

# Veblen Revisited: Faculty Workload and Productivity in an Era of Privatization and Assessment

By Henry Lee Allen

*Henry Lee Allen is professor of sociology at Wheaton College. He continues his research on the organizational dynamics of academic systems, focusing on the academic professions, labor markets. Allen continues his research on mathematical models of academic systems and labor markets and the future of academic work. He is writing a book on the sociology of the natural sciences in the 21st century. His research in criminology includes studies of at-risk youth and community policing.*

*An active consultant outside higher education, Allen is developing a national research center for the study of urban youth. He is also working on a curriculum development project under the auspices of the Behavioral Science Unit at FBI Academy.*

---

Nearly a century ago, Thorstein Veblen noted the plight of institutions of higher education and their constituents, especially the consequences of the “conduct of universities by businessmen.”<sup>1</sup> Today’s institutions similarly grapple with the demands of external clienteles, including the business community, and with changing social and cultural norms. But they also must respond to increased diversity in student enrollments and to decreasing financial resources: research funding, state fiscal support, and private donations.<sup>2</sup>

Scholars have rediscovered Veblen’s critical insights while investigating structural changes in contemporary colleges and universities<sup>3</sup> and in the academic division of labor.<sup>4</sup> Privatization<sup>5</sup> and corporatization (commercialization), as Veblen predicted, have become fashionable managerial strategies.<sup>6</sup> Privatization involves “more centralized decision making, declining acceptance of academic norms, loss of faculty autonomy, and developing private funding sources.”<sup>7</sup> Corporatization presents its own dangers: “By trying to acquire more money for their work,”

observes former Harvard president Derek Bok, “universities may compromise values that are essential to the continued confidence and loyalty of faculty, students, alumni, and even the general public.”<sup>8</sup>

Institutional adaptations to these strategies shape academic labor markets (recruitment), internal labor markets (tenure), job requirements (workload), and working conditions (productivity).<sup>9</sup>

Information technologies have further altered the postsecondary environment.<sup>10</sup> Distance education, smart classrooms, and computer software architectures are now part of academic life, while cyberspace institutions compete with traditional campuses for students. No one knows when the cost spirals supporting these innovations will cease or how they will affect the academic professions.<sup>11</sup> Machines encode and transmit existing knowledge, but professors create and embody expertise. Such tasks, Veblen might say today, require the intangible software of imagination and human experience coupled with meaningful social interaction. Few regulators of faculty work—“captains of erudition,” to use Veblen’s

term—use this software to produce enduring cognitive innovations.<sup>12</sup>

Resource-dependent academic institutions face a conservative policy climate that aims to privatize costs. Policy-makers exacerbated a growing affordability crisis by altering financial aid packages.<sup>13</sup> These packages have moved from maximizing the *public* human capital investment in all eligible citizens while minimizing private debt (by awarding grants in aid), to reducing government costs while allowing private student debt to soar (via increased loans). This shift occurred as media-hyped fears about unemployment, recession, crime, terrorism, and medical expenses spiked the demand for higher education. Privatization schemes reigned supreme; promoting the general welfare had a lower priority.<sup>14</sup>

Privatization, corporatization, and assessment, as Veblen foretold, form the agenda of postsecondary education today.<sup>15</sup> Immigration, globalization, and cybernization have further restructured institutional demographics.<sup>16</sup> Economic phenomena underlie these changes: markets, decisions, preferences, and bargaining processes.<sup>17</sup> Increased global interconnections and faculty mobility constrain individual institutions.

Some academic institutions benefit from treating higher education as a private good. But the external forces Veblen chastised are eroding the traditions and norms of U.S. higher education system, and are changing the public perception from trust in academic autonomy as worthy of investment to instrumentalist preoccupation with assessment. Higher education also faces discordant pressures precipitated by globalization or immigration, national security, and environmental hazards. The fiscal dimensions of these changes, as Veblen understood, affect academic work. Professors must adjust to increased workloads, contingent employment, uniformed restrictions, and a climate that blames them for the inadequacies of undergraduates.

Community colleges are especially at-risk.<sup>18</sup> Fresh vision and leadership must address the consequences of increased student diversity, faulty public policies, and rapid industrial transformation as manifested at these institutions lest the fate of their faculty engulf all of academe. This article delineates the working conditions of academic labor, especially community college faculty, using evidence from interviews and secondary data. The chapter then analyzes faculty workload and productivity using data from the 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:04). Last, it suggests implications for faculty, academy, and society.

## THE STATUS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY

The nation's increased social stratification affected American higher education by tying access for poor and minority students to the fate of community colleges.<sup>19</sup> Public policy, meanwhile, underwent a not-unrelated shift from promoting equal opportunity to promoting cost containment, performance measurement, assessment, corporatization, and consumerism.<sup>20</sup> The costs of technological innovations—from labs to laptops—and in infrastructure have escalated.<sup>21</sup> So have administrative costs, as colleges enhance competitiveness and comply with external regulations.<sup>22</sup> Local businesses and legislators pressure community colleges to reduce costs and to focus on economic development, not on individual mobility.<sup>23</sup> Community colleges must also address the needs of local school districts, create non-credit programs, negotiate articulation agreements, determine financial aid, confront immigration requirements, and adjust to industrial restructuring and technological change.<sup>24</sup> Remedying social inequality and promoting racial and gender diversity, once key goals, are now just part of the mix.<sup>25</sup>

The status of faculty and the conditions of academic work changes as the balance of power shifts among constituencies.<sup>26</sup> Community college faculty members are especially vulnerable. These colleagues are less likely to have full-time employment; they publish less, and they have heavier teaching loads and lower academic prestige.<sup>27</sup> Inability to control work activities places community college faculty at the lower end of the professional spectrum, despite their enormous contributions to postsecondary education. Professional autonomy and prestige are related, so nowhere is the battle over the status of academic work more significant.

