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Abstract

This dissertation studies the organization of adjunct instruction within Departments of English and Mathematics at three colleges – a public research university, a private masters granting teaching college, and a public community college. Four questions lie at the core of this project. First, what higher principles and standards of evaluation (i.e. forms of worth) are used among full-time faculty and administrators to justify and criticize adjuncts and the college's use of them? Second, what tests of worth have been institutionalized to evaluate adjuncts? Third, how does the college avoid the potential accusation of exploitation? And fourth, how does being an adjunct faculty member fit into the occupational trajectories of the adjunct faculty themselves?

Several general findings emerge. First, two forms of worth, scholastic and pedagogical, were dominant at the three colleges. Second, each college attempts to avoid the accusation of exploitation by claiming that adjunct work cannot and should not be thought of as anything approaching full employment. Third, the idea that adjunct work is a boundary object of the academic field is affirmed. Fourth, the tests of worth are often ceremonial in nature or somehow discredited. And fifth, the autonomy of a field is reconstructed to mean a positive heterarchical relationship.
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CHAPTER 1:
PART-TIME FACULTY IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

Part-time faculty members have become increasingly important for higher education, particularly its instructional activities. As enrollment increased faster than public support of higher education, colleges and universities increasingly turned to part-time faculty (Leslie 1998). Part-time faculty members represent a flexible and low cost form of labor to teach courses. According to a recent survey by the American Federation of Teachers (Hart Research Associates 2010), the average adjunct is paid about $2,500 per course per semester without benefits.

PART-TIME INSTRUCTION AS NORMAL ELEMENT OF ACADEMIC WORLD

According to the American Association of University Professors (Thornton 2009), 41.1% of all instructional staff in 2009 at American colleges and universities were part-time faculty. This was over 15% higher than it was in 1975, and more than double its 1967 level of 20% (Feldman and Turnley 2004:284). As an occupational category, part-time faculty members are primarily instructors (Clery 2001:3), as 88.4% claim teaching as primary work activity.

Aspiring and the Avocational Adjuncts

While many adjuncts and part-time faculty are aspiring yet struggling academics (Church 1999; Shumar 1999, 1997), one should not assume that all adjuncts fit this
image. Only 47% of all part-time faculty members want a full-time position teaching at the college level (Hart Research Associates 2010:4). The same study, commissioned and published by the American Federation of Teachers, states 26% of people are adjunct faculty primarily for income, while 57% claimed they primarily did so because they enjoyed teaching (Hart Research Associates 2010:10). Even if a concern for social desirability in respondents' answers is acknowledged, these findings suggest many adjuncts are not aspiring to become full time professors. This becomes even more likely when one considers that adjuncts do not appear to be primarily adjuncts: adjunct income only comprises on average 22% of individuals' total income, and 12% of their average total household income (Monks 2009). The image of adjunct faculty is therefore complex, and ambiguous, and the presence of both aspiring and avocational adjunct faculty members only increased the ambiguity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Tenure-Track Faculty</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Faculty</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student Employees</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: A Comparison of Proportional Sizes of Instructional Staff, 1975 and 2009 (Thornton 2009)

Responses to Part-Time Faculty

Concerns over part-time instruction hurting educational quality, be it due to a lack of credentials or fear of not being re-hired the next semester, are constant. These worries
continue despite some research suggesting quality is unaffected by part-time employment (Gappa and Leslie 1993). Second, there is a concern part-time instructors are poorly integrated into higher education, with decision making lacking their input and their needs being overlooked by the colleges and universities that employ them (Finucane and Algren 1997).

Judith Gappa and David Leslie (1993) call for the normalization of part-time faculty. Concluding “part-timers should be employed under parallel but different employment policies that cover the same topics as those in place for full-time faculty”, they offer a policy recommendations aimed at developing fair practices that are consistently implemented (Gappa & Leslie 1993: 260, emphasis in original). In doing so, they hope to reduce the isolation and frustration associated with part-time instruction while retaining the flexibility it gives colleges and universities.

Some voices, however, are more critical. John Curtis & Monica Jacobe (2006) argue the problems in part-time instruction (marginalization, lack of support, etc.) are inescapable, creating a situation where “the faculty collectively grows more contingent, [causing] the quality of higher education itself is threatened” (P. 12). Their policy position is that the public good is served better by full-time faculty, and part-time instruction ought to be resisted. Marxist scholarship, on the other hand, views part-time instruction in terms of inescapable alienation. Wesley Shumar (1997, 1999) argues higher education maintains an ever-shrinking cadre of tenured academic elites, paid for by the use of poorly compensated part-time faculty. Jonathan Church meanwhile describes part-time instructors as stigmatized phantoms who haunt colleges and
universities (Church 1999: 253). In his view, an academic is not treated as 'real' until he or she gains full-time employment, at which point a professional amnesia begins to edit one's memory of being a contingent faculty member. Discussing his own transition from part-time to full-time, Church writes, “I am beginning to forget myself and believe that finally I have arrived because I deserved to, and I deserve this more than others” (Church 1999: 255).

