Defining and Contextualizing Collegiality and the Collegium

Introduction and Context

American higher education and the academic profession that serve it are on the edge of an unprecedented restructuring that is changing the face—indeed, even the very meaning—of higher learning. … The coming change is unprecedented insofar as two powerful conditions reinforce each other: the sheer number of institution-molding forces that are in play… and the stunning rapidity with which these forces are reshaping higher education. (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006, p. 3)

A decade ago, Schuster and Finkelstein described the gathering storm of faculty role change that is now upon us, one that is causing the profession and the institutions it serves to reexamine the form and substance of the academic life. Among the outcomes of this reexamination is a challenge to the normativity of the research-focused, tenure-based (usually older White male) faculty position (Hearn & Deupree, 2013). Thirty years ago this ideal type was described as a “social fiction” (Rice, 1986, p. 12), yet it still largely remains the standard against which the typical professor, regardless of his or her terms of employment, is measured and measures colleagues.1 The data on

---

1Ironically, at a time when educators and activists have pressed for subgroup labels that do not define marginalized groups by what they are not (e.g., “persons of color” rather than “non-
faculty hiring and careers confront this narrative with the reality of the predominance of other employment forms, or what has recently been called “the new faculty majority” in which two thirds of all faculty and between 15 and 20% of full-time faculty are nontenure track (Finkelstein, Conley, & Schuster, 2016; Kezar, 2012c). Nevertheless, the mythology of the tenured researcher as normative ideal lingers at least in part because major elements of the profession, including the ideals of autonomy, shared governance, academic freedom, and, most directly for our purposes, collegiality, have over time become synonymous with the tenured faculty researcher (Rice, 1986). Extension of these core principles to NTTF2 has at least been uneven and controversial and at most has been actively resisted by some faculty and administrators (Haviland et al., 2017; Rice, 1986).

Although collegiality is a recognized ideal of professional behavior and shared purpose (Gappa et al., 2007), the collegium, or the collective membership of scholars, has received far less attention in recent years, particularly in the context of the American university. However, focusing first on the collegium as membership in a faculty body and secondarily on collegiality as behaviors and dispositions through which members fulfill obligations and exercise rights reorders the priority of the professoriate from improving behavior (e.g., improving respect and civility between faculty members) to first examining who has access to membership in the collegium and under what terms. The research and tenure orientation of the faculty ideal thus may be additionally reinforced by the denial of admission to the collegium to those whose employment focus does not facilitate this role (Haviland et al., 2017). If, as Hollenshead et al. (2007) argued, it is not the existence of NTTF but how they are treated that imperils the university because it undermines the institution through culture and behavior, then understanding membership in the White”), the most common language for contingent faculty is “non-tenure-track faculty.” Kezar and Sam (2010a) and others have discussed at length the varieties of terms employed and their uses, but none has achieved standardization. Although we use “nontenure track” here because of its simplicity and normativity, we do so with reservations and acknowledgement of its problematic assumptions.

2 In this monograph, we use “NTTF” as short hand for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. When making a distinction between full-time and part-time contingent faculty, we preface “NTTF” with the associated designation.
collegium as well as behavior within and outside it frames one of the most urgent questions of our times (Finkelstein et al., 2016).

Institutional perspectives on NTTF are changing, and with them, the terms of membership in the collegium may be changing as well. Over the past several decades, researchers have increasingly shifted their focus from criticizing nontenure faculty forms to recognizing the value of these positions (Gappa et al., 2007; Kezar, 2012a; Kezar & Maxey, 2016b; Kezar & Sam, 2010a). Kezar and Sam, in particular, review at length both these alternative conceptualizations and the assumptions embedded within them. Even with this conceptual transition toward more supportive approaches to NTTF, whether or how traditional faculty ideals such as collegiality are extended to NTTF becomes increasingly urgent and unclear (Haviland et al., 2017). The close alignment, if not integration, of collegiality with professional expertise (Haviland et al.) and professional expertise with scholarship (Rice, 1986) means that collegiality in the era of the new faculty majority risks becoming a Procrustean bed: a concept forced into a context that does not easily accommodate it. Thus, this monograph has two aims: (a) through historical perspective and a review of the contemporary literature and national data, to define and position collegiality and the collegium in an employment context increasingly estranged from the one that birthed and historically sustained this professional ideal; and (b) to explore the importance of and possibilities for collegiality in a differentiated faculty labor environment.