Union leaders at two Illinois community colleges discussed faculty vulnerability.<sup>28</sup> Each separate interview, conducted in autumn 2004 and lasting more than an hour under conditions of anonymity, addressed these questions:

1. What is your professional background as a community college professor?
  - a. years of experience
  - b. field of expertise
  - c. favorite accomplishments
  - d. most enduring challenges
  - e. relation to NEA (length of involvement and roles)

2. What are the most difficult issues affecting the careers of community college faculty today? Why? What is the impact of each issue on your campus?
3. What major challenges regarding workload and productivity do faculty face on your campus? Why? What is the impact of each challenge on your campus?
4. What major challenges regarding contracts and tenure do faculty face on your campus? Why? What is the impact of each challenge on your campus?
5. What issues concern you most about the administrative or organizational leadership on your campus? Why? What is the impact of each concern on your campus?
6. How would you describe the campus climate regarding the welfare of faculty? Why? What is the impact of each concern on your campus?
7. What future trends concern the faculty on your campus? Why? What is the impact of each concern on your campus?
8. How can faculty best defend their professional and educational interests on your campus or at any community college?

The faculty leaders also answered questions regarding the social context in which community college faculty work.<sup>29</sup> One leader—a veteran professor whose three decades of professional experiences included substantial union involvement—identified tensions between full-time and part-time faculty over turf. Patronizing attitudes on the part of full-time faculty deepened the rift. This leader stressed the importance of respect and recognition for adjunct faculty given their demoralizing experiences in the labor market. Higher education, added this leader, had no viable plan for addressing the needs of adjunct faculty. Alienation increased as the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty declined, and as the academic and administrative workloads of full-time faculty increased.

Administrators, suggested this leader, tried to pit the multiple unions on campus against each other. Administrators, faculty members complained, governed top-down; abused power; lacked sensitivity, vision, and planning; downplayed collaboration; and ignored threats to morale. Many administrators and faculty lived in a state of denial or ignorance about faculty issues. Apathetic unionized faculty members were too tolerant of the status quo or feared rocking the boat. Tenure was safeguarded, but part-time faculty

replaced full-time colleagues while student enrollments grew. The resulting increases in faculty workload hampered professionalization; this leader singled out grossly inadequate support for research and publications. About 50 adjunct faculty members had to share two computers, for example.

This leader despaired over the future of community colleges and the prospects for faculty employment. Unions must help governors, legislators, and K-12 leaders to understand higher education's unique features. They must also define professionalization, work more effectively with sympathetic administrators, and encourage collaboration among constituencies. Domineering personalities cannot impose or dictate these conditions and alliances.

A second faculty leader reiterated a key theme: the biggest challenge facing community college faculty is *deprofessionalization*. This leader—whose 12-year career as a faculty member included high-level local union experience—indicated that the college placed less and less value on academic work. The two leaders offered similar critiques:

1. a disproportionate institutional emphasis on assessment for public relations, rather than authentic assessment of student learning;
2. faculty assumption of more administrative roles and managerial tasks;
3. coexistence of a large cadre of part-time faculty and a small number of full-time faculty—affecting faculty legitimacy and eligibility for collective bargaining;
4. mismatches in faculty recruitment between the training and expectations of new recruits and campus realities;
5. worries over the concept of leadership within the institutional structure;
6. faculty disenfranchisement or demoralization.
7. weak faculty collegiality with few interdisciplinary interactions; and
8. increased work pace as a consequence of institutional changes, especially increased obligations and distractions.

The second leader, fearing further cuts in full-time faculty employment, offered “Veblenesque” comments about the corporatization of the campus culture—Total Quality Management (TQM), intellectual property rights, online courses, institutional ethics, dual-credit programs, and public accountability. Diminished public investment in this community college exacerbated salary competition between

full-time and part-time faculty. The full-time faculty believed an available pool of cheap labor held salary increases hostage. Meanwhile, informal administrative expectations, not defined in the union contract, had increased the faculty workload. Disdaining rhetoric about customer service and “bean-counting” associated with class sizes, the leader did note improved morale under new administrative leadership.

Both portraits confirm research findings on community college faculty,<sup>30</sup> especially pressures toward deprofessionalization, which seems correlated with the push for assessment. What can be done to stem the nationwide trend toward deprofessionalization at community colleges?<sup>31</sup> How does the fate of community college faculty compare to their colleagues at other colleges and universities? We examine the most recent National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:04) report for answers.<sup>32</sup> One caveat: national surveys, based on aggregated data on individual faculty, can obscure or neglect issues of power, vested interests, tradition, cultural norms, and negotiation.<sup>33</sup>

## THE CURRENT STATUS OF FACULTY

Table 1 displays the employment status for all faculty and instructional staff in fall 2003. Community colleges (“public associate’s” in the table) employed 67 percent of their faculty members on a part-time basis. For all institutions, 56 percent of faculty had full-time status. Public doctoral institutions employed the fewest part-time faculty members (22 percent). Three categories—public master’s, private not-for-profit master’s (the highest proportion—55 percent), and private not-for-profit baccalaureate—employed more than 33 percent part-time faculty. Future research must ascertain the effects of deprofessionalization and contingency labor at these locations. Is there a link between assessment and deprofessionalization at universities and colleges with the highest proportion of part-time faculty? My hunch is “yes.”

