...so I have been in the habit of going into the chair’s office and closing the door and saying “there may be a problem, a morale problem, it would help if x, y, and z happened or if this was tweaked a certain way, or if you are wondering why so-and-so is upset, it’s because of this.” I don’t do it too often, [but] it seems to produce some kind of results...

Ron leveraged his seniority in the department, despite his lack of positional power as a NTTF member, to provide information to the chair that also gave him an avenue to advocate for improved hiring practices (the source of morale issues). In each of the above examples, NTTF made decisions about how to approach structural and cultural impediments to full governance participation, receiving similar signals but responding at times in very different ways.

**Social Inclusion and Exclusion Experiences**

The social interactions and relationships of our NTTF member reflected their status as both marginal (due to contract terms) and central (due to heavy teaching loads and full time status) figures in their departments. Anthony (RU) described eating lunches with four or more colleagues on a regular basis, but also attending baseball games and running races with faculty members in his department. Nevertheless, Anthony suggested that these interpersonal investments were not, and need not be, of the same type and depth with each colleague:

I think people choose it at different levels. I wouldn’t say my experience is the experience of everybody. But I think it has been good and I have a number of colleagues in this department who by their own testimony, some of these are the tenure track, the big guns of research and they would say…that they’ve been other places but that is the thing that makes [RU] better for them is…the social aspect of it, the friendship, the community that has developed for them. And I certainly feel like…that’s where the distinctions between tenured, tenure-track, lecturer and everything certainly gets washed away.
Despite different degrees of social investment and involvement, Anthony described a culture of interpersonal regard where repeated and regular interactions led to a reduced emphasis on employment status differences. In this regard, interactions seemingly unrelated to worklife may, over time, modify and reduce perceptions of professional status differences.

Positive interpersonal regard was an outcome of both dyadic interpersonal relationships and perceptions of group identity. However, repeated or shared behaviors implied a culture of prosocial interaction and support. Jennifer (MU) described how sensitive she was to little things that signal regard, or lack of it: she noticed when colleagues stop to talk, ask advice, and show interest in her and her work, and when they do not. Becky (RU) reflected on the cards, food, and even monetary support she received from departmental colleagues when her husband unexpectedly died. Joan (RU) was direct: “Collegiality means helping. That’s what it means to me — that we help one another and support one another, but that we’re also critical of one another when we need to be.” Joy (RU) reflected on group practices that joined together social and professional functions and the benefits that resulted:

Well I think the potluck luncheons and the brown bag luncheons where we are sharing our research agendas and our teaching techniques, I think those help to improve trust. I think those relationships during in that time in front of one another really does develop the basis that you need to have those real cooperative efforts and a truly supportive environment that would be the basis for collegiality.

For other NTTF, social interaction was simply another venue where their status as non-experts and marginal members of the department could be reinforced. This took the form of unfriendly and at times uncivil behavior around the office as well as exclusion from formal events, such as holiday parties and retirement celebrations. Kari (RU) experienced both of these.
She contrasted the social acceptance she has experienced among the more recent TTF hires with some of the "old guard" to whom she, as a woman and a NTTF, was all but invisible. This treatment culminated with a lunch for one of the retiring veteran faculty members:

...one colleague would not look at me for the first five years that I worked at the department. When he retired he invited the whole department to a retirement lunch [at the] faculty club, but not me, but I happened to be at the faculty club eating lunch with someone else and saw my whole department sitting together — I mean it was just petty, I wasn't going to sit by him anyway. So I was really glad when he retired.

For many NTTF, the litmus test of social inclusion was the invitation to lunch. In many cases NTTF ate frequently or exclusively with other NTTF; in a few departments meals were inclusive of all employment statuses. Karen (MU) contrasted her interactions around the office with what she considered more meaningful lunch invitations that never occurred:

Well my department is super nice to me in terms that they always smile, they always say "hello." They ask me how my children are for two minutes but in 26 years I've never gone out to lunch with anybody. I've never been invited. They go out together but they don't invite me. Again, I know my place. The peasant can't eat with the king and queen.

But, you know, it is what it is.

