DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 466 107 HE 035 023

AUTHOR	Leslie, David W.; Walke, James T.
TITLE	Out of the Ordinary: The Anomalous Academic. A Report of Research Supported by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.
INSTITUTION	College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA.
SPONS AGENCY	Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, New York, NY.
PUB DATE	2001-08-00
NOTE	40p.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.wm.edu/education/Faculty/Leslie/anomacad.html.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Age Differences; *Career Choice; College Faculty; *Diversity (Faculty); Employment Patterns; Higher Education; *Part Time Faculty; Sex Differences; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Surveys

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to provide information about an anomalous population of college and university faculty, those who hold or are eligible for tenure, but whose employment is part-time. This is an unusual arrangement, but the study of the attitudes of such faculty members may provide insight into the preferences and career decisions a more diverse faculty may choose in the future. The study drew on findings of the National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty (National Center for Education Statistics) and a survey completed by representatives of 83 colleges and universities. The principal finding was that age and gender interact to lead men and women to different career paths at different stages. This finding reinforces the view that future faculty will need and may choose options that many colleges and universities have yet to provide. Family circumstances, the tenure clock, ambivalence about relative emphases on teaching and research, and an array of personal concerns all appear to affect career decisions and trajectories among those who have chosen a nontraditional path. (Contains 24 tables and 12 references.) (SLD)

Out of the Ordinary: The Anomalous Academic

By
David W. Leslie
Professor of Education
and
James T. Walke
Graduate Assistant

The College of William and Mary

August, 2001

A report of research supported by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation

The College Of
WILLIAM&MARY

School of Education
P.O. Box 8795
Williamsburg, VA 23187-8795

November, 2001

Dear Colleague:

I am pleased to forward copies of our report on a recently completed study of an "anomalous" population of college and university faculty – those who hold or are eligible for tenure, but whose employment is part-time.

We undertook this study with the support of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation in order to better understand factors that led some long-term faculty to seek part-time work. Because this is an unusual arrangement (probably applying to fewer than two percent of all faculty) we believed the characteristics and choices of this population would serve as signals about the preferences and career decisions a far more diverse faculty might elect in the future.

Indeed, our principal finding – that age and gender interact to lead men and women to different career paths at different stages – reinforces the view that future faculty will need and will choose options that many colleges and universities have yet to provide. Family circumstances, the tenure "clock," ambivalence about relative emphases on teaching and research, and an array of personal concerns all appear to affect career decisions and trajectories among those who have chosen a non-traditional path.

It is our hope that this study will lead to more discussion about options for faculty careers, especially during a time when large numbers of new faculty must be attracted to academe and employed under terms and conditions that will help them commit to rewarding and productive careers.

We thank the Sloan Foundation for making it possible to distribute this report, and offer a limited supply of additional copies upon request. You may also access the text of the report at http://www.wm.edu/education/Faculty/Leslie/anomacad.html.

Sincerely,

David W. Leslie
757-221-2349
dwlesl@wm.edu

Introduction

This study was suggested by Kathleen Christensen, Program Officer with the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. Access to data from the National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty and support from the Sloan Foundation have made it possible to examine a small, but important sliver of the population of American academics: those who hold tenure (or are eligible to receive it), but who work part-time. As outliers in an otherwise well-understood work force, these "anomalous academics" have made unconventional choices that this report seeks to understand more fully. Our principal findings show the clear effects of gender and age on these choices. Since most projected changes among newer faculty entering academic careers suggest both more women and a wider range in age distribution, what we can learn from our anomalous group has important policy implications for the future attractiveness of the career to people of talent.

We acknowledge and appreciate the support of the Sloan Foundation, the cooperation of over 80 institutions in responding to our survey, and the helpful support of staff at the College of William and Mary in the execution of the project. We are grateful, as well, for the close reading of our final report by our colleague and astute observer of faculty careers, Roger Baldwin.

Executive Summary

Out of the Ordinary: The Anomalous Academic

Long-term, part-time employment in higher education is relatively anomalous. National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) data show that only about 18,000 tenured or tenure track faculty (fewer than 2% of all faculty) were working part-time in 1992-93, the most recent accessible estimate.

This study, sponsored by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation characterizes the individuals who hold (or are eligible to achieve) tenure, but who work less than full-time. In addition to an analysis of data from the 1992-93 NCES National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93), we report on policies at a survey sample of 83 colleges and universities. We were principally interested in why individuals eligible for tenure chose to work part-time, and to compare them with full-time tenure-eligible faculty. This population was seen as anomalous among academics, who usually follow a linear career path of full-time appointments involving a probationary period, the award of tenure, and promotion through the ranks to full professor. Who steps away from that path and why? The report concludes with an assessment of the implications of our findings for policy and practice.

Only five of the institutions we surveyed (6 %) had policies permitting part-time faculty members to earn tenure. Most also reported that they had no part-time appointments among their tenured faculty. Consistent with national data, the average number was about three such appointments per institution.

Data from the NCES survey showed that part-time tenured and tenure track faculty were significantly older than full-timers. Tenured and tenure track women

faculty were more likely to elect part-time positions than men. Men were more likely to be older; women were more likely to range widely in age. Men in these positions are at later career stages – potentially with different issues at stake – than are women. Tenured faculty who work part-time, especially men, are more likely to be "stepping down" their work schedule in preparation for retirement. Nearly two-thirds of part-time tenure-eligible faculty preferred part time work. Other contrasts are presented in the report.

Age/gender interaction is an important way to frame analyses of career pathways, interests, and critical points in prioritizing values that affect employment decisions. Almost half (45.9%) of part-time men are 60 years of age or older – and therefore more likely to be in a pre-retirement phase of their careers. Part-time women are more likely to be younger (almost twice as likely to be under 40 as men). These data suggest that men and women elect part-time work for very different reasons and with very different career implications. As might be expected from the wider range in ages, women in this group considered a more complex array of issues in making career decisions. Age affected the way faculty assessed the importance of career advancement, job security, and tenure, and women preferred less pressure to publish in favor of greater attention to and rewards for teaching.

The study reached two principal conclusions. First, women face more complex decisions about careers than men do. Second, age matters, and it matters greatly. Using age 50 as the dividing line between younger and older faculty substantial differences in interests, concerns, and career directions were observed on many NSOPF survey items.

These results suggest that people's lives and careers change in composition, emphasis, and values as they age. What may work for an unmarried male with a new Ph.D. in, say, mathematics, at age 30 does not necessarily work for a married woman with a master's degree and two children who is teaching English

composition at age 45. They further suggest that women's lives and careers tend to be more complex than those of men, and their choices more difficult. The fundamental tension between teaching and research in academic reward systems appears more troublesome for women. For those who have chosen part-time work on the tenure track, the tension appears more pronounced than for those who remain in full-time jobs.

Different career pathways that correspond to age- and gender-related life circumstances, values, and behaviors would undoubtedly be welcomed by present and prospective faculty. The newer generation of prospective faculty will almost certainly seek more flexibility in how, when, and why they work, and they will weave work into their more complex lives in ways that demand balance and proportion.