Focus of the Monograph

This monograph focuses on the intersection of the increased and increasing differentiation of faculty and collegiality. Differentiation by faculty labor segment, in concert with demographic factors (e.g., race, gender, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic status), has increasingly problematized collegiality and access to the collegium as it came to be understood in the late twentieth century. Here, we emphasize the factor of labor differentiation and the rise of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, not at the exclusion of demographic and other factors, but as a cross-cutting aspect of the professoriate within which other factors may additionally complicate collegiality.
Over the past decades, a number of major works have oriented the field to the particular and problematic professional position of faculty who are not part of the tenure system (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kezar & Sam, 2010a). However, within this revealing literature, the distinction between the experiences, motivations, and opportunities of full-time and part-time faculty have been shown to be acute (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). In part, this difference is exemplified by the variations within each employment status. Full-time NTTF are engaged in work that is more often commensurate with a career. Individuals pursue part-time faculty employment for a wide range of reasons that capitalize on the flexibility of the role, including the opportunity for additional income, for sharing expertise gained through years of professional work, and for accommodating family and other responsibilities. The work and role of part-time and full-time NTTF thus have and deserve to continue to receive focus that gives due recognition to these professional differences.

In this monograph, we focus on full-time NTTF whose primary responsibilities are instructional because their work lives most closely mirror and align with that of tenure-system faculty. We also discuss individuals of diverse demographic backgrounds (e.g., race, gender, class, and sexual orientation) whose historically marginal and marginalized identities, in combination with employment status, challenge the homogeneity that has traditionally been an implicit aspect of collegiality and the collegium. Specifically, their activities often include involvement in traditional faculty functions such as advising, governance, and in some cases, research expectations (Alleman, Cliburn Allen, & Haviland, 2016; Hollenshead et al., 2007). As well, recent literature indicates that many full-time NTTF expect to be involved in service, governance, advising, and other functions usually associated with faculty who are tenured or tenure track (Alleman et al., 2016; Levin & Shaker, 2011; Murphy, 2009; Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, & August, 2012). Given the focus here on collegiality, the collegium, and their future in the era of the new faculty majority, we begin with the point of least divergence: full-time NTTF at 4-year universities. Understanding the nature of and possibilities for collegiality and a new American collegium in this context represents a beachhead upon which further exploration of the viability of collegiality can then be
explored in other college and university contexts, which we in part take up in the final chapter.

Part I: Contemporary Definitions of Collegiality and the Collegium

In this section, we provide a brief orientation to how collegiality and the collegium are popularly defined in the contemporary literature, examining the concepts in more depth in the third chapter.

Collegiality

Collegiality is a widely assumed and frequently lauded concept in the faculty profession (Gappa et al., 2007), though precise articulation is rare, in the scholarly literature (Bess, 1988). Cipriano (2011) argues that “there has been much deliberation and outright confusion concerning the term collegiality” (p. 15). Where it is described, researchers define collegiality in ways that highlight the interrelated relational and professional aspects of the concept. Gappa et al. (2007) refer to collegiality as “opportunities for faculty members to feel that they belong to a mutually respectful community of colleagues who value their unique contributions to their institutions and who are concerned about their overall well-being” (p. 142). Cipriano (2011) asserts that collegiality is the healthy and respectful sharing of ideas that does not shy away from debate and disagreement. The author also notes that good relationships among departmental members are an essential but often missing element. Cipriano additionally links collegiality to aspects of loyalty and institutional purpose, observing that it “can connote respect for another’s commitment to the common purpose, goals, and strategic plan of the department and an ability to work toward it in a nonbelligerent manner” (p. 23). Bess (1992), Bennett (1998), and Fischer (2009) emphasize that collegiality requires respect across differences that appreciates, rather than merely tolerates, multiple perspectives. In sum, the elements of shared purpose, interpersonal trust, participatory process, and to a lesser extent, shared identity, are themes regularly appearing in descriptions of collegiality.
Although each of these definitions identifies important nuances of the concept, James Bess (1988, 1992) emphasizes that collegiality is not a single construct. Bess argues that collegiality is a multidimensional concept best understood through three interrelated forms: collegial culture (local expectations of supportiveness), collegial structure (access to grievance and governance systems, among others), and collegial behavior (actions that reflect prosocial and trusting values and that exceed typical workplace norms). Underlying these three forms, Bess (1992) identifies two foundational aspects of collegiality: a belief in rationality and a belief in trust in colleagues. Rationality includes the open exchange of information, a commitment to the principle that self-advancement best results from working toward the common good, and a confidence in the authority of expertise over organizational status. In describing belief in the importance of trust in colleagues, Bess includes such aspects as a belief in the goodness of others and a willingness to behave accordingly without expectation of reciprocation, faith in the virtue and integrity of others in the organization, and confidence that personal and organizational problems may be revealed, generally, without reprisal. Although these subelements are not necessarily associated with trust in other settings, in the context of collegial relationships, they represent a shared commitment to the advancement of professional others, which fits under the umbrella of trust.

