned in the literature review regarding contingent faculty classifies contingent faculty as adjunct and non-tenure-track faculty, due to the high probability that part-time and full-time, non-tenured faculty are often studied together under the classification of “contingent” (Kezar, 2013). In studies which mention non-tenure track faculty, the authors of the study mean salaried faculty, who are continuously employed at an institution, and likely, not on an academic term-to-term basis. Studies which refer to adjunct faculty identify faculty who are paid per course, and on a term-to-term contract.

Anticipatory socialization. ¶The process by which an individual experiences the requirements, responsibilities, and duties of a position in an organization they inspire to join by working alongside a member of the organization (Merton & Kitt, 1950).

Attribution Theory. ¶The theory that individuals prescribe their own interpretations of circumstances to explain decision making (Weiner, 1972)

Constructivist paradigm. ¶The constructivist philosophical paradigm assumes that the learning process experienced by participants occurs through their social and environmental interactions (Kukla, 2000).

Continuance commitment. ¶Continuance commitment is the extent to which an individual believes they need to stay at their place of employment due to no other opportunities of employment existing for the individual (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

Employer of choice. ¶The identification that an organization's employees internally rank the organization as their first option of employment (Herman & Gioia, 2000).

Learned helplessness theory. ¶The theory that individuals ascribe their present, undesired situation to external, unstable conditions, rather than evaluate any controllable, internal elements, which if adjusted, may change the current circumstances of the individual (Silegman, 1975).

Organizational socialization. ¶The process by which an employee becomes oriented into the responsibilities, duties, organizational function, and organizational roles within the employee's place of work (Feldman, 1981).

Socialization¶The process in which people observe the functions required to be proficient members of society (Cooley, 1902).

Conclusion

Federal and state financial support for higher education institutions drastically declined in the past 30 years (Mitchell, Leachman, & Masterson, 2010). Many institutions opt to eliminate tenure-track positions to combat the reduction in funding (Kezar & Maxey, 2013). As such, Ph.D. candidates can no longer expect to enter tenure-track positions upon graduation. Some graduates elect to accept positions at institutions which, altogether, do not offer tenure. The following case study answers the research question, why do credentialed faculty choose to take a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state public university? The results of the study contribute to the field of research in two specific ways. First, little currently available research exists which analyzes a faculty member's choice to work at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. The study will fill the current void of research related to the phenomenon of non-tenured faculty at such institutions. Second, the findings of the study allow the author to craft recommendations for stakeholders and policy makers in higher education for more effective recruitment, retention, and development of non-tenured faculty. The implementation of the recommendations will yield improved work environments, hiring practices, and employee morale.

The author uses the theoretical lens of socialization as means to explore the experiences of the faculty at Mosaic University to better understand their reasoning for choosing to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state public university. Additionally, the author takes the constructivist philosophical paradigm stance in that, the socialization experiences of the faculty during their undergraduate, graduate, and academic careers affected their choice to take a position at Mosaic University. The study uses interviews as part of a qualitative case study with ten faculty to uncover said experiences. In the next chapter, the author discusses available

research related to a non-tenured faculty member's choice to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state public university.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The dissertation examines the choice of faculty to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state public university. The literature review considers fields of research regarding the experience of tenured and non-tenured faculty, the potential experiences facing those who choose to wait for a tenure track position, the current employment environment for higher education faculty, and identification of the experiences and issues which affect a faculty member's choice to accept a non-tenured position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. The literature review's purpose is to identify both available and missing research to provide context in which to better understand a faculty member's choice related to employment. The chapter also presents research to support the theoretical lens of socialization used in the study.

Literature Review Purpose

The available literature regarding the current state of tenure, institutional governance, and the academic job market varies drastically in subjectivity and bias (Kezar & Sam, 2013). Selected research can be used to construct a framework depicting an inaccurate portrayal of the working conditions of tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty. To provide an accurate presentation and discussion of the factors leading instructors to choose employment off of the tenure track, specifically at Mosaic University, a review of the merits and drawbacks of the use of tenure by institutions, life experiences of non-tenure-track faculty, and a discussion on non-tenured faculty's interaction with tenured and tenure-track faculty is appropriate. Similarly, a

review of the possible effects facing higher education, due to the increase in instructors accepting non-tenure-track faculty positions, is appropriate to further articulate the value of the results of the study.

Gap in Literature Related to Non-Tenure Universities and Faculty

A unique element of Mosaic University is that it is a new institution. Additionally, Mosaic University is the one of the few four-year universities in America which is part of a state postsecondary system but does not offer tenure. No literature currently exists regarding the understanding of a faculty member's choice to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state public university. Associated literature exists which allows higher education stakeholders to draw conclusions as to why a faculty member would choose a full-time position at a non-tenure institution. Literature regarding the difficulty of the life of an adjunct faculty member (Kezar, 2013), the stress of earning and keeping a tenure position (Malesic, 2016), and a recent flood of Ph.D. graduates and academic job seekers to the job market (Larson, Ghaffarzadegan, & Xue, 2014) all provide insight into why a faculty member takes a position at a non-tenure granting institution.

Options Exist for Faculty Outside of Careers in Tenured-Academia.¶ Many observers may arbitrarily assign the choice to accept a position at Mosaic University to the probability that the faculty member had no other offers of employment available to them. For example, should a credentialed academic seeking employment be denied for tenure positions, the individual has the option to begin looking for adjunct positions. Kezar (2013) reflects on the difficulty of adjunct faculty to secure enough work to constitute full-time employment, and provides some support to the argument that the choice to accept a position at a non-tenure-granting institution is based in part on financial necessity. However, assigning financial security as the sole explanation for

accepting a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university becomes a questionable hypothesis when juxtaposed to the availability of non-academic positions available to individuals with advanced, academic degrees. Well respected, national consulting firms such as Bain, McKinsey and Phillips, and Boston Consulting, offer a variety of positions for Ph.D. graduates (Venkatraman, 2014). Boston Consulting utilizes a recruitment division to seek out prospects with advanced degrees, with such candidates accounting for 20% of their new hires. (Venkatraman, 2014). Outside of consulting, nationally, companies increased the educational requirements for employment consideration (Dishman, 2016), making those with advanced degrees more desirable candidates (Dishman, 2016).

The desire to choose a position at a non-tenure-granting institution also relates to self-actualization (Maslow, 1943), meaning the participant finds fulfillment in working in academia, rather than choosing the position solely for the fulfillment of their own physiological and safety needs (Maslow, 1943). If an individual chooses the self-fulfillment of working in academia over the private sector, it is not unreasonable to assume such individuals would desire to work in a tenure-earning position, since tenure is widely considered to bring financial security, job security, and career autonomy (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001).

Review of the Tenure in the Expanding Higher Education Landscape

A review of the progression of faculty employment with the American higher education system provides context regarding the changes in higher education which led to the current decline of tenure positions and rise of non-tenure-track faculty.

Non-tenured positions. ¶Two types of non-tenured positions exist for prospective faculty, which are often categorized with the title of full-time non-tenure track faculty and adjunct faculty (Ambrose, Huston, & Norman 2005). Collectively, the two positions may be

referred to as contingent faculty (AAUP 2003). Distinguishing between full-time faculty and adjunct faculty is difficult because some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty are classified as adjunct faculty, with a workload of that of a full-time faculty, yet without the similar title (Straumsheim, 2013). Some contingent faculty are employed at one or multiple institutions (Straumsheim, 2013). The positions may vary in name and condition per institution, but fundamentally, they share similar characteristics in terms of unstable job security, lack of involvement in institutional governance, and unavailability of resources equal to those of tenured colleagues (Kezar, 2013; Kezar & Maxey, 2012). Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty positions are traditionally salary based, and, in terms of job categorization, work in positions with the title of lecturer or instructor (Kezar & Maxey, 2013). Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty currently comprise 18.8% of the academic workforce (Kezar & Maxey, 2013).

Often, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty secure outside professional positions that provide compensation suitable to maintain secure employment at a single institution (Kezar, 2012). Full-time, non-tenure track faculty are appointed to either single-year or multi-year contracts, with institutional variation in the guarantee of the contract renewal (Kezar, 2012). However, faculty categorized as adjunct often face worse working conditions than individuals who are full-time faculty. Kezar and Maxey (2013) report that adjunct faculty are paid near minimum wage salaries, required to teach difficult course material, given course workloads considered higher than normal, considered ineligible for faculty benefits, and only secured in employment through the end of each academic term. Research suggests that adjunct faculty take positions at multiple institutions to sustain a living wage (Dolan, Hall, Karlsson, & Martinak, 2013, p. 40). Full-time faculty enjoy both higher pay and better benefits than adjuncts (Kezar, 2012). Kezar and Maxey (2013) and the AAUP (2003), in their recommendations to policy

makers of higher education, advocate that decreasing dependence on adjunct and part-time faculty should be at the forefront of administration's staffing processes.

Kezar and Sam (2010a) suggest that full-time employment at a single institution is more attractive than employment across multiple institutions to create the equivalent of a full-time position. Kugler (2013) provides insight into details of the adjunct faculty work condition:

- Adjuncts, on average, receive \$2700 per course, per semester.
- 79% of adjuncts do not receive health benefits.
- 86% do not receive retirement.
- Adjuncts have little input in institutional governance.
- Adjuncts have restricted access to institutional resources (offices, computers, etc.)

Adjunct faculty, when used correctly, can benefit institutions. Adjuncts are vital in situations where financial constrictions do not necessitate the use of a full-time or tenured faculty position for certain courses (Stenerson, Blanchard, Fassiotto, Hernandez, & Muthe, 2010). Specifically, adjuncts are in demand for highly specialized courses as part of larger majors offered by institutions (Goodman, 2015). Yet these positions often go to full-time professionals, who are already employed, and not the unemployed or under employed adjunct faculty member seeking full-time work (Gordon, 2015).

As higher education enrollment grows (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2016a), the budgets of higher education institutions may not immediately grow at the rate of enrollment (Oliff, Palascious, Johnson, and Leachman, 2013), meaning short-term staffing solutions are needed. As result, adjuncts are used during said adjustment periods (Modern Language Association, 1994). Despite their need to fill shortcomings, research suggests adjuncts should be not used as long terms solutions by

institutions to fill major roles in departmental vacancies (Modern Language Association, 1994; Stenerson, Blanchard, Hernandez, & Muth, 2010; Kezar & Maxey, 2013). Rather, adjuncts should be used to defer the course load of other full-time faculty until the department or institution can rectify staffing needs in a more favorable manner (Modern Language Association, 1994; Stenerson, Blanchard, Hernandez, & Muth, 2010; Kezar & Maxey, 2013).

However, research regarding the staffing of adjunct faculty suggest many institutions are over-dependent on adjunct faculty, to the extent that the institutions borderline exploit their employed adjunct cohort (Lunenberg, 2012; Benton, 2011, p. A49). In some cases, adjuncts are used to teach large portions of courses in departments (Benton, 2011 p. A49). Staffing teaching sections with an adjunct majority presents many ethical problems within academia. First, the practice is an abuse of the adjuncts. Most institutions refuse to pay adjunct faculty members a salary commensurate with their assigned workload (Kezar, 2012). Nor do many institutions provide adjunct faculty with compensation benefits similar to the tenured or full-time faculty within the department (Kezar, 2012). Secondly, employing an adjunct majority fails the students within the institution, as research suggests most adjuncts may not have the resources and support needed to provide quality instruction (Chickering & Gemson 1991; DeSantis, 2011). To further elaborate, Chickering and Gemson (1991) state that the first principle of good practice for undergraduate learning is to provide contact in and out of the classroom with students. Many adjuncts convey they rarely receive the resources to adequately perform teaching duties inside the classroom, let alone have the space or resources to work with students outside of the classroom (DeSantis, 2011). Studies and publications on adjunct faculty identify the higher education community is aware of the demoralizing employment conditions adjunct faculty face (Caruth & Caruth, 2013; Kezar & Maxey, 2013; Kugler, 2013). Yet, the overall response to

ceasing reliance upon and improving conditions for adjunct faculty within the higher education system is minimal (Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, & August, 2012).

Faculty Turnover. Studies show that tenure-track positions are not available at the rate they once were (Ginsberg, 2011), but also identifies institutions will continue to open and fill tenure-track positions (Jaschik, 2013; Rogers, 2013). However, the looming retirement of aging tenured faculty in the next few decades may sharply decrease the amount of tenured faculty in higher academia (Campbell, 2016). The Great Recession of 2008 delayed the retirement options of some tenured faculty, meaning that those already tenured may stay employed for decades to come (Campbell, 2016). Tenure is declining, but tenure is not dead. Until the mass retirement of tenured faculty occurs, under the current model, full-time and part-time non-tenure-track faculty will work in environments where tenured faculty exist.

The sustainability of an institution is reliant on a steady influx of new talent for a multitude of reasons. New employees fill openings from terminated, retired, or resigned former employees. Additionally, new employees provide a work force for expanding departments and programs. Ideally, an effective orientation of new hires results in said hires receiving the opportunity to offer new, prospective ideas and experience within the organization, while continuing to uphold the core institutional culture and values (Coleman & Kleiner, 1999). The continuing trend of eliminating tenured jobs and increasing reliance on non-tenure-track faculty inevitably leads to an academic labor environment where the employed non-tenure-track faculty may have comparable qualifications and credentials to the tenured faculty in the institution of employment (Wescott, 2015). Yet, the non-tenured faculty are unable to earn tenure and the privileges associated (Wescott, 2015).

Tenure positions are not awarded. Rather, they are earned through a stringent peer-review process on an institutional basis (AAUP, 1940). Inevitably though, in institutions which begin to employ more non-tenured faculty than tenured faculty, non-tenured faculty morale will lower by watching colleagues and coworkers enjoy the inherent benefits of tenure (Wescott, 2015). The large number of individuals earning terminal degrees suggests a high probability of availability of instructors to fill open on-tenure track roles (Iasevoli, 2015).

If a culture exists to where the tenured faculty are the sole administrators in charge of governance, studies show the disproportionate work environment culture will have a negative effect on the autonomy of workers and will lead to lowered employee morale and job satisfaction (Herzberg, 1969). Lowered moral and job satisfaction is shown to directly correlate to lowered productivity and higher turnover (Herzberg, 1969). Such issues have an adverse financial effect on the higher education institutions. Much like in any other industry, turnover in higher education is costly for institutions who lose employees (Iarrobino, 2006). Costs of turnover within the realm of higher education include recruitment costs, training and onboarding costs, development costs, loss or productivity costs, and loss of fundraising revenue (Iarrobino, 2006). The Center for American Progress (Boushey & Glynn, 2013) proposed that organizational costs of turnover for a highly skilled employee, such as a faculty member, is 213% of the position's salary. Merging the 213% estimate with reports showing that adjunct faculty earn between \$20,000 to \$25,000 a year (Sanchez, 2013), cycling through adjuncts on yearly basis can cost over \$53,000 per adjunct. Such a loss is a number closer to the cost of paying a full-time professor's salary. Understanding the high costs of turnover conveys the need for institutions to enact standards which combat the potential for antagonism between those faculty who have tenure and those who do not.

Previous negative experiences with tenure. Tenure has a current and historical significance which protects academic freedom and basic principles of free speech, both of which are also protected by constitutional law (Nelson, 2010). Social equality theories found in the academic fields of humanities and social sciences, which inherently promote discussions on topics concerned with direct impact on social and cultural change (Bate, 2011), are often cited under the banner of academic free thought when defending the need for tenure (Trachtenberg, 1996). Social advances such as the Civil Rights movements of the 1960s (Wallenstein, 2008), which carried staunch support from and vitriol towards academic institutions, can be seen as social ideals in need of institutional protection of tenure.

Despite tenure's ability to protect tenants of academia and free thought, debate exists regarding universally effective use of tenure in present day academia (Pearce, 1999; NPR, 2013). A common criticism by tenure detractors is the perception that tenured faculty are prone to lack of motivation, and thus, become complacent in both their teaching and researching duties and responsibilities (Pearce, 1999). While this notion is not false in some instances (Pearce, 1999), assuming that all tenured faculty meet this stereotype is irresponsible and detrimental for the future of tenured positions. Outliers of excellent to poor faculty with tenure can shape each state, region, and institutional administration's perception of the effectiveness of tenure systems (Flaherty, 2017).

Some research suggests credibility to the claim of complacency in terms of classroom productivity. Wetherbe (2013) discusses the lack of classroom teaching innovation institutions receive from tenured faculty, citing a 2011 UCLA report that "of 6,768 male teachers of science, technology, engineering, and math found 70% relied on lecture, while only 33% used student inquiry-type methods". Such statistics counteract studies focused on effective in-class teaching

methods such as Savery and Duff (2009), who assert that instruction using problem-based learning techniques proves more successful in student retention, as compared to standard lecture. Further advancing Wetherbe's findings is a report by the National Bureau of Economic Research (2011), which finds that non-tenure-track professors offer benefits towards learning retention in different ways than tenured professors.

Additionally, as cited by Wetherbe (2013), a multitude of reports rank the United States higher education systems poorly, in terms of productivity, compared to other countries. As cited by Wetherbe, the National Science Foundation (2013) reported that the U.S. is behind in the publication of engineering and science articles, as well as the number of articles cited in other publications. Wetherbe suggests that the lack of citations is due to institutional tenure promotion processes placing heavy reliance on publication, even though the "... subject matter may be static and less critical." In terms of why such trends may go unnoticed in higher education institutions, Tierney (1999) states that "Researchers and policy-makers often confuse teaching productivity, quality, effectiveness, and time allocation, and mistake faculty input (e.g., hours spent teaching) for student learning" (p. 61).

With regards to in-class teaching performance, an additional attack on tenure systems is that receiving tenure provides the security for faculty to become lazy in their teaching, research, and service responsibilities to their institution (Riley, 2011). Certainly, as with any profession, some tenured faculty might fit the "lazy" characteristic, if used within the context of delivering sub-standard instruction to students, contributions to research, and service to their institution. However, defining and standardizing a metric of "lazy" is hard to substantiate, much less prove. Arguments are made that tenure, as it currently stands within the American higher education system, does not allow for tenured faculty to maintain a balanced level of research and teaching;

publication requirements placed on tenured faculty are often steep when juxtaposed to the required teaching loads (Cummins, 2014).

Other studies show tenure does encourage innovation in research and teaching (Pain, 2014). When tenured instructors are free from the threat of dismissal, such freedom allows for research in unique fields and with methods which may not be available to similar researchers in areas of the private sector (Pain, 2014). The freedom from removal is also rooted in the fact that removal of a tenured faculty member is a costly endeavor (Amacher & Meiners, 2004). The critique of tenure is a circular argument, which makes the case against tenure difficult to objectively prove. Essentially the argument is as follows:

- Professors receive tenure for being at the top of their field (AAUP, 1940).
- Once a professor receives tenure, the professor loses the motivation to stay at the top of their field, and thus begins providing substandard work (Wetherbe, 2013; Tierney, 1999).
- Removal of the tenured professor is an expensive and arduous process, and so, the tenured professor is not removed (Amacher & Meiners, 2004).
- The professor is then no longer considered at the top of their field, and thus, does not warrant the earned tenure (Riley, 2011).

Pre- and post- tenure review systems have been implemented by many institutions (Edwards, 1997). For example, the University of Texas requires annual evaluations of tenured professors, which mandates two consecutive negative evaluations could lead to the option of dismissal (Basu, 2012b). The University of Hawaii's tenure review process "tended to enhance faculty morale and sense of purpose and engagement in their disciplines" (Goodman, 1994, p.

93). This process stands in stark contrast to the 1983 American Association of University Professors stance on post-tenure-evaluation, which states that:

Periodic formal institutional evaluation of each post-probationary faculty member would bring scant benefit, would incur unacceptable costs, not only in money and time but also in dampening of creativity and of collegial relationships, and would threaten academic freedom.

A post-tenure review process should exist to make already successful faculty even more effective in their jobs (Flaherty, 2014). At the same time, as stated by Basu (2012b) a post-tenure review process should ease and expedite the removal proceedings of unfit, tenured professors. Not all institutions have such processes.

Instances of failure in institutional, tenure approval systems. Research suggests that the tenure system, as currently constructed, shows problematic instances regarding quality of teaching and professional motivation (Figlio, Schapiro, & Soter, 2015). To assume that in the American Higher Education System, that every program, in every department, in every institution can implement a system which protects academic freedoms, while also creating safeguards against complacency, is ill-considered. Instances of poor-performing professors unable to be removed is difficult to track, especially if institutions do not report all occurrences of negligence by the underperforming faculty. Van Alysne (1971) suggests that, though standards which justify adequate cause for dismissal are determined on an institutional basis, no uniformity exists across governing bodies on a national level.

Research identifies that supervisors and colleagues are shown to be the leading factors in turnover (TinyPulse, 2015), meaning that it is not unreasonable to assume individuals leave tenure-granting institutions based upon their past employment experiences. Abuse of power by a

tenured authority in an institution is the type of justification, reasoning, or determining factor (Clarke, 1986) which could influence the choice of an instructor to take a position at a non-tenure granting institution.

The Academic Employment Landscape

To accurately examine the state of tenured and non-tenured positions, both of which have factors determining the study's participants choice for employment, a discussion is needed on the current employment environment in higher education. Though higher education institutions face many obstacles since the Great Recession of 2008, three issues specifically face recent, advanced degree holding graduates in their attempts to become faculty. The specific issues are:

- A decrease in funding to four-year institutions from government entities.
- An increase in unfavorable support of tenure.
- An increase of doctoral graduates into the marketplace.

All three issues collectively create an atmosphere of unfavorable conditions and reduced institutional support to prospective faculty hires.

Federal and state governments continue to decrease funding to four-year institutions.¶An understanding of the overall governmental decline in financial support to higher education creates an overview of the current academic job market in terms of the availability of tenure positions. Tenure-track positions are disappearing at least in part due to choices made about finances. The influx in available Ph.D. holding candidates created a surplus in academic job seekers in a market already not favorable to employment, due to the decrease in funding to higher education (Grafton & Townsend, 2008).

A major cost of running academic institutions is the cost to staff faculty. In the academic job market, contingent faculty are much cheaper to hire than tenured faculty (Kezar & Maxey,

2013). Determining a true national average in terms of total compensation for a tenured faculty member is difficult to track across institutions, due to the numerous variables which factor into employment, such as benefits, salary, time-off, vacation, and incentives; all of which vary greatly by institution. An additional cost facing higher education administrations is meeting the demands caused by the influx in attendance (Marcus, 2014). Overall, government funding has not matched the increase in operation costs of institutions (Oliff, Palascious, Johnson, & Leachman, 2013).

The Great Recession of 2008 led to decreases in overall funding to four-year institutions (Oliff, Palascious, Johnson, & Leachman, 2013). Research indicates that states cut per-student spending by an average of 21% between the fiscal years of 2008 and 2014 (Young Invincibles, 2016), and an increase in tuition and fees. A closer examination of states which drastically cut funding to higher education shows the extent of the decline in higher education support. In South Carolina, since 2008, the state decreased the budget allotment to the higher education system from 13% annually to 8% annually (Davis, 2016). The state's overall reduction in commitment to higher education is \$300 million (Davis, 2016). To put this in perspective, the prison system of South Carolina's state budget allotment is 9% (Davis, 2016). Wisconsin's Governor Scott Walker recently announced plans to cut Wisconsin's budget for higher education by \$300 million (Bosman, 2016). Louisiana recently prepared for budget cuts as high as \$200 million to the higher education system (AP, 2016). Kansas reduced higher education by 4%, which resulted in the state's two largest universities, University of Kansas and Kansas State, implementing a decrease of 5% in their overall yearly operating budget (Seltzer, 2017). From 2010 to 2017, Mississippi decreased higher education funding by 4.5% (Norwood, 2017). Such

massive loss of financial support for higher education at the state-level has a direct effect on the type and number of faculty used at these institutions (Jaschik, 2013).

Institutions must make accommodations to compensate for the loss of funding. Even in Florida and Georgia, policymakers were forced to increase the scholastic requirements of eligibility for students to qualify for state-funded tuition programs due to the increase in cost to educate the growing number of students eligible for the tuition program (McGlade & Travis 2016; Davis, 2016). For many institutions, declining to fill tenure-track positions is one example of an extreme cost cutting measure (Glenn, 2016).

Institutions offset depletion of salary and benefits budgets from existing tenured faculty by using contingent faculty to teach introductory courses (Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2004). In some fields, introductory courses usually do not require the instructor to hold a Ph.D., and as result, the institutions may use graduate students or adjunct faculty to teach these courses (Flaherty, 2016). Employing tenured instructors to teach 400 and 500 level course serves a two-fold purpose, in that the instructors are then also qualified to teach graduate-level courses. Graduate programs generate a stable income for four-year degree granting institutions, as well as offer institutions a chance at increasing their scholastic recognition, based upon published research and graduate placement (Pelletier, 2012).

Political influence affects job availability in higher education.¶Reduced government support for higher education is not limited to the removal of funding via state and federal budgetary cuts. Rapid administrative growth only heightens the concerns of political-ideological influence on the higher education system (Marcus, 2014). A common justification for the reduction of tenure is the cost to hire and compensate a tenured professor (Wetherbe, 2013). While tenured salary faculty are expensive (Beam, 2010), administrative costs of running and

sustaining four-year institutions continue to substantially rise (Marcus, 2014). Institutions currently hire administrative employees at a rate that continuously increases the student-to-administrator ratio within institutions (Marcus, 2014). Such growth indicates that new administrative positions are created, rather than backfilled, at these institutions. Rapid growth would, hopefully, indicate a more diverse demographic population in terms of race, sex, and creed, acting as the governing body of an institution. Yet, few universal guarantees exist to ensure diverse viewpoints within administration. Should the institutional administrative and governing body suddenly find itself the majority and with the desire to remove un-likeminded employees, tenure offers the protection against such action.

Potentially, an individual may elect to take a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university because of the probability that the state will more readily support a non-tenured institution as opposed to a tenured institution. States who desire to remove tenure show they do not support the state funds to go towards paying the tenured salaries of professors within state institutions. This thought process is an issue because it further exacerbates problems stemming from the overall decrease in funding higher education institutions receive. The decreases in funding directly contributed to the rise of contingent faculty (Rodgers, 2013). Contingent faculty are widely used as short-term employment options due to funding decreases. Short-term employment of a contingent faculty member who is seeking full-time employment is an issue in higher education because term-to-term employment and, thus, a perceived lack of institutional support, are shown to have adverse psychological ramifications on contingent faculty (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Fear of losing one's job, as well as perceived loss of support from peers, can cause responses such as *presenteeism*, in which employees attend work but endure levels of stress which make it difficult to perform expected job duties (Aronsson, Gustafsson, & Dallner,

2000). The lack of support can result in low job satisfaction and workplace morale (Aronsson, Gustafsson, & Dallner, 2000). In turn, low job satisfaction and workplace morale is directly linked to diminished employee productivity (Aronsson, Gustafsson, & Dallner, 2000). In summary, the decreased support to higher education from government entities not only strips valuable resources from institutions of higher education, but also places an extreme strain on current human capital.

The increase of institutions which offer exclusively non-tenured roles parallels with the disappearance of tenure positions. The research serves as examination of the experiences which drive faculty to a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. Yet, the need for the research itself conveys the seriousness of a much broader issue facing academia, which is the disappearance of tenure. The removal of tenure in higher education gained support to the extent that non-tenure institutions in the private, public, for-profit, and not-for-profit sector now exist (Allen, 2013). Van Alstyne defines tenure as an affirmation by an academic institution that an individual's "professional security and academic freedom will not be placed in question without the observance of academic due process (Van Alstyne, 1971, p. 328)." Van Alstyne's definition of tenure establishes two elements key to modern day tenure, which are professional security and academic freedom. These tenets are the cornerstone a university's function to provide a place to gain "universal knowledge" (Newman, 1996). The ability and freedom of both students and faculty to learn, disseminate, and share universal knowledge becomes ever paramount in the increasingly divided political landscape.

Ideally, tenure is a system by which faculty are free from threat of unjust removal, censorship of research, and censorship of teaching, despite the current political environment. Tenure acts as an institutional and societal structure to "safe guard(s) the freedom of faculty

members to speak, write, and associate however they choose (Tierney, 2004, p. 161).” Van Alysne (1971, p. 330) writes of tenured faculty members:

“(a tenured faculty member) ... benefit(s) society through the innovation and dissemination of perspectives and discoveries aided by his investigations, without fear that he must accommodate his honest perspectives to the conventional wisdom.”

Tenure also gives instructors the freedom to ensure alternative viewpoints, contradictory to the governing body, are shared without threat of reprisal, discipline, or removal. Though tenure protects faculty from unjust removal, abandoned tenure positions are often replaced with full-time, non-tenure track positions (Finklestein, Seal, & Schuster, 1998). Over the coming decades, as more tenured professors leave due to retirement or career change, tenured professors will be a minority in the higher education workforce (Finklestein, Seal, & Schuster, 1998). As shown with the aforementioned removal of Tom Ross in North Carolina, the faculty employed in higher education institutions can be shaped by political affiliation and environment, rather than merit and qualification. Therefore, if the disappearance of tenure leaves faculty vulnerable to political climates, the full-time, non-tenured faculty of the future must be able to navigate changing external environments to protect the fundamental cornerstone of higher education, which is academic freedom. Such political factors highlight the need to conduct the study, and thus provide recommendations to policy makers on how to effectively implement non-tenured faculty in institutions to safeguard the tenants of academic freedom outside the protections the tenure position allows.

Institutions train academics for jobs that do not exist.¶The sheer amount of available, credentialed academics competing for tenured positions in the academic labor market is likely a factor contributing to an individual’s choice to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure

granting, state university. The decline in tenured and tenure-track positions creates steep competition amongst the abundance of qualified applicants in academia for those positions. As previously stated, around 35.5% of all positions in academia are tenure track. Such low numbers of availability pitted against a high numbers of Ph.D. graduates make for levels of competition seen in few other professions (June, 2012). The National Science Foundation shows that large numbers of Ph.D. graduates are either unemployed or underemployed (2012, accessed through Larson, Ghaffarzadegan, & Xue, 2014). Through the lens of examining doctoral programs as training departments for a graduate's return to academia, the small number of positions open, institutions are training Ph.D. candidates for positions that do not currently exist. An unfortunate truth is that institutions use an abundance non-tenured faculty, due to the current high availability of contingent faculty (Edmonds, 2015).

The oversupply of faculty in the job market drives the bargaining power of faculty down, and the authoritative power of administrations up, thus allowing instances of the disparate treatment of adjuncts (McPherson & Schapiro, 1999). The market, in many academic fields, is flooded with Ph.D. graduates and advanced degree-holding aspiring faculty who take satisfaction teaching and want to dedicate their life to the discipline of both research and instruction (June, 2013). To further complicate the matter, during the Great Recession, many administrations enacted cost cutting measures by removing tenured faculty (Ginsberg, 2011), which in turn, not only removes a position of tenure, but adds to the candidate pool of tenure-track seeking applicants for new employment. Simple economics of supply and demand show that, now, Ph.D. graduates have little bargaining power in their ability to command a high salary or prominent position. One study from *The Economist* (2010) determined that if position openings in life sciences increased at 5% a year, then only 20% of Ph.D. graduates in these fields would earn

secure employment. Jordan Weissmann, an editor at The Atlantic, states that Ph.D. graduates “have a less than 50% chance of having a full-time job (NPR, 2013).” Weissmann also concludes the availability of jobs for Ph.D. graduates declined over the last 20 years (NPR, 2013). In 2009, the number of research doctorates awarded in the United States was 49,562; up 1.6% from 2008 (Fiegener, 2010). Data suggests graduating Ph.D.’s face an extremely competitive market for full-time employment. 16,000 tenure-track positions were listed as open between 2005 and 2009 (Larson, Ghaffarzadegan, & Xue, 2014), in addition to studies which find only 52% of doctoral granting universities positions are tenure-track (Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, & August, 2012).

Even more alarming is that the Ph.D. graduates are now, again, at the mercy of higher education institutions. Regardless of how tuition is paid, either out of pocket or through an assistantship, a Ph.D. is a difficult degree to earn. Of course, hours are spent in the classroom, on homework, on research, and on a dissertation, all under the supervision of higher-ranking faculty (Morris, 2011). However, many overlook the life trials associated with earning a Ph.D., such as living on a low income, time away from family, and the missed opportunity costs of not working in an industry job (Kenty, 2000; Acker & Haques, 2015; Rockinson-Szpakiw, Spaulding, & Knight, 2015). Ph.D. graduates endure such hardships within the confines of institutions to earn their advanced degrees (Valdez, 1982). In turn, the institutions where they earned said degrees have collectively flooded the market with Ph.D. graduates, thus making the search for full-time employment an arduous process (Hersher, 2012). As a result, recent graduates jump from the struggles of earning a Ph.D. to the struggle of finding employment, let alone desirable employment, with a Ph.D. (Dolan, Hall, Karlsson, & Martinak, 2013, p. 40.).

The abundance of available faculty in the academic labor market juxtaposed to the aforementioned discussion regarding private sector employment available to the individuals with advanced degrees highlights the need to study faculty who accept non-tenured positions at four-year, non-tenure granting, state universities. The abundance of unemployed and under employed faculty searching for jobs in the academy versus the dearth of employees to field specialized jobs in the private sector means either the faculty member values the position of the professoriate over stable income, or, doctoral programs are not providing students with the skills needed to enter into non-academic labor markets. The many doctoral programs are not intrinsically designed to produce graduates only capable of returning to the field of instruction within higher education (Arimoto, 2010). Ideally, doctoral programs should be structured to develop graduates ready to contribute to the academic and research community but must also actively incorporate measures to ensure candidates earn employment after graduation (Walker, 2008; Austin, 2002). The Ph.D. process is meant to structure the candidate's time to focus on areas which make the candidate a productive member of an intellectual community, whether that be as a faculty member or an employee in industry (Arimoto, 2010). Undoubtedly, many qualified professors do not have the energy, available funds, or resources to maintain multi-year quests to find a tenure-track position (Maisto & Khan, 2014). For a qualified candidate, the attractiveness of the private sector potentially becomes undeniable, if said candidate meanders in low-paying, adjunct roles while waiting for a tenure position (Smith, 2015). The known scarcity of tenured positions, in some instances, is detracting the best and brightest candidates from applying for said positions, and thus, causes some candidates to remove themselves from academia all together (Kezar & Maxey, 2013). The need for the study is driven by the author's assumption that unemployed and underemployed faculty choose to stay within academia out of an internal

satisfaction gained through employment as a professor. Understanding characteristics of the professoriate which faculty cite as reasons for their choice to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting university helps policy makers adjust any practices within an institution's environment or culture which may be a detriment to the positive characteristic of the professoriate, as identified by the non-tenured faculty in the study.

The unlikely prospect of an eventual tenure position.¶A factor which may influence a credentialed faculty member to take a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university is the unlikelihood of receiving a tenure position after employment for extended lengths of time in a non-tenured position. Faculty often take non-tenure track positions at institutions hoping for the chance to move into a tenure track position (AAUP, 2003). Schuster & Finkelstein (2008) indicate the longer an academic is off the tenure track, the less likely they are to receive a tenured position. No research definitively validates that institutions find life-long, full-time, non-tenure track individuals undesirable in terms of hiring said individuals into tenure-track positions (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2008). Yet, knowing the difficult life of a contingent faculty member faces off-of the tenure track, hiring committees within tenure institutions surely question the capabilities of candidates who spent years of their professional careers in non-tenured positions (Kezar & Maxey, 2013). However, a nationwide survey of adjunct faculty showed that 46% of those surveyed who pursued a full-time teaching position at a higher education institution were not hired for the position (AFT, 2010). The results show that both tenure-track and full-time positions are difficult to hire into. Instructors off-of the tenure-track may never transition to a tenured position. First-hand accounts of adjuncts who leave academia indicate the primary reason for departure is the inability to financially sustain a lifestyle consisting of years of low-wages and no benefits, which causes them to leave academia

altogether (Peligri, 2014). Additionally, the consistent increase of newly graduating Ph.D. holding individuals into the job market reduces the bargaining power of adjuncts (McKenna, 2016). Sparse employment conditions in academia prompted some academic programs to ensure their departments created materials and resources to advise Ph.D. graduates on preparation for life outside of academia (Rodgers, 2013).

The inability to transition into secure employment, such as a tenure-track position, serves as a potential catalyst for Ph.D. graduates to take non-tenure earning positions. Many tenured institutions do not offer contingent faculty the developmental opportunities or resources available to the tenured faculty within the institution (Kezar, 2012). The practice of not hiring or creating tenure track positions creates a state of limbo in terms of professional development for contingent faculty members who accept non-tenure track positions with the hope of a transition into a tenure position (Purcell, Wilton, & Elias, 2007; Ginsberg, 2011). Unfortunately, for those instructors holding out for tenure-track positions, evidence shows that the longer faculty stay out of tenure-track positions, the less desirable their skills become to institutions (Kezar & Sam, 2011). Such a wait may result in these contingent faculty eventually leaving the academic world altogether (Jaschik, 2013).

Loss of qualified scholars and reduction in governmental support for tenure.¶

Faculty leaving academia due to lack of tenure-earning positions represents a loss in talented human capital. Within the current labor market, many adjuncts possess impressive vitae yet are still unable to earn tenure-track positions (Wescott, 2015). Potentially qualified faculty who receive jobs outside of academia often consider themselves more successful than if they were still employed in academia (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007). As for Ph.D. programs, traditionally, the Ph.D. acts as training for future faculty by structuring the candidate's time to

focus on the areas of scholarly content, intellectual community, and stewardship, which makes the candidate a productive member faculty member (Arimoto, 2010). However, Ph.D. programs could soon follow undergraduate trends and structure programs for work in the business and private sector (Venkatraman, 2014), thus ensuring the candidate has the potential to pursue a faculty career or a career outside academia (Arimoto, 2010). Studies also show the reduction in research funding drives graduates to academic positions in foreign countries (Basken & Voosen, 2014). Gould (2015) provides evidence that academics seek employment in foreign countries, due to an influx of Ph.D. graduates in the United States.