What alternatives can institutions of higher education offer them? With well over half of all teaching faculty off the tenure track and with substantial portions teaching part-time, the norm for faculty work is rapidly becoming one in which individually negotiated terms and conditions are more characteristic than the traditional tenure (and tenure-track) arrangements. Institutions may have to decide whether to react case-by-case to an increasing diversity of individual work styles, values, and career trajectories, or whether they will act purposefully to think through their policies and practices and take proactive initiative to open academic careers to alternatives that will appeal to the broadest array of people with talent. Flexibility in both the proportion of time one spends on the job, as well as options to change focus and emphasis at different career stages are among the options that this survey suggests may be welcomed.

Out of the Ordinary:

The Anomalous Academic

A report of research supported by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation

In the face of increasing numbers of faculty holding non-tenured and non-track positions (Baldwin and Chronister, 2001), some institutions have provided for individuals to hold tenure while working less than full time. As a matter of institutional policy, practice, and individual career development, the commitment to long-term, part-time employment is relatively anomalous. Our analysis of NCES data shows that only about 18,000 tenured or tenure track faculty were working part-time at the time of the national survey of postsecondary faculty conducted in 1992-93 (NSOPF-93). This is fewer than 2% of all faculty.

This study, sponsored by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, was an exploratory effort to characterize the population of individuals who hold (or are eligible to achieve) tenure, but who work less than full-time. In addition to an analysis of the NSOPF-93 data, we conducted a survey of a probability sample of institutions we determined were likely to employ tenured or tenure-track part-time faculty to assess their policies and practices.

We were fundamentally interested in how this small population might differ from those who work in more traditional job formats, the extent to which their work arrangement is voluntary or constrained by circumstances, whether it reflects a specialized assignment or simply a reduction in hours of a "normal" faculty job, how it affects their attitudes and morale, and where this arrangement fits in their overall career trajectory.

Because the numbers are so small, we also asked whether institutions recognize the option as a matter of formal policy, or whether it appears to be a more marginal negotiated practice that responds to individual needs. Is it an exception? Or is it one among other options available to faculty who may choose part-time work as a long-term career choice?

The importance of the issue lies in the anomalous nature of tenured (or tenure-eligible) individuals who work less than full-time. Faculty in higher education tend to be full-time and tenure-eligible or part-time and not tenure-

eligible. One consequence of this is a bifurcated work force (Gappa and Leslie, 1997). The consequences of bifurcation affect individual career opportunities (negatively for those who work part-time) and the integrity of academic programs (negatively to the extent that full- and part-time faculty form separate castes and differentiated cultures).

Increasing diversity among prospective and new faculty may not be matched by an adequately flexible array of employment options. As women and minorities earn more graduate degrees and form greater proportions of the eligible work force, they may see the old pattern of "up or out" associated with traditional tenure decision rules as too rigid for the kinds of life choices they expect to make. Academe is one option for them, and it may be among the most attractive because it is an intrinsically rewarding career – or so NSOPF data have suggested in various analyses. At the same time, the data we analyzed suggested that part-time work is an attractive half step toward retirement for late-career faculty.

As people at the early and late stages of their careers seek and negotiate more options, knowing more about them and the work they do should help frame attractive alternative employment policies that might expand the pool of qualified individuals interested in academe. And, as academics go, so may others. Learning more about committed part-time workers may signal employers that old assumptions about careers and work no longer fit an increasingly diverse work force and a work force with more older workers.

This report is an initial probe into the anomalous career path – one that in many ways violates traditional assumptions, but that may provide insights into new rhythms and cycles in peoples' work lives. How people choose to pursue their careers as they live longer and as jobs and professions attract more diverse pools of aspirants – especially the outlying models like long-term part-timers – can challenge our assumptions and open new possibilities for the future.

Source of data: NSOPF-93.

The data for this study came from the restricted use file of responses to the National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty conducted in 1992-93 by the National Center for Education Statistics (the most current available survey data pending release of the 1998 NSOPF). Responses were received from 25,780 full- and part-time faculty in a random sample of 31,354 to whom survey instruments were sent. Technical information about the sample, response rate, measurement and sampling error, and weighting of the data is reported in Kirshstein, Matheson, Jing, and Zimbler (1997). We have relied on the "restricted use" file and used weighted data (respondent weights) to establish population estimates. We restricted our analysis to faculty who had instructional responsibilities at the time of the survey and who held tenure or were on the tenure track at the time of the survey. Respondents self-reported their status as full- or part-time.

After analysis of the NSOPF-93 database an electronic survey was created and distributed to Chief Academic Officers in a sample of 220 institutions. The set of sample schools was derived using the IPEDS database. The sample set was created by selecting schools with Education and General expenditures in excess of $50,000,000 per year, a "floor" above which institutions were more likely to employ part-time tenured faculty. This filtering strategy yielded a set of 220 institutions. Responses were received from 83 schools for a response rate of 37.7%. We did not survey community colleges in this phase of the study. The NSOPF survey included only 129 actual responses from tenured or tenure track part-timers at community colleges. Weighted data showed that, proportionally, it is twice as likely that a part-time faculty member eligible for tenure works at a four-year institution. The comparative rarity of tenure track part-timers at community colleges, notwithstanding the far greater likelihood that a part-timer would work at a community college, suggested we concentrate our survey on strata of institutions that were more likely to employ tenure-eligible part-timers.

The 83 schools in our response set were a diverse group. Sixty-five of the schools are public institutions; 18 are privately controlled. The average corrected fall 1997 enrollment was 16,597 students (s.d. = 9,701) with a range of 1,671 - 51,388 students. Our response set included 23 Research I, 14 Research II, 12 Doctoral I, 14 Doctoral II, 18 Masters I, one Baccalaureate II and one medical school. The schools had an average of 922 full-time faculty members (s.d. = 663) with a range of 75 – 3,124. The average number of part-time faculty members was 311 (s.d. = 291) with a range of 1 – 1,332.

Our survey contained three items: 1) Does your school have an explicit policy allowing part-time faculty members to earn tenure? 2) How many part-time faculty at your institution have earned tenure? 3) How many tenured faculty at your institution work part-time?

Policies regarding tenure for part-time appointments.

Of the 83 responses, only five (6.0 %) indicated an explicit policy permitting part-time faculty members to earn tenure. Sixty-six responses (79.5%) indicated the absence of an explicit policy permitting part-time faculty to earn tenure. Thirteen responses (15.5%) were not clear on the matter of an explicit part-time faculty tenure policy. Illustrative comments from our surveys include:

> "We do not have specific provisions for those faculty in our polices on tenure. However, as a matter of practice, we only grant tenure to faculty holding full-time appointments. While they all have full-time appointments, tenured faculty may carry less than a full-time workload. Such an arrangement is negotiated by the individual deans on a case-by-case basis and can take many different forms."

A second response:

> "As long as a faculty [member] holds a position of two-thirds or greater, they are eligible for tenure. [Our] tenure policies are a joint mixture of the

[university system] tenure code and our UEA, faculty union, agreement."