Table 1 also indicates the distribution of employment status by discipline: only three of the ten fields listed—agriculture/home economics, engineering, and the natural sciences—report fewer than 30 percent of faculty with part-time status. Eroding full-time employment may significantly reduce institutional costs at many colleges.

Table 2 depicts the distribution of full-time faculty among institutions and academic disciplines by ethnicity. White faculty members still dominate all

types of institutions with more than 75 percent in each category and 80 percent overall. Asian/Pacific Islanders approach 10 percent of all faculty members. Blacks and Hispanics lag—5.5 percent and 3.5 percent respectively. Among minority faculty, only Asian/Pacific Islanders reached 12 percent at public and private doctoral institutions. Their proportion exceeds ten percent in business, engineering, health sciences, and the natural sciences.

Table 3 depicts the distribution of part-time faculty members by ethnicity among institutions and academic disciplines. Whites dominate the ranks of part-time faculty (85 percent) across all programs. Asian/Pacific Islanders had the lowest proportion of part-time faculty (3.6 percent), but only this group among minorities had as many as 13.2 percent of faculty in any academic discipline (engineering). A comprehensive study of ethnic and racial distribution should examine recruitment and social networks, organizational and contextual influences, mentorship and sponsorship processes, and assessment and deprofessionalization pressures.

Tables 4 and 5 show the gender distribution of full-time and part-time faculty, respectively. Women made far greater inroads than minorities during the decades of affirmative action—38 percent of all full-time faculty and at least 33 percent of full-time faculty in each type of institutions, including 50 percent of community college faculty (Table 4). The proportion of women is less than 35 percent in only three fields—engineering (9.5 percent), the natural sciences (23 percent), and business (27 percent). Women faculty with part-time status approached parity (48 percent) at all types of institutions (Table 5). Only engineering (ten percent) and business (26 percent) employed females below a 40 percent threshold. Thus affirmative action has assisted the employment of female faculty with few exceptions.

Tenure still matters. About 48 percent of full-time faculty members at all types of institutions possess tenure (Table 6). The range for tenured faculty on traditional campuses: from 42 percent at private not-for-profit master’s schools and 43 percent at baccalaureate institutions to 54 percent at public master’s institutions. Between tenure track and non-tenure track faculty, 20 percent of faculty members at public or private doctoral institutions are on a tenure track; more than 30 percent are not. A slightly higher proportion of professors have tenure track appointments at other types of institutions.

**Table 1. Percentage Distribution of All Faculty and Instructional Staff,<sup>1</sup> by Employment Status, Institution Type, and Program Area: Fall 2003**

Institution type and program area	Employment status	
	Full time	Part time
<b>All institutions<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>56.3%</b>	<b>43.7%</b>
Public doctoral <sup>3</sup>	77.8	22.2
Private not-for-profit doctoral <sup>3</sup>	68.7	31.4
Public master's	63.3	36.7
Private not-for-profit master's	45.1	54.9
Private not-for-profit baccalaureate	63.2	36.8
Public associate's	33.3	66.7
Other <sup>4</sup>	49.3	50.8
<b>All program areas in four-year institutions</b>	<b>66.1</b>	<b>33.9</b>
Agriculture/home economics	78.4	21.6
Business	54.0	46.0
Education	51.3	48.7
Engineering	78.2	21.8
Fine arts	53.0	47.0
Health sciences	69.7	30.3
Humanities	65.4	34.6
Natural sciences	76.5	23.5
Social sciences	70.3	29.7
All other fields	62.6	37.4

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:04).

<sup>1</sup> All faculty and instructional staff includes all faculty (regardless of whether they had instructional responsibilities) and all other instructional staff. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

<sup>2</sup> All public and private not-for-profit Title IV degree-granting institutions in the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

<sup>3</sup> Doctoral includes research/doctoral institutions and specialized medical schools and medical centers as classified by the 2000 Carnegie Classification.

<sup>4</sup> Public baccalaureate, private not-for-profit associate's, and other specialized institutions, except medical schools and medical centers.

The proportion of tenured faculty is lowest in health sciences (30 percent) and education (36 percent); 44 percent of faculty in the health sciences are neither tenured nor on a tenure track. Few part-time faculty members have tenure or possess tenure track appointments, regardless of institutional type or program (Table 7). Future studies should examine the effects of deprofessionalization on these patterns.

This data lead to several observations: Faculty members in the 21st century face complex structural issues. The composition of the faculty workforce is more diverse, though much remains to be done. Vulnerable contingent labor makes up more of the

academic profession; full-time academic employment is endangered at many colleges and universities. Community college faculty members face the most uncertain future where part-time or contingent faculty members already dominate (Table 1). Student composition at community colleges shows greater diversity, while the faculty gender ratio approaches parity (Tables 4 and 5). But full- and part-time faculty membership is still disproportionately white (Tables 2 and 3). Tenure is the last bastion of secure professionalization for faculty employed at these colleges (Tables 6 and 7).

