

Casual Labor and the Future of the Academy

By Ben Johnson and Tom McCarthy

Teaching at universities has always been done by a mix of full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty, temporary full-time instructors, and part-time adjuncts.

Historically, the numbers in this last category were small. But, over the last generation, universities, facing mounting financial pressure, have taken advantage of a slack job market to hire more casual labor.

The number of part-timers—including graduate students, who are paid substantially lower salaries with few or no benefits, are not integrated into the faculty as a whole, and with whom colleges and universities have no long-term relationship—has increased dramatically over the last generation.

In 1970, 22 percent of faculty members held part-time positions. By 1992 that number had risen to nearly 45 percent.¹

A survey of 1993 faculty, the most recent available, shows the trend continuing (see table 1):²

In the U.S. economy as a whole, about 17 percent of the workforce holds part-time jobs.³ The academy, where over 40 percent of the workforce consists of part-time and adjunct instructors, relies on casual workers more than virtually any other sector of the economy.

This casualization of higher education's teaching labor is perhaps the single most serious threat facing the academy today. It is, in addition, most clearly and directly, a major cause of the difficult job situation confronting the next generation of academics.

These scholars unable to find full-time work, whose demanding jobs as teaching or research assistants generally preclude them from producing the scholarship necessary to break into the tenure-track, are the primary victims of the casualization of the academic workforce.

But they are not its only victims, for the increasing reliance on part-time and adjunct teachers has

Ben Johnson is finishing his graduate studies in history at Yale University, where he has also been an organizer for the Graduate Students and Employees Organization (GESO). He writes on United States and Mexican history and will teach at the California Institute of Technology next year. *Tom McCarthy* is finishing his doctorate in history at Yale. He holds an MA in history from NYU and an MBA from Columbia. He has taught at Yale and Smith College. His dissertation is an environmental history of the automobile in America.

consequences for the profession as a whole.

This enormous labor pool weakens the relative strength of faculty vis-a-vis administrations and boards, since a smaller proportion of faculty has the long-term relationship with an institution necessary to play an active role in university governance, let alone the independence and job security to exercise such responsibility.

Temporary instructors are also less able to exercise their academic freedom. To follow controversial lines of scholarly pursuit and to advance unpopular positions, academics must be free from arbitrary reprisals, evaluations, or dismissals by administrators and fellow faculty alike. The American Association of University Professor's statement on part-time faculty states:

The teachers who must go, hand in hand, every year . . . indefinitely into the future, to ask if they may stay, are not teachers who can feel free to speak and write the truth as they see it . . . Not surprisingly, the more cautious among them are likely to avoid controversy in their classes or with the deans

and department heads on whose good will they are dependent upon for periodic reappointment. The institution may express its commitment to protect their academic freedom, but to those whose appointment may not be renewed solely at the administrator's discretion such a commitment may seem of little value—and best not tested.⁴

The effects of casualization on undergraduate education are equally grave. A learning environment of the highest quality can be maintained only by a faculty with a long-term relationship to one another, their students, and their institution.

As the AAUP also notes in its statement on part-time labor:

It is difficult to develop a coherent curriculum, maintain uniform standards for evaluating students' performance, or establish continuity between and among courses when major academic responsibilities are divided among 'transient' and regular faculty, especially when they have relatively little interaction with one another.⁵

Table 1

Total # faculty (excl. graduate teachers)	# Full-time	% Full-time	# Full-time	% Part-time
915,474	545,706	59%	369,768	40%
Total # faculty and graduate teachers	FT Faculty	%PT Faculty	% Grad.	#Grad.
1,118,293	48.4%	33.1%	18.1%	202,819

The quest for a cheap labor source is the most important drive behind the use of graduate teachers.

One of the ironies of the casualization of the academic workforce is that, although it erodes the power, autonomy, and economic prospects of faculty as a whole, these costs are distributed in a highly unequal fashion.

A few professors have been able to command the salary and perks of academic “superstars,” and tenured faculty at elite private and public research universities are secure and even prosperous. The use of graduate students as casual academic workers at most major research universities brings this irony to the fore.