"If someone is appointed with the title of assistant or associate professor or professor on at least 50% time, the appointment is automatically tenure track. All other faculty titles are not tenure track regardless of the appointment FTE."

Part-time faculty in tenured positions. The mean number of part-time tenured faculty per responding institution was 2.01 (s.d. = 7.73, modal response = 0). The mean number of tenured faculty working part-time per institution was 3.88 (s.d. = 9.3, modal response = 0). (In both cases there were a few responses with a relatively high number of faculty members which skewed these results in an upward direction, thus the large standard deviations. Almost all other institutions reported none.)

Responses to our survey suggest that for those part-time faculty with tenure it is more often than not a matter of individual negotiation:

"With approval, a faculty member can receive a 'reduced responsibility contract' and work part-time, if the individual has become partially disabled, or is caring part-time for an ill or injured family member, or wishes to take a part-time infant or newly adopted child care leave."

"[One tenured faculty works part-time] plus a few who have negotiated temporary reductions to participate in business opportunities or particular research projects."

"[No tenured faculty work part-time] but many tenured faculty use research grants to 'buy off' part of their contract, enabling them to devote more time to research and less to teaching."

Who works part-time while holding tenure: demography.

Of the approximately one million college and university faculty, a small number, estimated at just over 18,000, work part-time while holding tenure, or whose appointment makes them eligible for tenure. These faculty are "anomalous" in the sense that tenured and tenure-track faculty are almost always full-time, and that part-time faculty are almost never eligible for tenure (Gappa and Leslie, 1993). Tenure eligibility signals both a commitment to long-term employment, and, for those who hold tenure, a significant level of professional achievement. The "anomaly" in which we were interested is the special case of a highly committed and/or achieving individual who chooses to work part-time. We have compared the part-time tenured and tenure-track faculty to full-timers in the same status to make the contrasts meaningful.

Distribution among institutional types. Part-time tenured and tenure-eligible faculty are more likely to be employed by community colleges than by other types of institutions (Table 1). They are particularly underrepresented among comprehensive colleges and universities (principally the regional, master's degree granting institutions). Proportions of part- and full-time faculty on the tenure track are statistically similar at research and doctoral universities and liberal arts colleges.

Table 1: Distribution of tenured and tenure-eligible faculty by type of institution.

	Type of Institution					
	Research	Doctoral	Compre-hensive	Liberal Arts	Community College	Total
Part-time	25.4	16.3	18.4	6.4	33.5	100 %
Full-time	29.6	16.5	27.7	7.1	19.1	100 %
Total	29.5	16.5	27.3	7.0	19.7	100 %

*We drew the sample for our survey of policies from research, doctoral, and comprehensive universities with expenditures of over $50 million. Notwithstanding that community colleges as a "type" were most likely to employ tenure-eligible part-timers, about two-thirds of this population were at the larger senior institutions, and were more likely to have entered traditional academic careers.

Gender and marital status. Almost exactly two thirds (66.0%) of the part-timers were male; slightly more, 71%, of the full-time tenure-eligible faculty were male. So there is a slight tendency for tenure-eligible women to elect part-time work at a higher rate, but in practical terms, this does not seem to be a very important difference. Roughly three quarters of both groups (77%) were married.

Age. Part-timers were significantly ($p<.001$) older than full-timers. They averaged 53.3 years old, while full-time tenured and tenure track faculty averaged 48.8 years. When tenure track (as yet untenured) faculty are removed from the sample, the difference widens from 4.5 years to nearly 7 years, with part-timers averaging 58.5 years old and full-timers averaging 51.9 years. This difference, too, is statistically significant ($p<.001$). (Note that age/gender interaction will be discussed in depth later; women tend to be younger, men tend to be older. The effects on career issues are important.)

Ethnicity. Both groups responding to the 1992-93 survey were overwhelmingly white. Eighty three percent of part-timers and 87% of full-timers were white. Part-timers were just slightly more likely to be Asian/Pacific Islander or Black (7% vs. 5% in both ethnic groups).

Length of employment. On various indicators of length of employment, part-time tenured and tenure-eligible faculty (consistent with their older average age) appear more senior than full-time tenured and tenure-eligible faculty. (Tables 2 and 2a). Men had longer employment histories than women in both the full- and part-time groups.

Table 2: Longevity Indices: Part-timed tenured and tenure-eligible faculty

	Gender	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Years tenured	Male Female	8,451 3,072	18.43 11.38	11.31 9.25
Years in current Position	Male Female	12,040 6,211	17.51 11.10	13.62 11.90
Years since Rank Achieved	Male Female	11,877 6,114	11.77 7.46	10.22 8.05
Highest Degree Year	Male Female	11,734 6,081	1967.0 1976.0	13.42 11.10

Table 2a: Longevity Indices: Full-time tenured and tenure-eligible faculty				
	Gender	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Years tenured	Male Female	222,497 71,781	13.30 9.81	8.29 6.96
Years in current Position	Male Female	293,413 119,770	13.43 9.68	9.68 8.14
Years since Rank Achieved	Male Female	288,778 115,954	9.37 6.32	7.50 5.75
Highest Degree Year	Male Female	291,878 119,475	1974.0 1979.0	9.80 8.57

Men in both the full- and part-time groups had been employed longer than women in their current positions. Tenured men in both part- and full-time groups had held tenure for longer. Variability was greater for part-timers on all measures, and the differences between men and women were greater for part-timers than for full-timers. The very clear implication of these data are that gender makes a difference, and that men in these populations are at later career stages – potentially with different issues at stake – than are women. Of at least equal importance, the greater variation among part-timers suggests that they have elected the terms and conditions of their employment for more widely differing individual reasons.

Retirement plans. Intentions to retire were recorded as interval data in the NSOPF survey, so it is not strictly possible to assess meaningful averages. Interpolation suggests, though, that part-timers (consistent with the age data) are closer to retirement, intending to retire on the average in about 4 years. Full-time tenured or tenure track faculty reported they planned to retire in about 8 years, also from interpolation. "Late 50's" is a reasonable estimate for both groups, although perhaps not entirely realistic as an estimate of actual behavior. The main point is that part-timers are – on average – both older and closer to retirement than full-timers. This indicates that tenured faculty who work part-time are more likely to be "stepping down" their work schedule in preparation for retirement. This is particularly true for men.

Highest degree earned. Table 3 indicates that part-timers and full-timers differ substantially in their preparation for faculty positions. In each stratum or type of institution, part-timers were substantially less likely to hold the doctoral degree, and more likely to hold either a professional degree or a master's degree as their highest. In all strata, part-timers were also far more likely to hold the baccalaureate as their highest degree. This table suggests that part-timers are clearly "out of the ordinary" and consistently so in each type of institution.