The increased reliance on non-tenure-track faculty creates a complicated discussion within the academic community. When a new academic position is created, regardless of if the position is tenure-track or not, the position means one less unemployed instructor. A large volume of available jobs indicates a demand by students for higher education. Additionally, a large population of instructors means a greater chance of disseminating diverse thoughts and opinions. However, a downside of the success of institutions which rely either almost or exclusively on non-tenure-track faculty is that the success of these institutions can be used as justification for decreasing reliance on tenure within academia. Leadership within institutions choose to replace vacated tenure positions with contingent faculty (Glenn, 2016). As tenured professors either retire or leave the position, administrations infrequently keep the vacated position as tenure-track, and instead, fill the role with a contingent faculty member (Glenn, 2016). Contingent faculty positions cost less and do not require the long-term investment of a tenured faculty member (Cross & Goldenberg, 2009). Also, institutions value the option to easily remove ineffective instructors, which is easier to do with contingent faculty, rather than tenured faculty (Umbach, 2007; Kezar, 2013). Institutions which provide the resources for non-

tenure-track faculty to succeed see high levels of productivity and institutional commitment from non-tenure-track faculty (Kezar, 2013).

Adverse Employment Characteristics of Contingent Positions

The following literature further examines the expected working conditions, professional expectations, and quality of life contingent faculty experience.

Administrations view of non-tenure-track faculty. Baldwin and Chronister (2001) and Gappa and Leslie (1993) state that institutional leaders often perceive faculty in non-tenure earning positions as lacking the status and professionalism seen in tenured and tenure-track faculty. Such a position by institutional leaders is flawed due to the fact that administrations themselves play a part in shrinking the amount of tenured positions available (Kezar &Maxey, 2013). Conflicting evidence exists on the quality of work performed by faculty in non-tenure earning roles. Kezar (2013) notes several studies which show non-tenure-track faculty do not meet learning objectives associated with their assigned courses. Students who take a large number of major-related classes with non-tenure-track faculty have a lower graduation rate (Jacoby, 2006). As stated by Kezar (2013, p. 572), “Students who take courses with part time, non-tenure-track faculty perform significantly worse in follow up courses compared to students who took courses with tenure track faculty.”

Carrell and West (2008) suggest that contingent faculty do not provide the same quality of in-class instruction as their tenured counterparts, although Wetherbe (2013) indicates tenured faculty do not engage students in effective problem-based learning within the classroom, resulting in diminished retention. Kezar (2013) suggests the conclusions of studies regarding the sub-par outcomes of contingent faculty are caused by the working conditions faced by contingent

faculty. Kezar's argument claims that, if contingent faculty were given the working conditions to more closely mirror that of tenured faculty, they could perform higher quality work.

Research indicates the professional skills of tenured and contingent faculty are not varied; rather, the difference in resources provided to each cause contingent faculty to appear less productive and competent as their tenured colleagues (Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011; Kezar, 2013). A study conducted by Baldwin and Wawrzynski (2011), specifically examined full-time, non-tenure-track faculty on contracts, and compared teaching styles to those of their tenured counterparts. Findings suggested that full-time, non-tenure-track faculty prepared to teach within the classroom in similar ways to their tenured counterparts (Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011). The authors concluded, "Tenure ineligible full-timers looked more like tenured and tenure-track faculty in the way they structure their classes . . . they used active and collaborative techniques with the same frequency and spent significantly more time preparing for class" (Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011, pp. 102, 104).

Terms of employment. ¶ Institutions that do not offer tenure can remove faculty with adequate cause or simply not renew a contract (Mallon, 2000). Reasons for non-renewal or dismissal include "professional incompetence, neglect of duty, and moral turpitude or delinquency" (Mallon, 2000, p. 14). A multiple-year contract offers more security over that of a term-to-term adjunct position. Adjunct teaching contracts vary in terms of length (Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, & August, 2012). Research shows multiple-year contracts have positive effects on academia in that, faculty employed by institutions for longer periods of time create a more stable environment for the students and the department (June, 2012).

The lack of job security is a major source of job dissatisfaction for contingent faculty. Job dissatisfaction in faculty is harmful to institutions, as job dissatisfaction is directly correlated to

poor performance of the workplace responsibilities of an employee (Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, & August, 2012). Reevy and Deason (2014) found that non-tenure-track faculty often experience extreme stress and anxiety due the inability to secure long term employment. In addition to job insecurity, adjuncts stated that financial compensation and lack of promotional opportunities at their respective institutions lead to job dissatisfaction (Feldman & Trunely, 2001). For example, availability of teaching opportunities during summer months is not guaranteed, meaning less income for contingent faculty (Boldt, 2014).

Bertz and Judge (1994) provide data suggesting that higher education employees who are employed for a lengthy duration with an institution experience high levels of job satisfaction. Such findings conversely suggest that newly hired faculty experience stress regarding accepting a new job, meaning that, contingent faculty who move from position to position are likely in a current state of stress. From a purely economic and financial standpoint, employee commitment increases productivity and economical gains (Brown, McHardy, McNabb, & Taylor); institutions which provide a plan to help establish commitment and job satisfaction for employees have a positive impact on the economic capital of the institution. Multi-year contract employment in a non-tenured institution provides more security than term-to-term contract employment but does not offer the same security as tenure contracts.

Benefits.¶The option of health and retirement benefits at an institution may also play a factor in an individual's employment decision. Contingent faculty often have difficulty securing benefits at their institution of employment, thus further exacerbating the fears of unemployment (Thomsen, 2015). Contingent instructors may not be eligible for unemployment benefits in their state as unemployment is determined on a per state basis (American Federation of Teachers,

2010). Should the faculty member find themselves in a state which does not allow for these benefits, the instructors face earning a paycheck for only nine months.

Institutions also face work designation problems concerning adjuncts due to health care reform caused by the Obama-Care enactment of 2010 (Flaherty, 2012). Research shows instances of administrations reducing the workload of adjunct faculty to less than 30 hours to avoid healthcare payments (Flaherty, 2012). Based on the average adjunct salary such restrictions, which drop the adjunct faculty member to 25-hour work-week, reduces the salary of adjunct employees to under \$25,000, which is roughly half the national average for starting salary of graduates with a bachelor's degree (Kena et al, 2016).

Home life. Job insecurity causes stress for contingent faculty. The stress of job insecurity is shown to carry over into the homelife of all individuals, not just contingent faculty (Shin & Jung, 2014). For contingent faculty, non-renewal of a contract is essentially a layoff (Sobieralski & Nordstrom, 2012), but rarely are severance packages offered to adjuncts. Almost all professions carry risk of sudden unemployment, but the nature of the term-to-term contracts for contingent faculty creates an “up in the air” status of contingent faculty for the duration of their career (Bess, 1998). Such stress caused by job insecurity is shown to cause problems within the personal and home lives of the faculty (Shin & Jung, 2014)

Contingent faculty are not expected, institutionally, to perform research to the extent their tenured counterparts do primarily due to higher teaching work-loads (Kugler, 2013). However, forcing teaching loads on contingent faculty that leave no time for personal or professional advancement has the probability to cause burn out within the profession (Stout, 2013). Contingent faculty may experience longer office hours or time spent helping students, due to

having more classes than tenured faculty. Thus, time available for home-life is limited. Studies show that stress within home life affects performance within the workplace (Shin & Jung, 2014).

Salary and workload for non-tenure.¶The College and University Professional Association for Human Resources reports that between 2012-2013 the average salary for a tenured professor at a research public university was \$115,570 a year. Contrastingly, the AAUP reports full-time, non-tenure-track faculty earned a median salary of \$47,500 (Curtis & Thornton, 2013). Despite the average, the AAUP reports some full-time, non-tenure-track faculty only receive an average per course compensation of \$2,700 (Curtis & Thornton, 2013).

Research shows state funding is steadily decreasing for public institutions (Mitchell, Leachman, & Masterson, 2016). Since 2008, state agencies have decreased the amount spent per student by around \$1,598, which is roughly 18% (Mitchell, Leachman, & Masterson, 2016). The decreases in funding to public institutions increased reliance on tuition and private funding to meet the demands of supporting institutional needs (Mitchell, Leachman, & Masterson, 2016). A study released by the Center on Budget Policy and Priorities shows that since the Great Recession, tuition at four-year institutions increased by 33% nationally, which is likely an offset the reduction in government funding (Mitchell, Leachman, & Masterson, 2016).

In addition to steep tuition increases, measures such as increasing the workload of faculty members is used to equalize the decrease of funding to higher education (Flaherty, 2014). For example, Arizona State University recently raised the workload of non-tenure-track faculty in the English Department from 100 students per semester to 125 students per semester, with no increase in compensation (Flaherty, 2014). Ohio repeatedly made attempts to pass legislation to increase faculty workload (Clark, 2013). Missouri enacted budget cuts which increase faculty workloads, as well as reduced funds for research, travel, and graduate teaching assistants (Esmie,

2017). A typical teaching workload of tenured faculty at an undergraduate, doctoral granting institution is around 6.1 hours per week (Flaherty, 2013), and the workload of full-time, contingent faculty is a recommended average of three-credit courses per semester (Flaherty, 2013).

The result of over-reliance on contingent faculty is that tenured professors spend less time within the classroom, and, contingent faculty teach a larger pool of students within institutions. Full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members are paid more than adjuncts, but in many cases, only half as much as tenure-track faculty (Curtis & Thornton, 2013). Evidence also suggest that in some institutions that rely heavily on non-tenure-track faculty, situations arise where non-tenure-track faculty carry workloads, including out-of-class commitments, as large as tenured faculty (Lawrence, Ott, & Bell, 2012). As referenced with the prior discussion regarding states and higher education, institutional governing bodies and administrations consistently battle to strategically distribute diminishing resources to combat budget cuts at departmental levels. Though the allotment of resources directly affects the career and work environment all faculty, the AAUP (Beaky, Besosa, Berry, Martinez, & Bradley, 2013) reports contingent faculty are “only sometimes included in departmental and governance structures (Beaky, Besosa, Berry, Martinez, & Bradley, 2013, p. 2).” Contingent faculty can find themselves in employment situations where they receive less compensation, less job security, and less input in departmental governance, while still performing teaching duties similar to or larger than their tenured colleagues.

Correlation between working conditions and faculty productivity. Kezar conducted a study which indicates, per the author’s research into the institution, that Mosaic University may succeed because of the commitment to providing appropriate teaching and research resources to

their non-tenured faculty. A study conducted by Kezar (2013), reports that there is no definitive correlation between providing non-tenured faculty resources equal to those of their tenured counterparts within an academic department and an improvement in “student learning (Kezar, 2013, p. 179).” Kezar’s study examines contingent faculty member’s reaction to the policies and culture found within four-year institutions. Specifically, the study examines the teaching impact policies and culture have on non-tenure-track faculty (Kezar, 2013). However, as Kezar states, the study contains limitations, leading elements of the study to further be examined (Kezar, 2013). First, Kezar examines both full-time and part-time faculty over multiple institutions (Kezar, 2013). As previously stated, the plight of adjuncts suggest that answers gathered from full-time and part-time faculty could differ greatly across institutions, thus not providing an appropriate context for the experience of full-time faculty.

Second, Kezar acknowledges that the study focuses on the perceptions of the faculty, and not the actual outcomes, due to the institutions being “hesitant to share this information (Kezar, 2013, p. 180).” Regardless of the institution, academia focuses the importance of teaching outcomes of students. Revisiting the findings of Figlio, Schapiro, and Soter (2013), which suggest that students learn similarly from adjuncts compared to tenured faculty; it can be inferred that perception is not a limitation, but rather, a rational, measurable outcome which can influence the student learning outcomes. Thus, the inclusion of adjunct faculty in Kezar’s study further blurs the experiences of full-time faculty, due to the findings which suggest negative workplace experiences do not necessarily affect the teaching outcomes of non-tenured, full-time faculty.

Third, Kezar suggests another limitation of the study involves the difficulty to measure the “willingness, capacity, and opportunity for faculty to perform” (Kezar, 2013, p. 181). The author takes the stance that, across all institutions, faculty rank, workload, and resources are so

varied, a universal example of faculty is impossible to combine into one, examinable element. For example, willingness to perform in terms of an adjunct faculty may result in a positive outcome due to the hope of a future tenured position. Conversely, willingness to perform in terms of a tenured faculty may result in a negative outcome, due to a tenured faculty member's stress from attempting to achieve "high self-expectations (Crosmer, 2009)" inherent with tenured positions. Related to the case study, Mosaic University is examined as a new, non-tenure granting, four-year, state institution. Should Mosaic University produce verifiable metrics of success, such as producing published research, achieving high graduation rates, and maintaining financial sustainability, other institutions may look to study Mosaic University's achievements while using a non-tenured system of employment. Examining the faculty of Mosaic University to determine the motivating factors to accept the position at the institution, in addition to the faculty member's experiences employed at the institution, helps to establish recommendations for best practices for future, non-tenure granting institutions.

Administrations incorrect evaluation of contingent faculty. ¶ An additional reason non-tenured faculty may turn away from traditional, tenured institutions, is due to the flawed metrics many of these institutions use to judge the success of their contingent faculty. Institutional administrators use objective information such as publications, syllabi, teaching evaluations, and work history when making hiring and retention choices concerning faculty (Ezell, 2002). Further proof of the discrepancy in literature regarding non-tenure-track faculty is the study by Bland, Center, Finstad, Risbey, and Staples (2006) which concludes that non-tenure-track faculty produce low results in vital areas of faculty responsibilities such as research productivity, teaching productivity, and commitment. Berstein and Kezar's (2016) and Kezar (2013) findings that non-tenure-track faculty often do not have access to the same resources as tenured faculty,

show that, potentially, Bland, Center, Finstad, Risbey, and Staples' low results regarding output and performance are skewed by non-tenured-track faculty's inability to obtain equal workplace resources.

Despite the low productivity results of non-tenure-track faculty, Umbach (2007) states that full-time contingent faculty spend more time using "active and collaborative learning methods" (Baldwin and Wrawrynzki 2011, p. 1489) than similar tenured faculty. These results indicate providing faculty, tenured or not, with building resources, such as office and research space, increase positive, measurable learning outputs for institutions. In fact, the desire for ample work space is so prominent, such lacking resource conditions was cited as part of the conditions which led to the attempted unionization of adjunct faculty at colleges (Leatherman, 1998). Kezar (2013, p. 156) cites Gapp et al. (2007) and presents five specific characteristics that affect faculty performance, which are employment equity, academic freedom and autonomy, flexibility, professional growth, and collegiality. Kezar presupposes that, when combined, these characteristics are tantamount to the creation of an institutional culture of respect for contingent faculty (Kezar, 2013). Kezar's findings substantiate her claim that research which portrays contingent faculty negatively is often conducted using questionable methods (Kezar, 2013). Through Kezar's lens, if the adjunct faculty studied in Bland, Center, Finstad, Risbey, and Staples (2006) research were not supported with one of her five faculty performance characteristics, then Bland, Center, Finstad, Risbey, and Staples results would erroneously portray the faculty negatively.

Kezar's beliefs resonate with widely known Ohio State President Gordon Gee, who stated he believes the success of faculty is defined in a very "narrow" term (Buch, Huet, Rorrer, and Roberson, 2011, p. 41). Gee states that narrow definitions of success can frustrate faculty,

which affect work place environment and productivity; as well as, discourage well roundedness of a faculty member (Buch, Huet, Rorrer, and Roberson, 2011, p. 412). Institution's which create a culture of respect for all faculty members will increase the commitment to the organization, which will improve faculty productivity and performance outcomes (Kiesler, 1971). Such stark differences between defining success for contingent faculty and tenured faculty is potentially a reason credentialed faculty accept positions at four-year, non-tenure granting, state universities, as opposed to continuing contingent employment at traditional, tenured institutions.

Contingent Faculty Members Exclusion from Leadership Roles

Non-tenured institutions have a form of hierarchal system to ensure balance completion of institutional and departmental duties. Yet, without tenure, non-tenure, contract institutions will not have such a stark and clear divide in terms of faculty classification. As such, contract universities may provide more opportunities for autonomy in teaching, research, and service for all faculty. Tenured institutions may not have systems which allow for immediate and autonomous involvement in the institution. Such opportunity may be a factor related to an individual's choice to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university.

A common area of conflict within the faculty workplace involves the concepts of advancement and promotion (Holton & Phillips, 1995). Contingent faculty are "only sometimes" put in roles of governance (Beaky, Besosa, Berry, Martinez, and Bradley, 2013, p. 2). Contingent faculty often have similar responsibilities as full-time faculty (Costano, et al, 2007). Assuming tenure-track positions remain on the decline, academic departments will face a precarious situation of a diminished amount of tenured faculty to act in governance roles. Accurately tracking faculty vacancies and retirement rates is difficult because many institutions

may not accurately document the replacement of tenured positions with adjunct or non-tenure-track faculty (Twombly, 2005, p. 424). The result of inaccurate tracking is the potential for a drastic reduction in positions of governance within higher education, with some qualified faculty deemed ineligible to backfill those roles, due to their classification as contingent faculty (Beaky, Besosa, Berry, Martinez, and Bradley, 2013). Assuming as high as 70 % (Wilson, 2010) of all instructors are off the tenure track, eventually, there may not be enough tenured faculty to fill roles of governance (Flaherty, 2016). Such a trend may lead to a small minority of faculty, privileged to different rights and benefits, placed into the control of departmental direction, production outcomes, hiring, and advancement decisions. Such a scenario undoubtedly will affect all employees within an institution, as these elite few will have the ability to shape departmental cultures in the institution. Mosaic University is of interest to examine in that the institution can only put non-tenured faculty in governance. Examining the experience of the faculty will provide data as to the success of non-tenured faculty in governance, and thus, identify the extent to which faculty discuss the opportunity for departmental involvement as a reason for accepting a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university.

Including non-tenured faculty in governance. ¶The opportunity for inclusion for non-tenured in governance at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university may be a reason an individual accepts a position at the institution, because, historically, such opportunities for non-tenured faculty are uncommon. The AAUP (2003) reports that institutions do not encourage contingent faculty to hold governing positions within departments. Additionally, the report suggests some institutions forbid inclusion of non-tenured faculty in governance (AAUP, 2013). Contingent faculty report, rank-based mistreatment from colleagues within their institutions which supporting the AAUP report regarding suppressing contingent faculty in governance

(Cronin & Smith, 2011). Exclusion of non-tenured faculty in governance is a problem because, should institutions continue to reduce the number of tenured positions in the workplace, a small minority of tenured faculty will be governing a large majority of non-tenured faculty. Including both non-tenure-track faculty and tenured faculty in strategic planning is one solution minimize the likelihood of contempt within the work place (Hall & Hord, 2006). Research suggests employees uninvolved in decision making process within institutions have difficulty accepting the purpose of the institution's desired outcomes (Hall & Hord, 2006). McGregor states employees experience "genuine satisfaction in knowing that opinions and ideas are given consideration (McGregor, 1944, p. 60)." Including faculty in shared governance provides faculty the ability to generate interest in institutional outcomes (Ketokivi & Castañer, 2004). Faculty appreciate opportunity to provide input (Ketokivi & Castañer, 2004), even if their suggestions are not chosen as the determine course of action (Tannenbaum & Massarik, 1950).

Exclusion in the area of governance related to curriculum development hinders contingent faculty from excelling in the classroom (Lunenburg, 2011). Studies show contingent faculty are not consistently included in development of curriculum related to teaching, such as course assignments and material selection (Rodgers, 2013). Contingent faculty, especially those newly hired, are often not allowed to select the material taught, nor are they given time before the school term to prepare for the delivery of unfamiliar material (Lunenburg, 2011). Despite the professional degree earned by the contingent faculty member; the memorization and mistake-free implementation of an entire course worth of material cannot reasonably be expected of any new faculty member (Street, Maisto, Merves, & Rhoades, 2012). Becoming comfortable and secure teaching courses in the manner designed by the department takes time, yet, with lack of secure

teaching contracts, many faculty members do not have the time to wait to get better (Street, Maisto, Merves, & Rhoades, 2012; Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, & August, 2012).

Research suggests providing contingent faculty the ability to leverage material with which they are familiar is paramount to success within the classroom (Street, Maisto, Merves, & Rhoades, 2012). Inability to do so causes job dissatisfaction, and thus, low morale within the contingent faculty member (Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, & August 2012). An example of such low morale is found in a case involving the Maryland College systems. In 2012, the University of Maryland University College president, Susan Aldridge, was placed on “indefinite administrative leave (Kiley, 2012).” The faculty cited the reason for the move was the institution’s indifference towards “shared governance, and professor’s views that the administration lacked interest in academic standards (Kiley, 2012).” Responding to a survey on a scale of 1-10 (1 being lowest), 53% of the responding faculty, none of whom were tenured, rated their moral as a “3” or lower (Kiley, 2012). The prominent cited area of dissatisfaction stated no shared governance existed within departments (Kiley, 2012). Essentially, faculty were told what to teach, as well as removed from the input processes within the institution (Kiley, 2012). Such examples show how paramount the inclusion of faculty into the learning process is for morale within departments.

Contingent faculty are not developed at the same rate of tenured faculty. Contingent faculty are not given the opportunity for advancement that is offered to their tenured colleagues (Kezar, 2013). As such, a contract institution may be able to offer development opportunity, funds for attending conferences, earning certifications, and research publication to a larger pool of faculty. Once a student graduates with a doctorate degree, the responsibility to stay current on advancements within the field becomes internal, rather than institutional. As a Ph.D. candidate,

students are constantly surrounded by instructors who train the candidates to become faculty members of future departments. During candidacy, the faculty disseminate information on the characteristics of job expectations, hiring practices, teaching techniques, research skills, and variety of other elements that institutions expect from faculty members (Austin, 2002; Gardner & Barnes, 2007). The faculty of a Ph.D. student initiate the anticipatory socialization of the candidate's beliefs as to the requirements of a faculty member. Candidates experience such interaction on an almost daily basis.

However, once a Ph.D. candidate graduates and removes themselves from this role of constant learning, the individual also removes their daily interaction with his or her field (Kezar, 2013). If the recent graduate becomes a contingent faculty member, the constant training likely ceases (Kezar, 2013). Contingent faculty new to their department stated they experienced a "lack of advancement opportunities (Feldman & Turnley, 2001, p. 12)." Non-tenured faculty, at any level, cannot count on the same interaction with high-level department administrators as tenured faculty. Thus, the longer the non-tenured faculty member is removed from their Ph.D. program not on a tenure-track position, the less qualified they become in terms of opportunity to receive a tenure-track position. Moreover, once in teaching positions, non-tenure-track faculty may have trouble securing funding to do such things as attend conferences or present papers (Kezar, 2013). Often, these types of privileges are afforded to only tenured faculty, who, as result, can select who may or may not attend with them (Kezar, 2013). Some non-tenure-track may faculty may be put in a situation where the organizational structure theoretically allows them to advance but are not provided the capabilities to do so. As such, a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university will likely have a more even distribution of faculty developmental

resources, thus making the institution a desirable place to work for those individuals who are not advancing as contingent faculty.

Departmental views of contingent faculty. ¶ Institutional mistreatment of contingent faculty is not limited to only the highest-ranking, administrative officials. Kezar states that individual departments within institutions provide negative working environments for contingent faculty members. Kezar establishes cultures that emerge within departments can either be “destructive, neutral, inclusive, or learning (Kezar, 2013, p. 163)”, depending upon leadership within the department. These cultural factors were shown to shape the contingent faculty member’s “capacity, willingness, and opportunity to perform (Kezar, 2013, p. 163)”. Faculty who understood all aspects of their departmental processes, both positive and negative, were shown to be more self-aware in terms of adjusting their performance within the department as needed (Kezar, 2013). The potential for contingent faculty to transfer into tenure-track positions improved the moral within the department (Kezar, 2013, p. 163). Kezar reports a pervasive feeling that tenured faculty believe faculty without tenure-track positions or Ph.D.’s are not “qualified instructors or professionals (Kezar, 2013, p. 163)”. One area that Kezar cites which hinders contingent faculty is departmental lack of trust towards the teaching competency of contingent faculty (Kezar, 2013). Many surveyed institutions reported that their departments give contingent faculty “gateway classes” (Baldwin & Wrawrynzki, 2011, p. 1489), which include explicit instructions on how to teach the courses, thus taking away autonomy of the instructors.

Elements oft criticized about faculty of traditional, tenure, research institutions are the tenured faculty’s lack of availability to students outside of the classroom (Fields, 2007). Due to the lack of research requirements (Kugler, 2013), availability to students should be an area

contingent faculty are most utilized by their departments. Yet, some institutions implement internal rules which prohibit the extent to which contingent faculty are available to their students, in addition to other involvement restrictions, such as curriculum development (Fields, 2007 Baldwin & Wrawrynzki, 2011). For example, California State University at Fresno and George Mason University both limit the extent non-tenured faculty can be involved in curriculum (Fields, 2007). At California State University at Fresno, non-tenured faculty can advise students and assist in the development of courses but are not allowed to fully implement their efforts into the institution, due to the regulations which state that only tenured faculty are allowed such input (Fields, 2007, p. 12). Removal of autonomy creates a loss of morale in the workforce (Locke & Latham, 2002), and in turn, diminished employee productivity and higher turnover (Herzberg, 1969). Potentially, such experiences in other institutions is why faculty would be interested in accepting a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university.

Characteristics of Contingent Faculty

The previous literature discussed the personal and professional challenges faced by contingent faculty in the academic workforce. Each of the challenges may contribute to the choice of a faculty member to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. Though the previous literature focused on negative aspects of life as a contingent faculty member, institutions which offer full-time, contract employment likely have positive attributes to working as a professor within the institution. Understanding and identifying the extent to which both the removal of oneself of the challenges as a contingent faculty juxtaposed to the opportunities of full-time, contract employment affects the choice to accept a position at an institution, such as Mosaic University, requires qualitative inquiry. Two assumptions which must be revisited when discussing the choice to accept a contract position at a four-year, non-

tenure granting, state university are, first, the author assumes that the full-time employment at a single institution is more desirable than employment across multiple institutions to create full-time work. Second, research identifies the opportunity for gainful employment outside of academia, meaning that, the faculty employed at Mosaic University must have non-monetary factors which influence their choice to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. Identifying such factors answers the research question, why do credentialed faculty choose to take a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university? Additionally, identifying such factors allows higher education stakeholders and policy makers to create, implement, and adapt institutional policy to better recruit, retain, and develop non-tenured faculty.

Desire to Teach. ¶Research suggest a likely reason a faculty member would take a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university is due to the faculty member's devotion to classroom teaching. Research suggests that contingent faculty continue the pursuit of work due to their passion primarily for teaching; with research and service being secondary desirable elements of the professoriate position (Hackman & McCarth, 2011, p. 187). Such findings are in contrast to Wetherbe's (2013) identification that tenured faculty are more focused on research than teaching. A graduate student cognitively perceives earning a tenured position as a reward of a completed doctoral program (Chapman, 2011). As such, the author reasonably infers the prospect of a tenured position in academia is the reason to complete a doctoral program for some graduate students (Silegman, 1975). Declining availability of tenured positions (Kezar, 2013) suggest that when the reward of tenure is taken away, motivation for continuance in academic employment is diminished (Silegman, 1975). As such, faculty must have other factors which affect their choice to accept non-tenure positions, and thus, continue a career in academia.

Hackman and McCarth (2011) identify two studies regarding motivating factors of faculty to willingly accept a full-time, non-tenured position at an institution. Pounder (1994) identified that the faculty survey indicated primary motivation to become a faculty member came from the desire to "...prepare aspiring school leaders, engage in professional development, and enhance [personal] intellectual development (Hackman & McCarth, 2011, p. 187)". Hackman and McCarth reported in a study that clinical faculty cited their reasons for staying in academia came from "a desire to teach at the university level and to influence the next generation of school leaders (Hackman & McCarth, 2011, p. 187)". Logically then, an individual with an advanced degree who has the opportunity to earn an income at a level that potentially quadruples that of some contingent faculty members (Venkatraman, 2014; Dishman, 2016) does so due to a passion for their field (Dishman, 2016). Hackman and McCarth (2011) suggest such a passion stems from the faculty member's desire to teach within a classroom and work closely with students.

Stress of earning tenure and maintaining tenured positions.¶Faculty may opt to take a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university due to the individual's unwillingness to endure the intellectually and emotionally draining process of earning tenure. Earning tenure at an institution is a process which involves many years of documenting achievement, success, and service to the institution (Phinney, 2007). Fitzmorris, Shehab, and Trytten conducted a study involving ten non-tenure granting, electrical engineering faculty members teaching at public research universities (Fitzmorris, Shehab, & Trytten, 2016). The results showed that none of the ten participants expressed the desire to earn a tenured position at their respective university, with many respondents citing the increased publication requirements, reduction in teaching, and overall time commitments required of a tenured position (Fitzmorris, Shehab, & Trytten, 2016). Requirements for tenure vary by institution, but include several years of high productivity in

teaching, research, and service while employed, and yet, in some cases, even with high productivity, tenure is not granted to individuals (Reese & Smith, 1991). A study by Leatherman (1998) showed that some adjunct faculty in professional schools, categorized by Leatherman as law schools, business schools, and medical schools, prefer the less stressful requirements of adjunct positions. With the prestige of tenure comes the responsibility of work-load (Neumann & Terosky, 2007). An overall accepted effort workload for a faculty member consists of 40% of time devoted to research, 40% of time devoted to teaching, and 20% of time devoted to service (Reese & Smith, 1991). However, Reese and Smith (1991) state that a more realistic percentage of workload in the standard research intuitions for a tenured faculty member is 41% research, 41% teaching, and 18% service. Though this may be an accepted percentage of division of work, what is often not discussed are the hours spent included in the workload. Because of the mental stress tenured positions bring, tenured faculty can experience burnout (Malesic, 2016). As with any profession, when burnout occurs, work productivity decreases (Miller, 2009). Though options such as sabbatical are available to create a break from the drudgery, some faculty report feeling the need to work on publishing and maintaining service commitments during their sabbatical periods (Stripling, 2009; Patton 2014). Non-tenure-track positions in some institutions have the potential to require less job-related, strenuous demands, as non-tenured faculty are primarily hired to fill a teaching void (Kezar, 2011). Many institutions do not require adjuncts to advise students outside of the classroom (Flaherty, 2013). Some institutions also allow non-tenured faculty to provisionally step into leadership roles when tenured faculty take sabbatical (Lemmer & Robak, 2014). For some individuals, a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university may offer the internal fulfillment of the professoriate, without the stress of earning and maintaining a tenure position.

Opportunity to work in a STEM institution. ¶Mosaic University is unique in that the institution is a STEM focused university. Within the context of the case study, the author identifies that a factor relating to the choice to accept a position a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university may have to do with individual characteristics of the institution. For example, as identified by Leatherman (1998), some individuals prefer to work as non-tenured faculty in institutions which specialize in a particular field, such as law, business, or medicine. For the purposes of the case study of Mosaic University, the institution focuses on STEM fields, and thus, a literature discussion focused on the uniqueness of a STEM institution is needed to provide context as to why an individual would take a position at the institution.

Much as the post-millennium social climate has changed since 1960s, the academic landscape also changed, with institutions offering new courses and majors to students (Fisher, 2015; Stockwell, 2015). The digital era allows institutions to create majors in fields and industries which, in many cases, were not in existence even 20 years ago (Fishbane, 2017). Fields and majors such as digital marketing, user experience design, and unmanned aircraft system engineering are all majors created by institutions since 2009 and are now necessitated fields of study from both technological advancement and demand found in the relatively new digital age (Fishbane, 2016). Computer Science Bachelor's degrees exponentially increased in the last 60 years (Soper, 2014). From 1966 to 1978, less than 10,000 Computer Sciences degrees were granted annually (Soper, 2014). In 2004, there were 60,000 degrees granted (Soper, 2014). Tenure's place within with these new fields is yet to be determined, as studies show women and minorities struggle to earn tenure in STEM fields (Connolly, Lee, & Savoy, 2015). Studies also show that half of tenured, STEM faculty leave their institutions within 11 years of accepting the position (Kaminski & Geisler, 2012). The recent development of such technological fields

muddles tenures' use within STEM departments. High turnover does not suggest institutions will seek to make large investments in the high cost of tenure-track and tenured STEM faculty (Kaminski & Geisler, 2012). Additionally, tenured and tenure-track STEM positions appear to attract females, due to the work-life balance of science positions (Basu, 2012a), which means though females may not be placed in tenure-track STEM positions (Connolly, Lee, & Savoy, 2015), a large pool of candidates exists to fill the positions. As such, at a STEM institution such as Mosaic University, faculty may believe the traditional tenure model is not necessary for them to feel secure in their employment. Research which shows the STEM fields are prevalent with turnover (Kaminski & Geisler, 2012) indicates individuals may not wish to invest the time and effort in earning tenure to only leave the institution within the next few years. As such, the author postulates the opportunities for specialized teaching and research are likely a factor in an individual's choice to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university.

Examining Non-Tenure Track Faculty Through the Lens of Socialization

The preceding literature provided a discussion concerning the challenges contingent faculty endure in the current academic environment. Additionally, the literature discussed potential reasons a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university attract faculty. The literature review provided a discussion on numerous variables which could affect the individual's choice, and thus, such variables provide reasoning and explanation, not justification, of an individual's choice to accept a position a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. The choice to accept said position is ultimately based upon the individual's experiences related to the variables discussed in the literature review. Socialization is the theoretical lens through which to view these experiences. Within the context of the study, the socialization of a faculty member is their experiences as an undergraduate student, graduate student, and ultimately,

academic employee (Cooley, 1902; Merton & Kitt, 1950; Feldman, 1981; Chao, 2012). While current choices may appear to be limited, all faculty have a choice to the depths at which they will pursue a career path. Decision-making processes are “often founded on the assumption of human rationale (Tversky & Khaneman, 1981, p. 453).” Tversky and Khaneman describe a "decision frame" when discussing the “acts, outcomes, and contingencies associated with a particular choice” (Tversky & Khaneman 1981 p. 453). The study researches a decision, post “act, outcome, and contingency” (Tversky & Khaneman, 1981 p. 453), and are therefore concerned with the experiences and beliefs affecting choice. Related to socialization, social learning theory (Rotter, 1966), identifies that academics experienced or observed some form of hardship, success, or influencing factor, either themselves or vicariously through others, which formulate the basis for the participant’s choice to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. Referring to previous variables which could factor into the choice, such as lack of government funding, abuse of tenure powers, and potential hardships faced by contingent faculty, social learning theory explains the individual’s choice to remove themselves from the tenure search by reasoning of wanting to spare oneself the observed hardships endured from socialization experiences (Rotter, 1966). To the extent each individual identifies a success, failure, or experience as an influencing factor in the choice to accept the position at Mosaic University necessitates qualitative study.

Socialization theory related to scientific management.¶A rational systems perspective (Hoy & Miskal, 2001) of higher education institutions defines the organizations as a collection of employees focused on the advancement of learning, contribution to the collective research, and the sharing of free thought. Anticipatory socialization and organizational socialization of an academic individual occurs as the individual interacts with other academics in the organization to

promote the advancement of learning, contribution to the collective research, and the sharing of free thought. The foundation of the rationale systems perspective comes from the theory of scientific management (Taylor, 1947), which is focused primarily on implementation of the most effective way possible to complete tasks in the labor workforce (Taylor, 1947). Thus, socialization is a justified lens through which to view an individual's choice to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university because scientific theory (Taylor, 1947) identifies that negative experiences with development and orientation into an organization or field hinders the individual's commitment and career within the field. As such, negative anticipatory socialization and organizational socialization experiences are a factor in an individual's decision to cease pursuit of a tenured position and take a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university.

Within the confines of the academic institutions, individuals will undoubtedly have different socialization experiences. Yet, research shows contingent faculty in tenured institutions have different organizational socialization experiences than their tenured counterparts (Kezar, 2013). Contingent faculty can experience stress from short term contracts, large workloads of classroom teaching, and no orientation into the institution. Taylor (1947) establishes that stress in the workplace is psychologically detrimental to workplace productivity. Organizational theory relates to the Taylor's scientific management theory in that scientific management theory identifies that the workers perform best when workers are developed through proper training programs implemented by the organization (Taylor, 1947; Feldman, 1981). Such findings correlate to faculty within departments and institutions, with research suggesting faculty experience job dissatisfaction from lack of mentorship and orientation into the new institution from fellow faculty (Buch, Huet, Rorrer, & Roberson, 2011).

Scientific management's connection to socialization has elements, which, based on the established obstacles endured by contingent faculty, are useful in creating a more stable work environment for non-tenured faculty. Related to the importance of training faculty, Taylor suggests that experts be used to train faculty (Taylor, 1947). Scientific management theory suggests experts, such as tenured faculty, help prepare non-tenured faculty for administrative positions within the institutions. Essentially, scientific management theory establishes that tenured faculty should be the individuals in charge of the socialization experience of new members into both the institution and academic community. Respectively, graduate students experience anticipatory socialization and new faculty experience organizational socialization from tenured faculty. Scientific management theory, anticipatory socialization theory, and organizational socialization theory identify that tenured faculty trainers or mentors, as well as institutional management, should ensure that the mission of the institution is instilled to new members of the academic institution, regardless of the entrance level (Taylor, 1947; Feldman, 1981). New members of an organization desire to be orientated into their new surroundings (Buch, Huet, Rorrer, & Roberson, 2011). Teaching employees both the "explicit and implicit knowledge" (Brewer & Brewer 2010, p. 332) within an organization can lead to more effective educational organizations (Brewer & Brewer 2010, p. 332). Institutions which have systems implemented to train, monitor, and advance employees harbor workers with higher morale (Buch, Huet, Rorrer, & Roberson, 2011).