This article examines the use of graduate students—the next generation of academics—as teaching assistants (TAs) and how the increase in this practice has contributed to the casualization of academic labor.

Through an examination of graduate student teaching at Yale and in the academy as a whole, we argue that the widespread use of teaching assistants furthers the casualization of academic labor, undermines core values of university life, and compromises the ability of those who teach in higher education to address these problems.

Because teaching assistant are students as well as teachers, too little attention has been paid to the ramifications of the use of TAs in

the classroom. We argue that the quest for a cheap labor source is the most important drive behind the use of graduate teachers, and that academics should seek to limit the amount of teaching by TAs and support efforts to “bring the bottom up” by organizing the TA workforce.

With last summer’s successful union vote in the University of California system, around 20 percent of the nation’s 200,000 graduate teachers now have union representation, and more union drives are underway.

The increasing number of such drives will require professors to ask tough questions not only of university administrators, but of themselves as well.

Graduate students comprise over a third of the national pool of adjunct instructors. The authors of a 1986 AAUP report on non-tenure track faculty recognized the similarities between teaching assistants and other adjuncts.

What seems to have developed at many colleges and universities in the United States is a class of insecure, full-time faculty members whose status is inferior to that of both their tenure-eligible and their tenured colleagues and whose role in some respects does not differ from that of teaching assistants.⁶

Charles Clotfelter similarly

The greater the number of grad students, the smaller the share of faculty attention undergraduates receive.

notes that “the best single predictor of the format used in undergraduate instruction appears to be the ratio of doctoral students to undergraduates; the greater the number of graduate students, the smaller the share of the faculty’s attention that the undergraduate students will receive.”⁷ At many universities, including Yale, the number of graduate student admissions is determined partially by the staffing needs of departments.⁸

University administrators argue that TAs are “apprentices” and are provided with teaching opportunities as a part of their own graduate education, that they are studying under the tutelage of an individual professor, and that they are certainly not employees of the university.

All of these claims contain some truth. Graduate students do acquire teaching skills useful for the job market. They can learn much from professors with whom they work, and few would consider themselves employees.

But the rhetoric of apprenticeship begs the question of why so many graduate students are in the classroom in the first place. A brief history of Yale’s TA program demonstrates how this one university has shifted an enormous portion of its basic teaching

responsibilities onto the shoulders of non-ladder instructors.

Graduate student labor has become so critical at Yale that if TAs were to suddenly disappear, the institution would be faced with a severe labor shortage that it could make up in only one of four ways. The university would have to raise the teaching requirement of ladder faculty, hire significantly more ladder faculty, or hire many more adjunct instructors

Yale could also alter the curriculum to offer little or no basic instruction in composition, literature, and foreign languages and much less small-group interaction for the first several years of undergraduate studies.

Ironically, nothing makes the case for this argument more persuasively than Yale’s own studies of its graduate teaching programs. The most thorough of these studies was issued in 1989.

Reviewing the use of graduate student teaching labor from the 1960s to the 1987-88 academic year, the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching in Yale College acknowledged in the *Prown Report* the dual nature of graduate teaching, even as it noted the benefits for graduate students themselves:

the Teaching Fellow Program represents a significant fraction of the undergraduates’ classroom experience; it is an integral part

Ladder faculty ranks declined by 5 percent, while graduate teachers increased by 36 percent.

of most graduate students' education and financial support; and it provides an essential support for faculty in a research institution with a strong commitment to undergraduate teaching.⁹

Yale's official historian, George Pierson, notes that by 1976 there was a "large fringe of graduate students, lecturers, and visiting faculty who were coming to constitute almost a third of the very substantial corps of men and women now instructing in Yale College."