Table 3: Highest degree type by type of institution, percentage of part- and full-time tenured and tenure-eligible faculty

		Highest Degree Type (in percents)			
		Professional	Doctoral	Masters	Bachelors
Research University	Part-time	35.0	36.1	14.6	14.3
	Full-time	18.5	74.3	6.5	0.6
Doctoral University	Part-time	31.1	49.0	8.1	11.8
	Full-time	21.7	68.4	9.2	0.6
Comprehensive University	Part-time	3.8	42.5	47.2	6.5
	Full-time	5.5	73.3	20.5	0.6
Liberal Arts Colleges	Part-time	0	53.3	34.1	10.9
	Full-time	3.2	68.5	27.2	1.1
Community Colleges	Part-time	4.3	3.3	57.7	28.0
	Full-time	2.4	18.7	65.0	9.9

Other employment. Over half (55%) of all part-timers held "other employment," while only a quarter (24.6%) of full-timers did. For most (57%) part-timers, "other employment" meant part-time, except for community college faculty, almost two-thirds of whom held full-time jobs. Part-timers' other jobs tend to be in teaching or research (especially among research university faculty), with administration ranking a distant third. Among community college part-timers the other job tends to be "technical." Men in part-time tenure-eligible positions varied more than women in the nature and content of their other jobs. Women predominantly taught at one level or another; men held a variety of other positions, especially in clinical or professional practice. The

numbers of those holding other full-time work was too small to permit confident generalization about specific patterns.

Teaching field. Part-timers who hold or are eligible for tenure are heavily overrepresented in the health sciences and fine arts, compared to full-timers. They are substantially underrepresented in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. Among research university faculty, the tenure-eligible part-timers are also statistically overrepresented in education and engineering. These data are consistent with the "highest earned degree" data in suggesting that part-time tenure-eligible faculty are more likely to be in the professions and the arts than in more traditional disciplines.

Productivity. By various measures, and notwithstanding that part-timers are older with longer employment histories, they have not been as "productive" as full-timers. In fact, on such usual measures as publications and grants, they average between about 60% and 75% of the "output" of full-time tenure-eligible faculty, whether the measures are career-long or for a defined recent period. Table 4 shows comparative figures for career publications, recent publications, grant activity, and current student contact hours.

Table 4: Productivity measures by employment status

	Employment Status	Mean	Standard Deviation
Publications Career	Part-time Full-time	26.14 34.87	65.73 66.26
Publications Last two years	Part-time Full-time	3.07 5.42	7.84 8.77
Student contact Hours (per week)	Part-time Full-time	220.85 331.31	310.29 439.65
Average Grant Award	Part-time Full-time	93,612.72 156,830.60	216,749.85 604,144.52
Total Grant/Contract	Part-time Full-time	215,530.21 459,576.76	626,710.24 16,638.52

Satisfaction. On the whole, part-timers report higher levels of overall job satisfaction (3.36 for part-timers vs. 3.13 for full-timers, on a scale where 4.00 means "very satisfied"). They also report slightly higher levels of satisfaction with workload (3.26 vs. 2.87) and salary (2.85 vs. 2.55) than do full-time tenured or tenure-eligible faculty. There is no practical difference in satisfaction with benefits between the two groups, although the part-timers are slightly less satisfied (2.92 vs. 2.99 on a scale where 4.00 means "very satisfied." Although just slightly less satisfied (2.84 vs. 3.05) with "opportunities for advancement," part-timers were nevertheless slightly more inclined to agree (3.64 v. 3.51) that they would choose an academic career again.

Preference for part-time work. On the whole, part-time tenure-eligible faculty preferred part time work. Nearly two-thirds of both men and women expressed this preference.

Table 5: Preference for part-time work by gender, tenured and tenure-eligible faculty

		Preferred Part-time		
		Yes	No	Total
Gender	Male	61.8	38.2	100 %
	Female	63.0	37.0	100 %
Total		62.2	37.8	100 %

Table 6 shows that more women than men were likely to be working part-time because they could not find full-time work, but the data suggest that over three-quarters of part-timers had other motives. A generalized interest in being

Table 6: Working part-time because full-time positions were unavailable, by gender

		Full-time Unavailable		
		Yes	No	Total
Gender	Male	18.9	81.1	100 %
	Female	30.5	69.5	100 %
Total		22.9	77.1	100 %

part of the academic environment (55%) and working to supplement income (41%) were other motives reported by substantial numbers of respondents to the NSOPF survey.

Gender and retirement plans. Part-time tenured and tenure-eligible faculty intend, on the whole, to retire much sooner than do those with full-time appointments (Table 7). Over 54% plan to retire within five years. But the patterns for males and females are mirror images of one another; males typically

Table 7: Retirement plans for part- and full-time tenured and tenure-eligible faculty

	Years Until Retirement (in percents)					
	This year	1 – 5 years	6 – 10 years	11–15 years	16-25 years	25+ years
Part-time	37.2	17.1	9.1	12.4	12.7	11.5
Full-time	30.4	7.5	10.9	11.7	22.7	16.9
Total	30.6	7.9	10.9	11.7	22.2	16.6

plan to retire sooner, females later. When the data for part-timers' retirement plans are arrayed by gender, the difference becomes clear (Table 8). Women comprise about half of all part-timers who do not plan to retire for at least 15 years, while men comprise anywhere from 2/3 to 84% of those who plan to retire

Table 8: Retirement plans by gender, part-time tenured and tenure-eligible faculty

	Gender (in percents)	
	Male	Female
This year	66.3	33.7
1 – 5 years	77.5	22.5
6 – 10 years	84.0	16.0
11 – 15 years	66.3	33.7
16 – 25 years	51.9	48.1
Over 25 years	48.7	51.3

in less than 15 years. This indicates considerably different career pathways for men and women who hold tenure (or are eligible for it) while working part-time. While women in the sample were significantly younger (48.4 years) than men (55.8 years), they were not, on the average, younger than faculty as a whole; the men, however, were older.

Gender and family status. Family considerations may play a role in career paths of tenured and tenure-eligible part-timers. Table 9 shows that men are more likely to live in a "nuclear family" arrangement, with almost 70% reporting

Table 9: Family status by gender, part-time tenured and tenure-eligible faculty

		Family Status (in percents)			
		Single, no dependent	Single, with dependent	Married, no dependent	Married, with dependent
Gender	Male	9.8	11.4	9.2	69.6
	Female	22.9	8.6	26.7	41.7

being married with dependents. Another 11% of men are single with at least one dependent. Only about 42% of women report living in a nuclear family. More likely, women faculty have no dependents (about 50%), and are more than twice as likely as men (23% vs. 10%) to be single with no dependents.

Income. There is virtually no difference between the total income earned by part- and full-time tenured and tenure-eligible faculty. Part-timers averaged $64,961 and full-timers averaged $64,745. But roughly $40,000 of that total came from other sources than their basic salary from the institution in the case of part-timers. Income from other employment (approximately $23,000) including self-owned businesses and consulting or free-lance work ($4101) comprised these other major sources. On average, part-timers earned more from all non-institutional sources than did full-timers. Men (Table 10) have substantial sources of income beyond the basic salary they receive from the institution; women, while their basic salaries are not statistically different (p=.092) from those of men,

Table 10: Sources of income by gender, part-time tenured and tenure-eligible faculty			
	Gender	Mean	Standard Deviation
Total household income	Male	83,953.18	84,789.81
	Female	73,988.51	94,980.15
Basic salary	Male	25,088.66	37,892.34
	Female	24,114.00	35,390.00
Any other employment	Male	10,149.54	43,027.75
	Female	4,158.90	10,419.54
Outside consulting, Freelance	Male	5,754.34	27,662.67
	Female	896.64	3,922.01
Self-owned business, non-consulting	Male	12,081.68	41,693.64
	Female	1,994.31	13,438.03
Employed at other academic institution	Male	7,523.45	23,996.61
	Female	5,586.68	29,665.83

live in households with lower average income. Their own income from other sources is also less.