Collegiality, when achieved, has been linked to a variety of positive individual and organizational outcomes. Collegiality is a key element in establishing an attractive place to work and in creating an employment setting that faculty value (Boice, 1992; Rice, Sorcinelli, & Austin 2000; Tierney & Ben-simon, 1996). Collegiality may also contribute to institutional commitment and a desire to stay (Barnes, Agago, & Coombs, 1998) and may result in reduced stress and increased professional satisfaction (Bode, 1999). Despite these virtues, many new faculty members find the lack of collegiality to be one of the most disappointing aspects of the profession (Sorcinelli & Austin, 1992). New faculty may be surprised that collegial interaction and collaboration are relatively rare occurrences (Bode, 1999). As a result, new faculty may withdraw from unsupportive senior faculty and seek other senior or junior faculty who can provide needed relationships, knowledge, and resources (Boice, 1992).
In analyses of NTTF satisfaction (Levin & Shaker, 2011; Ott & Cisneros, 2015; Waltman et al., 2012), collegiality often emerged as an area of greatest dissatisfaction. These findings support assertions that although institutions are improving in their treatment of NTTF, important challenges remain to be met.

The Collegium

Collegiality, though often misunderstood, is still generally regarded as a professional ideal (Cipriano, 2011). The collegium, however, is both misunderstood and, with exceptions (Bennett, 1998; Haviland et al., 2017; Petro, 1990) often relegated to discussions of the “old time” college (Bergquist, 1992; Birnbaum, 1988; Clark, 1963). Although referring to both collegiality and the collegium results in occasionally awkward phraseology, the dual function of collegiality as both an action and a status makes use of both terms to parse out these distinct functions necessary. As already explored, as an action, being collegial refers to prosocial, supportive, and respectful behavior that promotes collective identity and goals. However, as a status, to be collegial denotes membership and a state of belonging independent of any particular action (Hatfield, 2006), or in other words, belonging to the collegium. To be “collegial” in this sense is to be a faculty member at the same institution as another faculty member (Hatfield).

The distinction between behavior and status that Hatfield (2006) draws is a valuable starting point to understanding the collegium. However, others emphasize that to be a part of the collegium requires one not simply to have satisfied entry criteria but also to dutifully fulfill the roles and obligations associated with membership (e.g., supportive behavior, willingness to “pitch in”) as prerequisite to enjoying associated benefits (such as a voice in decision making) (Haviland et al., 2017; Mangiardi & Pellegrino, 1992; Petro, 1990). The collegium, then, is a system of membership that includes entry criteria, access to rights and privileges, and obligations to prioritize the advancement of the collective over the advantage of the individual (Pieber, 1991; Petro, 1990). The collegium is grounded in a claim of expertise that implies legitimate group oversight, peer review, and governance (Pieber, 1991). According to Downey (1996), the collegium is
the complex network of assumptions, traditions, protocols, relations, and structures within the university which permit the professoriate to control and conduct the academic affairs of the institution, determining, among other things, who shall be admitted, who shall teach and research, what shall be taught and researched, and what standards shall be set for which rewards. (p. 75)

The collegium is, in short, the space in which collegiality (via trust, open debate, prosocial behavior, etc.) is enacted. However, what the criteria for membership are and who has access to the collegium are areas of emerging concern, particularly in light of the proliferation of NTTF in the university (Alleman & Haviland, 2016; Haviland et al., 2017). In the section that follows, we place the growth of NTTF and their liminal position against the backdrop of the historical development of the research university, establishing the pressing need for a reconsideration of collegiality and the collegium.

Part II: The Contextual Imperative for Revisiting Collegiality

To understand the shifting role and significance of collegiality requires perspective on the changing shape of the academic labor force and the factors that have influenced it in the contemporary university. Specifically, it is imperative to understand the field of forces inside and outside the university that gave new form to the modern professoriate in the second half of the twentieth century and continues to inform views on its ideal state (Rice, 1986). Most major works on the faculty profession include an overview of contextual factors (among them, Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Brenneman & Yoon, 1988; Finkelstein et al., 2016; Gappa et al., 2007; Kezar & Maxey, 2016a; O’Meara & Rice, 2005; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006), though specific foci vary. In aggregate, these introductions highlight the 1950s and 1960s as a formative moment for the profession, most notably at the confluence of three elements: the prioritization of mass education, the acceleration of PhD production, and
the sudden abundance of federal research dollars. The frequent emphasis on this transitional era highlights persistent questions about its appropriateness as a model in our current context.