For "the discerning eye," he wrote, "the drift away from a full-time professional teaching faculty, and so also away from departmental promotion ladders and discipline controls, would be quite unmistakable, and perhaps disturbing."¹¹

The expansion of graduate student labor made possible a series of much-needed undergraduate curriculum changes. In the late '70s, Yale, responding to a heightened interest in writing instruction, added a variety of writing courses, including intensive writing sections of selected lecture courses. At the same time, the English Department revised and expanded its basic writing course.¹¹

Similarly, several years later, the faculty "approved a requirement that all Yale College students demonstrate a competence in a

foreign language at the intermediate level." This action increased enrollment and created a need for instructors that couldn't be filled by ladder faculty.¹² In fact, the increased enrollments were met entirely by graduate student labor.

From 1980 to 1988, the years studied in the *Prown Report*, undergraduate enrollment in language courses increased by 32 percent. Ladder faculty ranks declined by 5 percent, while graduate teachers increased by 36 percent. Over the same period, undergraduate course registrations per ladder faculty member climbed from 58 to nearly 82.¹³

Quite apart from curricular changes, the increased undergraduate enrollment in the '60s and '70s was only partly offset by hiring more ladder faculty. The gap was made up by using more graduate labor (see table 2).¹⁴

Further curricular shifts in the 1980s only heightened the substitution of graduate labor for tenure or tenure-ladder faculty positions.

The Prown committee notes:

Departments like History and American Studies, which have substantial seminar requirements for the major . . . have had an increase in the number of majors. Because of a slight reduction in the number of ladder faculty . . . particularly at the

rank of Assistant Professor, these seminars are often taught by TF IVs [the TA classification with the highest pay and job expectations] and PTAs [Part-time acting instructors, graduate students in charge of their own courses].¹⁵

In other words, instead of hiring more ladder faculty—who have full-time jobs with competitive salaries, benefits, and at least some permanence—or even keeping the numbers of faculty positions constant, Yale chose to employ graduate students to teach hundreds of sections, seminars, and labs.

Why? Yale has a clear financial motive for using graduate student labor to carry out teaching duties previously performed by ladder faculty. Consider the situation in spring 1995, when The Graduate Employees and Students Organization conducted a comprehensive survey of the work done by graduate students in the humanities and social sciences divisions of Yale.

GESO found that 384 graduate students led discussion sections or taught their own courses, for a total of 864 classroom hours per week. Yale compensated these graduate students about \$1.85 million for their work over the course of the semester. On the other hand, 431 full-time faculty were responsible

for only 756.5 classroom hours per week.

Had Yale not been able to resort to graduate labor, and hired faculty at the assistant professor level (with a standard teaching load of two courses per semester), the university would have needed to hire about 190 junior professors. At an average salary of \$46,200 per year, this would have cost Yale \$4.43 million. Thus, Yale saves more than \$2.5 million per semester—more than \$5 million every academic year.¹⁶

Regular faculty have gained from the increasing use of graduate students as teachers. The Prown Committee notes:

a number of departments have reduced the number of courses expected of full-time ladder faculty, in part in response to the decrease in teaching loads at Universities with which Yale competes for faculty . . . [t]his has also contributed to an increase in the amount of teaching done by graduate students.¹⁷

The long-term cost for graduate students, of course, is that several hundred fewer good, full-time jobs are unavailable for would-be professors.

In March 1999, GESO released a more comprehensive study of

Table 2

	Students per faculty member, ladder faculty only	Students per faculty member, including graduate teachers
1968-69	8.82	7.6
1975-76	11.28	7.7

The student status of TAs severely compromises their ability to improve their working terms and conditions.

teaching at Yale, counting the contact hours between instructors and students in every course in Yale College.

Ladder faculty were responsible for about 30 percent of those hours, with graduate teachers responsible for fully 40 percent. Other casual instructors made up the remaining 30 percent.¹⁸ How much larger would Yale's faculty have to be if the university could not resort to graduate students and other casuals?