Highest degree earned. Notwithstanding that men and women part-timers are comparably distributed across teaching disciplines, women are far less likely than men to have earned terminal degrees in their specialty (Table 11). While 52% of men hold doctorates or terminal professional degrees, only 32% of

Table 11: Highest degree earned by gender, part-time tenured and tenure-eligible faculty				
	Highest Degree Type (in percents)			
	Professional	Doctoral	Masters	Bachelors
Male	18.4	33.6	30.7	16.3
Female	9.5	22.2	44.7	18.3
Total	15.3	29.7	35.5	17.0

women do. On the other hand, 45% of the women hold master's degrees, while only 31% of men report that the master's is their highest degree. A dramatic difference in preference for part-time work emerges when men and women are compared by their highest degree level (Table 12) . At each degree level, women prefer part-time work, with 100% of those holding professional degrees

preferring part-time work. Only 38.4% of men holding a terminal professional degree and a minority of those holding the master's degree (48%) prefer part-time work. But this preference clearly varies by degree level for men. Those holding the doctorate prefer part-time work by a wide margin (78%), as do those holding only the baccalaureate (74%). (Without reporting the detail, women

Table 12: Preference for part-time work, highest degree earned by genders

		Preferred part-time work (in percents)	
Gender	Highest Degree Type	Yes	No
Male	Professional	38.4	61.6
	Doctoral	78.0	22.0
	Masters	47.6	52.4
	Bachelors	52.4	26.1
Female	Professional	100.0	0
	Doctoral	61.4	38.6
	Masters	62.5	37.5
	Bachelors	53.3	46.7

obviously feel more constrained in the work force because between three and four times the proportion of women with terminal professional or doctoral degrees report that "full-time work is unavailable.") So, quite independently of highest degree earned, women and men faculty who hold tenure or are tenure-eligible differ in the way they are either constrained to or choose to work part-time.

Table 13 shows the distribution of other jobs held by the respondents, specifying whether they are full- or part-time. Men, almost regardless of their highest degree, tended to hold other part-time jobs. And while the total proportion holding part-time other jobs for women was close to the same proportion (roughly 42% for both genders) for men, there were dramatic differences by degree level. Almost none of those holding professional degrees or doctorates held other full-time jobs, and only 6 of over 500 holding professional degrees held part-time other jobs. Table 14 shows that the very

Table 13: Other job(s) of part-time tenured or tenure-eligible faculty, by gender			
		Other job status (in percents)	
Gender	Highest Degree Type	Full-time	Part-time
Male	Professional	40.3	59.7
	Doctoral	32.3	67.7
	Masters	41.9	58.1
	Bachelors	50.8	49.2
	Total	41.5	58.5
Female	Professional	0	100
	Doctoral	6.4	93.6
	Masters	42.3	57.7
	Bachelors	68.5	31.5
	Total	42.4	57.6

large majority of men and women held full-time jobs prior to their current part-time jobs. It is especially interesting to note that women holding professional degrees all held full-time jobs, indicating a clear break from their previous employment pattern. Women holding both doctoral and master's degrees were far more likely than men to have held part-time jobs prior to their present job.

Age/gender interaction. To some extent, age and gender appear to interact as individuals choose their employment options. Table 15 shows that almost half

Table 14: Part- or full-time status of "most recent main job" by degree level within gender			
		Most recent main job (in percents)	
Gender	Degree level	Full-time	Part-time
Male	Professional	87.9	12.1
	Doctoral	90.0	10.0
	Masters	86.9	13.1
	Bachelors	57.3	42.7
Female	Professional	100.0	0
	Doctoral	64.1	35.9
	Masters	63.4	36.6
	Bachelors	93.5	6.5

Table 15: Age distribution of male and female faculty by part- and full-time status, tenured and tenure-eligible						
		Age Intervals (in percents)				
Gender		< 30	30 – 39	40 – 49	50 – 59	> 60
Male	Part-time	3.2	13.0	18.7	19.1	45.9
	Full-time	0.5	15.6	32.3	35.2	16.4
Female	Part-time	4.4	23.9	34.1	17.0	20.5
	Full-time	1.2	20.7	41.3	27.8	9.0

(45.9%) of part-time men are 60 years of age or older – and therefore more likely to be in a pre-retirement phase of their careers. Part-time women are more likely to be younger (almost twice as likely to be under 40 as men), but are also more widely distributed across the age spectrum than are full-time women. These data suggest that men and women elect part-time work for very different reasons and with very different career implications – essentially because the men and women who do elect part-time work are distributed very differently across the age spectrum. The following analyses broke the population into those under 50 and those over 50 – perhaps too simplistic, but convenient and roughly close to the mid-point of both age and career for large numbers of faculty.

Table 16 shows that women under 50 are substantially more likely than either men or older women to be working part-time because "full-time work is unavailable."

Table 16: Full-time work unavailable by age and gender, part-time tenured and tenure-eligible faculty				
			Full-time unavailable (in percents)	
Gender		Age	Yes	No
	Male	< 50	27.6	72.4
		> 50	14.1	85.9
	Female	< 50	38.3	61.7
		> 50	14.2	85.8

Older men and older women show similar patterns and appear to be less constrained.

Table 17 shows the interaction of age and gender on respondents' intent to continue in a part-time position at another institution in three years. This item is not a clear measure of long-term intent, because it confounds the intent to move to another institution with the intent to stay in a part-time position. Nevertheless, it does seem to indicate that older faculty do not see their part-time positions as a long-term arrangement. (About the same small proportion of older full-time tenured faculty would consider part-time employment as a serious option.) Younger faculty appear to hedge their bets, showing somewhat more willingness to consider remaining in a part-time position. In both cases, though, the proportion considering longer-term part-time work appears limited.

Table 17: Estimate of likelihood that respondent would hold a part-time position at a different institution in three years

		Part-time at different postsecondary institution (in percents)		
Gender	Age	Not at all likely	Somewhat likely	Very likely
Male	< 50	59.5	25.3	15.1
	> 50	80.3	16.9	2.8
	Total	72.8	19.9	7.2
Female	< 50	69.4	20.9	9.7
	> 50	88.4	9.5	2.1
	Total	75.6	17.2	7.2

Plans. The preceding section shows that age/gender interaction is an important way to frame analyses of career pathways, interests, and critical points in prioritizing values that affect employment decisions. Several items on the NSOPF survey asked respondents about the relative importance of several factors in influencing their decisions about future employment. Responses to those items reinforce the importance of both age and gender in analyzing the academic work force. Table 18 displays responses to a question about how

important a tenured position would be should a respondent leave his or her current position. Tenure is clearly a far less important consideration for older faculty. Women appear to be more ambivalent about tenure's importance, with fewer extreme ("not important" or "very important") responses than men, but

Table 18: A tenured position would be important if respondent left current job

		Importance of tenured position (in percents)		
Gender	Age	Not important	Somewhat important	Very important
Male	< 50	24.7	19.4	55.8
	> 50	44.9	20.7	34.4
Female	< 50	18.1	34.9	47.0
	> 50	35.2	36.5	28.3

substantially more "somewhat important" responses. While the options did not permit an "it depends on other things" response, it would appear that women consider a more complex array of issues in making career decisions.