**Table 2. Percentage Distribution of All Full-Time Faculty and Instructional Staff,<sup>1</sup> by Race/Ethnicity, Institution Type, and Program Area: Fall 2003**

Institution type and program area	Race/Ethnicity <sup>2</sup>				
	White	Black	Asian/Pacific Islander	Hispanic	Other
<b>All institutions<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>80.3%</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>8.7%</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>2.1%</b>
Public doctoral <sup>4</sup>	78.9	4.0	12.2	3.0	2.0
Private not-for-profit doctoral <sup>4</sup>	78.2	4.6	12.3	3.3	1.6
Public master's	78.1	8.6	7.2	3.7	2.4
Private not-for-profit master's	85.6	4.7	5.5	2.4	1.9
Private not-for-profit baccalaureate	85.7	6.6	3.4	2.2	2.0
Public associate's	80.7	6.9	4.0	5.9	2.5
Other <sup>5</sup>	86.7	4.5	5.5	1.8	1.6
<b>All program areas in four-year institutions</b>	<b>80.3</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>
Agriculture/home economics	87.8	2.1	6.1	2.5	1.5
Business	76.9	4.3	13.9	1.9	3.1
Education	83.1	6.6	4.1	3.3	2.9
Engineering	69.3	4.9	21.7	2.4	1.8
Fine arts	87.5	6.2	2.9	2.2	1.2
Health sciences	78.4	4.6	11.7	3.0	2.3
Humanities	83.1	4.9	5.3	4.4	2.3
Natural sciences	77.1	3.4	15.7	2.6	1.3
Social sciences	81.5	7.4	5.1	4.0	2.0
All other fields	84.5	7.3	3.9	2.4	1.9

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:04).

<sup>1</sup> All full-time faculty and instructional staff includes all faculty (regardless of whether they had instructional responsibilities) and all other instructional staff employed full time by their institutions. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

<sup>2</sup> Black includes African American; Asian/Pacific Islander includes Native Hawaiian; Hispanic includes Latino; and Other includes American Indian/Alaska Native and those who selected more than one race. Race categories exclude Hispanic origin unless specified.

<sup>3</sup> All public and private not-for-profit Title IV degree-granting institutions in the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

<sup>4</sup> Doctoral includes research/doctoral institutions and specialized medical schools and medical centers as classified by the 2000 Carnegie Classification.

<sup>5</sup> Public baccalaureate, private not-for-profit associate's, and other specialized institutions, except medical schools and medical centers.

## CONCLUSION

Similar to most professions, college and university professors defer to colleagues who distinguish themselves in core endeavors. But why punish the majority of faculty who work diligently at academic pursuits to appease external audiences embittered over a relatively few abuses? Why is there so much fuss about assessment and accountability when most faculty members were recruited properly and tenured rigorously? Why would academic departments or institutions have hired unproductive faculty in the first place? Critics must confront these questions before calling for privatization and assessment.

Deprofessionalization threatens faculty autonomy and integrity as privatization and assessment escalate unabated.<sup>34</sup> Much of the impetus behind increasing assessment is aimed at satisfying external audiences who do not pursue the rigors of academic life. Professors have a collective interest in preserving the most attractive and beneficial features of their employment against unwarranted, misguided interference. Microeconomic research recognizes that labor contracts include many unanticipated, often indefinable obligations and duties.<sup>35</sup> Academic work requires voluntary assumption of these tasks.

**Table 3. Percentage Distribution of All Part-Time Faculty and Instructional Staff,<sup>1</sup> by Race/Ethnicity, Institution Type, and Program Area: Fall 2003**

Institution type and program area	Race/Ethnicity <sup>2</sup>				
	White	Black	Asian/Pacific Islander	Hispanic	Other
<b>All institutions<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>85.2%</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>2.2%</b>
Public doctoral <sup>4</sup>	83.6	3.2	7.7	3.6	2.0
Private not-for-profit doctoral <sup>4</sup>	87.7	3.6	5.2	2.4	1.1
Public master's	87.2	4.7	2.6	3.2	2.4
Private not-for-profit master's	90.0	3.5	1.9	2.6	2.0
Private not-for-profit baccalaureate	87.5	7.2	2.7	1.5	1.1
Public associate's	83.7	6.8	2.7	4.4	2.4
Other <sup>5</sup>	83.8	6.8	4.0	2.3	3.1
<b>All program areas in four-year institutions</b>	<b>86.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.0</b>
Agriculture/home economics	89.7	4.2	—	—	6.1
Business	89.3	5.0	2.7	1.3	1.7
Education	89.0	4.4	1.2	3.7	1.6
Engineering	80.8	1.8	13.2	1.3	2.9
Fine arts	89.2	2.9	2.2	2.5	3.2
Health sciences	85.0	3.0	9.0	2.0	1.0
Humanities	85.6	4.3	3.7	4.6	1.7
Natural sciences	84.3	3.4	8.4	2.1	1.7
Social sciences	85.1	6.0	3.0	2.8	3.3
All other fields	85.8	7.5	2.2	3.1	1.4

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:04).

<sup>1</sup> All part-time faculty and instructional staff includes all faculty (regardless of whether they had instructional responsibilities) and all other instructional staff employed part time by their institutions. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

<sup>2</sup> Black includes African American; Asian/Pacific Islander includes Native Hawaiian; Hispanic includes Latino; and Other includes American Indian/Alaska Native and those who selected more than one race. Race categories exclude Hispanic origin unless specified.

<sup>3</sup> All public and private not-for-profit Title IV degree-granting institutions in the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

<sup>4</sup> Doctoral includes research/doctoral institutions and specialized medical schools and medical centers as classified by the 2000 Carnegie Classification.

<sup>5</sup> Public baccalaureate, private not-for-profit associate's, and other specialized institutions, except medical schools and medical centers.

— Rounds to zero.

Preoccupation with trendy, standardized (often static) assessment schemas (based on deterministic assumptions) cannot capture the dynamics of faculty work. Learning and scholarship have always been dynamic enterprises, technology aside. Dynamic systems do not behave predictably, nor do they produce predictable outcomes.<sup>36</sup> Successful teaching and research involves intangibles and serendipities. Moreover, faculty work transcends institutional locales and teaching assignments, with many professional obligations that are fulfilled by intrinsic motivation.