Research on the effect of negative faculty organizational socialization experiences.

Proper socialization into an academic institution is imperative for all faculty; tenured or not. Within the context of the course, an individual's negative organizational socialization experiences into an organization by a tenured faculty could cause the individual to become

disenfranchised with traditional, tenure institutions, and thus may be a reason for the individual to take a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. Previous literature discussed hardships of contingent faculty in terms of employment insecurity, stress, salary, and work load (Bess, 1998; Curtis & Thornton, 2013; Shin & Jung, 2014). However, through the lens of socialization, a discussion is needed of the research that which discusses the stark contrast in established institutional support meant to provide positive experiences to recently hired, tenure-track faculty, compared to the support systems for contingent faculty. Research shows that many institutions do not have structure in place to provide a positive organizational socialization experience for contingent faculty members (Buch, Huet, Rorrer, & Roberson, 2011). Institutions who implement emotionally supporting practices for contingent faculty create a better sense of worker satisfaction for such contingent faculty (Bess, 1998). Conversely, faculty who feel they are not supported by their departments and institutions experience worker dissatisfaction (Bess, 1998), which can lead to low productivity and turnover (Herzberg, 1969). Buch, Huet, Rorrer, and Roberson (2011) identify areas where full-time, non-tenured faculty feel job dissatisfaction within their academic career. The first area cited was lack of mentorship from other professors (Buch, Huet, Rorrer, & Roberson, 2011, p. 42). Often, the idea of advancement in academia is mistakenly associated only with the award of tenure (Buch, Huet, Rorrer, & Roberson, 2011). However, as with most places of business, opportunity for vertical advancement exists within departments of academia as well, such as movement into chair positions, committee involvement, and program management (Feldman & Turnley, 2001). Without proper mentorship, such non-tenured faculty have the probability of becoming disenchanting with their position (Buch, Huet, Rorrer, & Roberson, 2011).

Second, full-time, non-tenured faculty identify that performance reviews are often limited to specific areas of work within the institution yet did not necessarily include the “range of contributions needed to meet the diverse goals and broad mission of the institution (Buch, Huet, Rorrer, & Roberson, 2011 p. 42)”. Publication is often cited as a measurement of success for faculty (Buch, Huet, Rorrer, & Roberson, 2011). Non-tenured, full-time faculty may not have the time or resources to publish enough within a specific time frame, due to the number of teaching courses assigned to them (Dolan, Hall, Karlsson, Martinak, 2013, p. 40; Kezar, 2013). As a result, non-tenured faculty experience lower employee morale because their job advancement depends on their institution’s review of the faculty productivity, yet the institution is not providing enough resources to meet set productivity goals. The third finding from Buch, Huet, Rorrer, and Roberson (2011, p. 42) indicates that despite the responses from faculty about the often-arbitrary performance reviews and promotional guidelines, faculty see little incentive to actually “seek promotion (2011, p. 42)”. Research suggests that a lack of perceived ability to advance within the workplace will lead to diminished work performance (Aronsson, Gustafsson, & Dallner, 2000), resulting in the potential for lower productivity rates and lowered student learning outcomes. The three areas of job dissatisfaction non-tenure track faculty face have the potential for remedy if institutions implement and are committed to organizational socialization programs focused of integrating, including, and offering opportunities of advancement to their non-tenure track faculty.

Established organizational socialization programs are also imperative for when contingent faculty experience change within the institution or department. Successfully reacting and adapting to faculty responses to change is imperative for maintained success in times of needed departmental change (Harvey, Novicevic, Ready, Kuffel, & Duke, 2006). Additionally,

lack of “communication exchange (Harvey, Novicevic, Ready, Kuffel, & Duke, 2006, p. 192)” affects performance output of faculty. Change is accepted to be inevitable, but a “collaborative decision-making process” allows for faculty to increase “ownership” of the mission and goals of departments (Harvey, Novicevic, Ready, Kuffel, & Duke, 2006, p. 193). Due to the nature of higher education, faculty may not be able to be included in all decision-making processes, such as changes in federal or state laws which could affect institutions. Contingent faculty, who are already likely to be less involved in governance roles (Rodgers, 2013) may be the most affected by sudden change in departmental policy (Lunenburg, 2011). For instances such as this, Presslee, Vance, and Webb (2013) identify that setting specific rewards for employees can increase said employee’s commitment to obtaining desired outcomes set forth by the administration. Though goals must be clear for faculty, the goals set must be goals which faculty find to be challenging (Locke & Latham, 2002). Performance, productivity, and cost- savings are all factors which will improve when engaging employees in a development process which harbors a positive organizational socialization experience (Hatch & Dyer, 2004). The absence of said processes may cause a faculty to seek employment elsewhere (Brewer & Brewer, 2010).

Socialization’s relation to commitment in work performance. ¶ Obtaining commitment, collaboration, and input from contingent faculty improves educational and organizational productivity (Brewer & Brewer, 2010, p. 32). Positive organizational socialization experiences play a major part in commitment to an organization (Chao, 2012). Lyon’s (2007, p. 6.) establishes criteria, which can be related to organizational socialization experiences, which should be met for contingent faculty to be properly utilized within their institutions. Included in these criteria are an understanding of the institution’s culture, creating a sense of belonging to the institution, and ability for professional development (Lyons, 2007, p.

6.). All faculty are likely to adopt better performance practices if they feel more committed to an institution (Sejits & Latham, 2000). If not involved, faculty may only view staying within a department as continuance commitment (Meyer & Allen, 2007). Essentially, continuance commitment is derived from the perception that a contingent faculty member's current job is the best option available to them (Meyer & Allen, 2007). In such an instance, the contingent faculty member is not committed to their institutions or departments, rather they are committed to not losing their job (Meyer & Allen, 2007). Continuance commitment does not promote a healthy work environment (Meyer & Allen, 2007). In the case of contingent faculty, teaching is assumed to be the primary performance directive (Kezar, 2011). If the level of commitment faculty feel towards their institution is only that of continuance, then faculty may resist implementing changes within course teaching styles, or not implement personal experiences or knowledge into the teaching of the course.

Proper socialization programs also ensure that an individual is familiar with the culture of an organization (Feldman, 1981). Inability to explain organizational culture leads to quick decline in morale, and poor job performance (Lunenburg, 2011). Organizations with poor organizational cultures often "... give newly hired employees more work than they can reasonably handle... (Lunenburg, 2011, p. 7)", as is the case contingent faculty (Rogers, 2013). Combining an unreasonable workload, as well as diminishing opportunity for involvement and advancement leads to low employee morale (Bess, 1998; Buch, Huet, Rorrer, & Roberson, 2011; Lunenburg, 2011). A positive organizational culture provides incentives for employees to complete their tasks (Hull, 1951; Graham-Moore, & Ross, 1983). Lack of incentives can hinder employees from buying into an organizational culture (Graham-Moore, & Ross, 1983). Related to contingent faculty in institutions with poor organization cultures, institutions which do not

provide contingent faculty incentives to complete their work cause the contingent faculty to become less productive, and thus, become less entrenched into the institutional culture (Graham-Moore, & Ross, 1983; Kerr & Slocum 2005). Individuals who encounter negative socialization experiences at tenured institutions, which result in heavy workloads and decreased commitment to the institution, are likely to search for employment elsewhere (Brewer & Brewer, 2010). Such experiences could factor into the reason a credentialed faculty member accepts a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university, such as Mosaic University.

Assigning reason for making a choice based upon organizational socialization experiences. ¶The author identifies that socialization experiences ultimately affect the choice of an individual to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. However, a possibility exists that such individuals may identify a worldly occurrence or phenomenon as a reason for accepting the position. For example, an individual may reason that positive socialization experiences related to teaching caused the individual to stay within academia, yet a flood of Ph.D. candidates in a particular field is the identified reason the individual does not have a tenure position, and thus, accepted a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. Attribution theory (Weiner, 1972) and learned helplessness theory (Silegman, 1975) provide further explanation as to an individual's rationalization assign their reason of choice to a situation or phenomenon outside of their control.

Attribution theory. ¶Attribution theory (Weiner, 1972) is closely related to social learning theory's (Rotter, 1966) characteristics of experience and observation acting as influencers of choice. In discussing attribution theory, Weiner cites Heider (1958) when analyzing the "can" and "try" of behavior, stating that can refers to "invariant" behaviors of a person such as intelligence and knowledge, while "try" refers to intentions and effort exuded at a given point in

time related to achievement, known as a “situational opportunity”. (Weiner 1972, p. 272).

Tenured faculty earned positions through the institutional review process established within their place of employment, meaning that, tenured faculty met all qualifications placed upon them during the duration of employment by the institution, thus succeeding in the available situational opportunity. However, in today’s academic job climate, the situational opportunity, such as a job opening, or as Weiner calls, a “given state” (Weiner 1972), is increasingly difficult to locate for those hoping to earn a tenured position. Additionally, research suggests an individual is likely to convey negative attitudes towards a position if they feel they are unjustly unable to solidify entrance into the position (Duffy & Shaw, 2000). Essentially, Duffy and Shaw suggest there is a likelihood faculty unable to secure a tenured position are likely to speak negatively of the tenure system (Duffy & Shaw, 2000).

Attribution theory is an appropriate lens through which to view the experiences of contingent faculty, in that, as Kelly (1967) states, four-year higher education institutions are some of the most structured organizations within America. Such structure has the potential to allow for attribution of factors beyond the control of the participant (Duffy & Shaw, 2000). When describing academics that removed themselves from the search of tenure-track positions, whether by accepting a non-tenured position, contract faculty position, or by leaving academia for the private sector, Weiner identifies that “causal attributions (1972, p. 208)” are determined by personal bias, meaning individuals prescribe their own interpretations of circumstances to explain decision making. Weiner also notes that the main difference between those in a “high and low achievement setting (1972, p. 208)”, is that those categorized as high achieving have a high propensity to “initiate achievement activities (1972, p. 208)”. In terms of career success in academia, the previous literature ascribes earning tenure a high achievement. Under attribution

theory's lens, tenured faculty likely assign their success, or high achievement, to high effort (Weiner, 1972, p. 208). Understanding the high effort correlated with tenure's perceived high achievement, individuals may very well determine that, within their observational view and experience, the high achievement of tenure does not warrant initiating such a high effort level to obtain the high achievement setting.

Learned helplessness theory. Silegman's learned helplessness theory (1975) is a useful lens when discussing the theory of choice, such as the choice to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state-university. An important factor of any choice includes the consequences related to said choice. Learned helplessness theory (Silegman, 1975), provides theoretical justification for faculty experiencing employment related difficulties. Within the scope of the study, individuals may identify their choice to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university, was due to external, unstable conditions (Silegman, 1975), rather than evaluation of any controllable, internal (Silegman, 1975) elements, which if adjusted, may change the current circumstances of the individual. Graduating academics may also relate inability to secure a job to learned helplessness theory, in that, factors such as diminished funding to higher education, removal of tenured positions, and a poor job market, are factors out of the control of the individual, and thus, easy to assign blame for unemployment or under-employment. Learned helplessness theory postulates that, rather than taking an accountability for a myriad of reasons the individual is not able to find a tenure-track position (such as unwillingness to relocate, or work at a specific type of institution), the subject will assign blame to external factors they deem to be outside of their locus of control (Silegman, 1975). However, this is not to say that factors outside of a person's locus of control do not cause stress. Rather, research shows the opposite (Jha & Bano, 2012). Yet, in the academic labor market, individuals

still hire into tenure-track positions, as well as well paying, full-time, non-tenured positions. Such individuals who secure high achievement may exhibit a higher sense of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977), compared to those individuals who assign their failures to circumstances outside of their control. Self-efficacy is a person's belief of their probability to successfully perform desired behaviors (Bandura, 1977). The greater one's sense of self-efficacy in a situation, the more effort they will exert, and thus, are more likely to be successful (Bandura, 1977). One's self-efficacy beliefs are directly related to their attributions, in that people who attribute successes to internal, stable factors, (e.g., ability), will experience greater self-efficacy than people who attribute their successes or failures to external, uncontrollable factors (Silegman, 1975; Wilson, Damiani, & Shelton, 2002, p. 94).

To assign learned helplessness theory to an entire faculty at an institution is irresponsible, and to the contrary, full-time employment at a single institution, which is also a state university, should be viewed as high achievement. However, the possibility exists some participants may internally harbor learned helplessness in terms of what they perceive as an involuntary exclusion from the tenured-track. Such participants may have accepted the position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university until a tenured position becomes available at a different institution. Learned helplessness theory is an important lens to view the responses of the participants in that, there exists the possibility that, despite the author's opinion that a full-time position at Mosaic University is a high achievement setting, some faculty would rather have a tenured position at a different institution.

Conclusion

Currently, a gap in literature exists as to why a credentialed faculty member would accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. Understanding the reasons an

instructor would take a position at such an institution allows for higher education policy makers to develop processes for the recruitment, retention, and development of non-tenured faculty. The literature review establishes four factors which indicate the future, increased reliance of non-tenured faculty, and thus, necessitates the study of faculty who accept positions at institutions which do not offer tenure. The factors are (a) diminished funding to higher education at a federal and state level (Oliff, Palascious, Johnson, & Leachman, 2013), (b) declining tenure-track positions across academia (Rogers, 2013; Jaschik, 2013). (c) continued increase in enrollment in higher education institutions, which increase institutional reliance on non-tenured faculty (Marcus, 2014), and (d) the potential loss of qualified candidates in academia due to mistreatment of contingent faculty (Kezar, 2013).

The literature review provides research which as to why individuals accept positions at four-year, non-tenured, state universities. The identified, potential reasons are (a) negative experiences with tenured faculty (Wetherbe, 2013; Tierney, 1999), (b) negative experiences as a contingent faculty member (Cronin & Smith, 2011; Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, & August 2012; Kezar & Maxey, 2013; Kezar, 2013), (c) lack of involvement, development, and advancement as a contingent faculty member (Lunenborg, 2011), (d) the opportunity to teach students as a full-time faculty member (Hackman & McCarth, 2011), and, (e) the full-time no tenure positions are less stressful than tenured positions (Fitzmorris, Shehab, & Trytten, 2016), but offer more security and autonomy than contingent positions (Feldman & Trunely, 2001; Reevy & Deason, 2014). The literature review presents research that the organizational socialization of faculty members correlates to the individual's workplace morale, workplace productivity, and commitment to the institution (Bess, 1998; Buch, Huet, Rorrer, & Roberson, 2011). Negative organizational socialization experiences likely play a factor in choice of faculty

members to seek employment at a different institution (Brewer & Brewer, 2010). Finally, the author identifies that faculty who accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university may do so out of the belief that external factors outside of their control prevent them from earning a tenured position (Weiner, 1972; Silegman, 1975). The next chapter discusses the data collection methods and instruments to interview Mosaic University faculty members and answer the research question, why do credentialed faculty members accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university?

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Government funding to higher education has declined in recent years (Oliff, Palascious, Johnson, & Leachman, 2013). A reaction to the decrease in funding is administrators and policy makers of higher education have reduced the number of tenured positions available at institutions and rely on contingent faculty (Kezar & Maxey, 2013). One institution, Mosaic University, is a newly created institution which eliminated the option of tenure for all faculty. Mosaic University is the one of the only four-year, non-tenure granting, public state universities in America. Research exists which shows the difficulty individuals face as a contingent faculty member, as well as the stress of earning and sustaining tenure (Neumann & Terosky, 2007; Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, & August, 2012; Kezar, 2013).

The following chapter discusses the methodology of conducting the case study with the sample population of Mosaic University to answer the research question: why do credentialed faculty choose to take a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university? The methods section discusses the reasoning and need for the use of qualitative analysis in the study. The methodology section discusses specific characteristics of Mosaic University, provides an explanation for the use of qualitative methods, provides a discussion on the methodology, describes the formulation of the interview protocol used to conduct the study, and finally, discusses the collection and analysis of the data.

Restatement of the Research Questions¶

The following explanatory case study conducts qualitative interviews with faculty at Mosaic University to answer the research question, why do credentialed faculty choose to take a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university? The study uses the theoretical lens of socialization to identify what experiences led the faculty at Mosaic University to accept a position at the non-tenure institution. To identify the specific socialization experiences of the participants in the study, the study additionally answers the following questions:

- a) What experiences as an undergraduate and graduate student positively or negatively influenced the participant's choice to continue a career in academia?
- b) What experiences as an academic employee positively or negatively influenced the participant's choice to continue a career in academia?
- c) How did the undergraduate, graduate, and previous employment experiences relate to the participant's choice to take a position at an institution which does not offer tenure?
- d) Based upon personal anticipatory socialization and organizational socialization experiences, what are the participant's suggestions for recruitment, retention, and development of non-tenured faculty?

Setting of the Research

The study is concerned with understanding the reasons why a credentialed faculty member would take a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. The explanatory case study uses Mosaic University as the institution of study. Mosaic University is the one of the only four-year, non-tenure granting, public state universities in America. The following background information on Mosaic University provides the setting of the institution researched.

Origins.¶Mosaic University is not an entirely new university, as the campus was a polytechnic focused satellite campus of a larger institution within the state school-system. Mosaic University became part of a state higher education system in 2012, when the Governor passed legislation to make the polytechnic campus of a large, four-year university within the state, an independent institution. For the sake of anonymity, this original university will be referred to as McMahon University. The Mosaic University founding Board of Trustees created a published, public Business Plan which established the economic need for the creation of the institution. The Business Plan cited a 2010 state council report, which argued that the state would need one-hundred thousand more science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) graduates than the projected rate of graduates of the other combined institutions within the state, to be ranked within the top ten most productive states. The Business Plan also identifies that the target STEM field graduation metrics “exceed the capability of [the state’s] existing institutions of higher education.” Within the Business Plan, the Board of Trustees continuously referenced a report from the U.S. Department of Labor report indicating that, nationally, jobs in STEM fields would grow by 29% between 2010 and 2020.

The Business Plan discusses the deficiencies within STEM institutions in programs within United States higher education systems, stating that, as of 2011, the United States has thirty-five institutions classified as STEM focused. Further, the report states that universities with STEM-focused colleges in interdisciplinary campuses are forced to compete with other programs at the institution for institutional resources. Within the Business Plan, the Board of Trustees states that Mosaic University will play a national role in reducing the scarcity of STEM graduates into the labor market, identifying the school intends to recruit on a national level. The Board of Trustees stated they developed a “decision matrix and program strategy” to meet the

“economic development needs and student demand” by identifying the economic opportunities and outcomes of implementing and graduating students from each specific major and program.

Mosaic University’s path to creation.¶The creation of Mosaic University in 2012 came with much dispute within the state. A state Senator was the biggest proponent of Mosaic University and pushed for Mosaic University to separate from McMahan University, and become a part of the state’s public university system. Supporters accused the senator of pushing for the creation of the institute simply to be part of the Senator’s legacy, despite the current reduction of state and federal funds to higher education within the state. The Senator stated he personally could verify that donors to McMahan University discussed withholding donations earmarked for the McMahan University’s satellite campus, unless such a change occurred. This withholding of funds, in the Senator’s view, would negatively affect the constituents in the county of McMahan University’s satellite campus.

Branching off to an independent institution meant the Mosaic University would immediately lose accreditation, and thus, cease eligibility for federal funding. Detractors from the split also identified that McMahan University was meeting present estimates of generating 36,000 jobs in the county, noting that a separation, and subsequent loss of accreditation, could jeopardize said job opportunities. Additionally, at the time, opponents of the creation of Mosaic University believed the school would have difficulty achieving enrollment forecasts and accreditation. The creation of Mosaic University was so divisive, the President of the McMahan University dismissed the Chancellor of McMahan University, due to the Chancellor’s support of branching-off the satellite campus into an independent university.

The State Senate threatened to cut McMahan University’s operational budget by 58% if McMahan University officials did not acquiesce to releasing the McMahan University

polytechnic satellite campus to become the independent institution of Mosaic University. Both McMahan University and Senator Alexander benefited in the passing of legislation to make Mosaic University an independent institution. In what the community took as a compromise between the two parties, McMahan University's South Campus location received a budget cut of \$45 million, rather than the \$78 million proposed cut. Additionally, McMahan University received compensation of \$10 million to absorb the McMahan University polytechnic campus faculty back into other McMahan University campuses.

Part of the allocation of the \$10 million was meant to allow students enrolled at the original McMahan University satellite campus to finish their degrees under the umbrella of McMahan University. The McMahan University satellite campus contained 80 faculty, 1,006 students, and 70 full-time staff. As a part of the teach out agreement, McMahan University allowed the students to finish their degree in McMahan University's satellite campus, starting in the Fall of 2012. Unavoidably, some part-time staff of McMahan University were laid off. The students were allowed to finish their degrees on campus until the doors of the McMahan University satellite campus shut in 2014. However, by the Fall of 2013, only 484 students and 37 faculty remained at the McMahan University's satellite campus. The reduction in resources required the use of online course and students to travel to the McMahan University main campus. When McMahan University satellite campus finally closed, the remaining faculty were transferred to the main campus of McMahan University, which is a distance of over 30 miles.

Funding and financials. A funding program listed by Mosaic University as a major source of revenue is the Public Education Capital (PECO) funds. PECO funds are identified as the state's plan of capital funding for public schools, community colleges, and state universities through issuing bonds from revenues generated from gross receipts tax, gas and electricity taxes,

and communications taxes. First year funds Mosaic University received from the PECO source were \$55,498,411, all allocated for the creation of campus structures for Mosaic University. Total revenue listed for the fiscal year ending on June 30th, 2013, was \$112,306,111, with \$60,645,414 listed as expenses for infrastructure, hiring a faculty and staff, and general operating expenses.

In the 2015-2016 academic year, Mosaic University reported revenue of \$35,259,591. Of that revenue, \$904,817 was tuition and \$30,833,130 was from recurring state funds. The 2016-2017 expected tuition revenue was placed at \$2,882,039, based upon the increase in students due to the recent accreditation awarded to Mosaic University, which enabled the university to award bachelor's and master's degrees. Mosaic University offers two graduate degree programs and six undergraduate degrees.

Mosaic University curriculum and degree programs are 100% STEM-field based. Administration members and policy makers for Mosaic University state they continuously research and communicate with STEM-field industry leaders to determine the best future degrees to offer to match positions of upcoming need of STEM companies. Mosaic University strategically positioned and marketed the need for the institution based upon statistics which forecast a shortage in STEM-field graduates coming from within the state, thus creating a demand for another institution focused solely on STEM-fields. Of note is that the Business Plan places a clear emphasis on hiring STEM focused faculty and students eager to work together in a collaborative environment on innovative research. To compete in STEM fields, Mosaic University boasts of the creation of a technology building, meant for laboratory work, which includes a 3-D printing lab, cyber security lab, and IBM Super Computer. In relation to funding for the STEM facilities, Mosaic University claimed revenues for the 2015-16 school year of \$3.1

million, listed as “Contracts and Grants” and “Local Funds”. In addition, a recent article stated that Mosaic University was eligible for a \$100 million grant towards autonomous vehicle research and development. Mosaic University also recently received its first National Science Foundation Grant in the amount of \$166,000. Such revenue and grant awards show that the administration is actively pursuing sustainment and growth for the institution

Mosaic University student demographic overview. Recruitment for students began in the Summer and Fall of 2013, and Spring of 2014, with classes opening to students in the Fall of 2014. The Business Plan states the admission criteria is an average 3.1 on 4.0 scale GPA, with a 1790 average SAT score; though mitigating factors such as aptitudes for math and science, and level of community involvement are taken into consideration. In the fall of 2017, Mosaic University enrolled 1,427 Undergraduate Students and 17 Graduate students. The Table 3.1 shows the breakdown of the ethnicity, race, and gender of students for Fall 2016.

Table 3.1

Race and Ethnicity of Mosaic University Students

Race and Ethnicity	Total Students	Percent of Total Headcount
American Indian or Alaskan Native	7	0.5%
Asian	67	4.6%
Black or African American	76	5.3%
Hispanic or Latino	262	18.1%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	3	0.2%
Non-Resident Alien	33	2.3%
Two or More Races	42	2.9%
White	934	64.6%
Race and Ethnicity Unknown	21	1.5%

Table 3.2 shows Mosaic University reported the following gender demographics for the Fall of 2017.

Table 3.2

Gender of Mosaic University Students

Gender	Total Students	Percent of Total Headcount
Male	1,252	87%
Female	193	13%

Mosaic University cites an average class size of 25 students, with a student-to-faculty ratio of 21:1. The institution has two colleges; the College of Engineering and College of Innovation & Technology. Within these two colleges, Mosaic University offers six Bachelor of Science degrees and two Master of Science degrees. Each baccalaureate major has between two and five specialized concentrations. The institution cites the majors of Computer Science &

Information Technology, and Mechanical & Industrial Engineering, with 44% and 22% of the students enrolled in these majors, respectively. Table 2.3 lists the majors by headcount.

Table 3.3

Mosaic University Headcount by Major

	Total	Percent of Total Headcount	Female	Male
College of Engineering	674	46.6%	95	579
Computer Engineering	230	15.9%	22	208
Electrical Engineering	114	7.9%	13	101
Mechanical Engineering	324	22.4%	58	266
Engineering M.S.	6	0.4%	2	4
College of Innovation & Technology	739	51.1%	91	648
Data Analytics	51	3.5%	11	40
Computer Science	630	43.6%	71	559
Science & Technology Management	47	3.3%	6	41
Innovation & Technology M.S.	11	0.8%	3	8
Undecided	31	2.1%	7	24
Non-Degree Seeking	1	0.1%	0	1

Mosaic University’s vision is to “apply research and intellectual capital to economic and social challenges”, per the Business Plan. The Business Plan also states the curriculum of Mosaic

University incorporates the following

- Immediate immersion in the field of study.
- Essential mathematics and physical science courses.
- A solid engineering foundation.
- Ongoing industry-oriented, hands-on engineering design projects with realistic constraints.
- Specific courses focused on individual programs and concentrations.

- Entrepreneurship, leadership, management, finance and innovation incorporated throughout the curriculum.
- Opportunities for online learning.

Mosaic University extends technological innovation to student learning by providing e-learning and technological based learning into blended courses of classroom learning and online learning; all of which can be individually paced to fit the learning need of the student. Students are required to take nine hours of General Education courses, which consist of Arts, Humanities, and Social Science courses. Listed below, in Table 3.4 are the titles and descriptions of the courses required, from the 2017 Course Catalog.

Table 3.4

Titles and Descriptions of Mosaic University Courses

Course Classification	Course name and required hours
Arts & Humanities	Three (3) to six (6) credits from the following: ARH 2000 Art Appreciation (3-W) PHI 2010 Introduction to Philosophy (3-W) IDS 2144 Legal, Ethical, and Mgmt. Issues in Tech. (3)
Social Sciences	Required one (1) from the following: AMH 2010 American History to 1877 (3-W) AMH 2020 American History Since 1877 (3-W) AMH 2930 Special Topics in American History (3-W) Required one (1) from the following: ECO 2013 Principles of Macroeconomics (3-W) ECO 2023 Principles of Microeconomics (3-W) PSY 2012 General Psychology (3-W)

Mosaic University faculty. ¶ Mosaic University does not offer tenure, and instead, offers contracts which last for one, three, or five years. Most initial contracts are for one-year terms. The contracts are renewed based upon merit. The provost of the institution stated that a driving factor to eliminate tenure-based employment is to ensure faculty are not driven to engage in “trivial publication and research”, which he feels many faculty produce in response to the

institutional demand to earn tenure in a short time frame. Mosaic University lists a faculty head count of 96 for the Fall of 2017, yet only 47 faculty are categorized as full-time faculty, and not adjunct or visiting faculty. Table 3.5 represents the faculty headcount at Mosaic University as listed in the Mosaic University Fall 2017 Profile.

Table 3.5

Employees by Position Level

	Total Headcount	Percentage of Total
Staff	140	37%
Faculty	96	25%
Adjunct Professor	30	8%
Visiting Assist/Assoc. Professor	3	1%
Instructor	8	2%
Assistant Professor	37	10%
Associate Professor	13	3%
Professor	5	1%
OPS	7	2%
Student Employees	124	33%
Workers	78	21%
Research Assistants	21	6%
Educational Assistants	19	5%
GA/TA	6	2%
FIPR Staff	11	3%
FIPR OPS	4	1%
Total Number of Employees	380	100%

Per discussions with participants in the study (Bret, March 12, 2018; Davey, April 2, 2018), Mosaic University offered one-year contracts to all faculty, initially, within the hiring process of 2013. The Fall 2013 hiring process brought in faculty to begin the development of

departmental curriculum and policy. Some contracts are not renewed because, per participants, the institution deemed the non-renewed faculty as a poor fit for the institutional vision. In situations where a faculty member is selected to chair a departmental position (Bret, March 12, 2018), Mosaic University will provide a contract equal to the length of the time of the chair position. For instance, a faculty selected for a two-year chair position in turn is granted a two-year, rather than one-year renewal of the contract. Mosaic University also has a teacher’s union, but no collective bargaining agreement in place. Important to note is that, despite the institution’s STEM-field focus, Mosaic University also employs General Education Faculty listed as Arts and Sciences instructors. Listed below are the reported demographics of Mosaic University faculty, per the 2017 Fall Profile.

Table 3.6

Mosaic University Faculty and Staff Demographics

Ethnicity	Total Headcount	Percent of Total Headcount
American Indian or Alaskan Native	3	0.8%
Asian	39	10.3%
Black or African American	30	7.9%
Hispanic or Latino	24	6.3%
White	271	71.3%
Race and Ethnicity Unknown	13	3.4%

The Mosaic University 2015-2016 Accountability Report showed that Mosaic University received 1,700 applications for faculty positions. The highest salary for an Assist Professor in Innovation and Technology at Mosaic University is \$140,000, with the lowest paid earning \$70,000.

Per a search of the Mosaic University Employee Handbook, the words “tenure” and “non-tenure” do not appear. Few instances exist in which Mosaic University explicitly states hired faculty will not be tenured. The first instance occurs in the Mosaic University Contract of Employment, which states, “This is a non-tenure earning, annual or multi-year, fixed term faculty employment contract.” No reference regarding the fact that institution does not bestow tenure is present in the contract. The second mention of tenure is located in the Business Plan, which states:

In keeping with its goal to be progressive and competitive, the Mosaic University Board of Trustees approved a non-tenure model. Instead of tenure or tenure track, new faculty members will sign fixed-term, multi-year contracts. The contract length will be for one to five years and may be renewed based on performance. The faculty will be evaluated annually. This model ensures a fair and equitable review process that allows the university to recruit and maintain talented faculty. The university has begun to hire teaching faculty with both industry and research experience and will have essential faculty members in place by Fall 2013 who will provide curriculum development.

Faculty recruitment. ¶The Mosaic University Business Plan includes a plan of strategy for the job recruitment process. The Business Plan states the process include:

- On academic job boards (*e.g., Chronicle of Higher Education, Higher Ed Jobs*)
- In professional journals (*e.g., IEEE, ASME, JSEE, CEE, JSS, and others*)
- In the publications of engineering professional organizations (*e.g., America Society for Engineering Education and the Society of Women Engineers*)
- Institutional representation at STEM-related conferences to announce vacancies and recruit speakers

- Visits to universities to recruit Ph.D. candidates and distinguished faculty in key subject areas who are interested in a new and innovative environment
- Competitive salaries and benefits
- Partnership opportunities with industry for visiting faculty relationships

The Business Plan also states that recruitment will include an element of enticing faculty by the promoting the new campus buildings and surrounding geographic area.

Faculty development. ¶ In terms of developing faculty, Mosaic University suggests that “faculty will engage, explore, explain, elaborate, evaluate and discover right alongside students.” As the industry-engaged model implies, industry is directly aligned with Mosaic University, and industry involvement is heavily solicited and welcomed to provide the optimum learning experience for the student. Mosaic University lists partnerships with 88 different companies which provide “... critical introductions to the workplace for our students.” Per conversation with a Mosaic University faculty member (Davey, April 2, 2018), Mosaic University assigns new faculty a mentor, to offer transition assistance, support, and feedback concerning performance and advancement (Davey, April 2, 2018). The senior departmental chair is responsible for training and assigning mentors to the new faculty (Davey, April 2, 2018). Often a new hire may report to their local department chair, meaning faculty work directly under their supervisor (Davey, April 2, 2018).

Research Methodology and Design

Population sample and selection. ¶ Mosaic University is chosen as a research site because the institution does not offer tenure to faculty.

Sample Selection and Limitations. ¶ The population selected for the case study were the faculty listed as full-time faculty on the Mosaic University faculty website. The faculty had the

title of either Assistant or Associate professor for eligibility in the study. Per the website and contact with the Mosaic University, 47 faculty members met this criterion, though Mosaic University listed 96 faculty members for the Fall of 2017. The other faculty listed were either adjunct or visiting faculty. Additionally, the study included an invitation to staff members of the human resources department at Mosaic University to participate in the research. No preference was given as to sex, race, religion, or age. An effort to contact all available persons in the population was made. However, the data is limited to members who agreed to act as participants. Only 12 of the faculty who meet the criteria for participation are female, which constitutes only a little more than 25% of the available pool of applicants.

Explanation of Methods

Qualitative methodology is the most appropriate methodology for approaching this topic of research. Qualitative methodology is delineated by four specific characteristics. The first characteristic of qualitative research is that it takes place in a natural environment (Creswell, 2009). The second characteristic of qualitative research is that the participant meanings are a focus of inquiry, and the third is that an emergent research design is employed. The fourth characteristic of qualitative research concerns the reflexivity of the researcher (Charmaz, 2016).

Qualitative research is well-suited for certain research contexts and questions. The first is when a problem or issue needs to be explored (Marshall & Rossman, 2016); another is when the voice of a particular group needs to be heard (Clarke, 2006). Also, qualitative inquiry works well when a process or issues needs explanation (Creswell, 2011).

Case study as a method. ¶The explanatory case study uses semi-structured interviews to examine the personal and professional experiences which affected the faculty member's choice to accept a position at Mosaic University. An explanatory case study is useful when determining

the “why” of a real-life phenomenon (Yin, 1984, p. 2). Yin identifies that a case study allows a research to uncover “competing explanations for the same set of events (Yin, 1984, p. 5)”.

Additionally, the results of the case study allow the author to forecast analysis related to other, similar current or future situations (Yin, 1984, p. 2).

Statistics related to the disappearance of tenure (Kezar & Maxey, 2013) relay data showing that tenure is disappearing and overall support for institutions is declining (McPherson & Schapiro, 1999). Within the context of this research, qualitative study offers participants the option to expand upon their rationale for taking a position at a non-tenure-granting institution in that qualitative inquiry “can tell the stories behind the numbers, capture unintended impacts and ripple effects, and illuminate dimensions of desired outcomes that are difficult to quantify” (Patton, 2002, p. 152). Qualitative research “allows for systematic, in-depth, holistic examinations of phenomenon in natural settings with participants’ voices at the forefront of the study” (Leko, 2014, p. 276). In this dissertation, such examinations come in the form of participant interviews. Qualitative research is useful to determine if a pattern of work habits, life choices, or other variables exist which lead to satisfaction or decision making among these individuals (Denzin, 2008). These types of work habits and life choices may not necessarily lend themselves to quantification through a traditional survey (Denzin, 2008).

Denscombe (2004) states that qualitative research is appropriate when examining multiple factors with varying degrees of importance which affect participants. Qualitative inquiry can be a successful method of research when the desire of the researcher is to understand insight and meaning regarding how human experiences manifest into action (Creswell, 1998). As such, Denscombe’s assertions suggest a qualitative method to accurately account for the myriad of reasons which exist as to why instructors choose employment at a four-year, non-

tenure-granting, state university. The interview method can elicit responses which cite a variety of factors, such personal, workplace, and family experiences (Creswell, 1998). Responses regarding experiences from student-level to faculty-level involvement in higher education will provide a qualitative interpretation of the sum choices related to accepting a position at Mosaic University.

Qualitative data analysis requires "working with data, organizing it, breaking it into manageable units, synthesizing it, searching for patterns, discovering what is important and what is to be learned, and deciding what you will tell others" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982, p. 145). The themes of the data are "significant concepts that link substantial portions of the interviews together" (Morse & Field, 1995, p. 140). The questions posed allow participants of the study to convey their experiences and attributing factors of accepting positions at a non-tenure-granting institution.

Data collection method. Invitations to participate in the study were sent via email. The author first sent an email to the Mosaic University human resources office informing the institution of the study (Appendix B). Emails were then sent out to eligible participants based upon the email list of faculty made available publicly on the Mosaic University website. A specific invitation for participation in the study were created for both faculty (Appendix C) and staff (Appendix D). Attached to the email was a copy of the Informed Consent form (Appendix E). The invitation email contained directions to respond back to the email to schedule an interview with the author. The Informed Consent form contained validation that all interviews and answers would be kept confidential. The confidentiality was validated through the Confidentiality between Researcher and Participant form (Appendix F), completed by both the author and the participant, and provided to participant prior to the interview.