First, college attendance as a fringe activity of the elite or professionally oriented underwent dramatic transformation midcentury, resulting in demand for access for previously unserviced groups of students and the faculty to teach them. On the undergraduate side, college attendance in the early 1900s was still a rare occurrence, with less than 3% of college-aged students attending (Geiger, 2015). By the late 1940s, 15% of the college-aged cohort was attending college, even as the 1947 President’s Commission on Higher Education called for that number to reach 50% (Geiger, 2015).

Roger Geiger (2015) points to the proliferation of institutional types (land grants, urban universities, and perhaps most significantly, the elite research university) and curricula as reflective of and providing momentum to national cultural interest in higher education. Arthur Wilke (1979) gives additional form to this argument, asserting that the key shift in the post-World War II era was the harnessing of higher education for the cause of social justice, expressed initially through the GI Bill, but ultimately reflecting a new commitment to mass higher education access. The GI Bill, as the first prominent manifestation, helped to solidify the link between academic credentials and occupational opportunity, a connection that had not been entirely apparent at the turn of the twentieth century.

Second, and related to the first, the emerging value of mass education has been linked to the 1940s-era economic projections that predicted a dramatic shortfall in the number of doctoral degree holders necessary to educate this rising tide of undergraduates (Trow, 1972). In response, graduate enrollments doubled, from 106,000 to 237,200, between 1940 and 1950 (Thelin, 2011, p. 281). Geiger (2015), echoing Jencks and Riesman (2002), argues that the “academic revolution” of the mid-century pressed the relationship between growth and prestige, through “the general acceptance that academic expertise was crucial for faculty and teaching among the better colleges and universities” (p. 548). A small group of elite research universities, already dominating access to newly available federal research dollars, quickly became the epicenter of response to the demand for doctoral degree recipients as a result of their
established graduate infrastructure (Thelin, 2011). The scramble for notoriety among ambitious but modestly resourced universities rapidly raised the professional stature of faculty through an increase in salaries, sabbatical leave expectations, stocked and staffed laboratories, and research support. The combined effect of this collegiate enthusiasm was the proliferation of instructional staff, which more than tripled between 1929–1930 and 1945–1950 (82,386 to 281,506), outpacing, by percentage, even enrollment growth (1,100,737 to 2,444,900) (Snyder, 1993).

Third, as noted already, the intensification of resources at a few institutions, evident by their physical and curricular infrastructure, national visibility, and high-profile faculty researchers, endowed a cadre of private and public research universities with a disproportionate share of federal and private research grant resources. Thelin (2011) cites the University of California system Chancellor Clark Kerr as claiming that in the 1960s, “six universities received 57 percent of the funds… and twenty universities received 79 percent” (p. 278). In 1957, Congress authorized the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) in response to the launch of the Russian satellite Sputnik. The NDEA provided funding not only for military and intelligence-related fields but also for language, history, economics, politics, and other academic areas thought to provide strategic geopolitical advantage (Thelin, 2011). However, this legislation did more to broaden resources across fields and disciplines within the same limited set of institutions than it did to expand access of federal resources to new institutions. Thus, the union of mass student access, graduate preparation, and federal research funding made central and prestigious those few institutions (and by extension, those faculty) best positioned to acquire grant funding and produce PhDs (Rice, 1986).

Breneman and Youn (1988) further develop the link between an emerging knowledge economy and the shifting role of higher education, and by extension, the professoriate. They argue that the distribution of opportunities for faculty is determined in part by the character of technological progress that generates demand for particular kinds of jobs in certain proportions:

*Society’s demands for certain types of knowledge, as well as technical changes since WWII, have profoundly affected research-oriented*
personnel in universities. The post-Sputnik upsurge of scientific development and public policy changes brought a massive change in institutions of higher education. (Breneman & Youn, 1988, p. 15)

The resulting effect was not only an upsurge in student interest and faculty prestige but also the further solidification of the researcher as normative faculty ideal (Gappa et al., 2007). Eugene Rice (1986) coined the phrase “assumptive world of the academic professional” to highlight the new centrality of research, peer review, specialization, and international reputation-building. By the late 1960s, the shift in normative expectations for the profession had crystalized into a new faculty ideal:

The typical professor now resembles the scientist more than the gentleman-scholar of an earlier time. As a result of the process of professionalization, achievement criteria are now given the highest priority, reputations are established in national and international forums rather than locally defined, and the center of gravity has shifted to the graduate faculties and their newly professionalized large-scale research functions. (Parsons, 1968, p. 545)

Yet even as these status markers increasingly defined the faculty ideal, labor market forces stimulated an undercurrent of faculty hiring within increasingly diverse employment types that were aimed at responding to the mandate for mass education, largely. However, these positions came into being without the elements of prestige that had flooded the faculty pipeline through the 1950s and 1960s (Thedwall, 2008). Alvin Gouldner (1957), in his classic local and cosmopolitan archetypes, similarly articulated this division. Rice (1986) critiques the veneration of Gouldner’s (1957) “cosmopolitan” faculty member as a “new social fiction” (p. 14); a position that did not represent the typical faculty member but against which most faculty members were measured and measured their colleagues. Yet, even as the golden years of faculty prestige birthed this employment bifurcation in the 1950s and 1960s, the lean years of the 1970s and 1980s would create an ideal environment for the
separation of teaching faculty from academic research faculty and with it, an increasingly differentiated faculty experience.

**Faculty Employment Differentiation**

Over the last decades of the twentieth century, the chasm between the cosmopolitan faculty ideal and the employment reality of the majority of faculty would only widen, owing in part to the changing environment and pressures on colleges and universities. The access revolution of the 1940s–1960s led to a heightened demand not only for more faculty but also in the final decades of the century, increasingly for different kinds of faculty. Rather than tripling in 20 years as had occurred between 1930 and 1950, total instructional staff nearly doubled in 10 years between 1960 and 1970 (281,506 to 551,000) (Snyder, 1993, p. 75). Although it would be another 20 years before instructional staff would double again, as Finkelstein et al. (2016) argue, changes to the makeup of the professoriate during the last quarter of the twentieth century would prove more dramatic than its growth in numbers. Constricting budgets, curricular diversification, and an enrollment spike in the 1970s contributed to the separation of faculty employment segments into research-intensive faculty and teaching-focused faculty (Garcia & Ratcliff, 1997). In the 1980s and 1990s, these trends were exacerbated by the corporatization of higher education (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2009), a reduction in government funding that coincided with increased operating costs (Kezar & Sam, 2010b), and an escalated emphasis on performance, accountability, and increased information reporting requirements (Finkelstein et al., 2016). These trends further encouraged faculty employment differentiation, as institutions sought simultaneously to adjust to the realities of constricted resources, even as they continued to pursue marketplace visibility and prestige. The effect of these environmental changes on the professoriate is most evident when examined in two categories: the proliferation of non-tenure-track faculty positions and the access of women and minorities to the profession. This emphasis, however, does not discount important changes to the composition of faculty by generation, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation and gender definition, citizenship
status/country of origin, and other demographic variables (Finkelstein & Schuster, 2006; Gappa et al., 2007; O’Meara, Terosky, & Newmann, 2008).

**Trends in Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Positions.** Despite the progressive normalization of the “faculty as researcher” paradigm and ascendancy of the research university in the last quarter of the twentieth century (Rice, 1986), the faculty role, in terms of employment expectations, fields, institutional type, and participation, became increasingly diverse. Between 2003 and 2013, NTTF increased as a share of all faculty roles at all types of institutions (Hurlburt & McGarrah, 2016). The proliferation of part-time faculty positions, fueled not just by the growth of 4-year institutions but even more so by state-level investments in nascent community college systems, led the way. Since the 1970s, part-time faculty have increased five times faster than all full-time faculty, accounting for 43% of all faculty positions by 2013 (Finkelstein et al., 2016). As a result, by 2014 the percentage of part-time and full-time faculty across all sectors was nearly equivalent (Snyder, de Brey, & Dillow, 2016). However, at research institutions the percentage of faculty in full-time NTTF positions increased more than any other faculty employment type, up 43% (or by 21,387 positions) at public research universities and up 45.5% (or by 9,995 positions) at private research universities (Hurlburt & McGarrah, 2016).