Other research has pointed out it is dangerous to over-generalize when discussing part-time instructors. Reliance on part-time instruction varies greatly by institutional type. “Nearly 70 percent of the instructional workforce” at community colleges (Hart Research Associates 2010:3). At public research universities, on the other hand, only 18% of all faculty were part-time (Clery 2000: 2). There are gender differences as well. Though the desire to be part- vs. full-time appears to be unassociated with gender, 50% of all female academics are part-time, compared to 41% of male academics (Monks 2009).

THE WORLD OF ACADEMIC CAPITALISM AND THE RESTRATIFIED UNIVERSITY

One cannot understand the rise of contingent academic work without observing that as society shifted to postmodernity and postfordism, so higher education became what Sheila Slaughter and Gary Rhoades (2004) call academic capitalism. Academic capitalism is a set of organizing principles (or knowledge/learning regime, in their terminology) based on academic actors “using a variety of state resources to create new circuits of knowledge that link higher education institutions to the new economy” (P. 1),
taking on traits of the new economy, including organizing around dynamic networks to allow for adaptability.

Work on academic capitalism by Slaughter and others suggests that part-time instruction is not only a shift in employment practices, but relates to a larger shift in American higher education's understanding of knowledge, including its production and dissemination. The new model emphasizes applied research (Gumport 2002; Kerr 2001; Slaughter and Leslie 1997), treating knowledge as a commodity and its dissemination as services (S. Slaughter and Rhoades 2004; Shumar 1997).

Some (Lanham 2002) hail the rise of academic capitalism as an opportunity for higher education become more dynamic, engaged, and effective. Jack H. Schuster (2011) builds off the concept of academic capitalism, preferring the term “the restratified university” or “Model C.” He explains:

Perhaps it is merely a variation of the capitalist university model described by Slaughter and Rhoades [, but the restratified university] has several features that are particularly noteworthy and problematic. Most prominent of these features are (1) the groundswell of off-track, full-time academic appointments; (2) the partially obscured but very serious threat to tenure; and (3) the more sharply differentiated compensation packages for faculty, within institutions, by institutional type, and across institutions by discipline. Each of these developments is set within, and fueled by, the rampant economic uncertainties and fiscal constraints referenced earlier. (Schuster 2011:8)

... [The restratified university] is more compartmentalized, more stratified than its predecessors and, at the same time, is subjected to ever more intense financial pressures... It means a more tightly managed faculty workforce, a greater vulnerability for large and growing proportions of faculty holding contingent appointments, and, in all, a more sharply polarized, more layered, more stratified faculty. (Schuster 2011:12)

The world of academic capitalism and the restratified university is not one populated by ivory towers withdrawn from the world. Rather, they have become organized anarchies
(Cohen, March, and Olsen 1972) twice over.

As Schuster points out, there is an increasing differentiation between them, though Roger Geiger argues one must continue to understand how the two interact within a given department. “Research and teaching,” says Geiger, “are the principal outputs of universities and the principal components of the faculty role. Since both contribute to learning, how do universities determine how much of each to produce?” (Geiger 2011:22). He continues:

Departments heavily engaged in sponsored research have long resorted to staffing redundancy by employing many more faculty members than are strictly needed to teach their courses… Economic development and interdisciplinarity essentially reinforce this pattern, while research institutes and raising the bar tend to extend it to more departments. Without redundancy it would be difficult to accommodate buyouts, leaves, and other reductions in teaching loads. (Geiger 2011:32)

The differentiation of teaching responsibilities does not mean they become unrelated.

Government funding of public colleges is highly variable. Weerts & Ronca (2012) find that from 1984 to 2004, university spending was constantly competing for funds with other agencies and issues and community colleges were the most politically acceptable form of college to fund due to their focus on practical education. College funding had become a contentious and partisan issue, as Doyle (2010) found that liberal United States Senators are more likely to vote for financial aid bills, while conservative Senators are more likely to vote for bills related to internal university matters, and that conflict over higher education policy has been increasing since 1964.
CULTURAL SOCIOLOGY’S POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTION: THE MORAL LANDSCAPE OF AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

A key issue in the discussion of academic capitalism and the stratified university is that they are regimes that are not purely economic or structural in nature. Rather, they are organizing principles, local modes of order (Law 1994). Even if that was not the case, it would still be a legitimate question to ask what can cultural sociology and the study of meaning tell us about the organization of adjunct work within contemporary American higher education. What meanings are woven into contingent academic work?

A Previous (And Parsonian) Approach

An excellent way to see what value there may be in doing a cultural analysis of academic work is to look at what others have done. In 2010, the *Journal of Higher Education* published a special issue devoted to the normative complexity of higher education. “Norms occupy a central place in the work of colleges and universities,” Braxton argues (Braxton 2010a) and the claim carries through the issue. The authors cover a range of issues, including norms and teaching assistants (Helland 2010), governance and science (Anderson et al. 2010), fundraising (Caboni 2010), university presidents (Fleming 2010), deans (Bray 2010), and admissions (Hodum and James 2010). However, as John Baxton makes clear in both his introductory and concluding pieces, the articles are unified by a functionalist orientation, with many authors relying on Mertonian norms of science, while Baxton attempts to show how all the articles fit into an action system of academic work, with various organizational positions and processes belonging
to one of the four basic functions of adaptation, goal attainment, integration, and pattern maintenance (Braxton 2010b).