Extrapolating this trend from Yale to the academy as a whole, it is easy to see the staggering cost in tenure-track positions that is exacted by the widespread use of graduate labor. There are slightly over 200,000 graduate teachers in the United States, as compared with slightly over 114,000 tenure-track junior professors.¹⁹

Individually, graduate students gain intellectual, job-market, and financial benefits from serving as TAs, and institutions such as Yale, in turn, get a cheap, highly motivated, and flexible labor force. But the benefits to both parties seem paltry when one realizes how many more junior professor positions there might be had Yale and other schools not chosen to exploit their own graduate students.²⁰

Graduate assistants have taken a number of steps recently to improve their situations, but the task is difficult. Compounding the

difficulty is the student status of TAs, which, aside from making them a cheap and flexible labor supply, severely compromises their ability to improve their working terms and conditions.

Teaching assistants are in a particularly weak position because they can be pressured by both universities as institutions and by their faculty advisors. The actions of Yale faculty during the 1995-96 grade strike make this chillingly clear.

In December 1995, the teaching assistant members of GESO voted to withhold grades from the university—in lieu of a teaching strike—until Yale agreed to negotiate a written and binding contract for graduate teachers. The TAs wanted this contract to cover such issues as salary and benefits, section size, and teacher training.

The grade-withholding action came after several years of organizing and after Yale had repeatedly declined to hold a union election or negotiate employment conditions with graduate teachers under any auspices.

The response from the administration and faculty to the grade strike was not long in coming. Within a week, the deans of Yale College and the graduate school warned of “serious consequences” for those who participated in the

Many professors told TAs they would no longer be willing to write letters of recommendation.

strike. These consequences, they suggested, would “bear on the evaluation of the graduate student instructor’s performance as a teacher and on the assessment of his/her suitability for teaching appointments during the spring semester.”²¹

Several days later, seven professors in the French department stated in a memo to graduate students:

Failure to perform any aspect of a graduate teaching assignment . . . would (1) be a de facto dereliction of professional duty to our students which would implicate the entire department directly, and (2) constitute behavior unacceptable anywhere in the profession for which graduate teaching is an apprenticeship.

The memo concluded that strike activity “could legitimately be taken into account in faculty evaluations of a student’s aptitude for an eventual academic career.”²²

Individual faculty members leveled their own threats. Historian David Brion Davis made it clear to his TA that his willingness to be on her dissertation committee was dependent upon her not honoring the strike.

When she informed him that she would in fact be withholding her grades, Davis wrote an angry letter to Graduate School Dean

Thomas Applequist insisting that the school bring her up on disciplinary charges.

Many professors across departments told TAs they would no longer be willing to write letters of recommendation for grad students who went on strike.

A faculty meeting in December then voted overwhelmingly to condemn the grade strike, and numerous senior faculty spoke of “defending our administration.”²³

Buttressed by senior faculty, Yale’s administration moved against the grade strike. In mid-December, Dean Applequist charged three students with a host of vague violations of Yale’s “Regulations for Academic and Personal Conduct,” including the following:

- Failure to adhere to a code of conduct that respects the values and integrity of the academic community.
- Coercion, harassment, or intimidation of members of the university community.
- Disruption of university functions and business.
- Defiance of legitimate authority, such as refusal to comply with an order issued in the line of duty by a university police officer, faculty member, or other university official.
- Theft of exam blue books.²⁴

Over 200 graduate teachers

Yale had various reasons for its decision to relent on the disciplinary actions.

participated in the strike initially, but the school chose to file charges against only three students. The three were all GESO coordinators, all women, two were racial minorities, and two of them were foreign nationals.

Dean Applequist acted as the prosecutor in the disciplinary committee hearings, and four of the eight committee members hearing the case were associate deans who directly reported to Applequist. The associate deans declined to recuse themselves when accused of having a conflict of interest.

Applequist provided no justification for why the three students had been singled out and offered no explanation of what action precisely had given rise to the general charges.

The first student tried, Diana Paton, was found guilty of some of the charges and punished with both a teaching ban for the spring semester and the placement of a letter of reprimand in her file.

Eventually, Yale ceased proceedings against the other two students and suspended Paton's teaching ban. Numerous other students in several departments had been demoted from teaching their own courses to being only teaching assistants, demotions that in most cases the school let stand.