Qualitative interview. ¶Dabić & Stojanov (2014) suggested “data should be collected in the form that will increase understanding of human experience in the real life” (p. 362). The qualitative research interview is used for the method’s ability to gain the story behind the decisions and choices (Kvale, 1996) of selecting to work at Mosaic University. Qualitative interviews offer the participants the option to explain the meaning behind their choices (Kvale, 1996). The selection of a semi-structured interview as the data collection method arises from the in-depth nature of the questions posed to the participants, as well as the limitations of a Likert-scale survey to provide the participants opportunity to expound upon responses (Oppenheim 1992). Many possible factors exist which affect the choice of a participant to accept a position at Mosaic University, such as lack of job availability, spousal hires, and cost of living. Such factors create a wide range of variables too numerous to accurately represent within a simple survey.

Question design and pilot test. ¶The interview questions were pilot tested on three individuals who currently work within higher education institutions. One participant currently works at a private, four-year institution; one participant works at a public, two-year institution; and one individual is a current community leader with experience as a contingent faculty member. Two of the three pilot test participants are on tenure-track career paths. The pilot group received the original questionnaire (Appendix G) followed by a phone interview. The participants provided feedback to the wording and flow of the questions, which allowed the researcher to adjust each question to better define the scope of the inquiry. The feedback of the participants resulted in the inclusion of the follow up prompt questions included in the final Faculty Interview Protocol (Appendix A). The Interview Protocol was ultimately approved by the University of Alabama IRB in February of 2018. A chronological path of questioning for the interview occurred, in the format of:

- I decided to pursue a career in academia because _____.
- The following were my experiences during my undergraduate education which affected my decision to pursue a career in academia _____.
- The following were my experiences during my graduate education which affected my choice to pursue a career in academia _____.
- My undergraduate and graduate education affected my view of tenure in the following ways_____.
- The major factors influencing my choice to apply for and accept a position at Mosaic University were_____.
- My advice to a new institution establishing a non-tenure employment format is_____.

Interview and interview questions. ¶The participants were asked for their consent to record the individual interviews. Recording the interviews allowed for transcription via Dragon NaturallySpeaking software. Dragon NaturallySpeaking software allows for users to upload wav. and MP3 files into the software for transcription purposes. One benefit is the immediate review of the interview data to compare against notes taken during the interview. Another is that the transcription software allows for the removal of a third-party transcriber who would have access to detailed, private, and personally identifying responses.

Validity and bias. ¶Validity acts to define a singular a truth about results of research (Gaskell & Bauer, 2000). Truth, within this study, are the experiences of the participants. Accordingly, truth is relative to the life experience or choices of each participant, which permeate acting upon the choice to accept a non-tenured employment position outside of tenure.

When conducting research, the sample size used must accurately reflect the population examined (Charmez, 2006).

Analysis of the data. ¶ Once collected, the data was transcribed and placed into Microsoft word documents, either manually for non-recorded interviews or automatically by the Dragon Text-to-Speech software. Once in text documents, the data was loaded into QDA Miner, a qualitative analysis software. QDA Miner allows for the quick coding, data analysis, and chart export of inputted data. Additionally, QDA Miner allows for the secure storage of data in electronic format, and not easily lost or damaged paper format.

Descriptive coding. ¶ The author employs the technique of descriptive coding to identify major themes, sub-themes, and commonalities of the data (Saldana, 2003). Descriptive coding allows for identification of topics within interview data, and thus, allows the researcher to more easily understand and place responses into a narrative. Descriptive coding also organizes the amount of differing data in a digestible way to provide themes to answer the research question (Gibbs, 2007).

Positionality

In terms of positionality, the author is a graduate student who both taught classes and worked on research projects as a graduate student. The author does not aspire to be a professor, but rather, is interested in the administration of higher education institutions. As such, the author takes great interest areas of administration related to human resources, such as the challenge to recruit, retain, and develop non-tenured faculty to an institution. The author takes great interest within the study of the faculty at Mosaic University, because, as discussed in the literature review, the author is fascinated that individuals choose to endure the hardships of adjunct life, rather than take what can be high-paying positions within private industry.

Conclusion

The research paper study is an explanatory case study on Mosaic University. Mosaic University is among the few public four-year institutions in America that does not offer tenure. Qualitative inquiry allows for answers to the research question, why do credentialed faculty choose to take a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university? The explanatory case study solicits faculty at Mosaic University, via email, to participate in a semi-structured interview with the researcher to answer the questions presented in the Interview Protocol. The Interview Protocol questions ask participants to identify socialization experiences and factors which affected their choice to accept a position at Mosaic University. Descriptive coding organizes the response data into a chronological progression of the participant's journey from student to faculty member. The next section reports the results of the study.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

The explanatory case study interviewed ten faculty from Mosaic University to answer the research question, why do credentialed faculty choose to take a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university? The data provides two identifiable benefits to the academic research community. First, the response data illuminates the participants' anticipatory socialization and organizational socialization experiences, which affected their choice to accept a position at the institution. Second, the data are used later in the study to provide suggestions for recruitment, retention, and development of faculty to future institutions which will not offer tenure.

The coding of the participant response data resulted in the following categories of themes related to accepting a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, public state university: a) Undergraduate Experiences, b) Graduate Experiences, c) Academic Employment Experiences, and d) Opportunity and Characteristics of Mosaic University. The themes within these categories are presented to craft the narrative regarding the choices to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, public state university. Response data regarding suggestions for recruitment, retention, and development of non-tenured faculty are also noted.

Collection Process

Population, sample, and participants. ¶The data collection began in February of 2018 after approval from the Internal Review Board of the University of Alabama. Initial contact with the identified list of potential participants began with an IRB approved Email Invitation to participate in the study. The Informed Consent form and the Interview Protocol to the email were included to ensure faculty received as much transparent information about the study as possible. The email invitation elicited only one participant, identified as Bret. Bret replied very quickly and relayed that Mosaic University was currently on Spring Break vacation that week; the vacation could be a reason for the low response rate. Bret identified interest in the study and was able to schedule time to complete the interview process. Nine days passed from the initial email invitation to participate in the study, and still, Bret was the sole respondent and interview. As a result, the author resent the invitation email. The Non-Disclosure Agreement for the study was attached to the second round of email invitations.

After the second email request for participation, two other participants, Owen and Keith replied to the email. Owen scheduled and participated in the interview. Keith chose not to participate in a direct interview but did reply with multiple email correspondence concerning his interest in the study. Keith was a former tenure-track professor with a lawsuit currently in litigation against another university over the failure to earn tenure and was reluctant to comment on some of the questions in the Interview Protocol. Rather, Keith provided select responses via email correspondence.

Keith is of special note because the study may not have been possible without his help. Keith's response to the email came twelve days after the first invitation for participation in the study, in which three total responses were received. Keith crafted an email which encouraged participation in the study and sent it to 20 faculty members. Keith also suggested directly calling

faculty, and stated, from experience, faculty respond to telephone calls rather than email. Five faculty members responded to the email sent by Keith, stating their intent to participate in the research. However, of these five, only three followed through with scheduled interviews.

A series of phone calls to the faculty eligible for the study were placed via the contact information listed in the directory. Messages for the prospective participants were left on four separate phone call sessions between the last half of March and the beginning of May. The phone calls resulted in four more faculty interviews, in addition to responses with three faculty members who explicitly stated they would not be participating within the research. Each participant was again sent the Informed Consent Form and Faculty Protocol Form. Within this round of emails the Non-Disclosure Agreement Form was also included to ensure the faculty were informed as to the intent of the study.

Table 4.1 provides a list of the research sample size, responses, and participants.

Table 4.1

Research Sample Size, Responses, and Participants

Participant sample	10
Sample declined	4
Response but no interview	3
Nil Response	30
Total eligible population	47

In addition to conducting interviews with faculty, the author also attempted to contact members of the human resources department. The author was directed to one specific member of the human resources staff. The author conducted an informal discussion initially to build rapport with the staff member during an exploratory phase of the study to obtain materials related to faculty recruitment and faculty contracts of employment within Mosaic University.

The author did explain the study and the research question to the staff member, and, during the course of the conversation, the staff member provided the author with the location of the Faculty Handbook. However, when the author attempted to contact the staff member for a formal interview, including an overview of the Informed Consent and Non-Disclosure Agreement, the staff member declined a formal interview. Additionally, no return contact was made when the author attempted to seek permission to use notes from the informal discussion in the study. The human resources employee is not included in the sample size or data.

Mapping of the Data. ¶The data was loaded into QDA Miner to run queries and visually map out consistencies within the data. Interviews were transcribed using the Dragon Speak Software after the interview. QDA Miner allows for upload of Microsoft Office Word Documents. The author's notes and search queries established the themes and codes discussed later in the chapter. Direct quotes were documented and mapped using QDA Miner, Microsoft Visio, and Microsoft Excel to pair quotes from participants to specific themes. After cleaning up the transcriptions from the Dragon Text to Speech software, major themes which took shape from the results of the interviews were identified.

Findings

Four major categories of themes resulted from the analysis, including the Undergraduate Experience, Graduate Experience, Academic Employment Experience, and Opportunity and Characteristics of Mosaic University. Before a discussion of the themes occurs, an overview of the participants is needed to provide context to the response data. Participants are identified by to protect their identity. One participant, identified as Stew, was eager to participate in the study, and even noted that, to his knowledge while working at Mosaic University, no researcher examined the institution from a social or human resources perspective. Stew reflected that,

through his experience, Mosaic University consisted of three categories of faculty: (a) experienced faculty members intrigued by the opportunity to start a new university, or looking to leave their previous institution of employment, (b) Ph.D. holding faculty with only industry experience, and (c) recently graduated doctorates starting their first faculty position.

Background of Participants. *Bret.* ¶ Participant 1, Bret, is a professor of history at the institution. Bret is a younger faculty member, with years of experience teaching at four-year institutions. Bret was drawn to teach by his experiences with his undergraduate faculty as well as his passion for history. Bret relayed he made his choice to become a professor prior to enrolling in graduate school; his graduate studies reinforced his interests. Bret was drawn to teaching by the mentorship he received from his instructors. Bret identified previously working at a startup company for two years post-graduation but found the “the workplace environment abusive and did not think the work was very fulfilling, which is a large reason I decided to go back to academia.”

Owen. ¶ Participant 2, Owen, is a younger faculty member who works in the field of mathematics. Mosaic University is the first full-time instructional position at a university for Owen. Choosing a career of academia was natural for Owen, who stated, “I did well in high school, I got a BS, Master's, and Ph.D. all in the same subject and it was just a natural progression for me.” Owen worked in private industry as well, but also shared that he preferred the academic environment. Owen previously worked for a community college system prior to accepting the job at Mosaic University, and was active in his national professional association.

Keith. ¶ Participant 3, Keith, is a mechanical engineer and is a former instructor at a four-year institution. Keith is a young faculty member, and his former job was the first full-time job after earning his Ph.D. Keith initially sought industry experience after his master's degree, but

the inability to secure work heavily influenced his decision to pursue his doctorate. Keith did not receive tenure at his previous institution and filed a lawsuit against the institution, alleging they knowingly withheld the financial and graduate student support he needed. The experience left him very suspect of institutional administrations and their power over faculty processes.

Stew. Participant 4, Stew, is a seasoned faculty member, who held tenured positions at different institutions prior to working at Mosaic University. Stew works within the technology department with advanced degrees in engineering. Stew is the only participant to have earned tenure at different institutions before coming to work at Mosaic University, and one of the few to have voluntarily left a tenured position. Stew also spent several years at a major technology firm. During the interviews, Stew repeatedly discussed his intrigue for the challenge to establish the department, curriculum, and foundation of Mosaic University (as a new, emerging institution).

Bruce. Participant 5, Bruce, is a former tenured professor who works in the chemistry department of Mosaic University. Bruce is one of three participants to voluntarily leave a tenured position. Bruce held post-doctorate teaching assignments at numerous other institutions prior to coming to Mosaic University. Bruce Has a track record of external grant support for his research. He was one of the participants in the study most critical of tenure. Bruce stated that Mosaic University has allowed him to focus on what he loves, which is research and helping students.

Davey. Participant 6, Davey, is unique to the study because Mosaic University is the first teaching job he took after graduating with his Ph.D. Davey is not a U.S. citizen and has experience teaching in his home country. Davey's expertise is in engineering. Davey is also a member of his national professional association and he reviews submissions for journals in his

field. Davey strongly praised both the faculty and the technology labs at Mosaic University and indicated both were a major factor in his decision to accept the position.

Helen. Participant 7, Helen, has years of professorial experience in the field of life sciences. Helen voluntarily left a tenured position. Helen earned her graduate and doctoral degrees outside of the U.S. During her education, she worked as a graduate assistant, which was where she formulated her passion for academia. Prior to accepting a position at Mosaic University, Helen worked as a tenured professor at a four-year institution, and also worked towards tenure at another institution. Her experiences left her critical of the tenure system. Helen was the only participant to say that Mosaic University's non-tenure system was a major attractive factor in applying to the institution.

Brian. Participant 8, Brian, is a middle-aged professor in highly specialized area of technology. Brian has extensive experience with government agencies and securing external funding for his research. Additionally, Brian is active in his national professional association and a regular reviewer for academic journals. Brian supports the concept of tenure and its use within higher education. He felt that his area of expertise was highly specialized and did not allow for abundant employment opportunities.

Diana. Participant 9, Diana, is a professor in history, with many years of teaching experience in different institutions. Diana shared a favorable view of tenure throughout the interview process. She repeatedly identified that tenure is the only power that academics have to protect themselves from arbitrary dismissal from administration. Diana felt there was the lack of opportunity in academia for those in the field of history, and expressed interest in possibly having a tenure-earning position in the future.

Jim. ¶ Participant 10, Jim, is a mid-career physics professor who works in an interdisciplinary field. Prior to joining Mosaic University, Jim worked at a small public four-year institution. He is active in the Mosaic University culture, including serving as a faculty advisor for student groups and working with campus organizations. He also edits an academic journal in the field.

Undergraduate Experience.

Undergraduate Experience includes themes that answer the sub-research question, “What experiences as an undergraduate and graduate student positively or negatively influence a participant’s choice to continue a career in academia?” Themes included Passion for Academics, Attraction to the Professorial Lifestyle, and Positive Mentoring Experiences. Participants identified that they began to ponder the possibility of becoming a professor during their undergraduate experience. Participants also shared that the idea of tenure was not an issue or topic they spent time deliberating upon as undergraduate students. Stew was the only participant who responded to internally reflecting on the opportunity to work in the tenure-track while as an undergraduate student.

The undergraduate experience cultivated the pathway towards a faculty career. The drive to become a professor led the participants to graduate school; and in graduate school, the participants experienced interactions which would eventually lead them to become professors. Two participants (Davey and Brian) did not identify experiences from their undergraduate careers as experiences which drove their desire to become academics. Both participants eagerly spoke about their experiences in graduate school.

Passion for academics. ¶ The participants identified a passion for academics, their field of study, and learning in general, as initial interests into pursuing an academic career. Such a

passion led participants to graduate school attendance, and then, professorial employment. The participants identified their passion for academics in two ways. The first was that the participants truly enjoyed their field of study, which included the course material, class attendance, and completion of projects related to their field of study. The second was that participants conveyed enjoyment in sharing their subject matter knowledge with other students by helping fellow students with their own studies. Owen's passion for his field of specialty, mathematics, stemmed back to his days in high school. Owen stated, "I did well in Math high school. I got a bachelor's, a master's, and Ph.D., all in the same subject. Becoming a professor was a natural progression for me."

Owen stated that he worked hard in his subject, and by the time he had the opportunity to apply for graduate school, he knew he wanted to enter academia as a professor. Bruce similarly traced his passion for science back to a young age, and identified that he was immersed in the fields of science since high school. Bruce shared that he had a strong desire to "help his fellow man," which led him to initially seek acceptance to medical school and become a doctor. During his undergraduate career, he combined his knowledge in science and passion for helping others by working as a tutor in STEM fields for fellow undergraduate students. Bruce stated: "In undergrad, I was all set to go to med school because I really liked helping people. But as an undergraduate, as I tutored other students in science, it made me want to pursue a career in academia, rather than as a doctor."

Diana, who was a history major as an undergraduate student, stated that she had strong intellectual interest in history, as well as a personal passion for applying the lessons of the past to the problems of the present. Diana also discussed how she often tutored her fellow history classmates and had a gift for modernizing the material in more digestible ways for the students

she worked with. By her account, Diana's undergraduate professors took note of both her interest in history and her ability to teach other students. Diana even shared that one professor came to her after class and stated, "Oh, Diana, you should be a professor yourself." The comment drove Diana to begin exploring the path to a career in academia, which included graduate school with the intention of eventually earning a doctorate and becoming a professor.

Other participants identified their undergraduate passion for not just their subject and teaching, but for conducting research. Stew identified that he was "absolutely immersed" in the academic culture during his time as an undergraduate. His social life and friendships revolved around study groups, after-hours lab research, and close work with his professors. Stew's love for his subject was so deep that, as a junior in college, he secured funding to work as a research lab assistant in the technology department and published two papers with faculty. Stew's undergraduate involvement in research established the foundation which would carry over into his graduate studies.

Keith shared that he also had a deep passion for his subject. Though many students enter college unsure of what their major will be, Keith started undergrad "... wanting to become a engineer and build airplanes at Boeing." Keith's passion for engineering lead him to involvement in a small student group on campus focused on racing solar powered vehicles. As required by many student groups, the solar vehicle group had an assigned faculty liaison. Keith stated that he and the faculty member quickly struck up mutual interests, and Keith enrolled in one of the advisor's design courses. From there, the advisor pushed Keith to become an undergraduate research assistant. In his third year of college, Keith began working for the advisor, and as graduation approached, the advisor convinced Keith to attend graduate school and to stay on as an assistant by securing funding for a graduate assistantship, thus continuing

their collaboration. At this point, Keith was not as focused on teaching as he was on research. However, he was extremely excited about the prospect to continue into a graduate assistantship and did not shy away from the fact that he knew there would be some form of graduate teaching and student interaction with the assistantship. Keith's response indicates that, indeed, as an undergraduate student, he was already contemplating his own career as a professor.

Helen shared a similar story to Keith in that, in her home country, she was identified by an advisor very early in her undergraduate career. The advisor saw Helen's interest in her discipline of study and enrolled Helen in a special program within her college that allowed her to gain an assistantship which would last from her undergraduate to her graduate and Ph.D. programs. The assistantship started as research based during her undergraduate enrollment. However, Helen shared that she entered the graduate program anticipating the opportunity to work with students at teaching-assistant level.

The data collected from the participants' interviews shows participants began their journey towards the professoriate with a passion for their subject matter. Such a passion caused the participants to stand out from their fellow undergraduate classmates, and in some cases, be identified by their professors as candidates for an academic career.

Attraction to the professorial lifestyle. ¶ At the stage of their undergraduate career where the participants identify a passion for their subject, and in some cases, begin to work as undergraduate research assistants, the very early stages of anticipatory socialization occur. During this stage of the undergraduate experience, the participants began to observe and, in a sense, imagine themselves in the professorate life. As previously stated in the theme of "Passion for Academics," Keith, Stew, and Helen were able to transition their passion for their subject into research assistant positions at a very young age. Such transitions, as identified by Keith and

Helen, reinforced their interest in the professorial lifestyle through the prospect anticipatory socialization experiences of teaching and research. Though not all participants were able to secure such assistantships during their undergraduate careers, the participants still identified their interest in becoming a professor while still earning their bachelor's degrees. Bret identified he was very immersed in his subject of history. And though Bret did not transition his love of history into a research assistantship, he did identify that the desire to enter an academic career began during his undergraduate studies:

“I liked the idea of being an academic. I liked the job I saw my professors do when I was in college and graduate school. I liked the flexibility of their job, and what it involved, which was teaching and research.”

Bret was so attracted to the idea of the professorate lifestyle during his undergraduate program, that he stated before he applied to graduate school, he already knew he wanted to be a professor. Bret identified that structured research, as well as reading for pleasure, within the field of history, always interested him, and heavily influenced his desire to become a professor. Yet, when pressed to discuss his thoughts of tenure as an undergraduate student, he commented that he had no thoughts or aspirations of becoming a tenured faculty member: As a student, I did not think a whole lot of tenure. I was aware it existed, how it works. Obviously, (I knew professors in academia) find tenure somewhat attractive.”

Owen had a great passion for his subject of mathematics but was unable to tutor fellow students during his undergraduate career because of his need to work to put himself through school. He shared similar experiences to Bret of both wanting to become a professor due to his love for researching and applying mathematical theory. However, he too was not aware of the tenure process, stating: “My desire to work in academia certainly began in undergrad. I worked

in retail stores as undergrad, and those experiences strengthened my desire to pursue an academic career. But the thought of tenure was not even on my radar.”

Stew came into his undergraduate career focused on pursuing science as a career, but did not enter his undergraduate studies knowing he would become a professor:

“I had great aspirations to be a scientist and was very interested in technology. I saw the job (of the professor) as an exciting way to both become a scientist, but also keep myself immersed in the university academic culture, which I truly loved.”

As stated, such aspirations led Stew accept his research assistantship as a 3rd year undergraduate and continue towards masters and doctoral degrees.

Jim’s experience as an undergraduate student was starkly different than the participants who identified working in close proximity to their professors as undergraduate students. Jim stated that, in his home country, the college where he earned his bachelor’s degree did not allow for the types of research assistantships that the other participants spoke of. However, this lack of personal interaction with the professors in his program enhanced his drive, out of awe and interest of the position, to become a professor himself. Jim mentioned multiple times during our interview that he has a continuous drive to learn. He also identified that his drive to learn during his undergraduate studies gave him the realization that the best way to learn is by working closely with his professors. He lamented on both his inability to work with his professors but also shared his excitement for his ability to work closely with his own students:

“As an undergraduate, I decided I wanted to be an academy professor. Right now, my undergraduate students are working on their own project very closely with me; almost as a partnership. In my day when I was a student, that sort of thing was just not common or really accepted.”

Such responses indicate that the attraction to the professorial lifestyle began during the participants' undergraduate careers, in that, the participants identified their attraction to the lifestyle based on both the ability to conduct research as well as the prospect of working more closely with faculty members. Participants' responses indicate they viewed professors as the gatekeepers of knowledge within the academic programs. Such a quality clearly attracted participants to the professoriate position. Participant responses show that, in a sense, they themselves desired to be the gate keepers of knowledge. Becoming a professor also meant the possibility of spending time on independent research with their own students at some point, which participants expressed a desire for. Responses indicate these desires played a factor in the participants continuing their graduate school education.

Summary of undergraduate experience. ¶Based on response data, the pattern emerges that eight of the participants outwardly displayed an interest, commitment, and superior intellect for their subject matter during their undergraduate career. The display of passion for their subject elevated their visibility within their classrooms and colleges to the extent that their professors took interest with the participants as students. Keith, Stew, Helen, and Diana all identified having relationships with professors who acted as mentors to the participants during their undergraduate years. Additionally, Bret, Owen, and Jim identified they experienced passive mentorship from their professors in that, the three participants were not working as closely with their professors as Keith, Stew, and Helen did, but still identified positive classroom interactions with their instructors. Such positive interactions were to the extent that the participants actively sought enrollment in graduate school with the intent of becoming professors. However, during the course of the interviews, the participants spoke more specifically as to how these mentorships shaped their desire to become professors during their

graduate studies, which is a theme which will be discussed in the following section. Responses indicate the early identification and attention from the professors facilitated the journey to graduate school, and thus, the path towards the professoriate positions at Mosaic University. As such, the themes identified in the category of Undergraduate Experience provides a partial answer to one of the sub research questions, which is, what experiences as an undergraduate and graduate student positively or negatively influenced the participant's choice to continue a career in academia? The participants' passion for their field of study, an attraction to the professorial lifestyle through interaction and observation of their professors, and, in some the cases of Keith, Stew, and Helen, positive initial mentoring experiences from their professors are the experiences which led the participants to seek a career in academia. The combination of these experiences led the participants to enroll into graduate school, which is the next category of themes discussed.

Graduate Experience

Graduate Experience explains how the experiences and anticipatory socialization which occurred within the undergraduate experiences drove the participants to attend graduate school, where they experienced a more robust anticipatory socialization of the professoriate position. As graduate students, the participants began to develop their understandings of the classifications of instructors within the institutions, the job duties of each position, the daily life of an instructor, and how to interact with their own students, while working as either graduate assistants or adjunct instructors. The category of Graduate Experience is broken into the themes of "Positive Mentoring Experience" and "Work with Students." The experiences discussed in the following themes act together as the catalyst which influenced the participant's to actively seek a career as a college professor.

Positive mentoring experiences. ¶The previous section discussed the participant's undergraduate experience in terms of interaction with their professors. Keith, Stew, and Helen even began working alongside professors as undergraduate research assistants. Keith, Stew, and Helen also stated that the relationships forged with their professors in undergraduate school continued during their graduate school career, as their professors actively sought to extend their assistantships in order to fund their master's and doctoral degrees. For the other seven participants, graduate school was the beginning of side-by-side work with academic professionals. All ten participants stated they worked as graduate assistants during their master's programs, and all participants except Bruce, who worked as an adjunct while completing his Ph.D., held assistantships through their doctoral programs.

The process of seeking, navigating, and accepting an academic assistantship provides participants experience into the bureaucratic processes inherent with academia. The participants identified that graduate assistantships allowed them to begin to understand the responsibilities and duties of their professors. In addition to understanding the role of the professor, the participants began to learn about the concepts, merit, and process of tenure. Bret stated that during his assistantship, he saw the divide in the history department between the faculty that had tenure and those that did not. Bret identified that the involvement in governance and student outreach was more prevalent and visible with tenured faculty than the adjunct or non-tenured faculty. The observations and interactions with tenured faculty gave Bret a positive outlook on tenure and the tenured professorial position:

“The big criticism with tenure is that (faculty) become unproductive after (receiving) tenure. I never saw that...I am really a fan of tenure. The professors I gravitated towards

in graduate school were all tenured and that made a difference to me (in my research and decision to become a professor).”

Owen discussed that, during his time as an undergraduate, he did not give much thought to the concept of tenured faculty. However, as a graduate teaching assistant, Owen stated that he worked alongside and observed tenured professors perform research. Additionally, he discussed working closely with students in programs within his department. His graduate experiences with tenured professors instilled in him a sense that the security of tenure within an institution allows tenured professors the chance to build and grow the foundations of academic programs: “As a teaching assistant, I saw faculty build programs because they had the time to do it; whereas if you do not get tenure and are jumping around to different schools, how are you going to have time to build anything?”

Owen identified that, even at his young age in graduate school, he began formulating the opinion that tenure equated to departmental stability, in that, tenure allows departments to enact learning programs for students and evolve those programs over time. Owen noted that, as with any new program which involves a large population of people, academic programs focused on student learning objectives incur successes and failure throughout the implementation of the program. Owen insinuated that in private industry, such growing pains or delayed success could equal termination. Owen’s perception is that tenure allowed the faculty to experience these growing pains and make the correct adjustments to, ultimately, provide the best educational program possible for students.

Diana’s responses regarding mentorship in her graduate program closely mirrored Owen’s. Diana stated that she did not understand the concept of tenure prior to accepting her first graduate assistantship, but that, within her first semester of working with faculty, she began

to cultivate a strong belief in the need for tenure within institutions. Within the context, Diana stated that she observed the constant struggle between her department and the college for program improvements for the students: “I saw strong faculty governance in the university. Because faculty had tenure, they had the freedom to constantly battle for what they believed in.”

Keith stated that the same professor who convinced him to stay on as a graduate assistant also found funding within the department to extend the assistantship into Keith’s Ph.D. program. The assistantship was contingent upon Keith working as a research assistant with the professor. When discussing the process behind staying in school to enroll in the Ph.D. program, Keith stated:

“At the same time my advisor was finally able to solidify my assistantship, I had also applied to many engineering design firms. I was torn, so I gave myself an internal deadline. If I didn’t hear back from any of the design firms by April, then I’d stay (to earn my) Ph.D. Well, that day came and went with no firm job offers, just unpaid internships. When that happened, I signed the dotted line on the Ph.D. form and started the program and continued my research with my advisor.”

Keith’s involvement in research with a faculty mentor mirrors the experiences described by Stew. When discussing his experience as a graduate assistant, Stew identified that his “immersion in academic culture” deepened during his graduate school experience. Stew said that, during his Ph.D. career while in the department of engineering, he experienced a healthy level of competition between groups of faculty members and their students. Within this competition, members of the department formed a comradery, where the free exchange of thought, knowledge, research processes, and data findings were shared by everyone involved. He identified that the department had a communal vision, where graduate students and faculty

had the internal drive, personal pride, and desire to be the group or team to make scientific break-through discoveries. But, those in the department, including faculty, also had the humility to share in each other's successes. Stew said that, in his experience, the members understood that good research positively benefitted the academic community, their department, and the institution as a whole. Specifically, Stew identified that the faculty in his Ph.D. program were always willing to share credit with and praise their graduate assistants. He mentioned this while discussing that he has heard numerous stories in academia of faculty taking an unwarranted share of credit for work done by graduate students. Though he identified a criticism of tenured faculty, Stew stated that he experienced the exact opposite in his department:

“When you hang out with a group of such great people, and when you are surrounded by such an incredible collection of upper level scientists who all have such a passion for the field, it's hard to not be motivated and consumed by the drive to continue such ground-breaking technological research.”

Helen shared an immersive graduate school experience, similar to that of Keith and Stew. Her discussion regarding her graduate experience conveys the importance of support from faculty that graduate student's need to complete complex requirements such as teaching courses and conducting research. Helen's graduate program experience was unique in that she completed both her master's and Ph.D. in her field at the same time. Helen noted that the intense program required a great commitment to research and learning, and without the help of her advisors and faculty in her department, she would not have been able to complete the program. “You have to have support for that growth as a graduate student. For me, I was lucky to receive all of the support I needed to pursue graduate school,” she shared.

She also identified, from her discussions over the years with other faculty, that she understands now, even more than she did then, that the positive support was paramount in her success. She noted that many of her colleague's marvel at her stories regarding the support she received in graduate school, as, per her conversations with fellow faculty over the years, they did not receive the same support during their graduate studies. Helen stated that the graduate school experience is imperative to prepare individuals to become professors. She relates this, again, to the horror stories her colleagues shared with her, stating that negative experiences or mentorship related to a graduate student's responsibilities to teaching and research will carry over into an individual's academic career as a professor.

Brian's discussion of the mentorship he received in graduate school is unique in that, as a graduate student, he worked under a professor who was on the tenure-track, but not yet tenured. Brian observed the difficult process of earning tenure. Brian said working in such close proximity and observing the work ethic of his advisor was "truly inspiring." As will be discussed later, Brian did not immediately become a professor after earning his Ph.D., and instead, worked in the private sector for over a decade before accepting a position at Mosaic University. However, Brian said that during his time in the private industry, he kept in touch with his advisor and continued to hold the same admiration for him that he had while in graduate school. Brian's advisor, much like Brian, also worked in the private industry before returning to academia; per Brian's recollection, his advisor continued to champion him to return to academia. In reference to the work ethic of earning tenure, Brian stated:

"I saw how hard my advisor had to work to get funding, to get studies and articles published, to get invited to conferences and speaking engagements, to do consulting as to stay relevant in the industry. I saw how hard he worked to get the good portfolio he

needed for his tenure application. And he did all of this while still teaching a full course load.”

The participants identified mentorship experiences which were positive, and thus continued the participant’s formulation of the desire to become professors themselves. Within the scope of the graduate assistantship were requirements for teaching within the participant’s respective institutions. As instructors in their own classrooms, participants identified their mentors offered help and support in areas critical to the success of reaching student learning outcomes, such as student engagement and delivery of material within the classroom.

Work with students. ¶ Participants identified that working with students as instructors and tutors further solidified their desire to enter the professoriate position. During their graduate school careers, participants discussed their interactions with students as either graduate assistants or adjunct faculty. Nine participants stated they worked in a teaching position or teaching assistant position during graduate school. The teaching experience during graduate school allowed the participants to interact with students in a proximity to that of the professor, and thus, continue the anticipatory socialization of the professorate. Bret, Owen, Keith, and Diana all discussed their love for teaching students during their assistantships. However, in the totality of the interviews, the responses from those four participants indicate that they were attracted to the entirety of the professorial position, specifically the research and service. The participants certainly conveyed their enjoyment for teaching students, but their interviews indicated they enjoyed the “service” element of professorial life as much as teaching. Stew, throughout his interview, consistently brought up his love for research and departmental service. Stew professed that he had more of a “managerial” mindset and would prefer to work within institutional programs to ensure the programs had the best instruction available, rather than spend

the bulk of his time delivering the instruction himself. However, Jim, Davey, and Helen all identified that their experiences as instructors during their graduate programs were the experiences which solidified their choice to pursue academia as a profession, post-graduation.

Up until this point in the study, the participant Davey has yet to be discussed, and as a reminder, Davey is the youngest participant and an engineering faculty. Davey did not discuss much of his undergraduate career during the interview, but cited graduate work with students as the main reason he chose to become a professor. Davey identified that he took great satisfaction in working within an academic institution, particularly working with the faculty and students for the purposes of conducting research, stating:

“As a graduate student, I was able to share knowledge with different people from different places, and that had not happened to me before. I saw during my studies that I would work with students, develop them, and then they would go on to these exciting new places. I just thought to myself, working with students, and learning from them as much as they learn from me - this is how I can contribute to the academic community.”

Helen worked as a teaching assistant during both her master's and Ph.D. programs, which is where she solidified her desire to return to academia as a professor, post-graduation. As previously mentioned, Helen discussed the support system she received from her advisors during her graduate programs. She spoke of her assistantship, and how it allowed her to shadow instructors during other courses they taught, discuss best teaching practices for material with fellow faculty, and the opportunity to falter in the classroom. She spoke of the need for faculty to ensure their graduate student's failures in teaching and research are used as learning moments:

“I taught as an instructor all through my master's and Ph.D. program. Working as a teacher and student in graduate school helped me grow as a faculty member. As a

student myself, I was empathetic to my own students and was cautious about not frustrating them. I am driven and want to grow as an instructor, and that really began for me in graduate school.”

With reference to teaching experience as a graduate student, Jim referred back to his statement identifying that he did not have much interaction with his faculty as an undergraduate student. Citing his frustrations from the power distance from his professors that he experienced in undergrad, Jim welcomed the opportunity to work closely with his own students as a teaching assistant. Jim identified that, as a graduate assistant, he found working closely with his students very rewarding. He has continued the practice of close proximity to his students alive in his own classroom today and cites the ability to work closely with small groups of students on research as a major factor for accepting the position at Mosaic University.

Within the theme of “Working with Students,” participant responses indicate the opportunity to act as instructors positively influenced their desire to continue pursuit of the professoriate lifestyle. As Helen stated throughout the interviews, when discussing the opportunity to teach during graduate school, the participants collectively conveyed they shared empathy for their students, as they themselves were once students. Additionally, all of the participants attended graduate school immediately after undergraduate school, and thus were not far removed from both positive and negative experiences within the classroom.

Summary of graduate experience. ¶The combination of the participants “Positive Mentoring Experiences” and “Work with Students” contributed to the participants’ choice to the become professors, post-graduate school. The experiences in these institutions is discussed in the next category of themes. As professors in various institutions, the participants then shared

the experiences which influenced their choice to accept a position at the non-tenured institution of Mosaic University.

Opportunity and Characteristics of Mosaic University

Opportunity and Characteristics of Mosaic University explains the participants' choice to accept employment at Mosaic University.

Nine of the participants, except for Davey, were employed, post-doctoral graduation, in other higher education institutions prior to accepting the position at Mosaic University. The undergraduate and graduate anticipatory socialization experiences solidified the choice to become professors. The organizational socialization experiences prior to accepting the position at Mosaic University contributed to the choice to accept the position at Mosaic University. The themes which emerged during participants' discussion of academic employment are "Work Experience with Tenured Faculty", "Best Employment Option Available", and "Location" and "Opportunity to Create the Foundation at a New Institution". In a sense, these three themes cannot be discussed independently, because they constitute the choice to accept the position at Mosaic University. The narrative of each participant and their decision to ultimately select Mosaic University as a place of employment hinges on the convergence of these experiences categorized by the three themes.

Experience with tenured faculty. ¶The theme of "Experience with Tenured Faculty" is a major factor in the participants' choice to accept a position at Mosaic. During the interviews, participants discussed vastly different experiences with tenured faculty during their academic employment. Such experiences with the tenured faculty influenced the participant's choice to accept a position at Mosaic University. The fact that Mosaic University does not offer tenure is perceived to be an attractive quality for some of the participants, and an unattractive quality for

others. Bret, Owen, Keith, and Diana all identified having very positive experiences with tenured co-workers in their past institutions. These four participants all relayed that when they accepted positions at the non-tenured Mosaic University, they did so with the hope that Mosaic would eventually offer tenure. Furthermore, the participants conveyed that in accepting positions in such an early stage of the new institution, they hope to be immediately eligible for or “grandfathered in” to the new tenure positions, should the institution eventually adopt tenure.

Rather than merely act as a bystander and hope Mosaic University adopts tenure, Bret, Owen, Keith, and Diana stated they devote their institutional service time to the organized faculty group. The faculty group is in the continuing process of finalizing a collective bargaining agreement. A goal of the collective bargaining agreement is to require Mosaic University to offer tenure to the faculty. As of the study, there is still no finalization of collective bargaining agreement with the faculty group and Mosaic University.

However, per the purpose of the explanatory case study, it is important to discuss what experiences led to these participants to convey pro-tenure attitudes, especially compared to responses from other participants. Bruce and Helen staunchly identified their disapproval of tenure in general, and vehemently disagreed with Mosaic University adopting a tenure system. Of note is that per the invitation to be involved in the study, the Interview Protocol identifies that the study focuses on the phenomenon of an institution which does not offer tenure, and thus, the subject of tenure, or Mosaic University’s lack thereof, permeates through each interview.