Even as tenure-system positions have lost ground, by percentage, NTTF positions have gained it, resulting in associated losses in job security and employment continuity. Between 1979 and 2013, the proportion of all faculty, tenured and tenure eligible, declined by nearly half (29% to 17.2%, and 16% to 7%, respectively), whereas full-time NTTF increased nearly by half (10.3% to 14.9%) (Finkelstein et al., 2016). Specifically at research universities, growth in NTTF hiring has consistently matched the losses in tenure-track positions, suggesting an increased dependence on contingent faculty for
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3 As Finkelstein et al. (2016) also note, an emerging challenge to reporting on faculty demographics and hiring has been the defunding of the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF), a dataset collected and maintained by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) through 2004. Consequently, much of the reliable national portrait of faculty demographics is outdated, though some more recent studies have drawn directly from Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System data. However, this dataset is neither as rich or as accessible as NSOPF had been.
core instructional and other academic responsibilities. These new roles not only come without the security of tenure, but very few are attached to multiyear contracts, further reducing both their sense of employment continuity and the depth of the contribution they are likely able to make. In 2013, only 10% of faculty positions at private research universities and only 6% of faculty positions at public research universities paired nontenure positions with multiyear contracts. However, the percentage of NTTF with multiyear contracts at other institutional types is lower still (Hurlburt & McGarrah, 2016).

**Gender.** The demographic story of women in the professoriate since the 1960s highlights encouraging trends of increased access that must be contextualized by the specific employment roles, academic areas, and institutional types where they tend to be clustered. The brief portrait that follows is indebted to several recent books and previous monographs that have provided excellent summaries of these shifts and conditions (Kezar & Sam, 2010b; O’Meara et al., 2008; Finkelstein et al., 2016; Gappa et al., 2007).

Undeniably, the participation of women in the faculty profession rose dramatically throughout the second half of the twentieth century. According to Gappa et al. (2007), the percentage of new faculty who were women more than doubled between 1969 and 2003, from 20% to 44%. Currently (2014 data), 48.8% of all faculty are women; that percentage is slightly lower in some sectors, such as public 4-year institutions (45.9%) and slightly higher in others, such as public 2-year colleges (54.4%) and private 4-year institutions (54%) (Snyder, de Bray, & Dillow, 2016). Between 1990 and 2006, women represented nearly all the growth in teaching faculty: women’s full-time positions increased 74% at public institutions and 54% at private institutions during this period (National Education Association, 2007). However, within this growth, a disproportionate percentage of these positions have been off the tenure track. The proportion of all women faculty in full-time, NTTF roles have increased from 35.5% to 44.3%, and part-time appointments have increased from 48.2% to 56.1%, even as the proportion of women in tenure-system positions has shrunk from 64.5% to 55.7% in comparison to NTTF roles (Finkelstein et al., 2016). Finkelstein et al. (2016) note that men, too, have experienced a shrinking proportion of positions in tenure-system versus NTTF roles. However, the advantage men held prior to
2003 provided a margin in their favor that, although shrinking, has primarily lost ground because of a reduction in the number of overall positions and not because of gains by women.

The national economy, the labor market, and other broad trends have all influenced the distribution of positions by gender. Nevertheless, these forces do not provide an adequate causal explanation for the continued inequitable distribution of faculty roles. Harper, Baldwin, Gansneder, and Chronister (2001) place the responsibility at least in part on institutional policy and practice: “It appears that a number of barriers exist both to steer women away from tenure-track opportunities and also to hamper their career progression once they succeed in being hired” (p. 256). Ward and Wolf-Wendel (2012) further elaborate on this point, arguing that when women have chosen to opt out of or completely avoid the tenure track to accommodate family and other traditional gender roles “[t]he nature of these choices also have absolved colleges and universities from doing much to create change. If women choose to opt out of tenure-track positions, it’s easy for institutions to wash their hands of responsibility, citing individual choice” (p. 176).

The gender inequity among faculty is evident across nearly all measures. Women make up, as of 2014, a lower percentage of full professors (30%) and tenured faculty (43%). Women also receive salaries that are on average about 22% lower than their male counterparts ($85,500 versus $70,400) (Snyder et al., 2016). Women faculty are more likely to be in non-tenure-track positions and, if additionally possessing a doctorate, to be among the least satisfied individuals in their profession (Harper et al., 2001; Waltman et al., 2012). A variety of authors and researchers have observed that the impressive growth of women in the faculty ranks has varied considerably by academic area as well (Buchmann, 2009; Finkelstein et al., 2016; O’Meara et al., 2008). Most clearly, women tend to be overrepresented in education and health sciences and underrepresented in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields. In a telling but dated 1998 cohort analysis, women filled 67% of faculty positions in the professions but only 12% of positions in STEM (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). The collegiate and doctoral pipeline suggests that gender desegregation may have been slow to change but is slowly changing; by 2004 women constituted the majority of students in biological
sciences (60%) and social sciences (except economics), were close to parity in chemistry, but lagged behind in engineering (20% of bachelor’s degrees) and other science fields (Buchmann, 2009), suggesting continued field/discipline disparity in future faculty representation as well. Researchers have attributed this persistent deficit at the undergraduate level to a range of factors that include college choice, labor market expectations, gender-specific effects of the college experience, and “unmeasured aspects of academic preparation” (Turner & Bowen, 1999, p. 309).