Karen's language reflects the symbolic significance of exclusion from faculty lunches that she interpreted from it. Most centrally, she perceived that this exclusion is not a matter of social preference (who one enjoys socializing at meals) but a reflection of status differentiation only exacerbated by what she interpreted to be a false front of interest in her personal life otherwise.

Thus, social interactions, both formal and informal, carried the potential for positive and negative outcomes: positively it created interpersonal knowing that often established a view of a
colleague as a whole person. In many cases this resulted in elevated respect and regard, which indirectly contributed to professional integration by creating situations where personal and professional melded and provided a context for personal opinions or views during difficult governance, hiring, or policy-making moments. Negatively, lack of social inclusion aggravated perceptions of second-tier status, increasing the sense that NTTF were simply present to do a job for the department but not to be fully known and engaged as members of the collegium.

**Discussion**

The idea of the "the faculty" and the academic profession undergoes regular change (Kezar, 2013a; Kezar & Maxey, 2015), as do expectations of the role and what counts as expertise (Prieber, 1991; Rice 1986). Recent changes include a rapid growth in the full-time contingent workforce (NTTF), a trend with which the profession has only beginning to grapple. Yet as Ott and Cisneros (2015) have noted, the literature is silent on whether the concepts used for TTF, such as collegiality, even apply to NTTF and, if so, how. In this study, the experiences of NTTF with collegiality reflect their status as a category of faculty that is still ill-defined (Bess, 1992) and therefore given only conditional access to collegiality and the collegium.

As we have shown, participant NTTFs' experiences with collegiality were at best incomplete and, at worst, seriously deficient. Structurally (Bess, 1992), opportunities to vote, and on what, varied significantly, even within campuses. Even if NTTF wished to perform service, whether they could do so was often unclear or constrained. Culturally (Bess, 1992), many lacked access to departmental information and were excluded from meetings, limiting their ability not only to influence colleagues, but in some cases, to carry out tasks as assigned (Birnbaum, 1988). And behaviorally (Bess, 1992), many felt excluded either by omission (e.g., not acknowledging their presence, not inviting them to social and work events) or by co-mission
(e.g., taking courses and offices from them). Such experiences were not the sole creation of TTF or institutions: some NTTF themselves limited their engagement and agency (e.g., sat along the wall, stayed silent at meetings), likely reflecting the strong pull of professional socialization (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Weidman et al., 2001).

To be sure, there were positive stories of appreciation and inclusion, particularly at RU. RU’s environment was likely influenced by a combination of factors, including the absence of collective bargaining that defined MU and an institutional mission that participants’ noted as a source of solidarity and shared purpose across the university faculty. However, even these faculty faced structural obstacles to engagement, often in the form of policies at the institutional level. What appeared to differentiate these NTTF from others was the willingness of their TTF colleagues (particularly chairs [Kezar, 2013b]) to find cultural and behavioral workarounds that provided the NTTF with some voice and presence in department governance. Yet even in these cases (and the less positive ones), NTTF work was valued not for its own sake and its demonstration of professional expertise, but for its service to the higher-status work of TTF and the advantages gained for the department generally. Indeed, in their own words, much of it was “grunt work” that the TTF were “letting” them do.

Driving these NTTF experiences were the tacit question of what counted as expertise and concept of role clarity. Kezar and Sam (2011) have argued that lack of tenure, as an indicator of quality, shapes the experiences of NTTF. Although true, our findings suggest that tenure is an indicator for a more fundamental concept that drove the NTTFs’ experiences with collegiality in this study: expertise, or the perceived lack of it. As a new type of faculty member, NTTF have an as-yet-undefined role (Bess, 1992), yet exist in a system in which the currency for full access to the collegium and collegiality is scholarship (Berquist & Pawlak, 2008; Rice, 1986).
Prepared by a profession that has no mechanism for preparing NTTF professionally, they are trained as scholars and move into roles where they perform work that resembles that of TTF, including program leadership and curriculum development (Hollenshead et al., 2007; Kezar, 2013; Kezar & Sam, 2011). The many non-teaching functions NTTF perform (advising students, participating in community outreach, serving as undergraduate program coordinators, running websites and social media) all contributes to the operation of the department and are generally valued. However, while valued, these duties generally do nothing to contribute to the perception that NTTF have expertise. Although many of our participants had some combination of graduate socialization, non-academic professional experience, extensive teaching experience, and in some cases active research agendas, their employment category and primary duties culturally, behaviorally, and structurally excluded them from the collegium and hence, equal collegial experiences. As a result of this departmental instrumentalization, some NTTF more closely resembled members of the professional bureaucracy (Mintzberg, 1979) than they do full members of the faculty.