Job security is a related, but more general concern. Table 19 repeats the analysis, relating age and gender to responses expressing the degree of importance respondents attached to job security in considering future employment.

Table 19: Job security would be important if respondent left present job

		Importance of job security (in percents)		
Gender	Age	Not important	Somewhat important	Very important
Male	< 50	7.9	29.7	62.4
	> 50	30.4	30.5	39.1
Female	< 50	6.8	33.5	59.7
	> 50	28.8	19.4	51.8

Older faculty, again, saw it as less important than younger faculty, but older women were substantially more likely (52%) to see job security as "very important" than were older men (39%). Note that only 28% of older women saw

tenure as "very important," but nearly twice as many (proportionately) saw job security as "very important." Even for younger women, job security was more likely to be rated "very important" (60%) than tenure (47%).

Pressure to publish clearly affects women's responses to the importance of tenure in considering their future employment plans. Table 20 indicates that women, substantially more than men, would prefer jobs that do not entail pressure to publish.

Table 20: No pressure to publish would be important if respondent left current job

			Importance of no pressure to publish (in percents)		
Gender		Age	Not Important	Somewhat important	Very Important
	Male	< 50	32.3	41.9	25.8
		> 50	35.5	36.3	28.1
	Female	< 50	30.3	29.0	40.7
		> 50	31.3	19.8	48.8

This is very important to about half of the older women, a dramatic and telling figure that seems to reflect a personal need for something other than the publish-or-perish chase as a model for academic careers. (See also Baldwin and Chronister, 2001).

Age makes a very substantial difference, gender notwithstanding, when respondents assess the importance of career advancement in considering a move to a new job. Table 21 shows that only half as many older faculty consider it very important, while about twice as many older faculty consider it "not important." Again, this points to issues of intrinsic interests and values as principal motivating factors – and as factors that appear to outweigh the competitive criteria institutions typically use to evaluate faculty and reward them.

Reward systems. On the whole, faculty tend to agree that teaching, and not research, should be the primary criterion for promotion and tenure. An overwhelming majority of part-time tenured or tenure-eligible women (96%)

Table 21: Opportunity for career advancement would be important to a respondent leaving a current job				
		Importance of advancement opportunity (in percents)		
Gender	Age	Not important	Somewhat important	Very important
Male	< 50	18.5	21.4	60.1
	> 50	35.2	36.0	28.8
Female	< 50	13.0	29.9	57.1
	> 50	36.4	36.6	27.0

either agree or agree strongly that teaching should be the primary criterion for promotion and tenure. But only 67% disagree that research is rewarded more than teaching. While one could argue that these findings show broad support for teaching, both as a criterion for rewards and as the actual basis for rewards (presuming that not rewarding research means rewarding teaching), the distance between 96% and 67% suggests a substantial dissonance between individual preferences and actual practices. (Full-time tenured and tenure-eligible women are also conflicted in the same directions, and are also heavily arrayed against research as the primary criterion for promotion and tenure.) That women should also be concerned about reducing pressure to publish, corroborates the likelihood that many are concerned about the pressures that publish-or-perish criteria put on their lives and their careers. (It is possible that the time-pressure associated with the traditional seven-year up-or-out tenure deadline is the objection rather than publication, *per se*, but the survey question did not include a response option to make the distinction clear. Hypothetically, at least, women would not object to publishing as much as they would object to the time pressure that might peak during their own peak childbearing and –rearing years.)

Personal concerns. Personal concerns about family and location affect how part-time tenured and tenure track faculty view career moves. These concerns are particularly related to age, but gender enters the picture as well.

Table 22: Importance of a job for spouse in considering new job				
		Importance of job for spouse (in percents)		
Gender	Age	Not important	Somewhat important	Very important
Male	< 50	25.8	23.6	50.6
	> 50	46.1	27.3	26.6
Female	< 50	24.4	28.8	46.8
	> 50	42.5	26.0	31.5

Table 22 shows that opportunities for one's spouse are far more important to younger faculty (far more likely to be women in this population) than to those over 50. The impact of gender does not appear as great as that of age, but at least in a marginal way, older women are more concerned than older men, while younger men are marginally more concerned than younger women. On the whole, though this appears to be a principally age-related concern.

Another family concern is recorded in responses to a question about how important schools for one's children would be in considering a new job. Again (Table 23) age plays a central role, with older faculty much less concerned (as one might expect) than younger faculty. But gender clearly interacts with age, as well.

Men see this as a more important concern than women, with younger men being the most concerned. Men in this particular population are far more likely than women to be living in a nuclear family situation (Table 9), though, so the results may be as much a reflection of family circumstances as any more fundamental attitude.

Table 23: Education of children related to career move				
		Importance of schools for children (in percents)		
Gender	Age	Not important	Somewhat important	Very important
Male	< 50	12.0	16.2	71.7
	> 50	51.9	19.0	29.1
Female	< 50	23.6	20.8	55.5
	> 50	76.0	4.5	19.5

Gender and age again interact somewhat when respondents answered the question about how important geographic concerns would be in changing jobs. Table 24 shows that younger men are slightly more concerned than older men are, and that women in both age groups are less concerned than men.

Younger women appear to be by far the most ambivalent, with older women the least concerned. Again, the ambivalence of women suggests that they feel the question is too simple, given the array of other issues they bring to their decisions about careers.

Table 24: Geographic concerns about a career move

		Importance of geographic location (in percents)		
Gender	Age	Not important	Somewhat important	Very important
Male	< 50	6.5	22.0	71.5
	> 50	14.4	21.6	64.0
Female	< 50	12.8	38.3	49.0
	> 50	22.8	24.5	52.7

Comparison with full-time tenured or tenure-eligible faculty. Responses to these "career-move" items by part-time tenured and tenure-eligible faculty were compared with responses by full-time tenured and tenure-eligible faculty (n = 413,184) in the NSOPF weighted sample. Gender and age differences were far less noticeable in the "mainstream" population, nor were the interaction effects of gender and age as marked.

On the whole, the directions of both gender and age effects were similar, but the full-time faculty were far more concerned with both job security and advancement in any prospective move than were the part-timers.

To the extent that gender and age mattered, older women consistently would want less pressure to publish in future moves – whether they were full- or part-time at present. And tenure and job security were clearly less important to the older part-timers than to the older full-timers.