It is an interesting and compelling question to ask how normative and moral concerns influence the institutions of education and scholarship in our society. The social world is flooded meaning and normative concerns. Consequently, it is worth asking what normative and moral considerations intersect with American higher education is significant ways, shaping both hopes and outcomes.

*Sociological Departures from Parsons*

However, social theorists have become suspicious of functionalist social theories over the last several decades (For an overview, see Alexander 1987:111 – 126), and the reasons for this are numerous.

*Limited Cultural Analysis.* In arguing for a strong program for cultural sociology, Jeffrey Alexander and Philip Smith argue the approach to norms and values taken by Parsons and functionalism more generally is insufficiently cultural, as “he did not explain the nature of values themselves”:

When we turn to the empirical world, we find that functionalist logic ties up cultural form with social function and institutional dynamics to such an extent that it is difficult to imagine where culture’s autonomy might lie in any concrete setting. The result was an ingenious systems theory that remains too hermeneutically feeble, too distant on the issue of autonomy to offer much to a strong program. (Alexander and Smith 2001:16)

Functionalist analysis, in other words, conflates “is” and “ought”; the present is assumed functional *a priori*, and whatever norms are present support that order, both in principle and action.
Furthermore, studying norms gives us a limited understanding of culture, as it limits culture to boundary line, something one's rational calculation should not cross and something beyond which one should not strive. In short, there is more to normative life than norms. As Weber famously points out (Gerth and Mills 1968), power must be legitimated. At least in principle, legitimation requires more of a positive project than merely avoiding the violation of norms. Making moral choices is a positive process, not merely acting within constraining norms.

*Power.* Fitting a common criticism made against functionalist approaches, the articles in the special issue leave little theoretical space for the potential of domination, exploitation, or a systematically flawed social order. The norms are present, and they encourage good science and academic practice. Perfection is not possible, of course, so there is always a value for committed faculty and administrators to redouble their personal and organizational commitment to mertonian norms. A balance is always necessary in cultural sociology that strives to allow for the potential of critique without being over cynical, just as it allows for actors to have sincere belief without being too naïve. Due to the controversial nature of adjunct work, it is at least plausible that colleges are at least prepared to defend their use of adjuncts, to justify what they do as legitimate.

*Overlapping Normative Imperatives.* Finally, identifying the set of academic norms for researchers, instructors, and administrators does not tell one how individuals or organizations attempts to balance academic and non-academic norms. The articles from the special issue excel at identifying the normative boundaries for various academic
positions, but they do not discuss how a college or department balances academic norms with, say, economic or political ones. However, such analysis does not help us to understand how actors attempt to remain faithful to academic and scientific ideals in the light of economic realities. Or, put in a more culturally interesting way, how do actors or organizations attempt to balance ideals and values from science with those from the market?

A CULTURAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL CONCESSIONALIZATION OF AN EMPIRICAL QUESTION

This dissertation hopes to find insights by placing the discussion regarding adjunct and part-time faculty in relation with organizational and especially cultural sociology. Implicit in adjunct research and debates are questions regarding how one can attempt to balance economic value and academic concerns. The concern of economic forces colonizing the world of higher learning can be described using the concept of fields and their relative autonomy, originally developed by Pierre Bourdieu. However, his conception, as we will see in the next chapter, has a few key shortcomings: it is not sufficiently relational or process-oriented, and it accidentally promotes isolation.

To deal with this another strain of thought, the sociology of worth, is used. In this approach, the researcher is particularly interested in the act of assigning worth to objects, actors, and events is key for extending and reconstructing the idea of relative autonomy. This approach has several virtues, including its multi-dimensional interest in both cultural and structural matters, and its desire to allow for both sincere belief and cynical lip
service regarding normative concerns.

This dissertation is an empirical study of adjunct work and the forms of worth used to justify and criticize it. It relies on semi-structured, qualitative interviews. These interviews were gathered at three colleges (a public research university, a private teaching college, and a public community college) and targets two traditional liberal arts disciplines (English and Mathematics).

The Study

Each college is presented as a separate case study with its own chapter. These chapters offer thick descriptions regarding how actors within academic departments discuss what makes for a “good” college instructor, and how an employing college can most legitimately use adjuncts. Four questions lie at the core of this project:

1. What higher principles and standards of evaluation (i.e. forms of worth) are used among full-time faculty and administrators to justify and criticize adjuncts and the college's use of them?

2. What tests of worth have been institutionalized to evaluate adjuncts?

3. How does the college avoid the potential accusation of exploitation? In other words, how is proper compensation defined and matched to the worth of adjuncts?

4. Who are the adjuncts? What forms of worth do they use? What can be said about their occupational trajectory? How are they defined by the employing college in a way that is compatible with those forms of worth present?

BRIEF SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

In the final chapter, these chapters are compared, and several general findings
emerge. These can be listed as five distinct points of discussion.