Several factors were behind Yale's decision to relent on the disciplinary actions. First, the strike itself ended. In mid-January, the strikers still in New Haven voted to end the strike and submit their grades.

Second, by the time of the hearing, it was clear that the strike and the trials were generating terrible publicity for Yale, both with the general public and the academic community. The American Association of University Professors, the Modern Language Association, the American Historical Association, and hundreds of individual academics had condemned Yale for its threats against graduate teachers.

A civil disobedience action in front of Yale's Hall of Graduate Studies that led to 137 arrests during the first hearing attracted enormous media attention and suggested that Yale would pay an even higher price in negative publicity for continuing the hearings.

Finally, the university may well have been reluctant to continue the conflict in light of a looming strike—centered on outsourcing and the use of part-time workers—by its clerical and maintenance workforces.

The next November, after a relatively quiet spring and summer, the controversy and debate were renewed when the National Labor Relations Board filed an unfair

TAs who teach more than a few sections or seminars have been enlisted in the debasement of their own profession.

labor practice complaint against Yale for its conduct during the grade strike.

The complaint argued that graduate students have employee standing when teaching for a university, that the grade strike was a legitimate job action, and therefore that Yale's retaliation was illegal. The complaint made specific charges against at least 15 individuals.

In July 1997, an administrative law judge for the NLRB threw many of the charges out on a technicality. The judge ruled that the grade strike was a partial strike and not a legally protected job action—because the striking graduate students had continued to perform some of their duties, such as holding office hours, writing letters of recommendation, and proctoring and grading final exams.

Yale and the NLRB have reached a settlement on the other charges, in which the university admits no wrongdoing but agrees to respect the grad students' right to organize under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act.

Although the settlement is still under appeal, the NLRB has provided a significant window of opportunity for GESO and other graduate teaching unions.

Graduate students at New York University petitioned the NLRB for a union election in

March. The New York office of the NLRB ruled that grad assistants are indeed employees and covered by the National Labor Relations Act. This finding provides teaching assistants with legal protection against workplace coercion.

Most importantly, if a union is victorious in a National Labor Relations Board election, a university would be legally obligated to negotiate a contract with its graduate teachers. GESO is currently organizing toward such a goal.

We add one final note on the inadvertent contributions of graduate students and senior faculty to the casualization of academic work. The truth about the role of graduate students in the overall casualization of academic labor is as unsettling as it is undeniable: Those who teach more than a few sections or seminars—all that is needed to prepare them for the job market—have been enlisted in the debasement of their own profession.

The insistence by Yale's administration and senior faculty that a teaching assistantship is an apprenticeship—a stance echoed at other universities facing union drives—borders on the farcical.

The university's own studies contradict the school's public insistence that it provides teaching

'The apprenticeship argument makes no sense at all if there are no jobs to go to at the end of the apprenticeship.'

assistantships only out of an altruistic desire for the professional and financial well-being of graduate students.

In any case, the apprenticeship argument belies the harshness of the job market. As Katherine Kolb, a "temporary" teacher at the University of Minnesota for nearly two decades, notes: "The apprenticeship argument, which does not apply to adjuncts and does not address the issue of equal pay for equal work, makes no sense at all if there are no jobs to go to at the end of the apprenticeship."²⁵

The true tragedy of the grade strike was that mutual recriminations between Yale graduate students and their faculty obscured how much the strike embodied larger issues in the academy.

Most professors *are* alarmed at the collapse of the tenure system and the rise of casual academic labor. There are, as a result, powerful reasons for senior faculty to support the organizing efforts of graduate students, their own included. As Kolb writes,

despite the prospect of future union struggles, neither adjuncts nor graduate students are by any means natural adversaries of the tenured faculty. On the contrary, they are living out and demonstrating in poignant ways the

various arguments for tenure. Whatever the merits of the Yale faculty's estimation of their graduate students' demands, what is most noticeable is the emotional climate in which the actions and arguments have taken place. There is something about the stance of the Yale administration and faculty reminiscent of distressed parents who have done their best and cannot grasp that circumstances have outstripped their well-meant plans for their children. The distress must be all the greater, with both parties, when the adult "children" end up remaining around the home, barely earning their keep, not so much from lack of productivity (although productivity is inevitably affected) as from the lack of a secure frame for their work.²⁶

Outside of the context of the grade strike, Yale faculty do indeed acknowledge the precarious job market awaiting new Ph.Ds. But the faculty's sense of personal betrayal prevented them from seeing the strike in particular, and GESO in general, as growing out of the crisis of academic labor.