Keeping up with developments in one's area of expertise is a tangible example; how excellent it is to make substantive contributions at the frontiers of science, knowledge, and pedagogy. Enhancing faculty motivations via incentives rather than mandates would produce a richer atmosphere in this era of privatization and assessment.

A final question: Will administrators, trustees, and critics who measure, assess, and standardize academic work subject themselves to the same intense scrutiny? Almost a century after Veblen, one wonders.

**Table 4. Percentage Distribution of All Full-Time Faculty and Instructional Staff,<sup>1</sup> by Gender, Institution Type, and Program Area: Fall 2003**

Institution type and program area	Gender	
	Male	Female
<b>All institutions<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>61.7%</b>	<b>38.3%</b>
Public doctoral <sup>3</sup>	67.4	32.7
Private not-for-profit doctoral <sup>3</sup>	68.4	31.6
Public master's	59.0	41.0
Private not-for-profit master's	57.3	42.7
Private not-for-profit baccalaureate	59.1	40.9
Public associate's	50.4	49.6
Other <sup>4</sup>	58.7	41.3
<b>All program areas in four-year institutions</b>	<b>61.4</b>	<b>35.9</b>
Agriculture/home economics	63.9	36.1
Business	72.6	27.4
Education	41.7	58.3
Engineering	90.5	9.5
Fine arts	62.6	37.4
Health sciences	52.0	48.0
Humanities	59.0	41.0
Natural sciences	77.1	22.9
Social sciences	64.3	35.7
All other fields	58.7	41.3

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:04).

<sup>1</sup> All full-time faculty and instructional staff includes all faculty (regardless of whether they had instructional responsibilities) and all other instructional staff employed full time by their institutions. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

<sup>2</sup> All public and private not-for-profit Title IV degree-granting institutions in the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

<sup>3</sup> Doctoral includes research/doctoral institutions and specialized medical schools and medical centers as classified by the 2000 Carnegie Classification.

<sup>4</sup> Public baccalaureate, private not-for-profit associate's, and other specialized institutions, except medical schools and medical centers.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Veblen, 1918. Not all of Veblen's observations and conjectures were necessarily accurate.

<sup>2</sup> GESO, 2005.

<sup>3</sup> Zafirovski, 2004, Brewer, Gates, and Goldman, 2004.

<sup>4</sup> Pearson and Sherman, 2005; Rich and Merchant, 2003; Shaw and Jacobs, 2003.

<sup>5</sup> Cangiani, 2004.

<sup>6</sup> Bok, 2003.

<sup>7</sup> Lee, 2004, 1.

<sup>8</sup> Bok, 2003, x.

<sup>9</sup> Sociologists typically probe or resolve these complications by examining institutional forces, while economists direct their attention to market forces. Political scientists dissect policy issues while anthropologists analyze cultural

transformations. All these disciplines are relevant to higher education; so is historical and psychological research.

<sup>10</sup> Oh, 2003.

<sup>11</sup> Benjamin, 2003. No one can accurately determine the total direct or indirect costs of privatization schemas and assessment procedures—a discussion that is noticeably absent in the literature.

<sup>12</sup> "Union-bashing" sometimes prevails where ideological presumptions are specious, analytical schemas are deficient, and empirical evidence is sparse. Why should faculty unions avoid pursuing the legitimate interests of their members within a social system that gives them the constitutional right to do so? Is it reasonable to assume that they should be parasitic with respect to their reason for existence? For most critics, anecdotes, rhetoric, and aggregate statistics bury covert power dynamics and hidden interests.



**Table 5. Percentage Distribution of All Part-Time Faculty and Instructional Staff,<sup>1</sup> by Gender, Institution Type, and Program Area: Fall 2003**

Institution type and program area	Gender	
	Male	Female
<b>All institutions<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>52.1%</b>	<b>48.0%</b>
Public doctoral <sup>3</sup>	50.2	49.8
Private not-for-profit doctoral <sup>3</sup>	58.7	41.3
Public master's	50.1	49.9
Private not-for-profit master's	53.5	46.5
Private not-for-profit baccalaureate	50.6	49.4
Public associate's	50.9	49.2
Other <sup>4</sup>	56.8	43.2
<b>All program areas in four-year institutions</b>	<b>52.9</b>	<b>47.1</b>
Agriculture/home economics	35.6	64.4
Business	74.4	25.6
Education	34.2	65.8
Engineering	89.8	10.2
Fine arts	52.4	47.6
Health sciences	41.2	58.8
Humanities	43.9	56.1
Natural sciences	60.3	39.7
Social sciences	60.2	39.8
All other fields	57.8	42.2

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:04).

<sup>1</sup> All part-time faculty and instructional staff includes all faculty (regardless of whether they had instructional responsibilities) and all other instructional staff employed part time by their institutions. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

<sup>2</sup> All public and private not-for-profit Title IV degree-granting institutions in the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

<sup>3</sup> Doctoral includes research/doctoral institutions and specialized medical schools and medical centers as classified by the 2000 Carnegie Classification.

<sup>4</sup> Public baccalaureate, private not-for-profit associate's, and other specialized institutions, except medical schools and medical centers.

<sup>13</sup> Mumper, 2003.

<sup>14</sup> Knight and McCabe, 2003.

<sup>15</sup> Middaugh, 2003. Middaugh, an assistant vice-president for institutional research and planning at the University of Delaware, readily admits that many assessment mandates or measurable outcomes are designed to appease external audiences.

<sup>16</sup> Steck, 2003.

<sup>17</sup> Bowles, 2004.