*Avoidance of Exploitation and the Denial of Adjunct Work as Work*

A central finding in this dissertation is that all three colleges attempt to avoid the accusation of exploitation by claiming that adjunct work cannot and should not be thought of as anything approaching full employment. However, they are divided over whether or not this claim is made with the expectation that adjuncts are aspiring academics or avocational. The teaching college's organization actively attempts to exclude aspiring academic adjuncts in favor of avocational adjuncts. The community college also promotes the idea that adjuncts ought to be avocational, but it is also willing to consider adjuncts as potential future full-time faculty. The public research university, on the other hand, explicitly assumes part-time instructors are not only aspiring academics, but are graduate students enrolled at the university.

The question of whether or not adjuncts are expected is not itself the result of a particular form of worth. We can see this by the teaching college and the community college both anticipating avocational academics to be adjunct faculty. However, the *response* to this expectation is shaped by the college's dominant form of worth. One cannot understand how the research university denies exploitation, for example, without understanding both a) that it assumes its adjuncts are graduate students and aspiring academics, and b) their worth as instructors and academics is primarily a product of their ability to play seriously with knowledge and contribute to academic debates. The justification strategies embedded in their organizational processes would make little sense
from another stance, let alone a market perspective.

Scholastic and Pedagogical Worth

Two forms of worth, scholastic and pedagogical, were dominant at the three colleges. Two colleges within the study seem to organize themselves around scholastic worth, the ideal that knowledge is an end in itself, and that the goal of college instructors is to help students have a realization that they both understand the course content and that the course content is worth knowing. One respondent referred to this as “the light bulb moment”, and another as the “ah-ha moment”. Within this form of worth, attention and fidelity are focused squarely on academic knowledge as the thing instructors must be most interested in to be worthy.

A college that organizes itself around that definition of good teaching will likely look quite different than a college that has been organized around pedagogical worth, the notion that education ought to materially improve the lives of students. In this conception, the focus is on the student and the instructor's teaching skills, rather than his or her knowledge of the discipline. The college that relies on pedagogical worth will think quite differently about what should be rewarded and looked for in an instructor. As we will see in the chapter on Mahican Community College, this also creates a suspicion regarding the value of credentials, as advanced degrees are not viewed as an indicator of pedagogical worth.

Institutional Type, not Discipline. Forms of worth appear to be tied to universities more than individuals and their specific position within the academic field. At both the
research university and the teaching college within this study, scholastic worth is dominant in both departments. Meanwhile, pedagogical worth is dominant at both departments in the community college. The ubiquity of a single form of worth suggests ideological control within the formal organization of the full-time (but not adjunct) faculty and administrators at each college.

It may be surprising that discipline appears to play such a secondary role in defining the qualities of a college worthwhile instructor. However, the suggestion that the primary focus of disciplines is on knowledge production in the form of research rather than knowledge dissemination in the form of teaching is in line with previous research. There is a moment of speculation in the conclusion where this dissertation suggests academic disciplines, as institutions, are embodied quite differently depending on whether scholastic or pedagogical worth is dominant.

*Adjunct Work as Boundary*

Third, the idea that adjunct work is a boundary object of the academic field is affirmed. In both the community college and the teaching college, this is clear from the extreme diversity among adjuncts regarding their occupational trajectories. In the case of the public research university, the boundary-ness of part-time instructors is avoided by equating part-time instructor and graduate student.

This point is put into high relief when placed next to the uniformity among full-time faculty regarding the forms of worth used. As full-time professional employees of a particular college, full-time faculty are targeted with ideological control based on specific
understandings of what is academically worthwhile and legitimate. Adjunct faculty members, on the other hand, are not subject to ideological control, but rather more bureaucratic controls specifying behavior.

Tests of Academic Worth

Fourth, the tests of worth at the teaching college and community college are similarly organized, and both are problematic in ways that render them either difficult to apply consistently or effectively ceremonial. The research university, on the other hand, has a substantially different understanding of how to evaluate part-time instructors, as they are expected to be graduate students. As such, their primary form of evaluation comes in their graduate courses, not in the evaluation of their teaching.

Autonomy, Heteronomy, and Hierarchy

Fifth, the conclusion will attempt to use the cases to speak to the theoretical question regarding the relative autonomy of fields. Rather than grounding the ideal of autonomy in separation as Bourdieu does, this dissertation argues for autonomy to be reconstructed as a positive, sustainable heterarchy. The central heteronomous challenge adjuncts represent is the question of whether full-time professionals are necessary for teaching.
CHAPTER 2:
A LITERATURE REVIEW OF AUTONOMY AND JUSTIFICATION

How is the work of part-time instructors organized in such a way as to be “academic” in nature? The answer involves a type of boundary work that aims to establish an association between the academic field on one side, and part-time instruction positions and the individuals who occupy them on the other. Rather than being a theoretical dilemma, this is an empirical question of action and organization that does not assume a priori how “secure” (Boltanski 2011:78–82) these refractions and alignments are creating a stable and durable linkage that incorporates something into a field. Importantly, this dissertation does not identify the college as the heart of the academic field. Rather, it is analogous to Bourdieu's salon, a boundary site that is hybrid, living in both the academic and economic worlds (to say nothing of civil and political dimensions).