Positive experiences with tenured faculty. Of all participants, Bret and Owen were the most explicit and descriptive in sharing both their positive experiences with tenured faculty and co-workers, and in turn, support for the use of tenured systems in academia. Bret was the first interview conducted and was open from the beginning of our conversation towards his positive

feelings of tenure, despite not working in a tenured institution, nor having ever earned tenure himself. Bret, expressed support of tenure systems, stating that he supported the use of tenure, and that, he observed tenured faculty possessed an internal drive to work hard. Prior to joining Mosaic University, Bret worked for two years at a private-firm. He stated that he found the culture of the firm to “abusive and exploitive”, and shortly after his two-year anniversary with the company, decided to return to academia. His decision to return harkened back to his positive experiences in academia during his scholastic career. Bret’s interview conveyed a man who believed academia was his true calling in life.

Upon his return to academia, but prior to accepting a position at Mosaic University, Bret’s previous academic work experience was as a visiting professor position at a public university, and as a temporary lecturer at a private university. During both positions, Bret continued to seek a tenured position, as he never forgot his positive experiences with tenured faculty. Bret stated:

“The big criticism (with tenure) is people become non-productive after tenure; I never saw that. In my experience, at the other institutions I worked in, oftentimes, tenured faculty would have to be dragged out of the building to stop working.”

Owen’s prior academic employment experiences mirrored Bret’s. Owen previously worked at a community college prior to joining Mosaic University. Owen was not tenured or in a tenure position at the community college. However, he worked with tenured faculty at the institution and stated that he supported tenure based upon his experiences, “I read things about tenure and perception that faculty are lazy and quit after tenure. I never observed that.” Owen lamented that he was not accepted to the tenure positions he applied for within the community college institution. His inability to secure a tenure job ultimately drove him to continue his

academic employment search for tenure at other institutions. Owen's desire for structure and development as a faculty member drove his continued tenure search. With regards for his tenure search, Owen stated, "At an established research university with a tenure system, faculty come in and there is a development goal. I saw (tenure) as a development goal and was tired of (being in the perpetual cycle of) waiting."

Diana, similar to Owen and Bret, openly shared her desire for a tenure position. Also, similar to Bret, Diana chose to return to the academic world after working for three years in the private sector. Diana identified that she was not intellectually stimulated in the private sector, would often think back to her graduate school experiences, and long for the time she was back in academia. Diana finally took the steps to get back into academia and was able to secure an adjunct position at a university. Diana indicated that the adjunct position was a very positive experience, and a great way to return to doing what she loved, which was teaching history in an academic setting. She did, however, express that she was still searching for the illusive, full-time tenure position through the duration of her adjunct position. Diana related, regarding tenure, that:

"As an adjunct, I felt very vulnerable that I did not have tenure. I experienced a situation where a liberal faculty member was brought into a long, drawn-out departmental matter by a group of conservative students who disagreed with what the faculty member was saying and teaching."

Diana identified that the experience of the faculty enforced her belief in tenure, and the potential arbitrary dismissal by the administration if tenure is not there to protect the faculty. Diana expressed, "... tenure gives faculty freedom", and that she, herself, did not feel she had academic freedom or departmental protection from expressing her views without a tenure system in place

to protect her. As a result, after taking the position at Mosaic University, she has devoted much of her time to working on the faculty group and pushing the Mosaic University administration to adopt a tenure program for faculty.

Keith is of note because, as he readily identified, Mosaic University was not his first choice for employment. Keith's positive experiences with tenured faculty while in graduate school led him to take a tenure-earning position at another university prior to accepting the position at Mosaic University. Keith believed his tenure-track position was sabotaged by his department, to the extent that he filed a lawsuit against the institution. He provided a write up of the lawsuit he filed, with the crux of his suit alleging the institution offered employment with opportunities it could not support. Keith states the offer of employment came with the promise from his department that his program would provide a doctoral student for assistance in research, which did not occur. Despite Keith's identified negative experiences with the tenure system, Keith stated that he still champions the system of tenure. Keith readily discussed his involvement in the faculty group while identifying he was part of the group making the push for Mosaic University to adopt tenure.

The research study also found that not all participants who expressed support for tenure as a system were interested in earning tenure themselves. Participant Brian expressed support for tenure in academic institutions, but stated that, per his experience watching his mentor earn tenure, the process of earning tenure did not appeal to him. Post-graduate school, Brian worked in private industry for years, but as many participants stated, felt that academia was his calling. Brian taught as an adjunct at a four-year university prior to accepting his position at Mosaic University. Brian's adjunct positions were not enough for full-time employment and he continued consulting as a side business. With regards to tenure, Brian identified that he supports

the system because he witnessed arbitrary treatment, and what he considered, unfair punishment, of co-workers without tenure by the administration at his last place of employment. However, he also identified that the position at Mosaic University appealed to him because it was a full-time position in a university setting without the expectation of tenure. Brian stated, “The thought of tenure scared me. I saw what people had to through to get it, and I knew I did not have the energy to complete the process.”

Stew shared a similar path as Brian, identifying that, as much as he loved academia, he was presented with an amazing opportunity to work with a renowned private firm upon doctoral graduation. Stew explicitly stated that the money and industry recognition was better than that of academia, but that the corporate work environment was not as cohesive as the academic environment he spent the last decade working in. He stated:

“I had great experiences with tenured faculty in my academic career. I did have crossings with some tenured individuals, so I can see where some of the criticism of tenure comes from; but I also had some incredibly negative interactions with co-workers at (the private industry job). My opinion is there will be difficult people everywhere... Tenure is the brass ring. If you get tenure, you have the security to pursue your career the way you want. And sometimes that freedom can go to a person’s head.”

Stew continued that within a few years, of working in private industry, he began to search for options to return to academia. Eventually, he was offered a tenured faculty position at a major state university. He stated that he worked for the institution for many years, conducting interdisciplinary research with faculty and students. He also expressed how happy he was to be back in academia, working alongside fellow tenured faculty again. He was so successful in his return to academia that, eventually a major university invited him to apply for an administrative

position. The position included the opportunity to create the curriculum for an engineering program, which was appealing—he stayed in this position for some time. As will be discussed in the next section, a similar opportunity at Mosaic arose, which was the catalyst for his return to academia. Based upon his positive experience of working with faculty, Stew jumped at the chance to share his knowledge with the new faculty at Mosaic University.

Negative experiences with tenured faculty. Counter to the pro-tenured faculty are participants Bruce and Helen. Bruce and Helen identified that their negative experiences with tenure played a major part in their decision to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, public state university. Bruce’s previous work experience included two teaching positions, prior to earning tenure at a smaller institution. Bruce’s previous work experience peaked his interest into working at an institution without tenure, as his decision to leave the tenured position was based on his treatment by fellow faculty. Bruce stated:

“In my experience, sometimes people who have tenure use it as a crutch to do unruly things. Where I was, I was sick and tired of being sick and tired and wanted a change.... There were specific individuals try to make (my) life a living hell by trying to sabotage my work, my research, and my resources.... No one at Mosaic University is trying to sabotage you or get in your way, unlike the other place I was at.”

Bruce stated even with his negative experiences with tenured faculty, he never thought to leave academia. However, he did relay that the person causing such professional anguish to him on a daily basis also had tenure and was deeply entrenched in the department. Bruce knew that this person was not going anywhere for the next decade, and Bruce stated that, ultimately, he knew he had to leave his institution for the sake of his own mental health. The opportunity to

continue to work full-time at a university without the pressures and hierarchal system of tenure played a major factor in his choice to accept the position at Mosaic University.

“I enjoy the flexibility of academia, especially at this institution. You can be research focused and if you want to teach in the summer you can. But you don't have to do either.... I have a skewed version of tenure providing stability because I feel as long as you are doing what you are supposed to do, you will be fine (in your profession as an instructor).”

Helen shared similar sentiments regarding her experiences with tenured faculty. Helen laments that her experiences caused her to still have such negative feelings towards tenure and tenured faculty. Helen's anti-tenure perspective result from the first position she accepted immediately out of graduate school. She stated initially, she was thrilled to earn a tenure-track position at such a young age: “Tenure in higher education is the goal for most faculty, and I am no exception to having that goal myself. Tenure equals security, and who does not want security in their life?”

Helen identified an experience working in a tenured institution, which interestingly was also shared by Davey and Jim, in that, the tenured institutions tend to have a very hierarchal and seniority structure. Helen stated that in her experience, earning tenure in an academic department did not correlate into equality between her and her fellow tenured faculty members. Additionally, she stated that several faculty members, throughout both her pre-and post-tenure efforts actively and unethically involved themselves in her research, service, and work with students:

“The thing that I did not like when I worked at tenured institutions, especially my first tenured institution, was that tenured faculty had a seniority complex, such as ‘I am a senior, and I will be a part of your evaluation.’ It was really to the extent they tried to intimidate new faculty and non-tenured faculty. There was always that, ‘You be careful with me,’ feeling, even among people who were my peers.”

The experience led Helen to leave her tenured position. With work no longer keeping her in the town she was in, her partner was offered a better position in a different city. Helen initially struggled to find work, and was forced to take an adjunct position until a more permanent position opened up at a full-time institution. Eventually, Helen found a full-time position at another university, but she relayed, though, that the same negative experiences with tenured faculty continued at the new position. She cited the same experiences of a rigid, hierarchal system, which was controlled by people with even less academic experience as her. She actively looked for a new place of work while still employed, which was when she discovered Mosaic University. Helen was the only participant in all of the interviews that openly stated Mosaic University’s non-tenure system caused her to immediately apply for the position. Her responses indicate that she had little desire to work with tenured faculty again, and the prospect of working in a four-year, non-tenure granting, public state university presented a new challenge. When relaying her biggest issue with tenure, Helen stated:

“I had colleagues that did not have (my) drive. Because they are tenured, they have been teaching the same material for ten to twenty years, over and over. And to me that is the bad side of having tenure. For some people it has given them to the choice to be stagnant. Tenure can cause people to say, ‘I have reached the pinnacle of my career, and the hard work for me is over.’ For me, I do not need tenure to work or improve and do

the things I want to do. If you are doing your job, you should not be afraid or fearful that someone will come take you out (of your position).”

Best employment option available. ¶The interview data arose what the author perceived to be the logical theme of “Best Employment-Option Available.” Participants identified that, for a variety of personal reasons, which are discussed in this section, Mosaic University presented the best option of employment available. Of note is that, for some participants, Mosaic University did not provide the best financial or most prestigious job offer available. Table 4.2 lists the past experience of each participant prior to accepting the position at Mosaic.

Table 4.2

Previous Work Experience of the Participants.

Participant	Private Industry Experience	Tenured or Tenure-Track Experience	Full-time Teaching Position before Mosaic University	Only Adjunct Experience before Mosaic University
Bret	✓	✗	✗	✓
Owen	✓	✗	✗	✓
Keith	✗	✓	✓	✗
Stew	✓	✓	✓	✗
Bruce	✗	✓	✓	✗
Davey	✗	✗	✗	✗
Helen	✗	✓	✓	✗
Brian	✓	✗	✗	✓
Diana	✓	✗	✗	✓
Jim	✗	✗	✓	✗

Pro-tenure participants such as Owen, Bret, Keith, Brian, and Diana all discussed their search for tenured positions; however, their searches were futile, and the new institution of Mosaic University proved to be the only institution offering full-time work for the participants. Contrastingly, Stew, Bruce, Helen, and Jim all left full-time positions as instructors and later accepted positions at Mosaic University. Keith, Stew, Bruce, and Helen were also either previously tenured or in tenure-track positions. Bret, Owen, Stew, Brian, and Diana responded to having work experience outside of academia. Mosaic University represented the best

employment opportunity for the participants in terms their own either financial, intrinsic, and career development needs. Mosaic University, as a new institution, offered the participants unique opportunity as a new institution. The responses discussed in the theme of “Best Employment Option Available” provide context as to why an academic chooses to work in a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university.

Consistently in the interviews, the concept arose that Mosaic University and its non-tenure system offered an opportunity of involvement which was not available at other established universities, such as those with rigid and structured tenure systems. The following presentation of the field of themes of classified in the category of “Best Employment Option Available” discuss elements related to Mosaic University which are likely inherent of any non-tenured institution. However, later in Chapter 4, characteristics unique to Mosaic University are explored, which consistently emerged from the interviews as reasons related to accepting a position in a four-year, non-tenure granting, public state university. To themes within the category of “Best Employment Opportunity Available”, are “Only Employment Opportunity Available”, “Desire to Work in a New Environment”, and “Best Opportunity for Institutional Involvement.”

Only employment opportunity available. Bret, Owen, Keith, and Diana were the most pro-tenure participants of the explanatory case study. These participants readily took positions at Mosaic University because the institution offered full-time work at a university. Bret, Owen, and Diana cited their only other offers at the time of their job search were non-tenure offers of employment as adjuncts at community colleges. The interviews indicated the participants accepted the positions with the intent to work internally to change the non-tenure policy at Mosaic University.

In terms of discussing why Mosaic University was the best option for Bret, Bret relayed that as his visiting lecturer position ended, Mosaic University was the only offer he had available to him. Bret stated that his inability to secure a tenured position was primarily due to his field, which is history: “My field is a unique situation because the job market is so bad. History professors essentially take whatever offers become available to them. It's always been rough, but since 2008, it has been particularly bad.”

Owen’s experiences prior to joining Mosaic University consisted of working at a community college. The community college employed a tenure system, yet Owen was not accepted to the tenure positions he applied for within the institution. Because of his lack of opportunity, Owen moved to a geographical area where there were many other institutions located in the surrounding area. Owen openly discussed applying for several positions at other institutions, including tenure-track positions. Owen did not receive any offers from the tenured positions. When discussing the decision to accept the offer from Mosaic University, Owen noted:

“At the time the offer from Mosaic University came through, it was the only offer that was both full-time and at a university, and not a community college.... I had a few offers from community colleges, but honestly, they were even a step down (from the institution I left). The only university offer I had was an adjunct position that would have required a long commute.”

Despite Owen’s work towards Mosaic University adopting a tenure system, he identified that a major selling point for accepting the position was the merit-based employment that came with Mosaic University:

“My hard work and involvement with service and teaching makes me feel secure here, even without tenure. I do not feel it is the ‘make-or-break’ feeling that can come with tenure, but again, I am a contract employee, and at any point they could release me.”

Owen noted a unique characteristic of Mosaic University, and as a result, other non-tenured universities in that, the institutions do not have a ‘make or break’ feeling, which comes with accepting a tenure-track position at some established institutions. Owen lamented:

“If you go to a more established, tenured university, the politics of the department will already be in place. The bureaucracy of the college will already be in place. It takes a whole lot more effort to make an impact. And you have to go through a lot more red tape just to pitch new ideas.”

Diana identified Mosaic University represented the best option of employment for her because she was limited in the scope of her job search by location due to her husband’s employment. Similar to the other pro-tenured faculty, Diana relayed that, had a great, tenured opportunity materialized, her and her husband would have discussed the possibility of a move. However, no offers from any of the tenured positions for which Diana applied came through. Diana stated that she was working as an adjunct and had positive experiences with the tenured faculty in the institution, which caused her to seek employment in a tenured position herself. She was more concerned with a full-time position over a tenure position, hence the application to Mosaic University, but that she still actively applied for tenure. As no other full-time applications came to fruition, Mosaic University made an offer to Diana, which included the opportunity to take a lead on creating research and a curriculum. Diana stated that the offer was too good to pass up, but that the vulnerability she feels without tenure drives her to spend time with the faculty group pushing for a tenure process and system within Mosaic University.

Brian identified that even though he was pro-tenure, he found the idea of working in an institution without tenure very appealing. Full-time, non-tenure employment was appealing to Brian because, per his observation as a graduate student of his advisor's struggle to earn tenure, Brian had no interest in going through the tenure process himself. Brian spent years looking for the right opportunity to leave the private industry and come back to academia. His initial return consisted of working as an adjunct professor, but he was looking to make the switch to full-time professor. He identified that Mosaic University was the best employment option available for him because, as he said, the offer was "probably my last chance to get a full-time job at a university". With regards to why Mosaic University offered him the position, Brian stated:

"I had a lot of experience in the field but had been out of the academic realm for so long, I did not have credentials many top places look for, like publications, teaching experience, knowledge about online learning. Plus, my field is very specialized so not a lot of institutions have open positions available for nan-technology professors."

Of the last of the pro-tenure group, Keith identified Mosaic University was the best full-time, financial opportunity available to him, and that he was very excited about working with such a new university. Keith did apply for tenure positions at other institutions post his tenure denial, prior to accepting the Mosaic University position. Keith also discussed that, despite his previous employment ordeal, he never wavered about leaving academia:

"The one thing I do like about academia is the independence. It's also a lot of fun when you have a lab full of students and you're working with them to tackle a problem that hasn't yet been tackled. I get a big of a high from that!"

Desire to work in a new environment. ¶ For faculty stuck in what they perceive to be a negative culture, Mosaic University offers such individuals a chance to continue work in

academia, but within a completely new environment. Bruce, Helen, and Stew are participants of note because they are the only three of the ten who voluntarily left tenured positions. Bruce, however, is the only participant to leave a tenured position to accept a job at Mosaic University. To recall, Bruce and Helen stated they left their tenured positions because of their negative interactions with specific tenured faculty members; while Stew stated he left his previous position over his perceived financial prioritization of the program by the department. All three participants left stable, gainful employment, only to later accept positions at Mosaic University because the institution provided them intrinsic value and internal satisfaction their previous institutions could not.

Bruce stated that he remained employed in his previous institution while searching for a new position. At the time of his job search, he interviewed for multiple other institutions, including at one institution which was offering a tenure-track position. Despite the tenure-track offer, Bruce stated that he believed Mosaic University was a better opportunity for him. Bruce stated that science labs and facilities, the state-supported commitment to innovative research, and the lack of a rigid hierarchy at Mosaic University contributed to his selection of Mosaic over the tenure offer at the other institution. Essentially, Bruce believed that the unique characteristics of Mosaic University would ensure that he would have a different academic employment experience than the negative experience he looked to removed himself from:

“Mosaic University was a new and exciting adventure. A tenure granting institution is great and there are some perks to them, but going through the tenure process again, and working under tenured faculty for several more years, was not on my radar of something I wanted to do.... For one, Mosaic University is not financially driven because the state gives us a budget every year. So, if enrollment changes, our budget is still the same.”

Similar to Bruce, Helen chose to remove herself from her negative faculty experience at the institution where she earned tenure. Helen did have a stop gap at an institution in-between leaving her tenured position and accepting the position at Mosaic University, where she worked as a full-time instructor at a four-year university. Despite employment at this institution, Helen relayed that she was not experiencing the academic career she imagined for herself. She remained employed but continued her search for a new institution which more closely aligned with her career vision for herself. When pressed on the academic vision she searched for, Helen stated:

“I wanted to work with driven people, who have the same desire to continuously grow and develop.... Development to me is conducting collaborative research in your field and achieving high student success in the classroom.... Many of my former colleagues did not share (the attributes I do).”

Helen stated that her job search brought her to positions posted online for Mosaic University, which caused her to explore the institution further. She admitted the newness of Mosaic University and their non-tenure employment model immediately attracted her to the institution, and ultimately, drove her to accept the position. She explained, “When I saw the mission and the vision of Mosaic University, and that it was essentially starting from scratch, that was very enticing to me.”

Helen stated that in her initial interviews, the promotion of the collaborative teaching environment was what ultimately finalized her decision to accept the position. She stated that through her talks with the hiring committee, she understood that the environment was able to be so collaborative because the institution did not offer tenure, and thus, “everyone is at the same

level” at the institution. Such a concept met her vision and was completely different than that of the tenured institutions she looked to get away from.

Stew shared similar opinions with regards to the opportunity of working in a completely new environment as a major factor for coming to Mosaic University. Stew identified that after he left his last position, he contemplated retirement, a return to private industry, or perhaps, returning to academia as a specialized adjunct. However, he stated that he knew he had a rare set of skills in terms of both his research abilities, his knowledge of his field, and his leadership and administration experience. Stew identified that he heard rumblings through the industry that the a public, STEM-focused university was being established, which caused him to research the institution with what were initially just general inquiries. Once he learned more about the institution and applied, Mosaic University offered Stew the opportunity to become the director of a program of study within the engineering college. When describing what drove him to Mosaic University, he stated:

“Mosaic University has a different psychology to it than other institutions I’ve been at, and it comes from being a new university. I was very intrigued by trying to start something new and chart a new institution. For me, I have earned tenure twice, have published dozens of articles, and amassed thousands of citations. What is one more article or research paper for me at this point in my career? Doing something for the greater good in a new institution is an interesting challenge.”

Best opportunity for institutional involvement and leadership experience. ¶ Davey and Jim neither lacked employment opportunities, nor did they express past negative experiences with faculty or institutions. Rather, both Davey and Jim discussed the opportunity for involvement Mosaic University provided to them, as compared to other similar institutions

where they applied. Mosaic University is Davey's first employment position, post-doctoral graduation. Davey identified that he was offered a position at a more established university but took the Mosaic University job because he knew he would be "just another faculty member" at the other institution.

"I have opportunity for involvement here that I would not have at other institutions if I was not a tenured faculty. If I were to have accepted (a non-tenure job at an established university), with it being my first full-time faculty job, it would take me a while to understand how all of the processes are completed... In terms of facilities, we have the latest technology. Even some stuff other schools don't have. So, it's an opportunity to work with systems I may not even have access to if I did take (a different position)."

Davey also reiterated his passion for learning and sharing knowledge superseded his desire for a tenure position. Davey again discussed his assurance that, at this early stage in his career, Mosaic University offered him a position he would not have received at any other institution. He stated that, as he came close to finishing his doctorate, the allure of Mosaic University as a brand-new institution, in a city he wanted to live in, that was focused solely on STEM-fields was almost a dream come true for him. Davey identified that, during the interview process, he expressed his desire for service to the administration members interviewing him, and Mosaic University offered him the opportunity to serve on a chair within the department. The opportunity to serve on a chair, as Davey says, allows him to understand the processes at Mosaic, which then allows him to help other new faculty and students in the institution. Davey compared that to stories of his peers, who stated they felt "lost" being new faculty members in larger, tenure granting institutions.

Jim expressed similar responses as Davey with regards to the opportunity for involvement provided by Mosaic University. Davey was just entering his academic career, and as he said, took the position which would inevitably offer him the most experience. Jim is unique in that he declined the invitation by his previous employer to apply for a newly opened tenured position, and instead, joined Mosaic University. Jim discussed that, at his previous position, he did not take the non-tenured position hoping that, eventually, a tenured position would become available, but rather, it was a fortunate coincidence. In terms of taking the tenured position at his previous institution, Jim stated that he understood that tenure would equal job security, but that he questioned the level of autonomy and involvement the school would give him during years he would spend on the tenure-track. He juxtaposed his concerns to the opportunity Mosaic University offered:

“When I was looking for new positions, Mosaic University was a new college, and they saw my credentials (and asked to interview me). When I spoke to them during the interview regarding what I wanted to do, they provided me the opportunity to establish research projects and create course curriculum within the department.”

Jim identified that the opportunity for service and involvement in the institution provided by Mosaic University was a completely rare opportunity, stating, “It would have been years before I had the opportunity to have that responsibility at my last job (even as a tenure-track faculty member).”

Similar to Davey, Jim also spoke about the facilities available at Mosaic University, noting they are an attractive recruiting tool for both faculty and students.

“A major selling point of Mosaic University is the digital library. It’s the first of its kind in that is all digital. We are trying to create in a different way (at Mosaic University), and students are excited to be part of this new style of institution.”

Attraction to Mosaic University. ¶Mosaic University possessed specific characteristics which attracted the participants to accept positions at the institution. The non-tenure employment policy of Mosaic University was not the single attractive feature to participants with an unfavorable view of tenure, such as Bruce and Helen. Additionally, the non-tenure employment policy was obviously not a “deal-breaker” for tenure-supporting participants, such as Bret, Owen, Keith, and Diana. The previously discussed themes provide a context to which to view the choice of the participant to accept a position at a four-year, state university that does not offer tenure to faculty. Yet, even within said context, the participants also provided responses mentioning specific traits and attributes of Mosaic University that ultimately influenced their choice to accept the position. These traits are broken into the themes of “Location of the Institution” and “Opportunity to Create the Foundation of a New Institution”.

Location of the Institution. ¶The theme of “Location of Institution” involves both the desirability of the area near Mosaic University’s campus location, and also the immobility of participant’s due to family commitments. Seven participants responded that the weather in the area played a factor in accepting the position. Bret stated that his wife had veto power of all of the final applied institutions, and that other institutions were not in consideration due to weather. Davey and Jim both also stated that their families asked them not to accept positions in the parts of the country with undesirable weather. Jim stated that he had interviews and offers from other institutions, but that the weather and cost of living played a part in his decision. Davey simply

identified that he and his family loved being in the area. Bruce stated that when he was actively looking to switch jobs, he immediately included the area in his searches because of the weather.

Helen and Dianna are of note with regards to their responses concerning the location playing a factor in their decision to accept the position at Mosaic University. Helen relayed that at the time of her job search, her and her family were not living in the state. As Helen researched and learned more about Mosaic University, she spoke with her husband about the possibility of moving her family unit to the state to take the position at Mosaic University. Her husband is employed with a company that allowed for a transfer to the state. When Mosaic University offered Helen the position, her family moved and her and her husband were both able to start new positions in the state. Diana relayed a similar family situation in that her partner's employment position was restricted to the area. Diana did identify applying for other positions in the area; however she did not relay as to how far the range of her search extended. She noted that under the right circumstances, should an institution offer her a tenure position, her family unit would consider moving. However, such a circumstance had yet to arise.

Create the foundation of a new institution. ¶ Mosaic University is a new institution, and thus does not have many of the processes yet in place that older, more established universities do. Central to the idea that a faculty member may be lost within a large older institution, Mosaic University marketed to prospective faculty the opportunity for involvement and service to create the foundation of Mosaic University as the intuition continues to grow. Participants routinely listed the opportunity to create the foundation of a new institution as a characteristic of Mosaic University which influenced their choice to accept the job. Participants both for and against tenure systems provided responses regarding both the opportunity and struggles of creating a new institution. Four participants, Stew, Bruce, Helen, and Jim, who left or declined tenure-

positions at other schools, all stated the major factor for accepting the position at Mosaic University was the opportunity to work in developing a newly created university. Owen, Keith, and Diana, who consistently responded as to being critical of Mosaic University's non-tenure system, each gave lengthy responses regarding the uniqueness of the opportunity to establish the culture and policy of a new institution. Stew provided a response which encompassed the participant's view of working at a new university, stating, "There is an opportunity here to form a culture that is unique, and from what I have seen, that is why many of the faculty are here." Participants elaborated on elements which constitute creating the foundation of a new institution, and common responses were (a) curriculum development, (b) hiring process and committee standards, (c) serving as the chair of a committee to establish a policy, (d) serving in mentoring programs, and (e) leading research.

Regarding these elements, Owen, discussed how, in his experience, the tenure-process at tenure granting institutions can be "make-or-break" for a faculty member. Owen further elaborated that, if a faculty member does not earn tenure during the three-to-six-year tenure process, then the individual essentially has to attempt to restart their career at a different institution, if they are lucky enough to find another tenured position. Owen, despite his support for tenure, did identify that Mosaic University, in his experience, provided faculty the time to develop. Faculty are able to grow because the administration understands the institution, itself, is growing and developing, thus requiring a mutual understanding between faculty and administration.

Diana identified that, during her interview process, Mosaic University officials continuously pushed the fact that Mosaic University was a new institution and that those faculty

hired prior to and right after the institution opened would be instrumental in creating the foundational processes and culture of the institution:

“Mosaic did a good job, as far as marketing and with the sell, that ‘this is a new university, and it's going to be different, and you are going to have a chance to impact the university’. I do specifically remember that when I was talking with them initially.”

With regards to Helen’s previous negative experiences with tenure institutions, Helen believes that the newness of Mosaic University, combined with the lack of tenure system, ensures that faculty systematically remain equal within their respective departments. The structure of the departments within the institution, not just the non-tenure aspect, made Mosaic University a desirable place of employment for Helen. She identified that, inevitably, some hierarchy exists, as hierarchy is necessary when managing an institution as large as a university. However, much as Owen said, Helen believed that when she accepted the position, rigid systems would not be in place, and that, through her efforts, she could work to ensure such a system does not come into effect at Mosaic University:

“I will be part of something where we will be building the structure and putting something in place that is not found in established institutions. Hopefully there is that legacy of being able to inspire people who want to work, not because they are incentivized by the security that can be part of the (professor) job.”

Jim and Davey, both chose the opportunity to work in a new institution over tenure and the continued search for tenure, respectively. Each identified that they valued the opportunity to create and establish the foundation of a new institution more so than working towards tenure in an existing institution. Consistently through both Jim and Davey’s interviews, they continued to allude to their belief that tenure still carries a rigid hierarchal structure, in that, achieving tenure

at an institution does not guarantee a faculty member will be allowed involvement in their choice of service within an institution. As Jim said, “I have a chance to help establish the research and the curriculum within the department. I started out at the foundation of the institution and that gives me more satisfaction than having a tenured job.”

Davey similarly echoed Jim’s responses, stating:

“For me I like to learn, that’s my goal. We have lots of opportunity to put this institution on a bigger platform within the (academic research) community. I have opportunity for involvement here that I would not have at other institutions if I was not (a) tenured faculty (member).”

Additionally, participants cited that a perk of working within a new institution is the opportunity to work with new equipment and new facilities. Stew, Bruce, Helen, and Jim expressed admiration for the technology buildings on campus. The new, main building was constructed as part of the expansion project after the annex of Mosaic University. Jim and Davey cited the massive online library housed by Mosaic University’s technology division. Bruce and Stew did not give detailed specific details on equipment, but they did identify that Mosaic University contained engineering research tools in the laboratories that are not available at other, renowned institutions. Collectively, the participants identified that Mosaic University offered facilities which STEM-focused faculty undoubtedly would be attracted to, in terms of considering Mosaic University for employment.

Experiences with Mosaic University and Suggestions for Other, Non-Tenure Institutions. ¶

Through the lens of socialization, the data previously discussed identifies past experiences of the participants which affected their choice to accept a position at Mosaic University. The Interview Protocol contained a question that asked, what are the participant’s

suggestions for recruitment, retention, and development of non-tenured faculty? Participants provided both accounts of experiences and suggestions to institutions contemplating enacting a non-tenure system of employment for faculty.

Many participants discussed the existing opportunity which comes with developing a new university, such as Mosaic University. All participants agreed that a new institution will not have all the processes in place which are needed for success during periods of growth. Though the creation of these processes attracted participants, the lack of processes and procedures also causes great stress for the faculty. Bruce and Owen made a comment regarding the established and renowned universities, specifically institutions that are over 100 years old, and referred to said institutions as “well-oiled machines”. The term “well-oiled machines” is interesting for the context in which both participants spoke of such institutions in that, both participants identified the fluency of operations under decades of established and built upon processes. Yet, both participants also noted how easily a new faculty member, even a tenured faculty member, can become lost within an established, 100-year old institution.

Stew, who for context is the director of an academic program at Mosaic University, came across as the participant most involved in service at Mosaic University. Stew was the oldest and most experienced participant and was one of the first faculty hired. With regards to the struggles of starting a new institution, Stew admitted:

“Mosaic continues to struggle with planning. Mosaic perhaps started too quickly without enough infrastructure and too tight of a timeline to lockdown funding and accreditation. Lack of planning makes every aspect of running the institution more difficult, as we encounter challenges we did not plan for.”

Stew, with insight as an administrator in Mosaic University, was the only participant to provide a reason as to why Mosaic University does not offer tenure. To paraphrase a very lengthy explanation, Stew identified that not offering tenure at this time is Mosaic University's only option because, currently, the institution does not have the space to do so. Mosaic is very limited in classroom and laboratory space, in terms of multiple faculty having all the resources required to conduct the research needed to earn tenure. Stew suggested that offering tenure would be a "nightmare" for both Mosaic University and the tenured-track faculty because the tenure system, especially in a STEM university like Mosaic University, involves stringent research requirements. Mosaic University does not have the space to provide the resources for faculty to meet those requirements, and Mosaic University will not have the space until, per Stew, the planned construction of a new research building begins in two years.

Until more space is added, and a collective bargaining agreement is reached, Mosaic University will likely stay a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. The interview process provided the opportunity for participants to share their experiences at such an unconventional institution. The author's intention with the explanatory case study is that the participants discuss their own journey to accepting the position at Mosaic University, and thus, retrospectively review how to effectively recruit, retain, and develop faculty in a non-tenured system. The responses of the participants are broken down into themes of "Terms of Employment", "Faculty Development", and "Recruitment and Hiring".

Terms of employment. The premise of the case study centered on Mosaic University's system of contractual, non-tenure employment for faculty. Undoubtedly, participant's responses regarding their individual perception and navigation of employment under a non-tenure system at Mosaic University permeated through each interview. The theme of "Terms of Employment"

contains participant's suggestions regarding best practices for implementing and sustaining a non-tenure employment system in a new institution. Each participant indicated a measure of desire for job security but identified that tenure should not be the only provider of job security to a faculty member. Helen provided a quote which embodied the responses of the participants, regardless of their support or mistrust of tenure systems, which was, "I do not need tenure to work or improve at my job."

As discussed in Chapter 3, Mosaic University offers faculty an initial one-year contract, which is subject to renewal. However, Bret, Owen, Stew, Brian, and Diana all expressed they believed Mosaic University's requirements and expectations for contract and contract renewal are not clear. Additionally, all of the aforementioned participants, with the exception of Brian, stated that contract renewals are not done in a timely manner.

Bret gave a quote which represents the views of the participants who responded critically to Mosaic University's contract employment system, stating:

"The biggest problem I have with Mosaic University is they created a plan of a non-tenure granting institution without a plan of what was going to replace tenure. And either they need to have an alternative model (which existed prior to hiring faculty) and prove it would work, or they needed to go with tenure because it has been proven to work."

A pattern of responses emerge which indicated the participants believe the inconsistencies in the renewal process cause much stress on the faculty. Bret identified that the plans for a contract system acting as the alternative to tenure are poorly formed and not well communicated. In Bret's experience, Mosaic University does not establish clear criteria for why contracts are renewed, or even more specifically, for how long those contracts will be renewed. Owen identified that, the process causes unneeded stress on faculty because, to be fired from

Mosaic University, an individual must be an extremely underperforming faculty member, as in, a faculty member who fails to show up to teach class. Still, Owen and Diana state that they both observed fellow faculty stress over the fear of non-renewal of their contract. Job insecurity is a justified cause for stress, and Jim identified that, of the six faculty that hired with him, four have quit, due to the inconsistency of contract renewal. Brian also identified that the inconsistency in the contract renewal process makes the faculty employed on the first-year contract feel as though they are “at-will” employees, and thus, causes much unneeded stress and worry throughout the departments.

Responses indicate that participants are more upset about the inconsistent implementation of the non-tenure system, rather than the fact that Mosaic University does not offer tenure. As identified by Jim, the stress of the system has caused some faculty to leave the institution for more perceived stable employment. Stew shared suggestions for reducing the stress of faculty within the contract system by, as Stew said, creating a “culture of stability before the first student walks in.” The culture of stability, per responses, hinges upon clear communication regarding the required pillars of academia, which are teaching, research, and service, as well as a consistent contract renewal process. Helen and Owen both stated that, for institutions using the contract employment system, the details of the system must be clearly communicated to both current and prospective faculty. As Helen stated:

“I do think it would be great for more universities to establish non-tenure systems. The drive (of faculty) should be the motivation to work, not just earn tenure. But the university needs to be able to clearly say to the employees, ‘Look, we do not have tenure, but this is what we do have. We have a renewable contract system, and this is the type of productivity we want to see to continue to renew your contract.’”

Faculty Development. ¶The theme of “Faculty Development” emerged from analysis of responses relating to faculty promotion, faculty training for leadership positions, and faculty receiving performance feedback. Participants responded that the goal of the contract system should be to create the stable environment that a tenured system, ideally, creates, without the years-long tenured process, or the inability to remove poor performing faculty. However, Diana indicated that there is little to no review process, meaning that, rather than a formal review, faculty often compare themselves to their observations of their peers. Again, combined with an unclear renewal process, Mosaic University’s faculty’s uncertainty of their own performance appears to be a cause of stress throughout the institution.

Participant responses indicate the development process appears to differ by department. Davey and Jim both relayed that, upon hiring, they were given a mentor, and would schedule regular update sessions with the mentor. Jim and Davey both elaborated on the need for faculty to understand the requirements for promotion so that an individual has a plan for advancement. With regards to personal development, Davey commented about his recent discussion with his own mentor regarding his development goals for the 2018/2019 school year. Davey described the mentor program and structure within the department, stating the newly hired faculty work under the supervisor, which is often the department chair, and the department chair trains the new faculty. Each program within the department also has a Senior Instructor who is responsible for training and mentoring the faculty.

Conversely, Diana claims that no mentoring program exists within Mosaic University. She stated that at no point in her time at Mosaic University was she given a mentor, nor has she seen any colleagues provided a mentor. Diana also shared that, in terms of contract renewal based upon performance, “It is very unclear what the metrics are (for evaluation). To most

faculty it looks manipulated.” Furthermore, Bruce provided suggestions for the implementation of a structured mentoring program, by which departments would pair both young and old faculty together in an effort to allow older faculty to assist younger faculty with research, and younger faculty assist older faculty with classroom teaching.