<sup>18</sup> Shaw and Jacobs, 2003.

<sup>19</sup> Benjamin, 2003; Mumper 2003; Dowd 2003; Shaw and Jacobs, 2003.

<sup>20</sup> Mumper, 2003; Steck, 2003; Green, 2003.

<sup>21</sup> Oh, 2003.

<sup>22</sup> deLos Reyes and Rich, 2003.

<sup>23</sup> Gumport, 2003.

<sup>24</sup> Dougherty, 2003; Brint, 2003; Mazzeo, Rab, and Eachus, 2003; Grubb, Badway, and Bell, 2003.

<sup>25</sup> Deil-Amen and Rosenbaum, 2003; Shaw and Rab, 2003.

<sup>26</sup> Kelly, 2005; McDowell, 2003; Baldrige and Deal, 1983. But an observer from another solar system might wonder why faculty workloads and productivity seem to increase disproportionate to salaries, incentives, and reward structures in an era of rapid social change.

<sup>27</sup> Often in the quest to perceive prestige, institutional interests and professional motives lie dormant.

<sup>28</sup> Only selective findings are reported here. I interviewed one professor from the College of DuPage and a faculty member from Oakton Community College. For their protection, I will not identify specific remarks or divulge direct references

**Table 6. Percentage Distribution of All Full-Time Faculty and Instructional Staff,<sup>1</sup> by Tenure Status, Institution Type, and Program Area: Fall 2003**

Institution type and program area	Tenure status			
	Tenured	On tenure track	Not on tenure track	No tenure system at institution
<b>All institutions<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>47.5%</b>	<b>20.6%</b>	<b>23.7%</b>	<b>8.3%</b>
Public doctoral <sup>3</sup>	49.3	19.4	30.3	0.9
Private not-for-profit doctoral <sup>3</sup>	43.4	19.3	32.7	4.7
Public master's	53.9	27.6	17.6	0.9
Private not-for-profit master's	42.0	27.4	22.2	8.3
Private not-for-profit baccalaureate	42.7	24.4	22.7	10.2
Public associate's	48.5	15.5	10.1	25.9
Other <sup>4</sup>	39.8	16.8	19.4	24.1
<b>All program areas in four-year institutions</b>	<b>47.4</b>	<b>21.7</b>	<b>26.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>
Agriculture/home economics	55.1	19.6	22.5	2.8
Business	52.2	26.1	17.3	4.3
Education	36.1	24.7	32.6	6.6
Engineering	59.1	22.7	15.4	2.8
Fine arts	46.0	24.6	17.9	11.6
Health sciences	29.7	19.4	44.1	6.8
Humanities	52.5	22.5	22.2	2.9
Natural sciences	53.5	19.9	24.0	2.6
Social sciences	56.6	24.1	16.2	3.1
All other fields	44.6	20.7	30.7	4.0

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:04).

<sup>1</sup> All full-time faculty and instructional staff includes all faculty (regardless of whether they had instructional responsibilities) and all other instructional staff employed full time by their institutions. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

<sup>2</sup> All public and private not-for-profit Title IV degree-granting institutions in the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

<sup>3</sup> Doctoral includes research/doctoral institutions and specialized medical schools and medical centers as classified by the 2000 Carnegie Classification.

<sup>4</sup> Public baccalaureate, private not-for-profit associate's, and other specialized institutions, except medical schools and medical centers.

about their campuses. Thanks to each interviewee for taking time from their busy schedules to answer my questions.

<sup>29</sup> Abbott, 2004.

<sup>30</sup> Petrowsky, 2002; Hollowell, 1998.

<sup>31</sup> Allen, 2004.

<sup>32</sup> Cataldi, Fahimi, and Bradburn, 2005.

<sup>33</sup> These human proclivities and informal dynamics are likewise concealed or neglected in assessment schemas, along with the limitations of particular campus environments, inputs, resources, facilities, and student competencies. We often observe "sanitized" assessments!

<sup>34</sup> Current efforts to unionize part-time faculty and graduate students may arrest this trend, thereby opening the possibility for a countertrend toward increased professionaliza-

tion within the academic professions. Surely, academic labor markets and tenure will be affected in unpredictable ways.

<sup>35</sup> Bowles, 2004.

<sup>36</sup> Mandelbrot, 2004.

## REFERENCES

- Abbott, A. *Methods of Discovery*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2004.
- Allen, H. "Employment at the Margins: Nonstandard Work in Higher Education," *NEA 2004 Almanac of Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association 2004, 27-38.
- Ash, M. "The Uses and Usefulness of Psychology," in Pearson, R. and Sherman (eds.). *The Use and Usefulness*

**Table 7. Percentage Distribution of All Part-Time Faculty and Instructional Staff,<sup>1</sup> by Tenure Status, Institution Type, and Program Area: Fall 2003**

Institution type and program area	Tenure status			
	Tenured	On tenure track	Not on tenure track	No tenure system at institution
<b>All institutions<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>86.1%</b>	<b>9.4%</b>
Public doctoral <sup>3</sup>	5.6	1.9	91.5	1.0
Private not-for-profit doctoral <sup>3</sup>	2.7	1.1	91.7	4.5
Public master's	4.3	1.0	91.9	2.8
Private not-for-profit master's	0.9	1.3	92.4	5.5
Private not-for-profit baccalaureate	3.3	1.5	86.4	8.8
Public associate's	2.6	1.8	82.7	12.9
Other <sup>4</sup>	2.2	0.6	74.2	23.0
<b>All program areas in four-year institutions</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>88.9</b>	<b>6.5</b>
Agriculture/home economics	3.1	3.2	93.3	0.4
Business	1.2	0.3	84.6	13.9
Education	2.4	1.5	91.2	4.9
Engineering	8.0	—	92.0	—
Fine arts	1.2	1.1	89.4	8.2
Health sciences	4.0	3.2	82.6	10.2
Humanities	5.1	0.8	90.6	3.6
Natural sciences	5.4	1.2	88.5	4.9
Social sciences	3.2	1.7	89.3	5.8
All other fields	2.1	0.5	92.8	4.7

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:04).