On many measures, part-time tenured and tenure-eligible faculty are more varied and show more diversity than do tenured and tenure-eligible full-time faculty. This might mean that the part-timers have made more individual and personal choices about their careers, their jobs, and their lives. It suggests that the constraints of academic work favor a more homogeneous work force, but that those who deviate from the norms nevertheless find faculty careers attractive and rewarding provided that their needs can be met with flexible alternatives – like the opportunity to work part-time.

Discussion.

Part-time tenured and tenure-eligible faculty, as anomalous as the roughly 18,000 of them may be in a total population of about 1,000,000, may mark the front of the curve in an increasingly diverse academic work force. They have opted for a non-standard working arrangement that is only rarely contemplated by institutional policies. They are, in short, exceptions to the rule and "out of the ordinary." But it is precisely such cases that can help us look through the norms and see more clearly how things might be different.

In this case, the key seems to lie in age/gender interactions that bring individual life circumstances and choices into far clearer focus. Two main ideas emerge. First, women face more complex decisions about careers than men do. Their ambivalent responses to several key items suggest that they resist simplistic choices. The obvious logical alternative is that they would – given the alternative – respond with "it depends...." Unfortunately, the data we have from the NSOPF survey does not allow a clear assessment of what these choices depend upon. Presumably, it would depend upon a mix of both personal and professional considerations. Among the most interesting factors affecting women's choices is the interest of older women, both full- and part-time to find positions in which pressure to publish is less than they feel in their present

positions. Only a tiny fraction (3%) of older (>50) women agree strongly that research should be the primary criterion for promotion and tenure, while over three-quarters (77%) of them disagree with the statement. On the whole, and ignoring the effects of age, women are more supportive than men are of relying on teaching as the primary criterion for promotion and tenure.

These results suggest not only that women's lives and careers tend to be more complex than those of men, and their choices more difficult, but that a fundamental tension between teaching and research in academic reward systems is more troublesome for women. For those who have chosen part-time work on the tenure track, the tension appears more pronounced than for those who remain in full-time jobs. One possible explanation is that those who have chosen part-time work saw that as the logical escape from the tension they felt. (But women in this population were also less likely than men to hold terminal or professional degrees.)

These findings are generally consistent with those of McElrath (1992). She concluded that women in the fields of criminology and sociology tended to change jobs for reasons other than "upward mobility" (p. 278). Instead, she concluded that "....combining marriage with an academic career has a detrimental effect on academic women's careers" (p. 279) Her data and conclusions run parallel to findings in this study to the effect that women appear to face more complex choices and feel more constrained in their careers than men do. Earlier research by Long, Allison, and Mcginnis (1993) found evidence – as often alleged – that women in biochemistry are more severely judged (subjected to higher standards) than men in both tenure and promotion decisions, and that they take longer to achieve tenure and promotion as a result. The complexity of women's lives and career paths might well be further complicated by dual standards in achieving career "success." We should note that the data in this study, as well as the data cited in these other studies is now

ten or more years out of date. There have been dramatic changes in the academic profession in the past ten years, so it is not clear whether the effects of gender have remained the same or changed in commensurate ways.

The second major theme suggests that age matters, and that it matters greatly. Using age 50 as the dividing line between younger and older faculty – partly because it was conveniently close to the mean age for the population and for subgroups – substantial differences in interests, concerns, and career directions were observed on many items from the NSOPF survey. The specific differences between younger and older are partly demographic (such as differences in family situation) and partly career-related (such as retirement plans). But the overarching point is that people's lives and careers change in composition, emphasis, and values as they age. What may work for an unmarried male with a new Ph.D. in, say, mathematics, at age 30 does not necessarily work for a married woman with a master's degree and two children who is teaching English composition at age 45.

Yet there is at least a common understanding that academic careers should follow a linear and isomorphic trajectory based on scholarly productivity and upward mobility as measured by some invisible hierarchy of institutional prestige. Whether that model applies to all faculty or not (and there is considerable evidence that it does not), there do not seem to be many alternative tracks into which those with interests other than research and publication can fit. If the part-time tenured and tenure-eligible population is at all representative, different pathways that correspond to age-related values and behaviors would be welcomed. It would be a mistake to say "all older faculty," because there is a degree of heterogeneity in this and all other faculty groupings. But age does appear associated with progressive individual change along several vectors. Ferren (1998) pointed out how "life and career events interact and interrupt the flow [of a linear career progression]," meaning that for

many, "periods of stability [in a career]...are punctuated by periods of transition and reevaluation" (p. 8-9). Those who cannot actualize these changes by exploring alternatives in their jobs appear – at least in the population of part-time tenured and tenure-eligible faculty – to look for the next most suitable option: partial departure via a reduction in time. Since their choice to work part-time is largely a preference rather than perceived as a choice constrained by the lack of full-time work (Tables 5 and 6), there is probably as much "pull" of other attractors rather than the "push" of some kind of misadaptation or misfortune.

Norrell and Norrell (1996) suggest that the rhythms of the academic career and the realities of individuals' life cycles do not necessarily coincide. In fact, they probably coincide more with men's lives than with women's, given that women have traditionally assumed more family-intensive roles. As Norrell and Norell point out, "A family life-cycle approach may be particularly helpful in considering the compression of roles on a new faculty member, whose first years in the profession may coexist with the pre-school years of his or her children and the retirement years of his or her parents" (p. 221). In our study, the part-time tenured and tenure-eligible men were more likely to be seeking a family-conscious situation, as they were more likely to be living in a nuclear family situation with dependent children.

Ernest Boyer's Scholarship Reconsidered recommends that scholarly work be reconceptualized into four different strands – rather than as a single strand that would be limited to "research." This study suggests a further elaboration of Boyer's idea, namely that faculty careers may well unfold with changing interests, preferences, and emphases from stage to stage. While we simply and conveniently bifurcated our study population into "under 50" and "over 50" subgroupings, it is entirely possible that a more refined study would make visible ways in which men and women (quite possibly in different ways) progress through stages in which they prefer alternative roles based on different mixes of

scholarly and other kinds of work. (For example, Baldwin and Blackburn, 1981, suggested a curvilinear relationship between interest in teaching and age.) But isomorphism in both roles and rewards, unadjusted for life and career developments, may become overwhelmingly constraining for at least some faculty at given points in individual careers. (Notwithstanding the findings of Blackburn and others, 1991, that for some faculty the career does appear to be a relatively linear pathway.)

The possibility of richer options and alternative ways in which to progress through a faculty career appears to be important as a way to make and keep the academic life attractive to an increasingly diverse work force.

Most institutions responding to our survey reported that they had no explicit policy options permitting or encouraging part-time tenure. On the whole, the population of individuals who did elect to work part-time while holding tenure had to negotiate their own individual arrangement – usually an exception to institutional policies. In general, it appears that highly individual circumstances – not readily observable from NSOPF data – moved them to do so.

Part-time faculty who hold tenure, or tenured faculty who choose to work part-time are but a tiny fraction of all those now teaching part- and full-time in American colleges and universities. As exceptions to the norm, they are, as our title implies, "out of the ordinary." We began this project with no preconceptions about their characteristics or their motives, but assumed we would find a population that differed systematically from "mainstream" faculty. On the whole, they did not. Or at least they did not differ so much that we could clearly identify them by a particular set of characteristics. Instead, they appeared to be drawn from across the spectrum – by age, gender, ethnicity, academic field, and many other characteristics – of the faculty as a whole.