This dissertation engages the processes of relative autonomy, the refracting or assembling individuals as they participate in the academic field. While Bourdieu identifies the importance of relative autonomy in his discussion of fields, he fails to study the refraction into the field as a process or act. This dissertation relies on the sociology of worth (as developed by Boltanski, Thévenot, Stark, and others) to correct this, focusing on the act of qualification as a way to study how actors and objects become associated with a field, moving in accordance with its logic. This approach is not naïve, as it allows for manipulation and dysfunction, and it is similar to Alexander's “strong program” of
The third theoretical ingredient added here is a discussion of institutions. Though institutional theory owes much to Bourdieu, it has not developed a version of relative autonomy within its framework. The closest concept is field maturity, but there are significant differences between the two concepts. Additionally, this dissertation will consider academic disciplines as institutions that sustain the academic field.

FIELDS

Fields are a well-known theoretical concept developed by Pierre Bourdieu. “A field consists of a set of objective, historical relations between positions anchored in certain forms of power (or capital)” (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992:16). Thinking in terms of fields allows the researcher to assume various social spaces within society “cannot be collapsed under an overall societal logic, be it that of capitalism, modernity, or postmodernity,” but rather each field “prescribes its particular values and possesses its own regulative principles” (P. 16-17). Applying this to the empirical case at hand, the academic field will contain its own regulative principles, and these principles will necessarily be different than those found within the market.

Fields are not, however, realms of static consensus. For Bourdieu, a field is a “space of conflict and competition” (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992:17) that he likens to a game where actors constantly struggle both to ‘win' the game and change the rules of the game itself. As such, his interest lies with the struggles and fault-lines beneath the field's rules, stances, and institutions. Struggles may be more or less visible, but conflict is
never truly eliminated.

Relative Autonomy and the Field of Power

If the concept of fields allows research to argue for distinct social worlds, relative autonomy allows it to discuss the interaction between them. The relative autonomy of a field is the degree “of refraction which [the field's] specific logic imposes on external influences or commissions” (Bourdieu 1996:220).

Autonomy occurs to the degree restricted production is privileged within the field over mass production. An autonomous field will have its own traditions and history, and these will be acknowledge and respected by field actors. The more external hierarchization is dominant, the more power from outside the field is used to gain dominance within the field, and the more directly responsive the field will be to demands placed on it by the larger society, whether those demands take an economic or political form (Bourdieu 1996:220).

The primary inter-field relation Bourdieu investigates is the relationship of a given field to the field of power, “a kind of 'meta-field' with a number of emergent and specific properties” (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992:18). Citing an unpublished lecture by Bourdieu, Bourdieu & Wacquant (1992) offer a definition for the field of power:

It [the field of power] is a space of play and competition in which the social agents and institutions which all possess the determinate quality of specific capital (economic and cultural capital in particular) sufficient to occupy the dominant positions within their respective fields (the economic field, the field of higher civil service or the state, the university field, and the intellectual field) confront one another in strategies aimed at preserving or transforming this balance of forces. (P. 76)
Rather than being a field of actors and practices in and of itself, it is an ordering of the fields within society in terms of power and authority, and therefore different from other different from and more abstracted than other fields (the field of art, journalism, higher education, etc.).

Through discussions of homologous relationships between positions within a given field, Bourdieu offers a description of autonomy in terms of indeterminacy. To the degree a field is heteronomous, one's position within the field of power dictates one's position within that field. If one generally holds a privileged position, they will do so in a heteronomous field. Inversely, to the degree a field is autonomous, the field organizes space and actors according to its own, local principles. In these cases, the field of power becomes a less powerful predictor of field structure.

Field Autonomy vs. Maturity

The most similar concept within institutional theory to relative field autonomy is field emergence / maturity (Greenwood, Suddaby, and Hinings 2002; Greenwood and Suddaby 2006; Thomas B. Lawrence 2004; Maguire, Hardy, and Thomas B. Lawrence 2004). An emergent field is one that has few institutionalized practices, fluid boundaries, and “tend to involve a disparate, and relatively unorganized, set of actors” (Maguire et al. 2004:668). As such, it is similar to the network space between fields. Eyal (2005) describes. This is opposed to a mature field, which “has stable, routinized interactions between participants and heightened mutual awareness of which agencies occupy a given field and which do not” (Greenwood and Suddaby 2006:668). These terms give
institutionalists a way to discuss the stability and isomorphism present within a field. Additionally, it highlights the historicity of fields, showing that fields emerge, (potentially) stabilize around an institutionalized core, and eventually dissipate.

Maturity, however, does not ensure autonomy. A field can have highly routinized practices, but still be forced to change due to the demands of consumers. A field’s maturity generally deals with a level of isomorphism and institutionalization that has developed within a field, while a field’s relative autonomy deals with its coupling and reactivity to the field of power. For example, regulation by the government will influence the field differently than if it was regulated by an internal entity such as a professional association. It is even conceivable that maturity and stability could facilitate low autonomy, as a predictable field may be easier to control than a chaotic one.

One should not conflate self-determination with routinization. The formalization of part-time instruction in no way guarantees its form has become more autonomous from heteronomous forces from outside the academic field, or that its economic or academic status will improve. Consequently, this dissertation cannot effectively engage these questions from a pure institutional theoretical standpoint, and the value of Bourdieu's theoretical work is demonstrated.