<sup>1</sup> All part-time faculty and instructional staff includes all faculty (regardless of whether they had instructional responsibilities) and all other instructional staff employed part time by their institutions. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

<sup>2</sup> All public and private not-for-profit Title IV degree-granting institutions in the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

<sup>3</sup> Doctoral includes research/doctoral institutions, and specialized medical schools and medical centers as classified by the 2000 Carnegie Classification.

<sup>4</sup> Public baccalaureate, private not-for-profit associate's, and other specialized institutions, except medical schools and medical centers.  
—Rounds to zero.

*of the Social Sciences: Achievements, Disappointments, and Promise. The Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Science* 600, (July 2005), 99-114.

Baldrige, J.V. and Deal, T. (eds.). *The Dynamics of Organizational Change in Education*. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan, 1983.

Benjamin, R. "The Environment of American Higher Education: A Constellation of Changes," in Rich, P. and D. Merchant (eds.). *Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 585 (January 2003), 8-30.

Bergmann, B. "The Current State of Economics: Needs Lots of Work," in Pearson, R. and L. Sherman (eds.).

*The Use and Usefulness of the Social Sciences: Achievements, Disappointments, and Promise. The Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Science* 600 (July 2005), 52-67.

Bok, D. *Universities in the Marketplace*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Bowles, S. *Microeconomics*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2004.

Brewer, D., Gates, S., and Goldman, C. *In Pursuit of Prestige: Strategy and Competition in U.S. Higher Education*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 2004.

Brewer, D., Gates, S., and Goldman, C. "In Pursuit of Prestige: Strategy and Competition in U.S. Higher

- Education, Technical Papers," Santa Monica. Calif: Rand Corporation, 2001.
- Brint, S. "Few Remaining Dreams: Community Colleges Since 1985," in Shaw, K. and J. Jacobs (eds.). *Community Colleges: New Environments, New Directions. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 585 (March 2003). 16-37.
- Burawoy, M. "The Return of the Repressed: Recovering the Public Face of U.S. Sociology, One Hundred Years On." In Pearson, R. and Sherman, L. (eds.). *The Use and Usefulness of the Social Sciences: Achievements, Disappointments, and Promise. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 600 (July 2005), 68-85.
- Cangiani, M. "Veblen's Critique of Political Economy," *International Review of Sociology* 14 (3) (2004), 441-453.
- Cataldi, E.F., Fahimi, M., and Bradburn, E.M. "2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF: 04) Report on Faculty and Instructional Staff in Fall 2003 (NCES 2005-172)." U.S. Department of Education. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 2005. Retrieved [May 2005] from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch>.
- Deil-Amen, R. and Rosenbaum, J. "The Social Prerequisites of Success: Can College Structure Reduce the Need for Social Know-How?" In Shaw, K. and J. Jacobs (eds.). *Community Colleges: New Environments, New Directions. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 585 (March 2003), 120-143.
- deLos Reyes, G. and Rich, P. "Housing Students: Fraternities and Residential Colleges," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 585 (January 2003), 118-123.
- Dougherty, K. "The Uneven Distribution of Employee Training by Community Colleges: Description and Explanation," in Shaw, K. and J. Jacobs (eds.). *Community Colleges: New Environments, New Directions. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 585 (March 2003), 62-91.
- Dowd, A. "From Access to Outcome Equity: Revitalizing the Democratic Mission of the Community College," in Shaw, K. and J. Jacobs (eds.). *Community Colleges: New Environments, New Directions. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 585 (March 2003), 92-119.
- Field, H. "Integrating Tertiary Education in Europe," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 585 (January 2003), 182-189.
- GESO (Graduate Teachers and Researchers Union, Yale University). "The (Un)Changing Face of the Ivy League." GESO, UNITE HERE!, [www.geso.org](http://www.geso.org), 2005.
- Green, R. "Markets, Management, and "Reengineering" Higher Education," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 585 (January 2003), 196-210.
- Grubb, W.N., Badway, N., and Bell, D. "Community Colleges and the Equity Agenda: The Potential of Noncredit Education," in Shaw, K. and J. Jacobs (eds.). *Community Colleges: New Environments, New Directions. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 585 (March 2003), 218-240.
- Gumport, P. "The Demand-Response Scenario: Perspectives of Community College Presidents." In Shaw, K. and J. Jacobs (eds.). *Community Colleges: New Environments, New Directions. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 585 (March 2003), 38-61.
- Hollowell, R. (ed.). "Part-time Faculty: %, !, ? or Statistics, Responses and Questions." *FACTC Focus*. Faculty Association of Community and Technical Colleges, Wash. (Fall 1998), 2-10.
- Ivory, M. "The Social Context of Applied Science: A Model Undergraduate Program," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 585 (January 2003), 154-181.
- Jacobs, J. and Shaw, K. (eds.). *Community Colleges at a Crossroads: Emerging Issues. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 586 (March 2003).
- Jacobs, J. and Winslow, S. "Welfare Reform and Enrollment in Postsecondary Education" In Shaw, K. and J. Jacobs (eds.). *Community Colleges: New Environments, New Directions. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 585 (March 2003), 194-217.
- Kelly, H. "Games, Cookies, and the Future of Education," in *Issues in Science and Technology* 21 (4) (Summer 2005), 33-40.
- Knight, D., and McCabe, D. *Organization and Innovation: Guru Schemes and American Dreams*. Glasgow: Open University Press, 2003.
- Kumar, D. "Trends in Postsecondary Science in the United States," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 585 (January 2003), 124-133.
- Lee, J. "Why Are College Prices Increasing and What Should We Do About It?" *NEA Higher Education Research Center Update* 9 (5) (December 2003), 1-6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Higher Education and Privatization" *NEA Higher Education Research Center Update*, 10 (2) (March 2004), 1-6.
- Mandlebrot, B. and Hudson, R.L.. *The (Mis)Behavior of Markets*. New York: Basic Books, 2004.

