

Selected References on Contingent Faculty and Student Success

Compiled by John W. Curtis, Director of Research and Public Policy
American Association of University Professors (AAUP)

January 2010

- Benjamin, Ernst (2002). "How over-reliance on contingent appointments diminishes faculty involvement in student learning." *Peer Review*, 5(1): 4-10.
- Benjamin, Ernst (2003). "Editor's Notes" and "Reappraisal and Implications for Policy and Research." Pp. 1-14 and 79-113 in Ernst Benjamin (ed.) *Exploring the Role of Contingent Instructional Staff in Undergraduate Learning*. New Directions for Higher Education (No. 123), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bettinger, Eric P. and Bridget Terry Long (forthcoming). "Does Cheaper Mean Better? The Impact of Using Adjunct Instructors on Student Outcomes." *Review of Economics and Statistics*. Available at http://gseacademic.harvard.edu/~longbr/publications_outcomes.htm.
- Uses data on "traditional age" first-time full-time freshman entering Ohio public four-year colleges in 1998 or 1999. "The key explanatory variable is whether or not students took their initial course in a given department from an adjunct instructor" (p. 8) and the outcomes measured are "whether any additional courses are taken in the subject, the total number of subsequent credit hours taken, and whether the student majored in the subject." (p. 9) The multi-stage regression analysis includes student, departmental, and institutional variables.
- Conclusions: "Simple comparisons of students with full-time faculty members to those with adjuncts are likely to be biased because students who take adjuncts differ systematically from other students. The paper provides evidence that students sort by instructor type based on observable characteristics." "The analysis suggests that the impact of alternative instructors varies by discipline. However, taking a class from an adjunct often increases the number of subsequent courses that a student takes in a given subject and may also increase the likelihood that the student majors in the subject. These findings contradict assertions by groups that the use of adjuncts reduces student interest. The estimates also suggest that adjunct instructors are especially effective in fields that are more directly tied to a specific profession, like Education and Engineering, although they also had relative positive effects in the Sciences." (p. 24)
- Curtis, John W. and Monica Jacobe (2006). "Consequences: An Increasingly Contingent Faculty." *AAUP Contingent Faculty Index 2006*, available at <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/research/conind2006.htm>
- Provides both qualitative and quantitative perspectives on the increasing use of contingent appointments. Reviews the structural aspects of employment status for various categories of contingent instructors, and discusses the corresponding impact on student academic outcomes. Provides institution-level data from fall 2005 on the employment of both full- and part-time non-tenure-track faculty and graduate student employees.
- Eagan, Jr., M. Kevin and Audrey J. Jaeger (2009). "Effects of Exposure to Part-time Faculty on Community College Transfer," *Research in Higher Education*, 50:168-188.
- Data are from the California community college system. Analysis is of students who first enrolled in 2000 or 2001 and completed eight "transferrable credits" at a single college, tracking whether

they transferred to a four-year college within five years. The analysis uses hierarchical linear modeling to control for both student- and institutional-level variables. Student variables include “exposure to part-time faculty” and institutional variables include both the proportion of faculty employed part-time and their proportion of total instruction. “The findings indicate a significant and negative association between students’ transfer likelihood and their exposure to part-time faculty instruction.” (p. 180)

Ehrenberg, Ronald G. and Liang Zhang (2005). “Do Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty Matter?” *Journal of Human Resources*, 40(3): 647-659.

Abstract: Using institutional-level panel data from the College Board and other sources, our econometric analyses suggest that the increased usage of these faculty types does adversely affect graduation rates at four-year colleges, with the largest impact on students being felt at the public master's level institutions.

Jacoby, Daniel (2006). “Effects of Part-Time Faculty Employment on Community College Graduation Rates.” *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77,6 (November-December): 1081-1103.

Jaeger, Audrey J. and M. Kevin Eagan, Jr. (2009). “Unintended Consequences: Examining the Effect of Part-Time Faculty Members on Associate’s Degree Completion,” *Community College Review*, 36(3):167-194.

Abstract: This study examines the relationship between part-time faculty members and the associate’s degree completion of community college students. The authors use hierarchical generalized linear modeling to analyze student- and institution-level data from the California community college system. Findings indicate that students experienced a significant yet modest negative effect from exposure to part-time faculty members on the probability of completing an associate’s degree.

Jaeger, Audrey J. “Contingent Faculty and Student Outcomes.” *Academe*, November-December 2008. <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2008/ND/Feat/jaeg.htm>

Ruth, Stephen R., Martha Sammons, and Lindsey Poulin (2007). “E-Learning at a Crossroads—What Price Quality?” *Educause Quarterly*, 30,2: 32-9.

Schuster, Jack H. (2003). “The faculty makeover: What does it mean for students?” Pp. 15-22 in Ernst Benjamin (ed.) *Exploring the Role of Contingent Instructional Staff in Undergraduate Learning*. New Directions for Higher Education (No. 123), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Umbach, Paul D. (2007). “How Effective Are They? Exploring the Impact of Contingent Faculty on Undergraduate Education.” *The Review of Higher Education*. 30, 2 (Winter): 91-123.