Although much of the literature (Levin & Shaker, 2011; Kezar & Sam, 2011; Waltman et al., 2012) paints a portrait of a profession that has sought to keep NTTF on the periphery, our findings indicate that, in at least some cases, departments, chairs, and their TTF are gradually though purposefully making strides toward recognizing the expertise of NTTF. However, as a new and somewhat localized process in which cultural and behavioral workarounds are needed to respond to exclusionary policies, the result thus far has been the series of tensions and contradictions Bess (1992) might predict related to role clarity/ambiguity. NTTF, as well as their TTF colleagues, are caught in a push-pull among professional preparation and standards, institutional policies and norms for the role, and individual goals and expectations.
This tension among the concentric circles, and the corresponding role ambiguity (Bess, 1992), means that perhaps the only consistent experience is that, to the extent NTTF experience collegiality and access to the collegium, it is conditional and therefore not full. This conditional nature of NTTFs’ access to the collegium – to information, to voting and access to meetings, to positive and respectful interactions with colleagues (along with the need, when it happened, for workarounds), to take full ownership for their leadership work – reflects the “separate but not quite equal” status Joy described. Reflective of the symbolic interactionist portion of our framework, seldom was it any single event or interaction that gave this sense; it was the “little bits of salt” described above that accumulated to shape this gestalt. These micro interactions are the substance of collegiality as behavioral exchanges that accumulate to form an individual’s perception of belonging to the collegium. The social and professional positions of NTTF participants were established through interactions that were confirmed or undermined by the signaling of interactions. These messages occurred in tension with, or in harmony with, expectations established through graduate, professional, and departmental socialization.

Conclusion

Ott and Cisneros (2015) have asked scholars to question whether and how TTF concepts apply to NTTF. The outcomes of this study indicate the concepts of collegiality and the collegium do not currently apply to NTTF in the same way they do TTF. In this scenario, perhaps what is needed is a “collegiality lite,” or enhanced professional civility (Fischer, 2009) where the profession more clearly defines the role of NTTF to reduce ambiguity but keeps them, at most, on the periphery of the collegium. Indeed, there is some support for this idea in our own work (Alleman & Haviland, 2014), in the observation that at least some NTTF would prefer not to be involved fully in things like governance (Hearn & Deupree, 2013), and in the tendency of
some NTTF in this study to embrace and replicate the implied hierarchy and, in effect, abdicate their own seat in the collegium.

However, such a model necessarily strips full-time NTTF not just of rights, but also relieves them of their *collegial responsibilities* to make institutions and communities better (Kezar & Maxey, 2015; Magiard & Pellegrino, 1992). It also politically weakens the collegium by limiting the number of full and active participants, imperiling the ability to counterbalance an increasingly managerial culture (Hardy, 1991). As Hollenshead et al. (2007) have argued, it is not the presence of NTTF but how they are treated that threatens to harm the faculty. Others (Kezar & Maxey, 2015; Maxey & Kezar, 2015) have noted that we have marginalized and excluded NTTF when the TTF is already stretched thin with governance, service and other duties, and there is a risk of universities being unable to fulfill their missions. The idea of a "collegiality lite" does little to address these issues.

Affirming Bess (1992), our findings suggest that improving the collegial experiences of NTTF requires a micro (departmental) and macro (profession-wide) alignment of culture and behavior that cannot be achieved through structural reforms alone. The challenge then is to find ways to move beyond the narrow conceptualization of scholarship as the almost exclusive indicator of expertise. The findings from this study suggest we must ask how, in an era of increasingly differentiated faculty work, we can imagine new ways to define and demonstrate "expertise" in the academic profession. Rice (1986) raised this question nearly 30 years ago; it has been taken up by other scholars in the years since (e.g., Boyer, 1990) with limited success. However, as the momentum toward unbundled and differentiated faculty work seems likely to continue (Kezar & Maxey, 2015), the question and challenge remain timely but grow in urgency.
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