Criticism of Bourdieu's Study of Relative Autonomy

While there is clear value in using relative autonomy to discuss how various fields may overlap, Bourdieu's conception has some problematic elements, specifically, his reliance on homologies. Put simply, if relative autonomy is defined in terms of refection
as actors and objects enter a field, then homologies cannot speak to relative autonomy as
they are not process-oriented. Laurent Thèvenot (2001a) suggests Bourdieu's theory fails
to effectively deal with the coordination of action due to his inability to look at how
individuals quickly shift between different modes of conduct. The consequence of this is
an isolation of fields from one another. As Gil Eyal (2005) notes Bourdieu's relational
analysis ends at the field's boundary. Verter (2003) goes so far to suggest Bourdieu treats
fields as “parallel universes, or perhaps of an archipelago-independent islands scattered in
a common sea,” and that this “obscures the degree to which fields overlap, not just in
terms of their members, but also in terms of their content” (P. 163-164).

Related to coordination, autonomy must, at least on some levels, be accountable
by actors. Habitus, the driving factor for actors in Bourdieu's theory, is an instinctive feel
for the game, not their conscious understanding they can explain to others. This leads
Bourdieu into the unusual position of arguing action is based primarily on unconscious
strategy (Alexander 1995:152-157). In the same line, Nick Crossley (2001) worries that
Bourdieu's theory, including his notion of field-defined interest, does not engage the
possibility of reflection by actors.

This dissertation argues that a meaningful study of a field's relative autonomy can
be done with a focus on inter-field relationships and processes, and actors' reflections on
them. Doing so allows for the researcher to discuss relative autonomy as an achievement
of field actors in a way that cannot be done through an analysis of homologies.
While this dissertation has concerns regarding how Bourdieu studies relative autonomy, it is not by any means a total rejection of him. Indeed, Bourdieu offers hints on how to study the overlap of fields with attention toward process. In his analysis of the French literary field, Parisian salons were sites where one could find “genuine articulations between the fields” (Bourdieu 1996:51). Consequently, salons helped “structure the literary field (as journals and publishers will do in other states of the field) around great fundamental oppositions” (P. 53), defining the basis of field struggles. This made salons key sites for the literary field:

[The] number and quality of habitués – politicians, artists, writers, journalists and so on – are a good measure of the power of attraction of each of these meeting places for members of different sections and, by the same token, of the power which may be exercised through it, and thanks to homologies, over the field of cultural production and over all instances of consecration such as the academies.” (P. 250)

Bourdieu's desire to offer a coherent image of the (isolated) literary field prevented him from investigating the salons in their own right. Bourdieu's depiction of the salon was a place of exchange and interaction, but not ambiguity. Eyal recently (2005) criticized Bourdieu's field theory for assuming boundaries have no width; everything for Bourdieu is either in the field or not. Instead, Eyal suggests boundaries should be seen as sites that are both in- and outside a field, where the connections and blockades between fields emerge and maintain.
Summary

In line with Eyal, this dissertation argues the study of relative autonomy requires the study of salon-like boundary sites, locations where elements of one field (its actors, objects, logics, etc.) come into contact with foreign people and things not associated with the field. Such an approach must be sensitive to two matters of concern. First, it must attempt to understand boundary work and the act of crossing those boundaries. Second, it must be relational both in the sense of noting what types of relationships are created, maintained, and destroyed on the other; and the consequences of those relationships (Latour 2005).

THE SOCIOLOGY OF WORTH QUALIFICATION AS FIELD BOUNDARY WORK

We find the necessary concepts for this reconstruction within a strand of sociology known by several names ranging from French pragmatism to the sociology of critique that is strongly associated with the work of Luc Boltanski and Laurent Thévenot (Boltanski and Thévenot 1999, 2000, 2006). This dissertation will rely on economic sociologist David Stark's (2009) term: the sociology of worth. Stark argues that economic sociology ought to study both “the institutions in which economic activity is embedded” as well as “the actual evaluative and calculative practices of actors at work” (Stark 2009:7).

The sociology of worth “focuses on ongoing processes of valuation – whether in assessing the value of firms under competing metrics of performance, or in studying the incommensurable assessments made in everyday life” (Stark 2009:7–8). Stark brings this
down to a simple question: “What counts?” He elaborates:

Each of us confronts this question on a daily basis. Faced with decisions involving incommensurable frameworks – work versus family life, career opportunities versus loyalty to friends or attachment to a locality, vacations versus investments for retirement, and so on – we ask ourselves what really counts. What is valuable, and by what measures? As our lives are a search to find out what is really valuable, we try, we fail, and we try again to learn from our mistakes. (P. 6)

The act of assigning worth is referred to as qualification within the sociology of worth (Boltanski and Laurent Thévenot 2006:130). The study of qualifications and the forms of worth they deploy is an incredible useful tool for the issue at hand. Indeed, we can see Laurent Thévenot claiming a similar research interest to the one being explored in this dissertation: “We [he and Boltanski] wanted to address an important issue which could not be dealt with by Bourdieu's framework: the capacity demanded by contemporary societies to shift from one pragmatic orientation to another, depending on arrangements specific to the situation” (Thévenot 2001b:79).