Without a greater awareness of how the use of TAs is driven by the same forces casualizing the overall academy, the moral failure of Yale's

regular faculty during the grade strike will be repeated across the country.

Graduate teachers should suffer from fewer illusions than an older generation of teachers. They must understand their teaching as grad assistants to be the start of their teaching careers.

If grad assistants do not want to be paid below the cost of living, without retirement, health care, or leave benefits, for the rest of those careers, then they must not let the love of teaching and their hope to secure their own places in the academy blind them to the harm they do to their own profession and, ultimately, their prospects within it.

The current explosion of interest in unions, witnessed by the recent California victories, a lost election at the University of Minnesota, and additional union filings at Oregon State, Temple, and New York University, suggests that graduate students have begun to consider the long-term consequences of their academic labor.

All those who care about the academy can take steps to check the trend of casualization. The academic community should see efforts to check the downsizing of the academy—especially TA organizing

efforts—as the logical extension of faculty efforts to place their grad students in good positions.

Faculty who are committed to their graduate students could use their prestige and influence to help press professional organizations such as the American Historical Association and the Modern Language Association to keep accurate data on the employment and wages of adjuncts, including graduate teachers.

These faculty could also use their influence in pressing accreditors to penalize schools that have enlisted adjuncts to fulfill a large portion of their teaching needs.

And together with professional associations and unions such as the National Education Association, faculty could press state legislators to increase funding for state colleges and universities to convert the bulk of the part-time positions into full-time jobs.

In the absence of such aggressive action, the use of casual labor in the academy will only continue to increase and continue to undermine educational quality, faculty power, academic freedom, and the career hopes of thousands of would-be professors—and to pit graduate students against their own teachers. ■

Endnotes

¹ Data from Linda Ray Pratt, "Disposable Faculty: Part-time Exploitation as Management Strategy," in Cary Nelson, *Will Teach for Food: Academic Labor in Crisis* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), 265.

² From Ernst Benjamin, "Some Implications of Tenure for the Profession and Society," *Perspectives* April 1997, page 16; Benjamin's data are from a draft version of "Fall Staff in Postsecondary

institutions, 1993," National Center for Education Statistics; April 1996.

³ Linda Ray Pratt, "Disposable Faculty: Part-time Exploitation as Management Strategy," in Cary Nelson, *Will Teach for Food: Academic Labor in Crisis* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), 265. AAUP, "On Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Appointments, 1986."

⁴ AAUP, "On Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Appointment," 1986.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Charles Clotfelter, *Buying the Best: Cost Escalation in Elite Higher Education* (Princeton University Press, 1996), 249.

⁸ Personal communication with history department faculty, Yale University, Spring and Fall semesters, 1997

⁹ Yale University, Report of the Ad Hoc Committee in Teaching in Yale College, April 25, 1989, page 4.

¹⁰ George Wilson Pierson, *A Yale Book of Numbers: Historical Statistics of the College and University, 1701-1976* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), page 359.

¹¹ *Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching in Yale College*, page 6.

¹² Ibid..

¹³ Ibid., Appendix B-6.

¹⁴ Data from Pierson, page 362.

¹⁵ *Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching in Yale College*, *ibid.*.

¹⁶ This paragraph is based almost entirely on the analysis of Gordon Lafer, former Director Research for GESO and Locals 34 and 35, in "Historical trends in graduate employment," April 1997, manuscript in GESO files. Numbers for ladder faculty were calculated from Yale's course listings for the Spring semester of 1995; the number of TAs and PTAs are drawn from a GESO survey in spring 1995. Lafer's salary figures are taken from the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 21, 1995. Information on the number of ladder faculty comes from Table 2, "Total Budgeted FTE Teaching Positions (Ladder)," in *The Faculty of Arts and Sciences Departmental Trends 1979/80 to 1996/97*, September 1997, Yale University Office of Institutional Research.