- Mazzeo, C., Rab, S., and Eachus, S. "Work-First or Work-Only: Welfare Reform, State Policy, and Access to Postsecondary Education." In Shaw, K. and J. Jacobs (eds). *Community Colleges: New Environments, New Directions. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 585 (March 2003), 144-171.
- McDowell, G.R. "Engaged Universities: Lessons from the Land-Grant Universities and Extension," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 585 (January 2003), 31-50.
- Middaugh, M. "Faculty Productivity: Different Strategies for Different Audiences," *Planning for Higher Education* 30 (3) (Spring 2003), 34-43.
- Mumper, M. "The Future of College Access: The Declining Role of Public Higher Education in Promoting Equal Opportunity." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 585 (January 2003), 97-117.
- Nocenzi, M. "Conclusions" (special edition on Veblen) *International Review of Sociology* 14 (3) (2004), 543-549.
- Oh, C.H. "Information Communication Technology and the New University: A View on eLearning," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 585 (January 2003), 134-153.
- Pearson, R. "Book Review Essay: The Uneasy Partnership between Social Science and Public Policy," in Pearson, R. and L. Sherman (eds.). *The Use and Usefulness of the Social Sciences: Achievements, Disappointments, and Promise. The Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Science* 600 (July 2005), 157-173.
- Pearson, R. and Sherman, L. (eds.). *The Use and Usefulness of the Social Sciences: Achievements, Disappointments, and Promise. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 600 (July 2005).
- Pearson, R. and Sherman, L. "Preface: The Achievements, Frustrations, and Promise of the Social Sciences." In Pearson, R. and L. Sherman (eds.). *The Use and Usefulness of the Social Sciences: Achievements, Disappointments, and Promise. The Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Science* 600 (July 2005), 6-13.
- Petrowsky, M. "The Reduction of Faculty Reassigned Time as a Community College Cost Containment Initiative: A Case Study of the Maricopa County Community College District." Glendale, Ariz.: Glendale Community College, 2002.
- Plomin, R. and Asbury, K. "Nature and Nurture: Genetic and Environmental Influences on Behavior," in Pearson, R. and L. Sherman (eds.). *The Use and Usefulness of the Social Sciences: Achievements, Disappointments, and Promise. The Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Science* 600, (July 2005), 86-98.
- Prewitt, K. "Political Ideas and a Political Science for Policy," in Pearson, R. and L. Sherman (eds.). *The Use and Usefulness of the Social Sciences: Achievements, Disappointments, and Promise. The Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Science* 600 (July 2005), 14-29.
- Rich, P. and Merchant, D. (eds.). *Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 585 (January 2003).
- Riposa, G. "Urban Universities: Meeting the Needs of Students," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 585 (January 2003), 51-65.
- Shaw, K. and Jacobs, J. (eds). *Community Colleges: New Environments, New Directions. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 585 (March 2003).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Preface: Community Colleges: New Environments, New Directions," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 585 (March 2003), 6-15.
- Shaw, K. and Rab, S. "Market Rhetoric Versus Reality in Policy and Practice: The Workforce Investment Act and Access to Community College Education and Training." In Shaw, K. and J. Jacobs (eds.). *Community Colleges: New Environments, New Directions. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 585 (March 2003), 172-193.
- Sherman, L. "The Use and Usefulness of Criminology, 1751-2005: Enlightened Justice and Its Failures," in Pearson, R. and L. Sherman (eds.). *The Use and Usefulness of the Social Sciences: Achievements, Disappointments, and Promise. The Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Science* 600 (July 2005), 115-135.
- Steck, H. "Corporatization of the University: Seeking Conceptual Clarity," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 585 (January 2003), 66-83.
- Veblen, T. *The Higher Learning in America*. New York: B.W. Huebsch, 1918.
- Vianello, M. "Thorstein Veblen—A Systematic Thinker," *International Review of Sociology* 14 (3) (2004), 341-342.
- Waugh, Jr., W.L. "Issues in University Governance: More 'Professional' and Less Academic," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 585 (January 2003), 84-96.

- Wedel, J., Shore, C., Feldman, G., and Lathrop, S. "Toward an Anthropology of Public Policy," in Pearson, R. and L. Sherman (eds.). *The Use and Usefulness of the Social Sciences: Achievements, Disappointments, and Promise. The Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Science* 600 (July 2005), 30-51.
- Weisburd, D., Lum, C., and Petrosino, A. (eds.). *Assessing Systematic Evidence in Crime and Justice: Methodological Concerns and Empirical Outcomes. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 587 (May 2003).
- Zafirovski, M. "Paradigms for Analysis of Social Institutions: A Case for Sociological Institutionalism," *International Review of Sociology* 14 (3) (2004), 363-397.