Bret and Brian also relayed that they experienced no plan of advancement within the institution. Of note, is that Bret and Diana are in the same department. However, Brian, Bruce, Davey, and Jim are also in different departments, which means Mosaic University likely does not have a clear, institutional wide development plan. Bret’s belief regarding development of faculty is that, much like many other processes, the plan of development was not laid out properly for the new institution prior to hiring faculty. Bret stated he also observed colleagues, who had their contracts renewed, still leave the university due to the lack of vision guiding the expectations and plans for development:

“The reality is the computer engineers and scientists can get other jobs, and there have been people who are leaving already. A lot of the reason (for leaving) is that there's just no clear plan for how to develop professionally. Without that plan, it is hard for people to get invested in the university.”

Owen, who is also critical of the loosely implemented non-tenure system, discussed some of the issues with the lack of clear development path for faculty at Mosaic University, stating:

“At an established research university, faculty come in and there is a development goal. There is more structure, and faculty know what they need to work towards. At Mosaic, faculty may not know what the expectations are. Faculty may not know if they are doing enough. There may not be enough support from the administration. I do not feel as much structure or explanation of the expectations.”

Much like the stress caused from the inconsistent contract renewal, as Bret, Own, and Diana stated, the inconsistent development plan causes faculty to leave the institution. Even worse for both students and faculty, the lack of a review plan, as identified by Owen, may allow faculty to underperform in their job duties. Turnover and poor performance have a negative impact on the institution. In terms of creating a solution to the inconsistent development plan, both Brian provided suggestions for other non-tenured institutions, which are critical to ensuring faculty advancement. Brian indicated the best practice for non-tenure institutions is to review the tenure process of similar institutions, and then require a similar but less stringent tenure path throughout the duration of the faculty member's employment. Per the best practices for developing faculty, the consensus from the participant's responses call for a system, not as stringent as a tenure process, but where a standard review process still occurs at set intervals to review and discuss set milestones in terms of development, teaching, and research.

Recruitment and hiring. ¶The theme of "Recruitment and Hiring" emerged from participant responses related to their own experiences on committees or hiring process within the institution, as well as interaction with new and existing faculty and colleagues. Primarily, responses conveyed that the institutional personnel responsible for recruiting and hiring new faculty do not properly convey Mosaic University's systems of contractual employment and faculty development. Bruce and Stew noted that only recently did Mosaic University begin to have enough qualified faculty apply through the Board of Trustees planned channels of job postings and the Mosaic University website. Prior to this point, many of the faculty were hired through networking with existing Mosaic faculty. Per Stew's account, the institution barely had enough teachers to cover sections of the classes offered. The lack of instructors is further compounded by, what the participants described as high turnover in the institution.

Related to the responses regarding attracting faculty, Bruce and Stew also stated they understand that starting an institution from a foundational level with no available processes is not an attractive recruitment sell to all prospective and applying faculty. Many responses regarding the establishment of the new institution identified that Mosaic University, and thus non-tenured institutions, are systems and positions which applicants find counter-intuitive to the training that credentialed doctoral graduates receive. Universities, colleges, and institutions accredited to offer doctoral programs are assumed very structured and contain the processes necessary to bestow advanced degrees to students. Mosaic University does not have these processes yet, and as Bruce relayed, many new faculty at Mosaic University experience frustration because the new institution and non-tenure system asks the faculty, who may have only worked in established institutions, to radically adjust their own work process and methods they may have been accustomed to for the last 20 years.

Both Jim and Diana specifically identified they observed the stress of the new institution and non-tenure system cause turnover in their departments. In the participants' opinion, their exiting colleagues believe Mosaic University was not clear or upfront about the administrative policy and standards regarding terms of employment and job duties. Helen, at length, spoke of her dissatisfaction with the fact that Mosaic University is not clear within advertisements for job postings that the positions in Mosaic University are non-tenured positions. By her account, many applicants see postings with the term "Associate Professor" and assume the position is tenured. She identified as serving on a hiring committee, and relayed she encountered applicants end interviews with Mosaic University committees upon learning the position is not tenured. Bret commented on the struggle of the lack of clarity with the contract system, in terms of recruiting new faculty, stating "... the idea of not having tenure is scary to some applicants."

Per the summation of the responses, the applicants identified their view regarding the best practices for hiring new faculty to a non-tenure system is to be very clear in the marketing, job postings, and interview process that the institution does not offer tenure. The participants harkened back to their responses regarding the theme of “Terms of Employment” in clearly establishing how the implementation process of the non-tenured contract system in the institution. A clearly communicated employment system, as participants identified, is needed for both the current faculty, but also to ensure the institution attracts and retains new faculty as needed. The consensus from the participants, in terms of what to market to prospective faculty, is that the contract system is provides an opportunity to build a career in less stringent system than tenure. The contract system can come with the teaching, research, and involvement achievements, but not in a system as “make or break” as most tenure models.

Conclusion

The author coded the interview responses using the descriptive coding method and presented the major themes of the data in chronological order which traced participant’s journey from student to faculty member at the Mosaic University. Descriptive coding allowed a clear understanding of the participants experiences, and thus provided rich data which gave answers to the research question, why does a credentialed faculty member choose to take a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university? The author identifies that a combination of undergraduate, graduate, and academic employment experiences, as well as the desire to create the foundation of a new institution, contribute to the choice of accepting a position at a four-year, state university that does not offer tenure.

From the data, patterns emerged that the participants’ undergraduate passion for their specific subject and attraction to the professorial lifestyle influenced participants to apply to

graduate school with the intention of becoming a professor themselves. Once in graduate school, the participants cited positive mentorship and an enjoyment of teaching students as factors which influenced their choice to continue into the professoriate career. Upon entering their academic career, the participants cited a) lack of academic jobs available during the time of the job search, b) negative experiences with tenured institutions at previous places of employment, c) the best opportunity for involvement, d) the location of the institution, and e) the opportunity to create the foundation of a new institution, as the reasons for a position at a four-year, state university that does not offer tenure. Participants also identified that as faculty of Mosaic University, they collectively believe the processes and plans for the areas of contract renewal and professional development need to improve both the recruitment and retention faculty to and within the institution. Specifically, contractual renewal and employee review processes must come at specific, set intervals. The next chapter provides a discussion of the findings as related to the current academic employment environment, a discussion of socialization theory related to the findings, and recommendations for best practices regarding recruitment, retention, and development of non-tenured faculty.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Introduction

The research question posed by the explanatory case study asks, why do credentialed faculty choose to take a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, public state university? The dissertation is an explanatory case study using full-time faculty of the Mosaic University to gather data to answer the research question through a semi-structured, qualitative interview. The data gathered from the interviews elicited themes that created a chronological narrative of the participant's journey from student to employee at Mosaic University. Additionally, the participants discussed the success and challenges of working at a four-year, non-tenure granting, public state university.

The following discussion compares and contrasts the findings of the study with previous research in the field, and thus, provides research data to begin to fill the current gap in literature regarding credentialed faculty member's choice to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state institution. Next, the author provides recommendations for institutions seeking to implement non-tenure systems of employment. The chapter the presents the author's conclusions based upon the data gathered in the study. Finally, the discussion section addresses the study's limitations and implications for future research.

Discussion

The following discussion presents the interview data in a comparison to the previous research presented in literature review. Little research directly exists as to why faculty would

take a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. The four areas of integrative examples related to the findings used in the discussion section are the placement of experiential stories to the reduction of support to higher education institutions, reinforcement of socialization experiences affecting choice to accept the position at Mosaic University, the identification of faculty's passion for teaching and service, and the need for structured faculty development.

The discussion also includes a section regarding the finding's areas of divergence. In this section, the author discusses the findings which either go against or are not accounted for in the literature review. The section regarding the areas of divergence includes two specific discussions. First, discussion occurs on the findings related to the areas of attribution theory, regarding the participants' identification of causal events which affected their choice of employment. Second, discussion occurs on the identification of the specific characteristics of Mosaic University, which are the location of the institution and the opportunity to create the foundation of a new institution.

Placing stories to the plight of the current academic landscape.¶¶The need for the study derives from the drastic defunding in higher education over the last 40 years. A result of the defunding of higher education is the loss of tenure positions, and the rise of a reliance on contingent faculty, as cited numerously by Kezar (2011, 2012, and 2013) and Kezar and Maxey (2013). The data here yields stories which show the plight many faculty endure searching for full-time work within institutions. Bret, Owen, Brian, and Diana explained that Mosaic University was the only full-time position available to them. Diana did identify that she was isolated by location, however, Bret, Owen, and Brian freely admitted Mosaic University represented the only full-time position offered to them during the time of their job search. These accounts of job scarcity and underemployment provide real-life examples of the previous

research regarding the defunding of higher education, plight of adjuncts, and national reduction of tenured and full-time positions (Kezar & Maxey, 2013; Singell & Stater, 2006; Martin, 2012).

The experiences of Owen, Bret, Keith, Brian, and Diana provide stories, experiences, and faces which illustrate and personalize the National Science Foundation's findings that large numbers of Ph.D. graduates are either unemployed or underemployed (2012, accessed through Larson, Ghaffarzadegan, & Xue, 2014). Again, important to note is that all participants in the study carried the credentials to earn tenure-track positions. Each participant held a Ph.D. in their field of teaching, carried numerous publications on their vitae, and served on external organizations related to research within their field. Yet, five of the participants struggled to find full-time employment, let alone tenured positions. Unemployment of qualified individuals in a particular industry would then mean the industry is at capacity in terms of available positions for qualified individuals, thus, lending credence to the idea, using findings from *The Economist* (2010) and National Public Radio (2013), presented in the literature review, that institutions are flooding the academic job market with Ph.D. graduates for academic positions that do not exist.

Interview data further advances the discussion on the reduction in available academic positions in that the participants in the study who previously earned tenure did so well before the Great Recession of 2008. Bruce earned his first tenure position in 2007, and Stew and Helen earned their first tenured positions well over twenty years ago. Their experiences are of note because, despite the decrease in tenure since the 1970's, the research shows that the Great Recession of 2008 hastened the decline of tenure positions in higher education (Mitchell, Leachman, & Masterson, 2010), and as such, may provide reasoning as to why only the veteran faculty who participated in the interview were the faculty whom were previously tenured. Of

note is that Brian is a middle-aged faculty member , but an outlier, since he spent the first part of his post-doctoral career working in the private industry.

Participant responses support socialization theory related to choosing a career in academia. ¶¶¶The participants' responses support the idea that socialization during the undergraduate, graduate, and initial entrance into the workforce affect the choice of the participants to accept the positions at Mosaic University. Based upon responses, all participants decided to become professors either before or during their graduate school careers. Such findings support the research of Bess (1978), Clark (1987), Corcoran (1986), and Austin (2002) in that, as graduate students, the participants contemplated, formed, and created expectations of life as a faculty member. The collective narrative emerges that graduate school experiences further elevated the participants' desire to become professors. The internal drive to pursue the professorate increased through the participants' employment as graduate assistants or adjunct teachers. Such teaching positions allowed closer access to tenured and non-tenured instructors in their department and institution. Responses indicate closer access to professors, either through mentorship or involvement in their department, caused the participants to form personal beliefs, ideals, and expectations towards the role of a professor within an institution, which thus supports research which indicates that graduate students experience anticipatory socialization of the professoriate (Merton & Kitt, 1950). Participants, though themselves not in the position of the professor, were able to formulate expectations and a vision for themselves as professors.

The anticipatory socialization experiences during graduate school led participants to enter their first academic position with the preconceived beliefs, attitudes, and expectations of the professoriate position. As with any employment position, post-graduate academic employment involves organizational socialization into both the role and institution. Participants identified

their post-graduate employment experience shaped the views of their attitudes towards tenure. Bruce and Helen, who relayed negative experiences with tenured faculty, expressed that a non-tenure system at a university is a positive attribute of Mosaic University. Conversely, Owen, Bret, Keith, Brian, and Diana, who relayed positive experiences with tenured faculty, cited the non-tenure system as a negative attribute of the institution. Further, during their interviews, Bruce and Helen both championed their efforts to refine the contract system, while the pro-tenure participants relayed their efforts within the faculty union to champion Mosaic University to adopt tenure. The responses closely relate to Lunenburg's (2011) findings regarding positive organizational socialization and cultural indoctrination experiences directly relate to employee morale within the institution.

Essentially, the non-tenure system at Mosaic University is perceived as a "pro" to two participants, and an extreme "con" to four participants, regarding the choice to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. In general, the pro-tenure participants were the most critical of Mosaic University, with Bret, Owen, and Diana voicing their displeasure, throughout the duration of the interviews, of the administration's implementation of the contract system. Yet, the two participants who were most supportive of Mosaic University during the interviews, which were Jim and Davey, were admittedly ambivalent towards the desire to earn tenure.

Response data suggests that all the participants are vividly aware of the popular critiques of tenure mentioned. In every interview, each participant discussed their own view of tenure, and, to some degree, the positive and negative attributes of tenure espoused in the academic field by both supporters and critics of the system and its use. Six of the participants immediately brought up the critique that tenured faculty are lazy (Riley, 2011), only Bruce and Helen stated

that their negative experience with tenure affected their decision to come to a non-tenured institution. Bret, Owen, Brian and Diana stated explicitly that they had never encountered a “lazy” tenured faculty member. Rather, in their experiences, tenure allowed for the job security and innovation needed to produce rich research. Bret, Owen, Brian, and Diana’s statements lend experiential support to Pain’s (2014) findings regarding the security provided by tenure acting as an allowance for innovative and groundbreaking research not afforded to non-tenured or private sector researchers. In the instance of Bruce and Helen, these participants shared experiences of faculty simply “going through the motions” in their position. Bruce and Helen both explicitly stated that they witness abuse of power, stagnation in productivity, and lack of motivation from another tenured faculty, while employed as tenured faculty themselves.

Responses by Bruce and Helen provide experiential support to the findings of Figlio, Schapiro, and Soter (2015) which identify that the use of tenure in academic institutions will inevitably lead to problematic instances of reduced professional motivation and a reduction in the quality of instruction by a tenured professor. To be clear, some analysis provided by Figlio, Schapiro, & Soter (2015) is justified by Neumann & Terosky (2007), who cite the burdensome time commitments tenured faculty face in underfunded institutions as reasons for said decline; and Malesic (2016), who cites the high probability of tenured faculty burnout. However, Bruce and Helen did not discuss any other mitigating factors, such as citing the employee involved in the conflict was under stress. Rather, both stated that the individuals which caused them to seek employment elsewhere abused their departmental power and openly conveyed “seniority complexes” while in the office. Providing further experiential support to Malesic (2016), Brian’s anticipatory socialization experiences with the often-overwhelming effort and time commitment needed to earn tenure led him to not actively not seek a tenure position. The participant

responses indicate a myriad of previous experiences with tenured faculty. Research which portrays tenured faculty in a positive light, such as Carrell and West (2008) and Jacoby (2008), as well as research which shows tenured faculty in a negative light, such as Pearce (1999) and Wetherbe (2013), depend on the population sample.

Socialization and constructivism. ¶The study's findings support the idea that the participant's anticipatory socialization experiences and organizational socialization experiences led the participants to accept positions at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. The findings also speak to the constructivist paradigm perspective discussed in the theoretical framework. Constructivist perspective identifies that an individual takes the responsibility for determining meaning in their learning process, and thus, uses said experiences as motivation to continue to grow (Kukla, 2000). Within the constructivist paradigm, the participants of the study, which are faculty at Mosaic University, do not have a set process to reach their goal of employment as a professor. The participants spend their scholastic career working towards advanced degrees with the hopes, as they all said, of finding gainful employment in the realm of academia. Yet, post-graduation, the ability to earn employment suddenly is out of the realm of control of the participants. Other factors, such as position availability, and number of qualified candidates applying for the same position, affects the individual's ability to secure an academic position. At this point, the continuous learning process found within the constructivist paradigm takes place in that the participant's adapted to their current employment environment. (Savicks, 2005). Bret, Owen, Keith, Brian, and Diana were unable to secure tenured positions at other institutions, and thus, their learned response to their environment was that a full-time, university position provides more stability than adjunct employment. These participants, because of their

learned, positive socialization experiences with tenured faculty, are now working towards Mosaic University adopting a tenure.

Under the constructivist lens of the pro-tenured faculty, Bruce and Helen learned through negative socialization experiences with tenured faculty that an institution which does not offer tenure provides less of a probability of negative experiences with tenured faculty to reoccur. The learning process of the participants as professors in academia is continuous in that they are members of a unique organization, in an environment, which is unlike any other academic environment in American higher education. The participants continue to learn from their experiential involvement in creating the processes at Mosaic University, and thus, advance their ability as effective faculty in academia.

Attribution theory and helplessness theory. ¶The responses regarding experiences with Mosaic University's non-tenure system and the opportunity to establish the foundation of a new institution provided the most descriptive, passionate, and personally introspective responses given during the ten interviews. Mosaic University's status as a new institution was a major factor influencing the choice to take the position at the institution. The responses of the faculty concerning the theme of reasons for accepting a position at Mosaic University warrant a discussion on Weiner's (1972) attribution theory and Seligman's (1975) helplessness theory. Seligman's helplessness theory crafts the wording of the research to indicate that individuals ascribe blame to elements beyond their control for their choices regarding employment (Seligman, 1975), which in the context of this study is the choice to accept a position which may not be at the participants' employer of choice. The data inescapably shows that of the respondents Bret, Keith, Stew, Bruce, and Helen attributed leaving their previous places of employment to factors designated outside of their locus of control. Placing cause to external

factors for leaving a position support the principles of attribution theory in that, the participants each cited obstacles within their previous places of employment which caused them to seek employment elsewhere. Additionally, Bret, Owen, and Brian relayed that their inability to secure full-time employment was based on the current job market of their field of study. Such responses seem to support using the lens helplessness theory in that the participants identified factors completely outside of their control as primary reasons for limited job opportunity.

The principles of attribution theory most fit the participants of the study in that, each gave causes as to why they selected the position at Mosaic University. A summation of the causes identified are that Bret, Owen, Keith, Brian, and Diana all cited unavailability of job opportunity; Bruce and Helen cited the desire to work in a non-tenure environment, and Jim and Davey cited the unique opportunity for involvement in the institution. The decisions set forth by each group show a willingness and strong desire to advance their skillset and experience as professors. The faculty demonstrated a willingness to provide service to their institution, as well as discussed at length their passion for working with students.

Based upon the responses, learned helplessness theory is not an appropriate lens to view to the participants' choices. Under the lens of the constructivist paradigm, the participants each made the best possible career choice for themselves to stay within the realm of academia. The participants' anticipatory socialization experiences and organizational socialization experiences allowed them to formulate their own expectations and goals for themselves as academic professors. Mosaic University offers a continued opportunity of advancement, both personally and professionally, for the participants. The choice to stay within the previous work environments, as described by each participant, would have been counter-intuitive to advancement. For example, for a person who wants to pursue a full-time career in academia,

such as Bret, Owen, Keith, Brian, and Helen, the decision to continue on as an under-employed, part-time adjunct would have been illogical. For Bruce and Helen, to continue working in environments which lowered their morale and affected their research publication productivity would have similarly been illogical. And for Davey and Jim, who both identified their internal desire for service and involvement in academic institutions, to accept positions with no autonomy would, indeed, have been illogical.

Reasons were given for leaving other positions as well accepting the position at Mosaic University. Unless an individual is working within their career of choice, with their employer of choice, in their position of choice, and in their location of choice; a qualitative interview discussing an individual's reasoning for accepting a job will inherently contain elements ascribed to outside the locus of control of the individual, and thus contain responses easily ascribable to helplessness theory.

Participant passion for teaching and service. ¶The research data provided insight in the intrinsic importance faculty place on teaching students and providing service to an institution. The research responses showed that Owen, Keith, Stew, Diana, and Brian all either worked or had offers in the private sector for equal or higher pay yet continued to work in academia. In terms of financial security within academia, Stew, Bruce, and Helen all left tenured positions to come to work for Mosaic University. Finally, Jim identified that he turned down a tenure-track position to come work for Mosaic University. The participants' responses indicate a strong, inherent desire to help others and teach students, which is consistent with Hackman's (2007) findings that faculty member's driving motivation is their desire to teach and work with students. The participants' responses also supported the previously mentioned research which identifies financial gain is not always the dominant driver of an individual's employment choice (Adam's

Equity Theory, 1963; Herzberg's Two Factor Theory, 1964; McClelland's Human Motivation Theory, 1961; and Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, 1943). Presumably, no rational person would dedicate five to ten years of their life needed to complete graduate school, in addition to turning down jobs in the private sector outside of academia, if they were not immensely passionate and dedicated to the life in the professoriate.

A possible conclusion is that the participants feel a strong drive and passion for teaching students and providing service to their institution. Of note is that no participant responded to limiting their job search to only include institutions which did not offer tenure. Bruce, Helen, and Jim stated they interviewed for tenure-track positions at other institutions before accepting the position at Mosaic University. These participants indicate that Mosaic University speaks to the participants' psychological needs (Maslow, 1945). The inevitable creation of the organizational foundation of Mosaic University will also fulfill these participant's self-fulfillment needs (Maslow, 1945).

Participants identified that, as a new institution, Mosaic University provides a unique opportunity for involvement in service to the institution. Such opportunity is at a level which is not available to new faculty, let alone non-tenured faculty, at what many of the participants referred to as a "100-year old university". Participants noted that the opportunity for involvement at Mosaic University may not exist for them at other institutions, due to the layers of organizational structure at larger institutions, which are not present at Mosaic University. Such sentiments relate to findings by (Beaky, Besosa, Berry, Martinez, and Bradley, 2013) regarding institutions' unwillingness to include non-tenured faculty in governance. The commonality of the responses is the emergence that, regardless of their personal view of tenure,

participants believe larger institutions operate under an organizational structure which makes creating or influencing immediate impact systematically difficult.

Mosaic University's recent creation offers faculty the challenge and opportunity to begin work at the ground level of an institution. Multiple participants identified their involvement in the organization, creation, and participation in the establishment administrative functions such as faculty handbooks, hiring processes, hiring committees, and mentoring programs. Such involvement shows participants' willingness and drive to advance the institution, and thus, create an improved organizational process for their present and future colleagues. The nobility of the participants' service to the institution is of note because, the mere fact that the participants spend their time creating institutional processes and structure shows that the participants do not have the institutional support which would be found at the larger, established institutions.

The participants in the study respond that they overcome institutional challenges, which is counter to research that shows a lack of institutional support can cause job dissatisfaction, and thus, low employee productivity (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Further, the participants overcome their own lack of support to create systems for the institution so that their fellow and future colleagues will have a system of institutional support, which will equal both higher job satisfaction and increased productivity for their fellow faculty (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). The propensity of service towards the institution is also service towards the student body. The organizational systems created by the participants will increase the job satisfaction and productivity of the faculty within the institution, which will causally provide rich learning environment and experience for the students (Hatch & Dyer, 2004; Brewer & Brewer, 2010). The participants' commitment to the students, again, supports Hackman's research (2007), which

cites working with students is a primary factor for an individual's continuance as a faculty member.

The summation of the respondents who identify their active service to the institution indicates that the participants harbor an internal desire for involvement in the three pillars of academia, and to contribute to the collective good of both academia and the institution. Response data indicates each participant carried a passion for their subject, an observation which is further bolstered by the fact that each faculty member held a Ph.D. in their respective field. In an ideal scenario, an institution would strive to be an employer of choice, meaning that the institution's employees internally rank the institution as their first option of employment (Herman & Gioia, 2000). Few institutions achieve the employer of choice goal (Herman & Gioia, 2000). Mosaic University is no exception. Three participants stated they accepted the position because Mosaic University was the only job offer available to them. The findings support research presented in Chapters 1 and 2 concerning faculty finding themselves unemployed with few job opportunities (June 2013; Edmonds 2015).

The internal desire for service and involvement within an institution of academia superseded the desire for tenure for Stew, Bruce, Helen, and Jim; which support the findings of Brown, McHardy, McNabb, and Taylor (2011), which state that commitment increases productivity, in that, the responses indicate the participants are committed to Mosaic University, and thus, find the drive to create processes for the institution in addition to their commitments to research and teaching. A summarization found two commonalities in the responses of all participants, which is (1) their love of teaching and working directly with students in structured classroom setting, and (2) a clear passion for their field of study. At the time of their job search,

Mosaic University provides the best option for their desires to share their knowledge of their field of study with students in an academic setting.

Faculty development limitations within a non-tenure system. Stew provided a response regarding the non-tenure system at Mosaic University, which relates to Kezar's (2012) findings that institutions receive greater commitment from faculty when the institutions provide the faculty the resources to succeed at their job. As Stew stated, the non-tenure system at Mosaic University is currently warranted because the institution has not yet built the facilities or institutional processes a cohort of tenure-track professors would need complete the research warranted to earn tenure in a STEM field. Unfortunately, based upon responses, Mosaic University also has not built processes to effectively implement the contract system in lieu of tenure. All participants mentioned either their own personal frustration or witnessing colleague's frustrations with the contract system. The frustrations stem from the likelihood that Mosaic University did not meticulously plan out the entirety of the system with which to replace tenure. The participants' responses regarding the struggles of creating a new institution support research by Buch, Huet, Rorrer, and Roberson (2011), which identifies that institutions which have systems implemented to train, monitor, and advance employees harbor workers with higher morale. The participants' identification of their observation that Mosaic University faculty quit over the ambiguity of the contract and development system bolsters research from Herzberg (1969) and Iarrobino (2006), which shows an institution's inability to provide faculty job security will cause low morale and job dissatisfaction, which in turn will lead to turnover.

The problem then comes to the implementation of the contract and development systems, and not necessarily the fact that Mosaic University does not offer tenure. The general consensus among participants is that the non-tenure system of employment at Mosaic University could be

more clearly designed and more effectively implemented. However, the idea of a non-tenure position is attractive to some participants, even those who generally support tenure. Owen and Brian did respond that the elimination of tenure removes the stress caused by the urgency to earn tenure on a tenure-track position. In lieu of working towards tenure, the time can be focused at a reasonable pace for the faculty to improve their own teaching and research skills, as well as allow time for service to the institution.

Not all faculty have a clear understanding of the development and advancement process at the institution. Additionally, participant responses regarding mentorship were interesting in that, Davey and Jim applauded the Mosaic University mentorship program; yet Diana claimed there was no mentorship program, and Bruce suggested the institution establish a mentorship program. Clearly the non-tenure system, as currently constructed, results in different experiences for different faculty. Discussions regarding the contract renewal and development process at Mosaic University show that, if even staunch supporters of the institution, such as Stew, Bruce, Helen, and Jim, convey that problems exist within the institutions contract and development system, the system should be altered for improvement.

Non-tenure system of employment. ¶ The participant responses indicate that, for quality faculty, an institution which uses a contract system may still, inadvertently, cause faculty members to feel like adjunct faculty. Mosaic University faculty are full-time faculty, but those who are newly hired on a one-year contract are essentially contingent faculty. The participants' response also relates to research which suggests contingent faculty, and in this case Mosaic University faculty who feel as though they are contingent faculty, experience workplace stress over job security (Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, & August, 2012). Participants are split in terms of expressing the effectiveness of the current contract model. The dedication and

opportunity for continuous learning under a merit-based employment system superseded the need for participants, Helen, Jim, and Davey to take a tenure position. Yet, the responses from the five participants who are critical of the implementation of the current contract system support Stigmar's (2008) findings stating unclear faculty development programs are met with resistance and not often effective. The contract system eliminates the stress of tenure, and, theoretically, places all faculty at the same employment level, apart from the departmental chairs. Yet, nine participants identified they observed fellow faculty leave the institution due to the perceived instability and lack of development conveyed by the administration. As such, if the contract system is meant to reduce stress, responses indicate the system, or rather the administration's implementation of the system, fails at the desired outcome.

Areas of Divergence

The following are areas of divergence from assumptions and presented literature.

Attributes of Mosaic University. ¶The attributes of Mosaic University, specifically the location of the institution and the opportunity to create the foundation of a new institution, were not expected to be so commonly cited when discussing the choice to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. These characteristics are specific to Mosaic University alone, and are, per the responses, such prominent factors, that other similar institutions necessitate comparable inquiry to create a large breadth of knowledge related to the field of faculty accepting positions at four-year, non-tenure granting, state universities. With regards to future research and the context in which to view the findings of the study, the desirability of location of an institution to a candidate will be unique in each state and, will unfortunately affect institutions differently. In the case of Mosaic University, a new institution also means new facilities, and new contractual work with business partners in the area.

Participants Stew, Davey, Helen, and Jim mentioned the digital library, IT and computing facilities, and the IST building as strong drawing points for the faculty.

The second unaccounted attribute of Mosaic is the faculty's draw to create the foundation of the new institution. Participants overwhelmingly discussed their ability for involvement and service at Mosaic University, citing institutions ability to offer opportunity not found at other established institutions. The participant response related, albeit very differently from the research studies assumed purpose, in that the participants were able to help provide a framework for future, newly created, non-tenure institutions to develop systems to recruit, retain, and develop faculty.

Organizational socialization experiences with tenure. ¶The author expected a higher number of participants to respond negatively towards tenure. The author also expected a higher number of participants to cite the institutional removal of tenure as a major factor contributing to accepting a position at Mosaic University. The data gathered showed that only two of the ten participants, Bruce and Helen, shared openly negative views towards tenure. The other eight participants all spoke highly of their experiences with tenured faculty. The study's findings are in direct contradiction to the AAUP report citing non-tenure-track faculty report rank-based mistreatment from colleagues within their institutions (Cronin & Smith, 2011). Within the study, only the previously tenured faculty cited mistreatment by tenured faculty, while all non-tenured participants responded to having positive interactions with tenured faculty in both graduate school and as academic professionals.

Research presented in the literature review discussed several common critiques of tenure. Such examples are the perception that tenured faculty are prone to lack of motivation, and thus, become complacent in both their teaching and researching careers, as cited by Pearce (1999); and

the lack of classroom teaching innovation institutions receive from tenured faculty, as cited by Wetherbe (2013). The author, using the lens of socialization theory, incorrectly assumed that participants working at a non-tenured institution would more readily identify a major factor affecting their choice to work in the institution involved negative experiences with tenured faculty. Within the context of the participants interviewed, the data shows that positive socialization experiences with tenured faculty in graduate school and previous places of employment did not prevent the participants from accepting a position at a non-tenured university. Rather, the participants who responded to having positive experiences with tenure were critical of Mosaic University's non-tenure system. The four participants who self-identified that Mosaic University was the only job opportunity available to them at the time of their job search were the participants which responded most favorably to tenure as system.

Lack of established processes at Mosaic University. ¶

Data showing the lack of process regarding basic development and retention procedures at Mosaic University was not expected. The details of the contract system were not located online because either the process was handled on a departmental basis, or the document was not made available to the public. Based upon the interviews with participants, a formalized and approved process does not exist. The Faculty Handbook makes mentions contracts, but nothing other than employment periods of contracts and just cause termination of the contract. Such lack of processes makes for an intriguing challenge to service devoted faculty. However, the interviews were not able to gather valid information on specific processes, as the participants identified, there are few universal processes to critique.

Job stability and financial need. ¶The author hypothesized participants accepted the position at Mosaic University for factors other than financial security. The response data

verifiably shows Stew, Bruce, Davey, Helen, and Jim cited non-monetary factors as motivation for accepting positions in the institution. Each of these participants expressed offers from other institutions, yet they still chose Mosaic University.

The number of participants who did cite Mosaic University as the best financial option available was larger than expected. Five participants stated that the offer from Mosaic University was the only full-time offer of employment available to them at the time of their job search. Each of these participants discussed their desire for service and involvement within academia, and in particular, Mosaic University, thus providing a justification for staying in academia, rather than entering the private sector. However, the decision to select Mosaic University was ultimately made because Mosaic University represented the best financial decision for the participants.

Conclusions

The purpose of the research study is to make unique and specific contributions to the field of knowledge regarding credentialed faculty member's choices to accept a position at a non-tenure granting institution. From the research, the author makes the following conclusions based upon the participants' responses. First, nine of the participants identified their undergraduate anticipatory socialization experiences began to shape their view of the position of a professor, and thus, began their journey to the professoriate. All participants also identified their positive anticipatory socialization experiences in graduate school solidified their desire to become an academic faculty member. Furthermore, the participants both positive and negative socialization experiences as academic professionals led the participants to continue their careers as academic professionals. The participants, even those who stepped away from academia for the private industry for a period of time, all harkened back to where their passion for the

professoriate position began, which was in their undergraduate and graduate scholastic experiences, as they made the decision to pursue a career as a professor in academia.

Second, the data did not show that negative past experiences with tenured faculty was a major factor in the choice to accept a position at a non-tenured institution. Only two participants in the study specifically cited Mosaic University's non-tenure system as an attractive attribute of the institution based upon their past negative past experiences with tenured faculty. Five faculty cited positive previous experiences with tenured faculty, and, four of those faculty described actively working within the faculty group to get Mosaic University to adopt a tenure system. No participants identified negative experiences with tenured faculty in their undergraduate or graduate studies. All accounts of negative socialization experiences with tenured faculty occurred when the participants were employed in academic institutions. Based on the study's results, past, negative experience with tenured faculty is likely not the dominant factor or attribute of a non-tenure granting institution which attracts faculty to accept a position at the institution.

Third, the research data provided a profile of the type of faculty member who accepts a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, public state university. The faculty member is an academic professional who has a deep desire for teaching, service, and involvement within the department and institution. Five participants identified that Mosaic University was the only institution to offer them employment during their job search. The commonality did emerge that those same participants took the position because Mosaic University is a university and not a community college. Furthermore, all participants who had employment options at other institutions or private industry positions outside of academia ultimately chose to stay in academia. These participants chose to come to Mosaic University for the unique opportunity for

involvement the institution offered, due to less rigid, hierarchal system inherent in tenured institutions. Related to the opportunity available at Mosaic University are Bruce, Helen, Stew, and Jim's identification that they rejected tenure positions and came to Mosaic University, and Bret, Keith, Stew, and Brian's private industry experience, which each could have returned to in lieu of accepting the Mosaic University position. Such responses support idea that money is not the primary factor regarding career choice, as all but two participants expressed options in either other institutions or outside academia. Rather, the choice to accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting university is rooted in a desire for the opportunity to teach and provide service to academic institutions in the professorial role.

Recommendations

The following recommendations section acts as a recommendation to the stakeholders of higher education in both new institutions who do not offer tenure. However, the recommendations can be tailored for tenure granting universities as well. The recommendations section is the analysis of the responses of the participants in terms of the recruitment, retention, and development of faculty at newly created, non-tenure granting institutions.

Clearly establish the non-tenure terms of employment.¶[Institutions must rigidly establish and clearly communicate the system and processes which take the place of tenure. The data shows a pool of faculty candidates exists which, for various reasons, are not dissuaded to join an institution simply because the institution does not offer tenure. Participant response data indicates the participants believe Mosaic University is not effectively implementing many aspects of the renewable contract method of employment. Participants stated, per their observations, that their colleagues at Mosaic University understand faculty are not adjunct faculty but feel only minimally more secure than an adjunct. The data also consistently

highlights the likelihood that newly established institutions will experience growing pains and require much collaboration from the faculty to solve issues as said issues arise. Potentially, quality faculty could experience negative morale by the amount of work expected of them to create the processes and standards of an institution. Negative morale could increase should said faculty perceive themselves as nothing more than adjunct faculty, who are unprotected by a minimum term limit of employment. Ideally, faculty should harbor an intrinsic belief the contract system protects their employment status from arbitrary dismissal (Kiley, 2012).

Communicate to prospective employees the position does not offer tenure.¶Several participants responded that faculty who serve on hiring committees frequently receive applications from prospective faculty who are of the assumption the position is a tenure-track position. Helen indicated that within the job postings, posting descriptions list positions as “full-time assistant professor” and “full-time associate professor”, which cause some non-referral applicants’ confusion in regard to the tenure status of both the position and institution. The Mosaic University “Careers” section of the University’s website houses the online application for prospective faculty to apply for positions. The postings do not state that Mosaic University is a non-tenure granting institution.

Failure to identify that the institution, and thus, posted positions are non-tenured negatively affects Mosaic University in two ways. The first negative impact occurs with the loss of time the hiring committee invests in the background and research of the applicants. Convening an institutional committee to review and interview the candidate is time intensive for the committee members. Mosaic University loses valuable productivity and opportunity costs, in terms of the time of the institutional faculty’s service on the committee, when an interviewee immediately dismisses the position during the interview process because the interviewee was not

clearly aware the position is non-tenured. Such wasted time is more valuably spent on research or other service. The second major issue is the time wasted by the interviewee. It can be assumed that an interviewee has spent time applying for the position and preparing for an interview. The interviewee's time and effort is wasted if the interviewee is actively searching for tenure positions and has an expectation said position at the non-tenured institution is, in fact, a tenure-track position. Response data indicates that such experiences can lead to a negative view towards the institution, especially if interviewees leave negative reviews on professional job-boards.

Any institution who establishes employment practices, such as a non-tenure system, promote and identify the non-tenure terms of employment on any promotional material concerning faculty and student recruitment, the faculty sections of the institution's website, human resources or job posting section of the website, and all job postings for prospective faculty members. Additionally, identification of the institution's non-tenure status should be clearly indicated on professional social media pages, such as LinkedIn and Glassdoor.com.

Market the opportunity to create the foundation of a new institution. ¶ Response data showed participants were intrigued by the ability to create the foundation of the new institution. Opportunity within a new institution comes in the form of establishing curriculum, serving on committees, working with student groups, creating faculty governance documents, and working with the administration to create institutional change and policy which positively affects faculty and students. A new institution will offer the opportunity for a faculty member to immediately put into practice their knowledge, skills, and abilities; as opposed to the probability of a long, indoctrination process at a more established institution. Much as the institution must be

transparent as to the non-tenure system of employment, the institution should clearly market the opportunities for involvement and service to prospective applicants.