*Regimes of Justification*

For Boltanski and Thévenot, the act of qualification requires a regime of justification, a “model of legitimate order” (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006:66) involving both cultural, discursive structures on the one hand and forms of material practice on the other. A regime of justification is very much in line with John Mohr & Harrison White's (2008) definition of institutions as multi-dimensional linkage mechanisms that connect culture to structure. These justificatory regimes in turn produce distinct forms of worth as conventions that individuals can rely on and deploy when assigning a measure of worth, be it positive or negative. Different justificatory regimes are associated with
different forms of worth.

In Boltanski & Thévenot's key work on justification (2006), they claim France generally accepts six forms of justification: inspirational, domestic, civic, fame, market, and industrial. Since then, two more regimes have been suggested: one based on networks and flexibility (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005), and an environmentalist regime (Thévenot 2000). The proposed research is more interested in their analysis of argumentation and accounting than the eight worlds they describe in their findings. As we will see below, this dissertation wishes to look at the relatively local forms of justification associated with different institutional fields (and the tensions between them). However, for reference, Table 2 below outlines four of these regimes: civic worth, domestic worth, inspired worth, and market worth.

While Boltanski and Thévenot discuss thirteen distinct elements of a justificatory regime, the table lists eight, as those will be the ones this research focuses on primarily. The point remains, however, that by going beyond identifying a particular ideal and discussing its associated definitions of states, relationships, objects, and tests, one gains a thick description of how a moral economy may function that is deeply cultural without being idealist.

Higher Principle and States of Worth. At the center of a justificatory regime is a higher common principle, a convention that “ensures that beings are qualified, qualification being the condition for assessing objects as well as subjects and for determining the way in which they matter, objectively, and have value beyond any
A given justificatory regime's state of worth (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006:140) is the experience of being legitimate and worthy according to its particular definition of worth. Thus, as an example, market worth is based on the ideal of competition and the state of desirability, civic worth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Civic</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Inspiration</th>
<th>Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common Higher Principle</strong></td>
<td>The preeminence of collectivities</td>
<td>Endangerment according to tradition</td>
<td>Inexpressible &amp; ethereal</td>
<td>competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State of Worthiness</strong></td>
<td>Rule governed &amp; representative</td>
<td>Hierarchical superiority</td>
<td>Desire to create, anxiety &amp; passion over creation,</td>
<td>desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objects</strong></td>
<td>Legal forms</td>
<td>Rules of etiquette</td>
<td>Escape from habits</td>
<td>wealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Figures</strong></td>
<td>The democratic republic</td>
<td>The soul of the home</td>
<td>Adventure of the mind</td>
<td>markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relations of Worth</strong></td>
<td>Relation of delegation</td>
<td>Respect &amp; responsibility</td>
<td>The Alchemy of Unexpected Encounters</td>
<td>possess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment</strong></td>
<td>The renunciation of the particular</td>
<td>Consideration and duty</td>
<td>Universal value of uniqueness</td>
<td>opportunism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test</strong></td>
<td>Demonstration for a just cause</td>
<td>Family ceremonies</td>
<td>Stroke of genius</td>
<td>The deal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judgment</strong></td>
<td>The verdict of the vote</td>
<td>Knowing how to bestow trust</td>
<td>Certainty of intuition</td>
<td>price</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Four Regimes of Worth from (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006)

*Translation and Qualified Objects.* The act of qualification is the assigning of worth to an object or actor, substantiating worth and making it something more than an ephemeral ideal (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006:131). As such, different regimes of justification understand that which is to be evaluated in different ways. Where market worth evaluates wealth, domestic worth evaluates rules of etiquette. Consequently,
qualifications cannot occur until the thing to be evaluated has been translated into a regimes standards and categories, allowing for a particular regime to be applied. This process thereby establishes a degree of equivalence in the sense that all translated objects may be qualified according to the same justificatory regime (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006:143 - 144). Translation can therefore be seen as the initiation of the refracting process associated with relative autonomy: objects must be transformed in some way, to some degree, in order to be categorized in a way that allows for evaluation.

*Figures and Relations of Worth.* Objects and actors do not exist in a vacuum. Rather, they exist within social spaces and in relation to other objects and actors; and like actors, these spaces and relations are viewed differently depending on the justificatory regime one uses. Spaces are ideally “harmonious figures of the natural order,” “realities that conform to the principle.” (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006:143).

*Tests of Worth*

An important part of a regime is its test of worth, a distinct approach to assign worth to objects and actors (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006:130-138) The same actor or technique may be seen in radically different lights depending on the form of worth being tested. Just because something may be have been bought at a reasonable price (market worth) does not mean it a stroke of genius was involved in its creation (inspired worth), nor does it necessarily improve society as a whole. Different forms of evidence, investigation, and judgment will be involved in different regimes.
Boltanski and Chiapello discuss tests in terms of three characteristics (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005:314–319). First, a given test grants a certain amount and type of legitimacy, qualifying actors, and defining their worth in the eyes of others. This worth is more than raw coercive power due to the legitimation process, and it is always at least theoretically possible for worth to be questioned and re-tested. Further, the outcome of a test is “accompanied by a codification or, at least, an explicit formulation of valid proof” (Boltanski and Thévenot 2000:212). A test that is unrecorded and not remembered is not a test.