Uses data from the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement for 2004 to measure process-oriented educational outcomes for various categories of faculty members at 130 four-year institutions. Conclusion: “This study offers some compelling evidence to suggest that, compared with their tenured and tenure-track peers, contingent faculty, particularly part-time faculty, are underperforming in their delivery of undergraduate instruction. Part-time faculty interact with students less frequently, use active and collaborative techniques less often, spend less time preparing for class, and have lower academic expectations than their tenured and tenure-track peers.” (p. 110)

Trends in Instructional Staff Employment Status, 1975-2007

All institutions, national totals

	1975		1993		1995		2003		2005		2007		Growth, 1975-2007
FT Tenured	227,381	29.0%	279,424	25.0%	284,870	24.8%	282,429	19.3%	283,434	17.7%	290,581	17.2%	27.8%
FT Tenure Track	126,300	16.1%	114,278	10.2%	110,311	9.6%	128,602	8.8%	131,140	8.2%	134,826	8.0%	6.8%
FT Non-Track	80,883	10.3%	152,004	13.6%	155,641	13.6%	219,388	15.0%	261,050	16.3%	251,361	14.9%	210.8%
Part-time	188,000	24.0%	369,768	33.1%	380,884	33.2%	543,137	37.0%	624,753	39.1%	684,668	40.5%	264.2%
Grad Student Employees	160,806	20.5%	202,819	18.1%	215,909	18.8%	292,801	20.0%	298,602	18.7%	328,979	19.5%	104.6%
	<u>783,370</u>	100%	<u>1,118,293</u>	100%	<u>1,147,615</u>	100%	<u>1,466,357</u>	100%	<u>1,598,979</u>	100%	<u>1,690,415</u>	100%	115.8%
Contingent													
Instructional Staff	429,689	54.9%	724,591	64.8%	752,434	65.6%	1,055,326	72.0%	1,184,405	74.1%	1,265,008	74.8%	194.4%

Notes: Figures for 2005 and 2007 may not be exactly comparable with previous years, due to a change in the type of institutions included in totals. Grad student figure in 1975 column is for 1976.

Source: US Department of Education, IPEDS Fall Staff Survey

Compiled by AAUP Research Office, Washington, DC; John W. Curtis, Director of Research and Public Policy

Faculty Employment Status by Institutional Category, Fall 2007

All Degree-Granting Institutions

Public	Full-time Faculty, by Tenure Status (% of Total Faculty)						All Full-time	Part-time	Total			
	Tenured		Tenure-Track		Not Tenure-Track							
4-year	163,041	32.1%	73,847	14.6%	106,575	21.0%	343,463	67.7%	163,931	32.3%	507,394	
2-year	46,024	12.8%	16,559	4.6%	49,449	13.7%	112,032	31.1%	248,530	68.9%	360,562	
	<u>209,065</u>	24.1%	<u>90,406</u>	10.4%	<u>156,024</u>	18.0%	<u>455,495</u>	52.5%	<u>412,461</u>	47.5%	<u>867,956</u>	64.3%
Private Non-profit												
4-year	81,203	22.1%	44,258	12.0%	75,659	20.6%	201,120	54.6%	166,907	45.4%	368,027	
2-year	129	3.2%	77	1.9%	1,210	30.0%	1,416	35.1%	2,618	64.9%	4,034	
	<u>81,332</u>	21.9%	<u>44,335</u>	11.9%	<u>76,869</u>	20.7%	<u>202,536</u>	54.4%	<u>169,525</u>	45.6%	<u>372,061</u>	27.6%
Private For-profit												
4-year	107	0.1%	77	0.1%	10,535	11.7%	10,719	11.9%	79,372	88.1%	90,091	
2-year	77	0.4%	8	0.0%	7,933	41.8%	8,018	42.2%	10,969	57.8%	18,987	
	<u>184</u>	0.2%	<u>85</u>	0.1%	<u>18,468</u>	16.9%	<u>18,737</u>	17.2%	<u>90,341</u>	82.8%	<u>109,078</u>	8.1%
All institutions												
4-year	244,351	25.3%	118,182	12.2%	192,769	20.0%	555,302	57.5%	410,210	42.5%	965,512	
2-year	46,230	12.1%	16,644	4.3%	58,592	15.3%	121,466	31.7%	262,117	68.3%	383,583	
	<u>290,581</u>	21.5%	<u>134,826</u>	10.0%	<u>251,361</u>	18.6%	<u>676,768</u>	50.2%	<u>672,327</u>	49.8%	<u>1,349,095</u>	100.0%

Source US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.
 Full-time from *Employees in Postsecondary Institutions, Fall 2007* (NCES 2009-154): Table 4, p. 7
 Part-time from IPEDS Winter 2007 Compendium tables 9-10

Compiled by American Association of University Professors,
 John W. Curtis, Director of Research and Public Policy