Not surprisingly, Yale measures the amount of graduate teaching much differently than we do here. They count only those graduate students teaching their own course, and thus publicly maintain that only about 2 percent of teaching in Yale College is performed by graduate students. Another way of measuring the amount of teaching done by graduate

students versus ladder faculty would be from the perspective of a single undergraduate student enrolled in a lecture course with lectures given by a ladder faculty member and sections taught by a graduate assistant. For such a student, the ladder faculty member would be responsible for two-thirds of the teaching (two lectures per week, one discussion section is standard). We have chosen instead to measure aggregate contact hours (time which students spend with instructors) in our calculation. By such a measure, in a lecture class with two T.A.s, each teaching two sections, graduate teachers carry twice as much of the teaching load as does the ladder faculty member (four contact hours versus two). This measurement accurately reflects the amount of teaching labor necessary to provide undergraduates with an interactive, seminar-style learning environment—the type of learning that Yale prides itself on providing its undergraduates. The calculations are necessarily rough: one TF 3.5 is likely not as much work as a seminar taught by a ladder faculty, a fact which makes the calculation overstate the number of junior faculty slots needed to replace graduate labor; graders and other lower-level TF levels are not included in the calculations, which understates the equivalent number of ladder faculty needed to replace graduate labor; and even if Yale had not opted to use casualized graduate labor, there would still be a minimal level of teaching by graduate students in order to make them competitive on the job market (currently, most graduate students teach anywhere from 6 to 12 sections or seminars over the course of their stay at Yale; 1 or 2 would seem to fulfill job-market needs); and the salary comparisons do not include health and retirement benefits, whose inclusion would increase Yale's calculated savings. Nevertheless, the dilemma and its magnitude are clear: Yale saves several million a year by foregoing the creation of several hundred junior faculty positions.

¹⁷ *Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching in Yale College*, page 6.

¹⁸ Graduate Employees and Student

Organization, *Casual in Blue: Yale and the Academic Job Market*. Copies in authors' possession, or the report can be found at GESO's Web site, www.yale.edu/geso.

- ¹⁹ Numbers from Ernst Benjamin, "Some Implications of Tenure for the Profession and Society," *Perspectives* April 1997, page 16; Benjamin's numbers are taken from "Fall Staff in Postsecondary Institutions, 1993," National Center for Education Statistics, April 1996. We can find no survey of what being a "graduate teacher" actually entails, which prevents us from making an accurate reckoning of how many assistant professor slots could be created if the use of graduate labor declined to the levels of thirty years ago.
- ²⁰ For an analysis of the use of graduate labor at a public university, see Cary Nelson, *Manifesto of a Tenured Radical* (New York University Press, 1997), 168; and Nelson and Stephen Watt, *Academic Keywords* (Routledge, 1999) passim.
- ²¹ Deans Thomas Applequist and Richard Brodhead, "To Graduate Students

with Teaching Responsibilities in Yale College," December 12, 1995. Copy in GESO files and in possession of the authors.

- ²² Professors Denis Hollier, Christopher Miller, Edwin M. Duval, Françoise Jaouen, Susan Weiner, Ruth Koizim, Maria Kosinski, "To All graduate students with a current or eventual teaching assignment in the Department of French," December 15, 1995. Copy in GESO files and in the possession of the authors.
- ²³ Personal communications with numerous faculty.
- ²⁴ Thomas Applequist to Niljana Dasgupta, Cynthia Young, and Diana Paton, separate letters dated December 18, 1995. Copy in GESO files and in possession of the authors.
- ²⁵ Katherine Kolb, "Adjuncts in Academe: No Place Called Home," *Profession 1997* (New York: Modern Language Association, 1997), 100.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, 102-3.