In aggregate, even as women are increasingly present in the profession and in some sectors are a majority, data suggest a persistent pattern of gendered labor differentiation, if not segregation. Thus, despite historic gains, the resulting labor “clumping” (e.g., in the professions but not in STEM; in nontenured and tenure track but not in full professor rank) continues to correspond with positions of lesser influence and prestige while resulting in higher advising, teaching, and service loads than their male counterparts. Consequently, the employment role and institutional status of women faculty generally makes faculty collegiality an issue of increased concern from a gender perspective, particularly as membership in the university collegium continues to depend primarily upon tenure-system positions and research productivity. Scholars support this potentiality, finding lower levels of satisfaction with collegiality among women faculty when compared to male peers (Austin, Sorcinelli, & McDaniels, 2007; Bode, 1999; Trautvetter, 1999).

Race and Ethnicity. Similar to women, racial and ethnic minorities on the whole have made gains in the faculty profession over the past half century, but those gains reflect inconsistent improvement across institution types, employment types, field and disciplinary types, and population subgroups. From a historical perspective, the percentage of racial or ethnic minority faculty nearly quadrupled between 1969 and 1998, from a paltry 3.8% to 14.5% of all faculty (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006, p. 53). Over the following 16 years, this percentage climbed slowly, reaching 20.9% in 2014 (Snyder et al., 2016). This figure is still well below the 2010 U.S. Census national average of 28% of the total population. The percentage of racial and ethnic minorities who are employed part time is nearly half of what it is for all faculty: 20.2% compared to 48.7%. Although this appears to be good news
(more faculty of color are in full-time positions than might proportionately be expected), those full-time positions tend to be in lower academic ranks. White faculty make up 81.1% of all full professors whereas faculty who are racial and ethnic minorities constitute only 16.4% of the top employment roles, but 21.8% of associate professors and 25.3% of assistant professor positions. This percentage holds constant across gender categories as well (Snyder et al., 2016). Recent trends demonstrate slow but steady growth in the percentage of racial and ethnic minorities in associate and full professor ranks, suggesting that as the aging White and mostly male population retires, senior faculty ranks are gradually diversifying. In 2006, 14.1% of full professors and 18.6% of associate professors were racial and ethnic minorities, compared to 15.5% and 20.4% in 2009, and 16.4% and 21.8% in 2013, respectively (Snyder et al., 2016). Other data show positive signs of growth as well. Finkelstein et al. (2016) note that between 1993 and 2013, the ratio of White to underrepresented minority faculty (excluding foreign-born faculty) in tenured positions was cut in half, from 15:1 to 7.7:1. Although these figures reveal areas of positive development for underrepresented minority faculty, much of this growth has occurred in a decade of overall contraction, meaning gains are not as extensive as they might have been otherwise.

Despite gains in aggregate for members of underrepresented groups, employment and employment statuses are disproportionate across racial and ethnic subgroups. This difference is most evident among those groups with the largest representation. Black faculty represent 35% of all minority faculty, but only 6.7% of all professors of any rank. However, 43.5% of minority part-time faculty and 27.4% of minority full-time faculty are African American. By comparison, Asian American faculty members represent a similar total representation—6.5% of all faculty—but disaggregate by employment type very differently; they represent 45% of full-time racial and ethnic minority professors but only 22.2% of part-time faculty (Snyder et al., 2016). Latina/o and Native American faculty members have made similar gains: dramatic by percentage but miniscule by total representation (Finkelstein et al., 2016).

Growth in the percentage of the faculty who are racial or ethnic minorities at various institutional types has been slow but evident as well. From negligible
representation in 1969 (2.8% at universities, 5.9% at other 4-year institutions, and 1.4% at 2-year college), underrepresented minorities gained considerable ground but had not reached parity by 1998 (22.6% at universities, 18.5% at other 4-year institutions, and 17.4% at 2-year colleges) (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Data from 2014 suggest that these gains have continued in some contexts but have been reversed in others. Racial and ethnic minorities made up 21.4% of public university faculty, 18.5% of private nonprofit 4-year institution faculty, and 19.5% of professors at public 2-year colleges (Snyder et al., 2016).