But because they are out of the ordinary, having committed to a profession although working part-time, they also tell us something about the ordinary. Or, in this case the increasingly diverse people who will shape the faculty in decades to come. They will enter the profession more likely as women, members of ethnic minorities, and they will teach beyond traditional career end-points. They will seek more flexibility in how, when, and why they work, and they will weave work into their more complex lives, demanding balance and proportion in ways that may appear unfamiliar to traditional academics and their institutions.

Our principal finding in this study is that age and gender interact to differentiate part-time tenured and tenure-eligible faculty from "mainstream" faculty. The part-timers have made a (usually) voluntary and evidently rewarding choice to work part-time. For women, this choice involves a more complex array of considerations than it appears to for men. For older faculty, and especially for older women faculty, it appears related to an interest in aspects of work that diverge from the usual "publish-or-perish" competition.

If this population is a harbinger of trends, the most important conclusion appears to be that academic (and perhaps other) careers should no longer be considered an isomorphic, linear framework that molds all "workers" to a single model of performance and success. Younger workers with families (more males than females in our sample) need both security and time, as well as community support for their children. Older workers need new challenges and opportunities to put their experience and their perspectives to use in different ways. Not everyone needs tenure if tenure is defined as the culminating badge of honor for competitive success in the publishing game. Not everyone will define a successful career as one in which doing research has been its own reward.

More importantly, colleges and universities will find among their faculty individuals of talent and commitment who happen to be brave enough to step away from the norm and seek alternative pathways that enrich their own lives,

the lives of their families, and – ultimately – the lives of their students and colleagues. What alternatives can institutions of higher education offer them?

Our survey of institutional policies suggests that most do not formally recognize or encourage divergence from the tenure-track norm. Policies tend to assume that individuals eligible for tenure will work full-time. This may be less a matter of assuming that "full-time" is the norm than it is a matter of assuming that tenure is a well-conceived institution. The end result is both individual faculty and their employing institutions wind up negotiating exceptions – and very few of them at that – to the usual career boundaries. These individual arrangements appear to work well and appear to promote individual morale and a return on the institution's investment in some measure of flexibility.

In the face of potential shortages of qualified people at a time when demand for higher education is increasing, the academic job market is likely to need more diverse entrants. Because both the work and the lives of those who do it are almost certain to become more complicated and more divergent from older norms, institutions face a dilemma. Should they hold their policies to the standard of years gone by, while allowing individual exceptions – hoping that they will not drive too many out of the profession? Or should they expand the range of options to individuals whose lives and interests depart from the norm as a way to encourage more and more different individuals to become and remain faculty?

This study suggests that Ernest Boyer (1987) was on the right track when he argued that "scholarship" should be defined in multiple ways. This study concludes with the recommendation that academic careers be defined in multiple ways. For some, that means doing research and excelling in the national market place. For others, it means paying attention to teaching and doing it well. For all it means enjoying the flexibility to shift emphases at different life stages.

Perhaps most importantly, it means that institutions have to decide whether to react case-by-case to an increasing diversity of individual work styles, values, and career trajectories, or whether they will act purposefully to think through their policies and practices and take proactive initiative to open academic careers to alternatives that will appeal to the broadest array of people with talent.

Baldwin and Chronister (2001), in their study of non-tenure-track faculty, point out that policy is both underdeveloped and inadequate to assure the best use of this increasing segment of faculty. In point of fact, their study and this one affirm that a declining share of all faculty match up with the "standard" template for faculty careers. With well over half of all teaching faculty off the tenure track and with substantial portions teaching part-time, the norm for faculty work is rapidly becoming one in which individually negotiated terms and conditions are more characteristic than the traditional tenure (and tenure-track) arrangements. Perhaps individually negotiated terms and conditions of employment are appropriate, and they may certainly work to the advantage of individuals who have the bargaining power to satisfy themselves with favorable treatment. On the other hand, individuals whose lives (and work options) are more constrained may be disadvantaged when the rules are neither apparent nor consistent from one case to another. For institutions facing enrollment demand with potentially short supplies of faculty (Bowen and Sosa, 1989), the increasing individualization of academic employment may ultimately need reexamining lest treatment of individuals or classes of individuals become capricious and inconsistent – and potentially discriminatory, as well.

But the end result of this study is a clearer view of symptoms – not causes and not effects – of a changing academic work force. The small, anomalous population of tenured and tenure-eligible part-time faculty provides a glimpse of how that work force is likely to change in the future, and what kinds of alternatives and choices new academics may seek as their lives and careers unfold.

References

Baldwin, R. G. and R. T. Blackburn. *The Academic Career as a Developmental Process: Implications for Higher Education.* Journal of Higher Education. 52 (no. 6): 598 – 614, November-December, 1981.

Baldwin, R. G. and J. L. Chronister. Teaching without Tenure: Policies and Practices for a New Era. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.

Blackburn, R. T.; J. H. Lawrence; J. P. Bieber; and L. Trautvetter. *Faculty at work: Focus on Teaching.* Research in Higher Education. 32 (no. 4): 363 – 383, August, 1991.

Bowen, W. and J. A. Sosa. Prospects for Faculty in the Arts and Sciences. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Boyer, E. Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Ferren, A. S. Senior Faculty Considering Retirement: A Developmental and Policy Issue. Washington: American Association for Higher Education, 1998.

Gappa, J. M. and D. W. Leslie. Two Faculties or One? The Conundrum of Part-Timers in a Bifurcated Work Force. Washington: American Association for Higher Education, 1997.

Gappa, J. M. and D. W. Leslie. The Invisible Faculty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993.

Kirshstein, R. J., N. Matheson, Z. Jing, and L. J. Zimbler. Instructional faculty and staff in higher education institutions: Fall 1987 and Fall 1992. Washington: U. S. Department of Education, 1997.

Long, J. S.; P. D. Allison; and R. McGinnis. *Rank advancement in academic careers: Sex differences and the effects of productivity.* American Sociological Review. 58 (no. 5): 703 – 722, October, 1993.

McElrath, K. *Gender, career disruption, and academic rewards.* Journal of Higher Education. 63 (no. 3): 269 – 281, May-June, 1992.

Norrell, J. E. and T. H. Norrell. *Faculty and family policies in higher education.* Journal of Family Issues. 17: 204-226, March, 1996.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: OUT OF THE ORDINARY: THE ANOMALOUS ACADEMIC

Author(s): DAVID W. LESLIE AND JAMES T. WALKE

Corporate Source: THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM + MARY

Publication Date: AUGUST, 2001

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: David W. Leslie	Printed Name/Position/Title: DAVID W. LESLIE, PROFESSOR
Organization/Address: P.O. BOX 8795, WILLIAMSBURG, VA 23187-8795	Telephone: 757-221-2349 / FAX: 757-221-2988
	E-Mail Address: DWLESL@WM.EDU / Date: 7/2/02

(over)