Market the contract system as less stressful than a tenure system. ¶ Non-tenure granting systems eliminate the possibility of having to leave the institution if tenure is not earned. The response data indicates that such a characteristic may be desirable to some prospective faculty. The contract system provides faculty with less stringent timelines for research, teaching, and service advancement, as opposed to a tenure system. Additionally, non-tenured faculty do not have the fear of having to re-start their career at another institution should they not meet institutional requirements of tenure. Removing the stringent time requirements of earning tenure, and the life altering consequences not earning tenure places non-tenure granting institutions in a unique workforce position. At such institutions, faculty experience a more autonomous career, dependent upon their own effort, and not adherence to a preset tenure-track system.

Create intervals for performance review and contract renewal. ¶ The 2008 National Education Association Almanac of Higher Education contains a publication which offers best practices for contract employment systems of non-tenure track faculty (Rhoades & Maitland, 2008). Several of these best practices coincide with response data from participants and are thus applicable to institutions which establish non-tenure systems of employment. Research and participant responses support identified the institutional need to clearly define the contract lengths and terms of employment for specified employment periods (Rhoades & Maitland 2008). A system in which initial employment is a one-year probationary contract, with a two-to-five-year period renewal contracts is an acceptable contract length plan for faculty contract. More imperative is to ensure all positions adhere to the same set of contractual guidelines. For

example, one participant indicated participation on a committee results in a two-year contract renewal. Though the participant stated they did not feel in jeopardy of losing their job, the participant openly questioned (a) why said committee contract position was arbitrarily designated for a length of two years, and (b) if by accepting the committee position, did the participant lose out on a potentially longer contract at the expiration of the initial one-year contract. Before the hiring process begins with the new institution, the governing body should establish universal consistencies on the lengths of the various types of contracts the institution will offer and communicate the contractual guidelines to all departments and employees.

Establish an institutional wide renewal date. ¶Equally important as the length of contract is the established renewal date. Participants responded to observations that co-workers who had yet to receive their renewal letters felt anxiety with regards to job security. The institution should establish and adhere to mandated, departmental dates for contract renewal or non-renewal; preferably many weeks before the end of the summer, fall, and spring semesters. Required option renewal dates which exist before the end of the semester will prevent employee workplace anxiety. Preventing workplace anxiety related to the fear of job security will prevent workplace dissatisfaction, which in turn will prevent poor employee work performance (Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, & August, 2012).

Set clear performance expectations and milestones for advancement. ¶The generally accepted faculty performance parameters are research, teaching, and service (Phinney, 2007). Yet four participants stated Mosaic University's current system is unclear as to the institution's expectations of faculty for career advancement. The response data indicates that an institutional wide plan of advancement was perhaps not as explicitly put together as it needed to be prior to the hiring of faculty at Mosaic University. Faculty development should encourage commitment

to the organization by making the faculty interested in taking the job opportunities offered by advancement (Lyons, 2007). Participant responses supports research which identifies that departments and institutions should plan faculty development to meet the needs, and goals of both the department and institution (Locke & Latham, 2002). The responses also showed that participant's believe institutions should establish clear plans of faculty employment, which must include standardized timelines of performance reviews, evaluation criteria and parameters in terms of teaching, research and service, and a plan of action to improve performance, should the employee not meet said parameters.

Create a mentoring program. ¶Mentorship programs within academic departments are shown to be effective in indoctrinating employees into a new culture and increasing employee morale (Buch, Huet, Rorrer, & Roberson, 2011). The response data showed that the faculty felt a mentoring program would be useful for orientation and development of faculty. Additionally, an orientation program, new faculty would be provided a mentor to ask questions and navigate expectations. In a large faculty body, each faculty member will have unique skills, talents, strengths, and weaknesses. One participant stated that pairing an older faculty member with a newer faculty member would likely result in the newer faculty member improving their research skills, and the older faculty member improving their teaching skills.

Target faculty with specific experience. ¶A profile emerged of the type of faculty member who would be apt not only accept at position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university, but also succeed within the institution. Coded response data emerged three categories of applicants who may be a good cultural fit for a new, non-tenured university. The first type of applicant is the recent graduate applying for their first position. The graduate will need mentoring but may also have less desire to jump into a tenure track position, having just finished

a lengthy doctorate program. Additionally, the new graduate will not enter the institution with decades of indoctrinated process learned at a tenured institution. In this case, lack of experience can be considered positive, as the individual would not have preconceived notions, habits, and practices which would take time to change. The second type of applicant is a faculty member nearing retirement. The near-retirement faculty may be looking for a new challenge and to provide mentorship to younger faculty. Per response data, these faculty are not interested in the rigors of earning tenure at such a later stage in their career. Finally, the third type of applicant is a Ph.D. holding individual looking to exit private industry and make a return to academia. Again, such an applicant may be more interested in the opportunity to leave the strict time requirements which come with working in the private industry, and thus, may not desire immediate entry into a stringent tenure-track position.

The institution should also not dismiss career adjuncts, as such applicants may embrace the opportunity for full-time work. The author identified that the longer an instructor is off of the tenure-track, the less likely the instructor is to earn a tenured position (Kezar, 2013). Non-tenured institutions may find success in recruiting and hiring former academics who became disenfranchised with academic over not receiving tenure. These lapsed academics could have industry experience on top of academic experience, thus making them very well-rounded instructors to bring into an institution.

Implications for Future Research

The explanatory case study provides contributions to the existing body of research regarding why a credentialed faculty member would choose to take a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. However, limitations to the study necessitate further research into the phenomenon. The following section discusses areas for future research.

Review of other non-tenure granting institutions. ¶ Currently, Mosaic University is relatively rare. Mosaic University has key, marketable attributes which many new institutions may not possess. Such characteristics will not be found in all new institutions, nor will such characteristics be found in established institutions which may opt to eliminate future opportunity for tenured positions. As other state-universities either form or adapt contract systems, these institution's faculty must be included in similar study to provide a deeper understanding as to why their faculty chose to accept non-tenured positions.

Mosaic University will eventually establish many needed operating processes. ¶

At a time in the future, Mosaic University may be like the more established, tenure institutions which so many participants spoke of. When this transition occurs, Mosaic University loses a key recruitment piece of selling new faculty on the opportunity of establishing the culture of a new institution. All ten participants identified a level of attraction and intrigue to Mosaic University's ability for foundational involvement within the institution. Such attributes of Mosaic University were found to be a factor in the choice of the participant's accepting positions within the institution. Future research is needed to examine the factors underlying a faculty member's choice as to why an instructor would take a position at a non-tenured university, once such a key attribute of Mosaic University is gone.

Potential offer of tenure at a new institution. ¶ The choice to accept a position at Mosaic University can only be compared to choosing Mosaic University over existing institutions, such as established public universities, community colleges, private institutions, and four-profit institutions. All participants discussed, at some level, the attractiveness of the opportunity to establish the organizational structure and foundation of a new institution. The case study's findings would carry more depth if, in the future, a study examined a credentialed

faculty member's choice to select either a non-tenure track position or tenure-track position at a new institution, given an option exists between the two for the individual.

Recommendations for Higher Education Policy Makers and Stakeholders

The problem statement of the study identifies that no literature currently exists regarding why credentialed faculty choose to take a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. The author identifies that the factors which drive the creation of Mosaic University are the reduction in funding to higher education (Mitchell, Leachman, & Masterson, 2010), the reduction of available tenure positions within academia (Curtis & Thornton, 2013), and the potential creation of non-tenure, state-institutions within states that offer free-tuition programs to citizens (Mayo, 2011; Gottlieb, 2013). Should more institutions adapt employment models similar to the contract system implemented by Mosaic University, pre-emptive planning and creation of an institutional course of action will allow these institutions to establish organizational management plans for recruiting, retaining and developing non-tenured faculty. Participant responses to the study can be viewed within the context of examining the choice of an individual to accept a position at an institution which does not offer tenure. Using the participants from Mosaic University as the sample population, the author formulated best practices, as found in the "recommendations" section, for new non-tenure granting institutions, in terms of recruiting, retaining, and developing faculty. The recommendations can also be adapted to help existing institutions better attract non-tenured faculty. The author's recommendation to higher education policy makers and stakeholders is two-fold. First, the author recommends following Kezar's (2013) recommendation of discontinuing reliance on adjunct faculty by making the proper institutional changes necessary to establish full-time positions within the institution. Adjunct faculty face institutional and personal hardships which

may ultimately lead to a reduction in the amount of qualified academics available for employment. Second, policy makers and stakeholders should be pro-active and not re-active to the recruitment, retention, and development of non-tenured faculty. Identified by the participants, failure to plan causes unneeded workplace stress and loss of productivity within the institution.

Conclusion

The purpose of the explanatory case study was to observe the individual organization of Mosaic University to collect data regarding why credentialed faculty accept a position at a four-year, non-tenure granting, state university. The case study resulted in interview data used to both answer the research question and craft recommendations for the improvement of the recruitment, retention, and development of non-tenured faculty. The research contributed to academic literature providing experiential stories from faculty regarding the current plight of academia. Findings show that faculty who accept positions at a four-year, non-tenure granting state-universities do so because of previous socialization experiences which instilled in them a passion for teaching and service to academic institutions as a professor. The literature and research provided in the dissertation point to two continued trends in higher education, which are a) the likelihood that more states will enact programs to combat the loss of federal funding to higher education and, b) tenured and tenure-track positions will continue to decline. The reduction in tenure means more institutions will rely on non-tenured faculty for teaching, research, service, and governance within their institutions. The data and analysis provided by the research paper identify recommendations for higher education policymakers to ensure the effective recruitment, retention, and development of non-tenured faculty during the rapidly changing higher education labor market.

REFERENCES

- Acker, S.; Haque, E. (2015). The struggle to make sense of doctoral study. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 34(2), 229-241. doi:10.1080/07294360.2014.956699
- Adams, J. S. (1963) Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, 422-436.
- Arimoto, A. (2010). The formation of scholars: Rethinking doctoral education for the twenty-first century. *Higher Education*, 60(1), 119-121.
doi:http://dx.doi.org.jproxy.lib.ecu.edu/10.1007/s10734-009-9287-9
- Alaimo, C. A., (2015, September 19). UA Professor who plagiarized gets tenure. *Arizona Daily Star*. Retrieved from http://tucson.com/news/local/education/ua-professor-who-plagiarized-student-gets-tenure/article_473c728d-93ab-5460-8f5b-0606147d1637.html
- Allen, N. J., and Meyer, J. P., (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, Vol. 63, 1-18.
- Allen, H. L. (2013). Faculty workload and productivity in for-profit institutions: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *The NEA 2013 Almanac of Higher Education*.
- Amacher, R. C., & Meiners, R. E. (2004). *Faulty Towers: Tenure and the Structure of Higher Education*. Oakland: Independent Institute.
- Ambrose, S., Huston, T., & Norman, M. (2005). A qualitative method for assessing faculty satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(7), 803-830.
doi:http://dx.doi.org.jproxy.lib.ecu.edu/10.1007/s11162-004-6226-6
- American Association of University Professors. (2013) Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure. *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors (2010-)*,99, pp. 61-72. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24615245>

- American Council on Education, Washington, DC & American Association of Univ. Professors, Washington, DC & United Educators Insurance Risk Retention Group, Inc., (2000). Good practice in tenure evaluation: Advice for tenured faculty, department chairs, and academic administrators. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse
- American Federation of Teachers, Washington, DC. (2008). *Reversing course: The troubled state of academic staffing and a path forward*. American Federation of Teachers. Washington. Retrieved from: <http://www.aft.org>.
- American Federation of Teachers. (2010). Survey of part-time and adjunct higher education faculty. *American Academic*, 2(3).
- Aronsson, G., Gustafsson, K., & Dallner, M. (2000). Sick but yet at work. An empirical study of sickness presenteeism. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 54(7), 502-509.
- Austin, A.E. (2002). Preparing they next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73, 94–121.
doi:10.1353/jhe.2002.000
- Bair, L. and Duin, A. (2014). Leading change: Optimizing student success through analytics. *Higher Learning Commission*. Retrieved from: <http://cop.hlcommission.org/Learning-Environments/duin.html>
- Baldwin, R. G., & Chronister, J. L. (2001). *Teaching without tenure*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Baldwin, R. G., & Wawrzynski, M. R. (2011). Contingent faculty as teachers: What we know; what we need to know. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 55(11), 1485-1509.
doi:10.1177/0002764211409194
- Bamford, D. (2008). The use of grounded theory in change management research. *Journal of Change Management*, 8:2, 111-121. DOI: 10.1080/14697010801907286.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*. 1977, vol. 84, no. 2, 191-215.

- Baron, R. A. (1983). *Behavior in organizations*. New York: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.
- Basken, P., & Voosen, P. (2014, February 24). Strapped scientists abandon research and students. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from: <http://www.chronicle.com/article/Strapped-Scientists-Abandon/144921>
- Basu, K. (2012). Survival factor. *Inside Higher Ed*. February 17, 2012. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/02/17/half-all-tenure-track-faculty-stem-fields-leave-11-years>
- Basu, K. (2012, March 2). Post-tenure blues. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/03/02/what-does-post-tenure-review-really-mean>
- Bate, J. B. (2011). *The Public value of the humanities*. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Beaky, L. A., Besosa, M., Berry, J., Martínez, P., & Bradley, G. (2013). The inclusion in governance of faculty members holding contingent appointments. *Academe*, vol.99, iss.4, July/August 2013, 77-89.
- Beam, C. (2010, August 11). Finishing school: The case for getting rid of tenure. *Slate.com*. Retrieved from: http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/politics/2010/08/finishing_school.html
- Benton, T. H. (2011, February 25). A perfect storm in undergraduate education. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, A43.
- Bernstein, S., & Kezar, A. (2016, June 28). Is it time to eliminate tenure for professors? *The Conversation*. Retrieved from: <http://theconversation.com/is-it-time-to-eliminate-tenure-for-professors-59959>
- Bess, J. L. (1978). Money not a motivator. *Change*, 10(11), pp. 69-69.
- Bess, J. L. (1998). Contract systems, bureaucracies, and faculty motivation: The probable effects of a no-tenure policy. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 69(1), 1-22.

- Bertz, R. D. Jr., and T. A. Judge. (1994). Person – organization fit and the theory of work Adjustment: implications for satisfaction, tenure and career success. *Journal of vocational behavior*. 44(1), 32-54.
- Bland, C. J., Center, B. A., Finstad, D. A., Risbey, K. R., & Staples, J. (2006). The impact of appointment type on the productivity and commitment of full-time faculty in research and doctoral institutions. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(1), 89-123.
doi:10.1353/jhe.2006.0002
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1982). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Boldt, J. (2014, April 15). Summer survival strategies for adjuncts. *Chronicle Vitae*. Retrieved from: <https://chroniclevitae.com/news/444-summer-survival-strategies-for-adjuncts>
- Bollag, S. (2017, March 20) . California lawmaker wants tax to fund tuition-free college. *U.S. News*. Retrieved from: <https://www.usnews.com/news/best-states/california/articles/2017-03-20/california-lawmaker-wants-tax-to-fund-tuition-free-college>
- Boushey, H., & Glynn, S.J. (2012, November 16). There are significant business costs to replacing employees. *Center for American Progress*. Retrieved from: <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/economy/reports/2012/11/16/44464/there-are-significant-business-costs-to-replacing-employees/>
- Bosman, J. (2016). Ambitions seen in Walker’s push for university cuts in Wisconsin. *New York Times*, A1.
- Bozeman, B., & Boardman, C. (2013). Academic faculty in university research centers: Neither capitalism’s slaves nor teaching fugitives. *The Journal of Higher Education*. vol. 84, no. 1, January/February 2013.
- Brewer, P. D., & Brewer, K. L. (January 01, 2010). Knowledge Management, Human Resource Management, and Higher Education: A Theoretical Model. *Journal of Education for Business*, 85,6, 330.

- Brown, S., McHardy, J., McNabb, R., & Taylor, K. (2011). Workplace performance, worker commitment, and loyalty. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, 20(3), 925-955. doi:10.1111/j.1530-9134.2011.00306.x
- Buch, K., Huet, Y., Rorrer, A., & Roberson, L. (2011). Removing the barriers to full professor: A mentoring program for associate professors. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 43(6), 38-45. doi:10.1080/00091383.2011.618081
- Campbell, A. F. (2016, June 17). The workforce that won't retire. The Atlantic. Retrieved from: <https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2016/06/colleges-offer-retirement-buyouts-to-professors/487400/>
- Campbell, R. F., Fleming, T., Newell, L. J., & Bennion, J. W. (1987). *A history of thought and practice in educational administration*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Carey, K. (2012, June 26). What's driving college costs higher? *NPR*. Retrieved from: <http://www.npr.org/2012/06/26/155766786/whats-driving-college-costs-higher>
- Carrell, S. E., & West, J. E. (2010). Does professor quality matter? Evidence from random assignment of students to professors. *Journal of Political Economy*, 118(3), 409-432. doi:10.1086/653808
- Caruth, G. D., & Caruth, D. L. (2013). The impact of distance education on higher education: A case study of the united states. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 14(4), 121-131.
- Chao, G. (2012). Organizational socialization: Background, basics, and a blueprint for adjustment at work. In *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Psychology*, Volume 1. Oxford University Press.
- Chapman, D. (2011). Contingent and tenured/tenure-track faculty: Motivations and incentives to teach distance education courses. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 14(3), 1-15. Retrieved from <http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall143/chapman143.html>
- Charmez, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory*. (2006).

- Chickering, A., & Gamson, Z. (1991). *Applying the seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Clark, S. M. (1986). The academic profession and career: Perspectives and problems. *Teaching Sociology*, *14*(1), 24-34. doi:10.2307/1318296
- Clark, S. M., & Corcoran, M. (1986). Perspectives on the professional socialization of women faculty: A case of accumulative disadvantage? *The Journal of Higher Education*, *57*(1), 20-43.
- Clark, R. (2013, February 23). Kaisch again tackles faculty load. *The Columbus Dispatch*. Retrieved from: <http://www.dispatch.com/content/stories/local/2013/02/23/kasich-again-tackles-faculty-load.html>
- Cleary, M., Horsfall, J. and Hayter, M. (2014), Data collection and sampling in qualitative research: does size matter? *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *70*: 473–475.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education: 5. ed.* London u.a: Routledge Falmer.
- Coleman, J., & Kleiner, B. H. (1999). How to orient employees into new positions successfully. *Management Research News*, *22* (10), 6-11. doi: 10.1108/01409179910781832
- Collier, D., & Mahoney, J. (1996). Insights and pitfalls: Selection bias in qualitative research. *World Politics* *49.1* (1996) 56-91.
- Committee on Contingent Labor in the Profession. (2011). *Processional employment practices for non-tenure-track faculty members*. MLA.
- Contingent appointments and the academic profession (2003). Washington: American Association of University Professors.
- Connolly, M. R., Lee, Y. G., & Savoy, J. N. (2015). Faculty hiring and tenure by sex and race: New evidence from a national survey. Wisconsin Center for Education Research. Madison WI. Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association.

- Contract lengths of non-tenure-track faculty members, fall 2015. (2017). *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 63(43), 15.
- Cooley, C.H. (1902). *Human nature and the social order*. New York. Scribner.
- Cooley, A. (2013). Qualitative research in education: The origins, debates, and politics of creating knowledge. *Educational Studies*, 49:3, 247-262.
- Costano, R., Drury, D., Arcilla, A., Sheffield-Thompson, C., Smith, M. F., & Wilk, V. (2007). Part-time faculty: A look at data and issues. *NEA Higher Education Advocate*, 11(3), 1–12.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cronin, T, and Smith, H. (2011). Protest, exit, or deviance: Adjunct university faculty reactions to occupational rank-based mistreatment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 41: 2352–2373. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00826.x
- Crosmer, J. L. (2009). *Professional burnout among US full-time university faculty: Implications for worksite health promotion*. Texas Woman's University.
- Cross, J. G., & Goldenberg, E, N. (2009) *Off-track profs: Nontenured teachers in higher education*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Cummins, D. (2014, August 29). Why the backlash against adjuncts is an indictment of the tenure system. *PBS*. Retrieved from: <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/economy/making-sense/why-the-backlash-against-adjuncts-is-an-indictment-of-the-tenure-system>
- Curtis, J.W., & Thronton, S. (2013). Here's the news: The annual report on the economic status of the profession 2012-2013. *Academe*, vol. 99, iss. 2, March/April 2013, 4-19.
- Dabić, T., Stojanov, Z. (2014). *Techniques for Collecting Qualitative Field Data in Education Research: Example of Two Studies in Information Technology Field*. Paper presented at Sinteza 2014 - Impact of the Internet on Business Activities in Serbia and Worldwide. doi:10.15308/sinteza-2014-362-367

- Danish, R. Q., & Usman, A. (2010). Impact of reward and recognition on job satisfaction and motivation: An empirical study from Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management* 5(2), 159.
- Davis, J. (2016, January 26). Bill would boost GPA of HOPE scholars who take tough classes. *The Atlantic Journal-Constitution*. Retrieved from: <http://www.ajc.com/news/local-education/bill-would-boost-gpa-hope-scholars-who-take-tough-classes/DREnKnjVMKksHjrVU6TSaO/>
- Dempsey, P., & Dempsey, A. (1996). *Nursing research text and workbook*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Denscombe, M. (2014). *The good research guide: for small-scale social research projects*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Denzin, N. K. (2008). *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (Vol. 3). Sage.
- DeSantis, S. M. (2011) *Academic apartheid: Waging the adjunct war*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.
- De Vaus, D., & de Vaus, D. (2013). *Surveys in social research*. Routledge.
- Dishman, L. (2016, March 17). How the master's degree became the new bachelor's in the hiring world. *Fast Company*. Retrieved from: <https://www.fastcompany.com/3057941/how-the-masters-degree-became-the-new-bachelors-in-the-hiring-world>
- Dolan, D. M., Hall, M.S., Karlsson, C. R., & Martinak, M. L. (2013). Five years later: Maryland adjuncts tell us (again) who they are and what they want. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 61 (1), 35-45.
- Duffy, M. K., & Shaw, J. D. (2000). The salieri syndrome: Consequences of envy in groups. *Small Group Research*, 31(1), 3-23. doi:10.1177/104649640003100101.
- Dunkelberger, L. (2017, June 9). UF plans to hire faculty after funding boost. *WUFTChannel5*. Retrieved from: <https://www.wuft.org/news/2017/06/09/uf-plans-to-hire-faculty-after-funding-boost/>

- Eastman, N. J., & Boyles, D. (2015). In defense of academic freedom and faculty governance: John dewey, the 100th anniversary of the AAUP, and the threat of corporatization. *Education and Culture*, 31(1), 17-43. doi:10.5703/educationculture.31.1.17
- Edmonds, D. (2015, May 28). More than half of college faculty are adjuncts: Should you care? *Forbes*. Retrieved from: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/noodleeducation/2015/05/28/more-than-half-of-college-faculty-are-adjuncts-should-you-care/4b2397c41600>
- Edwards, R. (1997). Can post-tenure review help us save the tenure system? *Academe*, 83, 26-31.
- Ehrenberg, R. (2007). What's happening to public higher education?; The shifting financial burden. *Reference and Research Book News*, vol. 23, no. 1, 2008. Retrieved from: <http://search.proquest.com.jproxy.lib.ecu.edu/docview/199672037?accountid=10639>
- Ehrenberg, R. G., & Zhang, L. (2005). Do tenured and tenure-track faculty matter? *The Journal of Human Resources*, 40 (3), 2005, 647–659.
- Ernst, D. (2014). Expectancy theory outcomes and student evaluations of teaching. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 20:7-8, 536-556, DOI: 10.1080/13803611.2014.997138
- Ewell, P., & Jones, D. (1996). Indicators of “good practice” in undergraduate education: A handbook for development and implementation. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.
- Ezell, H. K., & American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2002). *Guide to success in doctoral study and faculty work*. Rockville, MD: American Speech-Language-Hearing Association.
- Ezrati, M. (2017, Dec. 4) The high price of Cuomo’s ‘free tuition’. *New York Post*. Retrieved from: <https://nypost.com/2017/12/04/the-high-price-of-cuomos-free-tuition/>
- Fain, P. (2014, April 7). Low expectations, high stakes. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/04/07/part-time-professors-teach-most-community-college-students-report-finds>
- Fairweather, J. S. (1994). The value of teaching, research, and service. *NEA 1994 Almanac of Higher Education*, National Education Association, 1994, 39-58. Washington, D.C.

- Fairweather, J. S. (1996). *Faculty work and public trust: Restoring the value of teaching and public service in American academic life*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Feldman, D. C. (1981). The multiple socialization of organization members. *Academy of Management Review*, 6(2), 309-319. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/257888>
- Fiegenger, M. K. (2010). Numbers of Doctorates Awarded Continue to Grow in 2009; Indicators of Employment Outcomes Mixed. *InfoBrief*. NSF 11-305. National Science Foundation.
- Figlio, D. N., Schapiro, M. O., & Soter, K. B. (2015). Are tenure track professors better teachers? *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 97(4), 715-724.
- Fields, C. (2007). *Faculty that aren't and won't be tenured*. American Association of College Professors. April, May. Retrieved from: www.aascu.org/uploadedFiles/AASCU/Content/Root/MediaAndPublications/PublicPurposeMagazines/Issue/april_may_07b.pdf+&cd=6&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us
- Fincher, C. (2003). Historical development of the University System of Georgia, 1932-2002.: *Institute of Higher Education*, Athens: University of Georgia.
- Finkelstein, M. J., Seal, R. K., and Schuster, J. H. (1998). *The new academic generation: a profession in transformation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Fishbane, L. (2016, July 18). 20 high-paying college majors you've never heard of. *Forbes*. Retrieved from: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/larafishbane/2016/07/18/20-high-paying-college-majors-youve-never-heard-of/3/54421d863888>
- Fisher, A. (2015, February 10). The fastest-growing STEM major in the U.S.. *Fortune*. Retrieved from: <http://fortune.com/2015/02/10/college-major-statistics-fastest-growing/>
- Fitzmorris, C. W., Shehab, R. L., & Trytten, D. A., "The career goals of non-tenure-track full-time engineering faculty." *Frontiers in Education Conference (FIE)*, IEEE, 2016.
- Fitzsimons, G.M., & Finkel, E.J. (2010). Interpersonal influences on self-regulation. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 19, 101-105.

- Flaherty, C. (2012, November 20). So close yet so far. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/11/20/college-cuts-adjuncts-hours-avoid-affordable-care-act-costs>
- Flaherty, C. (2013, February 6). Don't call me that. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/02/06/cuny-adjuncts-ask-not-be-called-professors-course-syllabuses-highlight-working>
- Flaherty, C. (2014, December 16). One course without pay. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/12/16/arizona-state-tells-non-tenure-track-writing-instructors-teach-extra-course-each>
- Flaherty, C. (2014, May 2). The new post-tenure review. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/05/02/colleges-try-new-approaches-post-tenure-review>
- Flaherty, C. (2015, October 2015). Enough time for justice. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/10/19/u-california-examine-deadlines-disciplining-professors-harassment-cases>
- Flaherty, C. (2016, April 5). Welcoming back accused serial harasser. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/04/05/ucla-students-and-faculty-protest-return-professor-accused-sexual-assault-and>
- Flaherty, C. (2016, March 8). The power of grad student teaching. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/03/08/study-suggests-graduate-student-instructors-influence-undergraduates-major>
- Flaherty, C. (2017, January 13). Killing tenure. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/01/13/legislation-two-states-seeks-eliminate-tenure-public-higher-education>
- Flannery, M.E. (2015, September 20). Adjunct faculty: Living below the poverty line with no unemployment benefits. *Education Votes*. Retrieved from: <http://educationvotes.nea.org/2015/09/20/adjunct-faculty-living-below-the-poverty-line-with-no-unemployment-benefits/>

- Friedman, Z. (2017, February 6). Why New York's 'tuition free' college is not exactly free. *Forbes*. Retrieved from: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/zackfriedman/2017/02/06/college-free-no-student-loan/1502835a5960>
- Florida Department of Education (2017). 2017-2018 Capital Projects Plan.
- Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E., & Trice, A. G. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's strategic imperative*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gardner, S.K., Barnes, B.J. (2007). "I heard it through the grapevine": Doctoral student socialization in chemistry and history. *Higher Education*, 54, 723–740. doi:10.1007/s10734-006-9020-x
- Gaskell, G., & Bauer, M. W. (2000). Towards public accountability: Beyond sampling, reliability and validity. *Qualitative researching with text, image and sound*, 336-350.
- Gibbs, G. R. (2002). *Qualitative Data Analysis: Explorations with NVivo*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Ginsberg, B. (2011) *The fall of the faculty: The rise of the all-administrative university and why it matters*. New York: Oxford UP.
- Glaser, B.G. and Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Sociology Press.
- Glassdoor.com. Tenure-Track professor salary (March 17, 2018). https://www.glassdoor.com/Salaries/assistant-professor-tenure-track-salary-SRCH_KO0,32.htm
- Glenn, G. (2016, May 16). College increasingly replacing full-time faculty with adjuncts. *WFAE*. Retrieved from: <http://wfae.org/post/colleges-increasingly-replacing-full-time-faculty-adjuncts>
- Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction (3rd ed.)*. Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon
- Goodman, C. K. (2016, June 19). Part-time teaching gigs can offer paid, unpaid rewards for full-time professionals. *Miami Herald*. Retrieved from:

<http://www.miamiherald.com/news/business/biz-columns-blogs/cindy-krischer-goodman/article84492677.html>

Goodkind, N. (2017, November 27). Trump's tax plan is making rich people flee to Florida to dodge higher taxes. *Newsweek.com*. Accessed Feb 12. <http://www.newsweek.com/trump-tax-plan-rich-people-florida-taxes-723778>

Gould, J. (2015). How to build a better PhD. *Nature*, vol. 528, no. 7580, 2015, 22.

Grafton, A., & Townsend, R. B. (2008). Historians' rocky job market. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54(44), B10-B11. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.jproxy.lib.ecu.edu/docview/214651709?accountid=10639>

Graham-Moore, B. E., & Ross, T. L. (1983). *Productivity gainsharing: How employee incentive programs can improve business performance*. Prentice Hall.

Guay, F., Chanal, J., Ratelle, C. F., Marsh, H. W., Larose, S., & Boivin, M. (2010). Intrinsic, identified, and controlled types of motivation for school subjects in young elementary school children. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80(4), 711–735.

Gulsecen, S. and Kubat, A., (2006). Teaching ICT to teacher candidates using PBL: A qualitative and quantitative evaluation. *Educational Technology & Society*, 9 (2): 96-106.

Hackmann, D. G., McCarthy, M. M. (2012). What constitutes a critical mass? An investigation of faculty staffing patterns in educational leadership programs. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 8, (1), 5 – 27.

Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (2006). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Harvey, M. G., Novicevic, M., Ready, K. J., Kuffel, T., & Duke, A. (2006). Viewpoint: Managing change in business schools: Focus on faculty responses. *Journal of Education for Business*, 81(3), 160-164.

Hatch, N. W. and Dyer, J. H. (2004). Human capital and learning as a source of sustainable competitive advantage. *Strat. Mgmt. J.*, 25: 1155-1178. doi:[10.1002/smj.421](https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.421)

- Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relationships*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Hesse-Biber, S. (2010). Qualitative approaches to mixed methods practice. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(6), 455-468.
- Herman, R. E., & Gioia, J. L. (2001). Helping your organization become an employer of choice. *Employment Relations Today*, 28(2), 63-78. doi:10.1002/ert.1015
- Hersher, R. (2012). Survey says: Too many PhDs. *Nature Medicine*, 18(3), 329. doi:10.1038/nm0312-329b
- Herzberg, F., (1964). The motivation-hygiene concept and problems of manpower. *Personnel Administrator*, 27, January–February 1964, 3–7.
- Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the Nature of Man*. New York: Staples Press.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Snyderman, B. (1969). *The Motivation to Work*. 1969 New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hightower, J. (2014, February 13). The educated poor: Adjunct professors. *Illinois Times*. Retrieved from: <http://illinoistimes.com/article-13480-the-educated-poor:-adjunct-professors.html>
- Holton, S. A., & Phillips, G. (1995). Can't live with them, can't live without them: Faculty and administrators in conflict. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 1995(92), 43-50. doi:10.1002/he.3691995920
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C.G. (2005). *Educational administration*. (7 ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hull, C. (1951). *Essentials of behavior*. Charlottesville: Greenwood Press.
- Iarrobino, J. D. (2006). Turnover in the advancement profession. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 6(2), 141-169.

- Iasevolo, B. (2015, February 27) A glut of ph.d.'s means long odds of getting a job. *NPRed.com*. Retrieved from: <https://www.npr.org/sections/ed/2015/02/27/388443923/a-glut-of-ph-d-s-means-long-odds-of-getting-jobs>
- Iverson, R. D., & Buttigieg, D. M. (1999). Affective, normative and continuance commitment: Can the 'right kind' of commitment be managed? *Journal of Management Studies*, 36: 307–333.
- Irwin (2018, March 23). Florida poly could tap into \$100M autonomous vehicle research funding. *Tampa Bay Business Journal*. Retrieved from: <https://www.bizjournals.com/tampabay/news/2018/03/23/florida-poly-could-tap-into-100m-autonomous.html>.
- James, J. (2007, July 12). Tenureless U: at Florida Gulf Coast University, tenure is out and multi-year contracts are in. *Diverse Education*. Retrieved from: <http://diverseeducation.com/article/8336/>
- Jacoby, D. (2006). The effects of part-time faculty employment on community college graduation rates. *Journal of Higher Education*, 77(6), 1081-1103.
- Jaschik, S. (2007, June 5). Could ratemyprofessor.com be right? *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2007/06/05/rmp>
- Jaschik, S. (2010, April 15). Who really failed? *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2010/04/15/lisu>
- Jaschik, S. (2013, February 19). Tenure track as alt-ac. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/02/19/research-aaas-meeting-notes-difficult-job-market-academic-science>
- Jaschik, S. (2013, January 23). Skepticism about tenure, MOOCs and the presidency: A survey of provosts. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from: <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/survey/skepticism-about-tenure-moocs-andpresidency-survey-provosts>.
- Jha, R. K., & Bano, B. (2012). Impact of locus of control on job stress: An empirical study. *Editor's Preface*, 32.

- June, A. W. (2012, June 13). Plan offers better pay, job stability, and a career path for contingent faculty. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <http://www.chronicle.com/article/Plan-Offers-Better-Pay-Job/132273/>
- Kaminski, D., & Geisler, C. (2012, February 17). Survival analysis of faculty retention in science and engineering by gender. *Science*, *335* (6070), 864-866. Retrieved from: <http://science.sciencemag.org/content/335/6070/864>
- Ketokivi, M., & Castañer, X. (2004). Strategic planning as an integrative device. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *49*(3), 337-365. doi:10.2307/4131439
- Kelley, H. H. (1967). *Attribution theory in social psychology*. In D. Levine (ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, Volume 15*, 192-238. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Kenty, J. R. (2000). Stress management strategies for women doctoral students. *Nurse Educator*, *25*(5), 251-254. doi:10.1097/00006223-200009000-00018
- Kerr, J.; & Slocum, J. (2005). Managing corporate culture through reward systems. *Academy of Management Executive*. doi 19. 10.5465/AME.2005.19417915.
- Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (2014). Troubling ethical lapses: The treatment of contingent faculty. *Change*, *46*(4), 34-37.
- Kezar, A. & Sam. C. (2010a). *Understanding the new majority: Contingent faculty in higher education*. Volume. I ASHE Higher Education Report Series. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Kezar, A. & Sam. C. (2010b). *Understanding the new majority: Contingent faculty in higher education*. Volume II. ASHE Higher Education Report Series. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Kezar, A. & Sam, C. (2011). New Theories for conceptualizing contingent faculty. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *55*(11), 1419-1442.
- Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2012). Governance as a catalyst for policy change: Creating a contingent faculty friendly academy. *Educational Policy*, *28*(3), 425-462.

Kezar, A. & Sam, C. (2013). Institutionalizing equitable policies and practices for contingent faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, 84(1), 56-87.

Kezar, A. (2012). Spanning the great divide between tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 44(6), 6-13.
doi:10.1080/00091383.2012.728949

Kezar, A. (2013). Comparing supportive and unsupportive departments for non-tenure track faculty. Impact on willing, capacity and opportunity to perform. *Research in Higher Education*, 54(5), 571-598.

Kena, G., Hussar, W., McFarland, J., de Brey, C., Musu-Gillette, L., Wang, X., & Barmer, A. (2016). The Condition of Education 2016. NCES 2016-144. *National Center for Education Statistics*.

Kiley, K. (2012, February 28). Dangers of depleted morale. Retrieved from:
<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/02/28/umuc-faculty-were-unhappy-president-she-was-placed-leave>

Kiesler, C.A. (1971). *The psychology of commitment: Experiments linking behavior to belief*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press

Kline, M. (2013) Public institutions lagged behind private institutions in awarding salary increases last year to tenured/tenure-track faculty members. *College for University Professional Association for Human Resources*. Retrieved from:
<https://www.higheredjobs.com/documents/salary/24.pdf>

Knapp, C. A. (2012). An evaluation of Florida's bring futures scholarships in a fiscally restrained era. *Backgrounder, Number 71*. Tallahassee: The James Madison Institute.

Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology: methods and techniques*. New Age International.