Understanding the experiences of minority graduate students and faculty members is a key part of uncovering the glacial growth in their representation. Scholars have shown how members of underrepresented groups, and particularly African Americans, “often feel isolated and alienated from faculty and peers . . . and are less likely to have mentor relationships with faculty members” (Gaston, 2004, p. 33). Gaston emphasizes that the trials of doctoral life, and particularly the dissertation journey, often are not successfully met without engaged mentors. Once in faculty roles, persons of color are less likely to find mentors among their new colleagues (Antonio, 2002) and often shoulder a disproportionate load of service (Umbach, 2006), particularly at predominantly White institutions where Black faculty are more frequently sought out for support, advising, and guidance by students of color (Patton & Harper, 2003; Williams & Williams, 2006). Additionally, at predominantly White institutions, Aguirre (2000) notes the pressures on minority faculty to serve the institution as “good citizens” representing the minority faculty perspective by special service on committees, as well as through advising and teaching. This dual responsibility may mean that minority faculty fail to find support and comfort in either world (Alger, 2008; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). These expectations and experiences may further vary by gender. African American women tend to carry a heavy mentorship burden whereas Black male faculty may compartmentalize relationships, aware of “surveillance” by peers and potential concerns about accusations of inappropriate relationships with females (Griffin & Reddick, 2011).

**Generational Difference.** Recently, researchers have considered what, if any, effect generational tendencies might have on the expectations and
experiences of faculty. Specifically, the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) found, in a multisite qualitative study, that generational tendencies might be relevant in specific ways that further reveals the ongoing transformation of the profession (Helms, 2010). First, few Generation X (Gen X, or those born between 1960 and 1980) faculty members had plans to leave their current institution, suggesting that at least for some, institutional place identification and stability may be a higher priority than status climbing. Second, Gen Xers prioritized quality over quantity of work and sought efficiency, or maximizing impact rather than logging lots of hours. Third, and most central to the subject at hand, Gen X faculty wanted to see their colleagues succeed: “through a powerful combination of non-competitiveness and genuine support for their colleagues, Xers seem to be taking [collegiality] to heart and perhaps are taking it to a new level” (Helms, 2010, p. 13). In combination, these findings, though limited in their generalizability, at least suggest that the youngest cohort of faculty may be less motivated by some of the competitive values of prior generations, whose attitudes contributed to the elevation of the researcher-faculty member above other employment segments. If indeed shifts toward “nesting” over “climbing,” doing good work over doing a high volume of work, and promoting the success of colleagues are emerging values, then generational factors add an additional positive and yet complicating factor to the influences on collegiality.

Summative Implications for Collegiality and the Collegium

In roughly half a century, the American professoriate has experienced a sea change in professional membership and identity. Largely a reactive enterprise during this historical period, it has benefitted from national priorities that raised the profile of the professor and diversified its membership, even as it splintered the faculty ranks not only by function but also by perceived status (Rice, 1986). Faculty differentiation and diversification have subsequently increased along employment type, gender, and racial/ethnic lines. Beyond these
demographics and statistics, another story is taking shape, one that Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) hinted at in the quote that opened the chapter. They declare the “unprecedented restructuring” of American higher education and the faculty profession that serves it. By employment type, these changes have led to the development of an academic underclass of part-time and non-tenure-system faculty. However, despite examples, models, and calls for recognition (Kezar, 2012a; Kezar & Maxey, 2016a; Kezar & Sam, 2010b), the question of what collegiality and the collegium mean in the era of the new faculty majority has gone largely unanswered. By gender and race/ethnicity, changes have increased access and representation. Nevertheless, impediments of undergraduate and graduate socialization, mentoring, institutional climate, and other factors mitigate against such progress. As members of racial/ethnic and gender categories continue to be overrepresented in lower status academic labor categories (part time, nontenure track, junior faculty, non-STEM fields,) conceptualizing and enacting collegiality that is more than civility is necessary if the profession is to take responsibility for the persistent inequalities outlined here.

Collegiality and the collegium are complex constructs, dependent upon both faculty relationships of a personal and professional nature and a sense of shared purpose or common enterprise. These relationships and purposes are additionally complicated by the status-oriented labor market that arose in the mid-twentieth century, contributing to a splintered, tiered profession. The experience of various faculty subgroups, particularly women and members of racial and ethnic minority groups, reveal systemic patterns of collection in roles that are traditionally less powerful, less prestigious, and less permanent. Researchers assert that collegiality may be an ideal seldom attained (Bess, 1992; Haviland et al., 2017); the evidence examined in this chapter and taken up in subsequent chapters further complicates the definitions of collegiality, the factors that influence who has access to the collegium, and what sort of collegiality those outside the traditional tenure normative system are able to access.