Kugler, S. (2013, December 2). Off the tenure-track, part time professors face low pay, negligible job security. *MSNB.com* Retrieved from: <http://www.msnbc.com/melissa-harris-perry-1>

- Kukla, A. (1942). *Social constructivism and the philosophy of science*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Kyvik, S. (2013). The academic researcher role: enhancing expectations and improved performance. *Higher Education*, 65, 4, 525-538.
- Ladwig, B. (2017, May 8). Ex-prof sues U of L, alleges fraud, breach of contract. *Louisville Insider*. Retrieved from: <https://insiderlouisville.com/education-community/ex-prof-sues-uofl-alleges-fraud-breach-of-contract/>
- Lambie, G. W., Hayes, B. G., Griffith, C., Limberg, D., & Mullen, P. R. (2014). An exploratory investigation of the research self-efficacy, interest in research, and research knowledge of Ph. D. in education students. *Innovative Higher Education*, 39(2), 139-153. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-013-9264-1>
- Langbert, M., Quain, A., & Klein, D. B., (2017) Faculty voter registration: rectifying the omission of two florida universities. *Econ Journal Watch*, 14 (1), 55-60.
- Larson R. C., Ghaffarzagdegan N., and Xue Y. (2014). Too many Ph.D. graduates or too few academic job openings: the basic reproductive Number R_0 in academia. *Systems Research and Behavioral Sciences*, 31 (6), 745–750. doi: 10.1002/sres.2210
- Langenberg, H. (2001). Uncertainty of short-term contracts is turning talent away from science. *Nature*, 410(6830), 849-850. doi:<http://dx.doi.org.jproxy.lib.ecu.edu/10.1038/35071226>
- Latham, G. P., Mawritz, M. B., & Locke, E. A. (2018). Goal setting and control theory: Implications for job search. *The Oxford Handbook of Job Loss and Job Search*, 8.
- Lawrence, J., Ott, M., & Bell, A. (2012). Faculty organizational commitment and citizenship. *Research in Higher Education*, 53(3), 325-352.

- Leatherman, C. (1998a, October 16). University of Phoenix's faculty members insist they offer high-quality education. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, A14-A15.
- Leatherman, C. (1998b, February 27). Faculty unions move to organize growing ranks of part-time professors. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, A12-A14.
- Leatherman, C. (1999). Growth in positions off the tenure track is a trend that's here to stay, study finds. *Chronicle of Higher Education* 9, April, A14.
- Leko, M. M. (2013). The value of qualitative methods in social validity research. *Remedial and special education*. 35(5), 275–286.
- Lemmer, C.A. & Robak, M.J. (2014). So you want to be an adjunct law professor? The process, perils, and potential. *NYSB Journal, July-August 2014*, 11-16. Retrieved from: <https://www.nysba.org/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=50512>
- Levin, Jo.S., & Shaker, G. G. (2011). The hybrid and dualistic identity of full-time non-tenure-track faculty. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 55(11), 1461-484.
- Lipman, V. (2015, October 10). Why do employees leave their jobs? New survey offers answers. *Forbes*. Retrieved from: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/victorlipman/2015/10/10/why-do-employees-leave-their-jobs-new-survey-offers-answers/6b89ff6f7ea1>
- Little, W. (2014). Introduction to Sociology – 1st Canadian Edition. McGivern.
- Long, B. T. (2004). How do financial aid policies affect colleges? the institutional impact of the georgia hope scholarship. *Journal of Human Resources*, 39(4), 1045. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ717419&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Lunenberg, F. (2011). Goal-setting theory of motivation. *International Journal of Management, Business, and Administration*, 15(1), 1-6.
- Lyons, R. E. (2007). Deepening our understanding of adjunct faculty. In R. Lyons (Ed.), *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty*, 1-12. Bolton, Mass.: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

- Maisto, M., & Kahn, S. (2016). No adjunct left behind? *Academe*, 102(3), 47.
- Malesic, J. (2016, October 5). The 40-Year Old Burnout. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from: <http://www.chronicle.com/article/The-40-Year-Old-Burnout/237979>
- Mallon, W. (2000). Standard deviations: Faculty appointment policies at institutions without Tenure. In Cathy A. Trower (Ed.) *Policies on Faculty Appointment: Standard Practices and Unusual Arrangements*. Bolton: Anker Publishing.
- Marcus, Jon. (2014, February 6). New analysis shows problematic boom in higher ed administrators. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from: https://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/02/06/higher-ed-administrators-growth_n_4738584.html
- Martin, A. (2012, December 14). Building a showcase campus using an i.o.u.. *New York Times*. Retrieved from: Martin, Andrew 2012 Building a showcase campus using an I.O.U <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/14/business/colleges-debt-falls-on-students-after-construction-binges.html?pagewanted=all>
- Marsh, C. (2010). *Becoming a teacher*. Pearson Higher Education AU.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A Theory of Human Motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-96.
- Massy, W. F., Sullivan, T. A., & Mackie, C. D. (2012). Data needed for improving productivity measurement in higher education. *Research & Practice in Assessment*, 7. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.jproxy.lib.ecu.edu/docview/1505321589?accountid=10639>
- Massy, W. F., Sullivan, T. A., & Mackie, C. (2013). Improving measurement of productivity in higher education. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 45(1), 15-23. doi:10.1080/00091383.2013.749140
- Maxey, D. & Kezar, A (2015). Understanding the shift to a largely non-tenure track faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, 86(4), 564-594.
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton, Van Nostrand.

- McGlade, C. R., & Travis, S. (2016, October 21). Minorities, poor hit hardest by stricter Bright Futures requirements. *Sun-Sentinel*. Retrieved from: <http://www.sun-sentinel.com/news/education/sfl-minorities-poor-hit-hardest-by-bright-futures-changes-20161021-htmlstory.html>
- McKenna, L. (2016, April 21). The ever-tightening job market for Ph.D.'s. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from: <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/04/bad-job-market-phds/479205/>
- McPherson, M. S., & Schapiro, M. O. (1999). Tenure issues in higher education. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 13 (1), 85-98.
- McNeill, C. (2017, August 14). Florida universities are hiring hundreds of new faculty in push for smaller classes, more prestige. *Tampa Bay Times*. Retrieved from: <http://www.tampabay.com/news/education/college/florida-universities-are-hiring-hundreds-of-new-faculty-in-push-for/2333695>
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Mehra, B. (2001). Research or personal quest: Dilemmas in studying my own kind. In B. M., Merchant & A. I. Willis (Eds.), *Multiple and intersecting identities in qualitative research*, 69-82. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Mercer, M. (2018, January 5). Why free college tuition is spreading from cities to states. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from: https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/why-free-college-tuition-is-spreading-from-cities-to_us_5a4f943fe4b0f9b24bf31692
- Merton, R., & Kitt, A. (1950). Contributions to the theory of reference group behavior. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press. (Reprinted in part from *Studies in the scope and method of "The American soldier."* Edited by R.K. Merton & Paul Lazarfeld. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Miller, B. (2009) . The truth about burnout: Doing less and doing more? *Public Management*, 91(9), 4.
- Miller, S. (2015, April 22) . Average starting salaries up for recent graduates. *Society for Human Resource Management*. Retrieved from: <https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/hr-topics/compensation/pages/starting-pay-graduates.aspx>

- Miller, V. (2017, January 12) Lawmaker's bid to ban tenure would make Iowa an outlier. *The Iowa Gazette*. <http://www.thegazette.com/subject/news/education/higher-education/iowa-lawmaker-hoping-for-conversation-on-bill-to-drop-tenure-for-university-professors-20170112>
- Mitchell, M., Leachman, M., & Masterson, K. (2016, August 15). Funding down, tuition up. *Center on Budget and Policy Priorities*. Retrieved from: https://www.cbpp.org/research/state-budget-and-tax/funding-down-tuition-up_ftn21
- Modern Language Association. (1994). Statement on the use of part-time and full-time adjunct faculty members.
- Morris, S. E. (2011). Doctoral students' experiences of supervisory bullying. *Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 19(2), 547-555.
- Morse, J. M., & Field, P.A. (1995). *Qualitative research methods for health professionals (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Mortenson, T. (2012). State funding: A race to the bottom. American Council on Education. Retrieved from: <http://www.acenet.edu/the-presidency/columns-and-features/Pages/state-funding-a-race-to-the-bottom.aspx>
- Musselin, C. (2007). Transformation of academic work: Facts and analysis. In M. Kogan, & Ulrich T.,(Eds.), *Key challenges to the academic profession. UNESCO Forum on Higher Education Research and Knowledge International Centre for Higher Education Research Kassel*. Paris and Kassel: INCHER-Kassel.
- National Education Association. (2007). *Part-time faculty: A look at data and issues*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. Retrieved from <http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/HE/vol11no3.pdf>.
- National Center for Education Statistics (2017a). Retrieved from: <https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/find-your-college>
- National Center for Education Statistics (2017b). 2016-17 integrated postsecondary education data system (IPEDS) methodology report. Retrieved from: <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2017/2017078.pdf>

- National Center for Education Statistics (2018). Race/ethnicity of college faculty. Retrieved from: <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=61>.
- National Research Council. (1977). *Women and minority Ph.D.'s in the 1970's: A data book*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/20352>.
- Nelson, C. (2010). Cultural front: No university is an island. *Saving Academic Freedom* (1). New York: NYU Press. Retrieved from <http://www.ebrary.com>
- New England Center for Investigative Reporting (2014, February 6). New analysis shows problematic boom in higher ed administrators. *New England Center for Investigative Reporting*. Retrieved from: <https://www.necir.org/2014/02/06/new-analysis-shows-problematic-boom-in-higher-ed-administrators/>
- Newfield, C. (2008). *Unmaking the public university: the forty-year assault on the middle class*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Newman, J., Garland, M., Castro-Klarén, S., Landow, G., & Marsden, G. (1996). *The Idea of a University*. Turner F. & Turner F., Eds, Yale University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1npgkj>
- Noble, H., & Mitchell, G. (2016). What is grounded theory? *Evidence Based Nursing*, 19(2), 34. doi:<http://dx.doi.org.jproxy.lib.ecu.edu/10.1136/eb-2016-102306>
- Norwood, A. G. (2017, January 23) Universities struggle with state budget cuts. *Mississippi Today*. Retrieved from: <http://mississippitoday.org/2017/01/23/universities-struggling-with-state-cuts/>
- National Public Radio. (2013). *Are there too many Ph.D.'s and not enough jobs?* Retrieved from: <https://www.npr.org/2013/03/10/173953052/are-there-too-many-phds-and-not-enough-jobs>
- Obamacarefacts (2018). Retrieved from: <https://obamacarefacts.com/>
- O'Meara, K., Terosky, A. L., and Neumann, A. (2009) . Faculty careers and work lives: A professional growth perspective. *ASHE Higher Education Special Report*. 34 (3).

- Oliff, P., Palacios, V., Johnson, I., & Leachman, M. (2013). Recent deep state higher education cuts may harm students and the economy for years to come. *Center on Budget and Policy Priorities*, 1-21
- Oppenheim, A.N. (1992). Questionnaire design, interviewing and attitude measurement. London: Pinter.
- Pain, E. (2009, May 22). Academia or industry? Finding the right fit. *Science Magazine*. Retrieved from: <http://www.sciencemag.org/careers/2009/05/academia-or-industry-finding-right-fit>
- Park, S., Sine, W. D., & Tolbert, P. S. (2011). Professions, organizations, and institutions: Tenure systems in colleges and universities. *Work and Occupations*, 38(3), 371; 340;-371. doi:10.1177/0730888411412725
- Parker, I. (2004). Criteria for qualitative research in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 1(2), 95-106. doi:<http://dx.doi.org.jproxy.lib.ecu.edu/10.1191/1478088704qp010oa>
- Patton, C. (2014, August 25). When faculty step away from campus. *University Business*. Retrieved from: <https://www.universitybusiness.com/article/when-faculty-step-away-campus>
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). Qualitative research and evaluation methods (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
- Pearce, J. A. (1999). Faculty survey on business education reform. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 13, 105-109.
- Peligri, J. (2014, July 17). Underpaid and overworked: Adjunct professors share their stories. *USA Today*. Retrieved from: <http://college.usatoday.com/2014/07/17/underpaid-and-overworked-adjunct-professors-share-their-stories/>
- Pelletier, S. (2012). Rethinking revenue. *American Association of State Colleges and Universities*. Retrieved from: www.aascu.org/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=5569
- Phinney, L. (2009, March 27). What I wish I'd known about tenure. *Inside Higher Ed*.

- Porter, E. (2014, Feb 25). The bane and boom of for profit colleges. *New York Times*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/02/26/business/economy/the-bane-and-the-boon-of-for-profit-colleges.html>
- Pounder, D. (1994). Work incentives to attract clinical faculty. *People and Education*, 2(1), 14–36.
- Kelly, K., Presslee, A., & Webb, R. A. (2017). The effects of tangible rewards versus cash rewards in consecutive sales tournaments: A field experiment. *The Accounting Review*, 92(6), 165-185.
- Purcell, K., Wilton, N., & Elias, P. (2007). Hard lessons for lifelong learners? Age and experience in the graduate labor market. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 61(1), 57-82.
- Pryal, K. R. G. (2016, May 19). The secret life of a doctoral student. *Chronicle Vitae*. Retrieved from: <https://chroniclevitae.com/news/1406-the-secret-life-of-the-doctoral-student>
- Rees, A., & Smith, S. P. (2014). Faculty retirement in the arts and sciences. Princeton University Press.
- Reevy, G. M., Deason, G. (2014). Predictors of depression, stress, and anxiety among non-tenure track faculty. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2014; 5. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00701
Retrieved from http://beta.nea.org/assets/docs/2013_Almanac_Allen.pdf
- Revey, G., & Deason, G. (2014). Predictors of depression, stress, and anxiety among non-tenure track faculty. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00701
- Rhoades, G., & Maitland, C. (2008). Bargaining for full-Time, non-tenure track faculty: Best practices. NEA 2008. *Almanac of Higher Education*.
- Rockinson-Szpakiw, A. J., Spaulding, L. S., & Knight, A. (2015). Protecting the marriage relationship during the doctoral journey: Strategies for students and partners based on the strong marital house concept. *The Family Journal*, 23(2), 141-146.
doi:10.1177/1066480714565106

- Rodgers, K. (2013, November 3). Humanities unbound: Supporting careers and scholarship beyond the tenure track. *New York Times*. Retrieved from: <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/11/03/education/edlife/finding-life-after-academia-and-not-feeling-bad-about-it.html>
- Rossiter, M. (1996). *Women Scientists in America: Before Affirmative Action, 1940–1972*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press
- Rotter, J., (1954). *Social learning and clinical psychology*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Saldaria, J. (2003). *Longitudinal qualitative research: Analyzing change through time*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Seijts, G. H., & Latham, G. P. (2000). The effects of goal setting and group size on performance in a social dilemma. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 32, 104–116.
- Sanchez, C. (2013, September 22) . The sad death of an adjunct professor sparks s labor debate. *NPR*. Retrieved from: <http://www.npr.org/2013/09/22/224946206/adjunct-professor-dies-destitute-then-sparks-debate>
- Savery, J. R., & Duffy, T. M. (1995). Problem based learning: An instructional model and its constructivist framework. *Educational technology*, 35(5), 31-38.
- Savickas, M. L. (2005). The theory and practice of career construction. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Career development and counseling*, 42-70. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Schell, E. E., & Stock, P. L (2001). *Moving a mountain: transforming the role of contingent faculty in composition studies and higher education*. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Scheurich, J. J. (1996). The masks of validity: A deconstructive investigation. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 9(1), 49-60.
- Schuster, J. H. & Finkelstein, M. J. (2008). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Scott, T. (2016, February 19). Tenure: A concept whose time has passed? *Sun Sentinel*. Retrieved from: <http://www.sun-sentinel.com/news/education/fl-college-tenure-future-20160219-story.html>
- Seidl, A., Wrzaczek, S., El Ouardighi, F. (2016) Optimal career strategies and brain drain in academia. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 168 (1): 268-295.
- Seijts, G. H., & Latham, G. P. (2000). The effects of goal setting and group size on performance in a social dilemma. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 32, 104–116.
- Seligman, M.E.P. (1975). Helplessness: On depression, development, and death. San Francisco: W H Freeman & Co.
- Seltzer, R. (2016, May 23). What's the matter with Kansas budget cuts. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/05/23/kansas-cuts-criticized-hurting-large-research-universities>
- Shin, J. C., & Jung, J. (2014). Academics job satisfaction and job stress across countries in the changing academic environments. *Higher Education*, 67(5), 603-620.
- Singell, L. D., Jr., & Stone, J. A. (2007). For whom the pell tolls: The response of university tuition to federal grants-in-aid. *Economics of Education Review*, 26(3), 285-295. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ762744&site=eds-live&scope=site>; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2006.01.005>
- Smith, N. (2015, October 10). Weakening tenure may invigorate academia. *Forbes*. Retrieved from: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/victorlipman/2015/10/10/why-do-employees-leave-their-jobs-new-survey-offers-answers/6b89ff6f7ea1>
- Sobieralski (Todd), J., & Nordstrom, C. R. (2012). An examination of employee layoffs and organizational justice perceptions. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 12(3), 11-20. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.jproxy.lib.ecu.edu/docview/1321925170?accountid=10639>
- Soper, T. (2014, June 6). The exploding demand for computer science education, and why America needs to keep up. *Geekwire*. Retrieved from:

<https://www.geekwire.com/2014/analysis-examining-computer-science-education-explosion/>

Srivatsa, N, and White, W., (2010, September 9). Hauser losing tenure not likely, Harvard's history shows. *The Crimson*. Retrieved from:
<http://www.thecrimson.com/article/2010/9/9/professor-faculty-misconduct-tenure/>

Stancill, J., and Bonner, L. (2015, January 16). Tom Ross asked to leave UNC system presidency. *The Charlotte Observer*. Retrieved from:
<http://www.charlotteobserver.com/news/local/education/article9260870.html>

Stenerson, J., Blanchard, L., Fassiotto, M., Hernandez, M., & Muth, A. (2010). The role of adjuncts in the professoriate. *Peer Review*, 12(3), 23.

Stigmar, M. (2008) Faculty development through an educational action programme. *Higher Education Resource Development*; 27(2): 107-20.

Stockwell, C. (2015 January 2016). Behavioral science tops list of fastest growing majors of the past 5 years. *USA Today*. Retrieved from:
<http://college.usatoday.com/2015/01/26/behavioral-science-tops-list-of-fastest-growing-majors-of-the-past-5-years/>

Stone, C., Van Horn, C., & Zukin, C. (2012). Chasing the American Dream: Recent College Graduates and the Great Recession. Work Trends. John J. Heldrich Center for Workforce Development.

Stout, R. A. (2013). Working at home: Exploring gender roles and burnout among online adjunct faculty at a proprietary postsecondary institution. Phoenix: Argosy University.

Straumsheim, C. (2013). Tackling the cap. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from:
<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/04/24/more-institutions-cap-adjuncts-hours-anticipation-federal-guidelines>

Straumsheim, C. (2013, May 9). A future without tenure. *Insidehighered.com*. Retrieved from:
<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/05/09/florida-polytechnic-u-offer-multi-year-contracts-not-tenure-faculty>

- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Street, S., Maisto, M., Meves, E., & Rhoades, G. (2012). Who is professor “staff, and how can this person teach so many classes? *Campaign for the Future of Higher Education*. Retrieved from: <https://www.futureofhighered.org/article/who-professor-staff-and-how-can-person-teach-so-many-classes>
- Stripling, J. (2009, March 6). Sabbaticals on leave. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2009/03/06/sabbaticals-leave>
- Schwarz, N., & Oysterman, D. (2001). Asking questions about behavior: Cognition, communication, and questionnaire construction. *The American Journal of Evaluation*, 22(2), 127-160.
- Svrluga, S. (2015, April, 13). A professor hates tenure so much that he’s making a federal case of it. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from: https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/grade-point/wp/2015/04/13/a-professor-hates-tenure-so-much-that-hes-making-a-federal-case-of-it/?utm_term=.00e8da3473f0
- Tahir, T. (2010, March 30). The irresistible rise of academic bureaucracy. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from: <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2010/mar/30/academic-bureaucracy-rise-managers-higher-education>
- Tan, J. (2010). Grounded theory in practice: issues and discussion for new qualitative researchers. *Journal of Documentation*, 66 (1), 93-112. doi: 10.1108/00220411011016380
- Tannenbaum, R., & Massarik, F. (1950). Participation by subordinates in the managerial decision-making process. *The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, 16(3), 408–418.
- Tellis, Winston, (1997). Introduction to Case Study. *The Qualitative Report*, Volume 3, Number 2, July.
- The Economist. (December 2010). The disposable academic: why doing a Ph.D. is often a waste of time. Retrieved from: <http://www.economist.com/printedition/2010-12-18>

- Thomsen, J. (2015, July 15) . Summer unemployment reality. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/07/15/contingent-faculty-earn-big-win-unemployment-benefits-national-battle-continues>
- Tierney, W. (2004). Academic freedom and tenure: Between fiction and reality. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 75(2), 161-177.
- Tierney, W. G. (1999). *Faculty productivity: Facts, fictions, and issues*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Toews, I., Glenton, C., Lewin, S., et al. (2016). Extent, awareness and perception of dissemination bias in qualitative research: An explorative survey. *PLoS One*. 11(8). Retrieved from: <http://search.proquest.com.jproxy.lib.ecu.edu/docview/1808601513?accountid=10639>. doi:
- Trachtenberg, S. J. (1996). Can we protect academic freedom without tenure? *The Education Digest*, 62(2), 53. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.jproxy.lib.ecu.edu/docview/218202408?accountid=10639>
- Travis, S. (2016, February 19). *Tenure: a concept who's time has passed?* Sun Sentinel.
- Tseng, E. (2017, February 7). *Faculty braces for more Cuts by Greitens*. University News. <http://info.umkc.edu/unews/faculty-braces-for-more-cuts-by-greitens/>
- Tseng, E. (2017, January 25). Gov. Greitens cuts \$10 million from UMKC: Mid-year budget cut impacts unknown. *UMKC University News*. Retrieved from: <http://info.umkc.edu/unews/gov-greitens-cuts-10-million-from-umkc-mid-year-budget-cut-impacts-unknown/>
- Tuhus-Debro, R. (2013, November 3). The repurposed Ph.D. *New York Times*. Retrieved from: <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/11/03/education/edlife/finding-life-after-academia-and-not-feeling-bad-about-it.html>
- Twombly, S. B. (2005). Values, policies, and practices affecting the hiring process for full-time arts and sciences faculty in community colleges. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76 (4), 423-447.

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1981). The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science*, 211(4481), 453-458.

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Circular No. OE-53014, Faculty and Other Professional Staff in Institutions of Higher Education, 1959 to 1960.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2016a). The Condition of Education 2016 (NCES 2016-144), Characteristics of Postsecondary Faculty.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2016b). Digest of Education Statistics, 2015 (NCES 2016-014)

US Business Cycle Expansions and Contractions Archived September 25, 2008, at the Wayback Machine., NBER, accessed March 17, 2018

Umbach, P. D. (2007). How effective are they? Exploring the impact of contingent faculty on undergraduate education. *Review of Higher Education*, 30(2), 91-124.

University of Georgia. (2001). Factbook.

University of Holy Cross New Orleans. (2016) Definition of course levels. Retrieved from: uhcno.edu/academics/docs/Course_Level_Guidelines.pdf + & cd=1 & hl=en & ct=clnk & gl=us

Valdez, R. (1982). First year doctoral students and stress. *College Student Journal*, 16(1), 30.

Van Alstyne, W. (1971). Tenure: A summary, explanation, and defense. *American Association of University Professors*, 57.

Varel, D. A. (2015). Bending the academic color line: Allison Davis, the university of Chicago, and American race relations, 1941-1948. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 84(4), 534-546. Retrieved from: <http://search.proquest.com.jproxy.lib.ecu.edu/docview/1845688757?accountid=10639>

- Venkatraman, Vijaysree. 2104. The Science Careers guide to consulting careers for Ph.D.'s *Science Magazine*, 78 (3), 282-310. Retrieved from: <http://www.sciencemag.org/careers/2014/09/science-careers-guide-consulting-careers-phd-scientists>
- Von Eckartsberg, R. (1986). *Life-World Experience: Existential-Phenomenological Research Approaches in Psychology*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Advanced Research in Phenomenology & University Press of America
- Vroom, V. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: Wiley.
- Wallenstein, P. (2008). *Higher education and the civil rights movement: White supremacy, black Southerners, and college campuses*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Walker, G. E., & Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2008). *The formation of scholars: Rethinking doctoral education for the twenty-first century* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- 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. Project MUSE, doi:10.1353/jhe.2012.0014
- Warner, John. (2014, December 18). ASU english by the numbers: it ain't pretty. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/just-visiting/asu-english-numbers-it-aint-pretty>
- Wattenberger, J. L., & Albertson, H. T. (2012). A succinct history of the Florida community college system. In *Trustee Orientation Manual*. Florida Association of Community Colleges.
- Wetherbe, J. (2013). *It's time for tenure to lose tenure*. The Harvard Business Review. Retrieved from: <https://hbr.org/2013/03/its-time-for-tenure-to-lose-te>
- Weiner, B. (1972). Attribution theory, achievement motivation, and the educational process. *Review of educational research*, 42(2), 203-215.
- Westheimer, J. (2003) Tenure Denied: union busting and anti-intellectualism in the corporate university, in B. Johnson, P. Kavanagh & K. Mattson (Eds) *Steal This University: the rise*

of the corporate university and the academic labor movement, 123-138. London: Routledge.

Westcott, D. (2015, May 1). Survival of the fittest, english department. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from: <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Survival-of-the-Fittest-in-the/229763>

Weissmann, J. (2013, April 10). The ever-shrinking role of tenured college professors. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from: <https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2013/04/the-ever-shrinking-role-of-tenured-college-professors-in-1-chart/274849/>

Westfall, B. (2016). *How job seekers use glassdoor reviews*. Softwareadvice. Retrieved from <https://www.softwareadvice.com/resources/job-seekers-use-glassdoor-reviews/>

Wilson, T. D., Damiani, M., & Shelton, N. (2002). Improving the academic performance of college students with brief attributional interventions. *In Improving academic achievement*, 89-108.

Wilson, R. (2010, July 4). Tenure RIP: What the vanishing status means for the future of education. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from: <http://www.chronicle.com/article/Tenure-RIP/66114>

Wilmath, k. (2012, February 23.) *Senate votes to split off USF Polytechnic, creating 12th university*. Tampa Bay Times.

Yin, R.K., (1984). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Beverly Hills, Calif: Sage Publications.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Interview Protocol Questions - Faculty

Introduction:

My name is Phillip Wynne, and I will be conducting the interview regarding your motivation to accept a position at Mosaic University. As we previously discussed, your participation is voluntary. You have read, understood and signed the “Informed Consent” form and “Researcher Confidentiality” form.

Research Question:

The question posed to you the participant is, “What is the motivation to take a faculty position at Mosaic University?”

The sub-context of this question includes two key characteristics of Mosaic University: 1) the University does not offer tenure to faculty, and 2) the University is part of the Florida state higher education system. All other schools in the Florida state higher education system offer tenure for some positions within the institutions.

Interview Questions:

- 1) What lead you to pursue a career in academia?
 - a. Are there any personal factors you are comfortable sharing which influenced your choice, such as family, friends, or geographical considerations?
 - b. Are there any professional factors you are comfortable sharing which influenced your choice, such as financial factors, business experience, or past work history?

- 2) Did you have any experiences as a student (undergraduate or graduate) while enrolled in a higher education institution which positively or negatively influenced your choice to continue a career in academia?
 - a. How did these experiences affect your perception of:
 - i. Tenure systems in higher education
 - ii. Tenured faculty in higher education
 - iii. Choice to take a position at an institution which does not offer tenure

- 3) Did you have any experiences as an academic employee (adjunct-instructor, instructor, graduate assistant) which positively or negatively influenced your choice to continue a career in academia?
 - a. How did these experiences affect your perception of:
 - i. Tenure systems in higher education
 - ii. Tenured faculty in higher education
 - iii. Choice to take a position at an institution which does not offer tenure
- 4) Did you actively seek employment at an institution which did not offer tenure, and if so, why?
- 5) Can you discuss what led you to accept your current position at Mosaic University?
 - a. Did or do you currently have any personal factors, which you are comfortable sharing, which influenced your choice to accept a position at Mosaic University?
- 6) Can you discuss your experiences working at a non-tenure granting institution, compared to any experiences you encountered as a student or academic professional, at an institution which does offer tenure?
- 7) Should other states create new state schools which do not offer tenure, can you discuss potential advice to them in the following areas:
 - a. Recruitment
 - b. Retention
 - c. Development

Appendix B

Invitation to Participate in Study

February 5th, 2018

Mosaic University
Office of Human Resources
Dear Mosaic University Office of Human Resources,

My name is Phillip Wynne and I am a doctoral student from the College of Education at the University of Alabama. I am writing to ask for permission to invite faculty and staff to participate in research regarding the study of faculty motivation to accept a position at a state higher education institution that does not offer tenure to faculty.

The study will focus solely on faculty employed at Mosaic University. However, all answers will be kept confidential, and no names of respondents will be published. Additionally, no answers with identifying components will be published. All answers will be securely stored on a safe server, where the password will be changed weekly to prevent hacking.

Faculty and human resource staff who agree to participate in the study will partake in a 10-15-minute interview with myself, concerning the choice to take a position at Mosaic University. The interview can be conducted via telephone or video-conference.

No compensation will be offered for the interview. However, the data collected will help future institutions that belong to state higher education systems, but do not offer tenure, in terms of recruitment, retention, and development of faculty.

I appreciate your time, and sincerely hope you choose to participate in the study. If you have any questions about the study, please email me at wynne004@crimson.ua.edu or contact me via phone at 251-802-0077.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Phillip Wynne

Appendix C

Invitation to Participate in Research - Faculty

Date

Participant Name

Contact Information

Dear *Mosaic University Faculty Member*,

My name is Phillip Wynne and I am a doctoral student from the College of Education, at the University of Alabama. I am writing to let you know about an opportunity to participate in research regarding the study of faculty motivation to accept a position at a state higher education institution that does not offer tenure to faculty. The study focuses solely on faculty employed at Mosaic University. As a full-time faculty member, you are eligible for this study.

If you decide to participate in the study, you will be asked to participate in a 10-15-minute interview with myself, concerning your choice to take a position at Mosaic University. The interview can be conducted via telephone or video-conference.

No compensation will be offered for the interview. However, the data collected will help future institutions that belong to state higher education systems, but do not offer tenure, in terms of recruitment, retention, and development of faculty.

Involvement in this study is completely voluntary. All information and responses will be kept confidential. No answers which may include specific identifiers will be published.

If you would like to participate in this study, or have any questions about the study, please email me at wynne004@crimson.ua.edu or contact me via phone at 251-802-0077.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Phillip Wynne

Appendix D

Invitation to Participant in Research - Staff

Date

Participant Name

Contact Information

Dear *Mosaic University Staff Member*,

My name is Phillip Wynne and I am a doctoral student at the University of Alabama, from the College of Education. I am writing to let you know about an opportunity to participate in research regarding the study of faculty motivation to accept a position at a state higher education institution that does not offer tenure to faculty. The study focuses on faculty employed at Mosaic University. As a staff member within the Human Resources Department, you are eligible for this study.

Your insights into Mosaic University's practice of recruitment, retention, and advancement concerning faculty will elaborate on successes and challenges with regards to maintaining a qualified faculty at a state higher education institution which does not offer tenure.

If you decide to participate in the study, you will be asked to participate in a 10-15-minute interview with myself, concerning your choice to take a position at Mosaic University. The interview can be conducted via telephone or video-conference.

No compensation will be offered for the interview. However, the data collected will help future institutions that belong to state higher education systems, but do not offer tenure, in terms of recruitment and retention of faculty.

Involvement in this study is completely voluntary. All information and responses will be kept confidential. No answers which may include specific identifiers will be published.

If you would like to participate in this study, or have any questions about the study, please email me at wynne004@crimson.ua.edu or contact me via phone at 251-802-0077.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Phillip Wynne

Appendix E

Informed Consent

Consent for Research Participation

Title: Examining Why Faculty Take Positions at the Non-Tenure Granting Institution of Mosaic University.

Researcher(s): Phillip Wynne, University of Alabama

Researcher Contact Info: 251-802-0077
Wynne004@crimson.ua.edu

You are being asked to participate in a research study. The box below highlights key information about this research for you to consider when making a choice whether or not to participate. Carefully consider this information and the more detailed information provided below the box. Please ask questions about any of the information you do not understand before you decide whether to participate.

Key Information for You to Consider
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Voluntary Consent. You are being asked to volunteer for a research study. It is up to you whether you choose to participate or not. There will be no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled if you choose not to participate or discontinue participation.• Purpose. The purpose of this research is to understand the motivation regarding a faculty member's choice to accept a full-time position at Mosaic University, which is state higher education institution that does not offer tenure.• Duration. It is expected that your participation will last 10-15-minutes.• Procedures and Activities. You will be asked to participate in a structured interview.• Risks. All data will be confidential, and no identifiable information concerning your answers will be published. The risks include computer breach, which may contain transcripts of the interview.• Benefits. Some of the benefits that may be expected include providing information for other state institutions which do not offer tenure for best practices regarding faculty recruitment, retention, and advancement.

Who is conducting this research?

The researcher Phillip Wynne, a graduate student in the College of Higher Education from the University of Alabama is asking for your consent to this research. The study is a dissertation for a Ph.D. in Higher Education Administration and is supervised by Dr. Karri Holley, who is the Coordinator for the Higher Education Program.

What happens to the information collected for this research?

Information collected for this research will be coded using QDA Miner to examine commonalities among motivation of faculty to accept positions at institutions which do not offer tenure. QDA Miner allows transcribed data to be imported from a variety of sources, such as Excel and Word. QDA Miner helps

the researcher quickly code the data for patterns related to participants responses. The data will be stored in UA Box, which a secure cloud based file manager.

How will my privacy and data confidentiality be protected?

We will take measures to protect your privacy including removing names as identifiers of interviews, removing detailed answers which could count as identifiers. Despite taking steps to protect your privacy, we can never fully guarantee your privacy will be protected.

Individuals and organization that conduct or monitor this research may be permitted access to and inspect the research records. These individuals and organizations include: representatives of The University of Alabama.

What are the risks if I participate in this research?

The risks or discomforts of participating in this research include computer breach, which could include transcripts of the data.

What if I want to stop participating in this research?

Taking part in this research study is your choice. Your participation in this study is voluntary. You do not have to take part in this study, but if you do, you can stop at any time. You have the right to choose not to participate in any study activity or completely withdraw from continued participation at any point in this study without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Who can answer my questions about this research?

If you have questions or concerns, please contact the University of Alabama College of Education Higher Education Department chair:

Dr. Claire Major
205-348-1152
cmajor@bamaed.ua.edu

An Institutional Review Board (“IRB”) is overseeing this research. An IRB is a group of people who perform independent review of research studies to ensure the rights and welfare of participants are protected. UA Research Compliance Services is the office that supports the IRB. If you have questions about your rights or wish to speak with someone other than the research team, you may contact:

University of Alabama IRB Office
358 Rose Administration
Box 870127
Tuscaloosa, AL 35487
1-877-820-3066
205-348-8461

STATEMENT OF CONSENT

I have had the opportunity to read and consider the information in this form. I have asked any questions necessary to make a choice about my participation. I understand that I can ask additional questions throughout my participation.

I understand that by signing below, I volunteer to participate in this research. I understand that I am not waiving any legal rights. I have been provided with a copy of this consent form. I understand that if my

ability to consent or assent for myself changes, either I or my legal representative may be asked to re-consent prior to my continued participation in this study.

I consent to participate in this study.

Name of Adult Participant	Signature of Adult Participant
	Date

- I consent to have the interview recorded.
- I *do not* consent to have my interview recorded.

Researcher Signature (to be completed at time of informed consent)

I have explained the research to the participant and answered all his/her questions. I believe that he/she understands the information described in this consent form and freely consents to participate.

Name of Research Team Member	Signature of Research Team Member
	Date

Appendix F

Confidentiality Agreement

Project Title: Examining Why Faculty Take Positions at the Non-Tenure Granting Institution of Mosaic University.

As the hired transcriptionist for the study, I agree to the following:

1. keep all the research information shared with me confidential by not discussing or sharing the research information in any form or format (e.g., disks, tapes, transcripts) with anyone other than the Phillip Wynne.
2. keep all research information in any form or format (e.g., disks, tapes, transcripts) secure while it is in my possession.
3. return all research information in any form or format (e.g., disks, tapes, transcripts) to Phillip Wynne when I have completed the research tasks.
4. after consulting with the Phillip Wynne, erase or destroy all research information in any form or format regarding this research project that is not returnable to the Phillip Wynne (e.g., information stored on computer hard drive).

(Print Name) (Signature) (Date)

Phillip Wynne

(Print Name) (Signature) (Date)

Appendix G

Pilot Interview Questions

1. Did you actively seek employment at non-tenure granting institution?
2. Did you seek employment at a tenure granting institution before accepting the position at your current place of employment?
3. Did you have any experiences as a student (undergraduate or graduate) while enrolled in a Higher Education Institution which influenced your choice to accept a job at an institution which does not offer tenure?
4. Did you have any experiences as an employee (adjunct-instructor, instructor, graduate assistant) which influenced your choice to accept a job at an institution which does not offer tenure?
5. Did or do you currently have any personal factors, which you are comfortable sharing, which influenced your choice to accept a position at your current institution of employment?