Second, tests vary in the degree of their results' clarity. Some tests only give vague hints of worth, some offer complicated results that must be interpreted by experts, and others offer blunt answers that anyone can understand. Third, the stability of participating actors and objects may vary. Depending on the test, a specific characteristic may be under examination, or the being as a whole. Additionally, some tests may question the worth of some participants without questioning the worth of others (i.e., the judged versus the judge), while other tests put all participants on trial (such as a theater performance).

Heterarchy, Compromise, and Critique

This dissertation studies boundary crossing, the process whereby things become part of the field. Specifically, how part-time work as a college instructor can come to be seen as an academic activity is a boundary process of incorporation. This process, however, will often need to confront the fact that part-time instruction is not purely seen
as an academic endeavor. It may be evaluated in economic terms (however individuals and organizations may define that criteria) or in other, personal terms. In this sense, then, boundary work is necessarily an engagement with heterarchy, an organizational form where “units are laterally accountable according to diverse principles of evaluation” (Stark 2009:19).

While embracing this uncertainty by accepting multiple forms of evaluation is often full of paradox and “friction,” Stark suggests this does not mean that heterarchy is necessarily a threat to a given organization (Stark 2009:4). Instead, innovation and entrepreneurship when one has “the ability to keep multiple evaluative principles in play and to exploit the resulting friction of their interplay” (Stark 2009:11).

Compromise. Field autonomy is often heterarchical. Refraction and reorganization according to a field's logic implies a possible, preexisting and foreign logic that must. In cases where one justificatory regime does not establish hegemonic dominance of a site, a compromise may be reached between the competing regimes of justification. “What is good for business is good for America” implies a compromise between a market and civic worths.

Compromises require a great deal of creativity on the part of actors (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006:278) until a form of compromise is institutionalized as a relatively stable boundary. The more actors, objects, organizations, techniques, etc. are viewed as shared by both regimes of justification, the more likely the compromise will hold. Additionally, the more ambiguous, liminal, and flexible these boundary objects are, the more stable the
compromise (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006:278-279; Star and Griesemer 1989). Good fences make good neighbors, and wide boundaries may limit the offenses one field may have on another. Thus, while Stark's (2009) work focuses on the value of heterarchy for innovation, heterarchical considerations may nevertheless be necessary for relatively stabilized sites of a field.

Critique. Regimes of justification inform both confirmation and critique. Criticism occurs three ways. First, and most obviously, a thing may be deemed unworthy by a test. One may be evaluated, and found lacking in some important way. An artist may be banal, a mother may be negligent, and a politician may be corrupt. Likewise, someone may be a bad academic, instructor, researcher, or administrator.

Second, one may question the validity or reliability of a test, claiming it may not measure what it claims. Privileging one gender over another corrupts tests that supposedly support meritocracy (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006:373-374). Criticism aimed at tests is corrective in nature, as the “purpose of criticism in this case is to improve the fairness of the test (we would say, to tighten it up); to ensure that the test is rooted in widely accepted conventions; and to enhance the regulatory or legal framework within which it is encased” (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005:174). The first form was a criticism of the individual based on a principled test. No test, however, is guaranteed to work exactly as desired with total reliability and validity for all time. The policy oriented research could be seen, to the degree it engages in justification and criticism, as generally being corrective.
Third, there is radical criticism. An actor may denounce an entire regime of justification. A denunciation is an accusation of false worth, and that this “false worth conceals deficiency” (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006:224). In this case, it is not a matter of making a more valid test, because the higher principle has been accused of illegitimacy and inappropriateness. This approach notes both the principle being attacked and the principle fueling the attack. Accusing someone of nepotism will have different consequences than accusing them of incompetence. Lanham (2002), for instance, exalts the flexibility of the virtual university as he denounces the traditional academic values, which he sees as ineffectual fronts for self-interest and complacency.

**Breaking Worth**

Qualification is a problematic and contingent action that is not assured success or accuracy. Indeed, as a performative act, it is possible the audience will not believe the actor's claims (Alexander 2004, 2006; Goffman 1959). However, beyond that general issue, the act of assigning worth has several distinct challenges.

**Evaluative vs. Ceremonial Tests.** There are more forms of worth than those that strive “to recognize whether this value is materialized in the very texture of reality and to attest it by evidence aspiring to general validity” (Boltanski 2011:106), or what he calls a reality test. The purpose of these tests is evaluative in nature: they set out to determine how much worth something has. Boltanski goes on to point out there is an inherent uncertainty or risk in using evaluative tests (Boltanski 2011:106). The entire point of
needing a genuine test of worth is that worth is not immediately obvious to the observer.

In many situations then, actors may resort to a truth test, though “ceremonial test” may be a more intuitive name for them. Halfway between ritual and genuinely evaluative tests, ceremonial tests involve significantly less risk than standard reality tests. Instead, they are “the work of confirmation”. He continues:

[Truth or ceremonial tests] make visible the relationship between the order of symbolic propositions and the order of the states of affairs whose image they are – and hence to confirm and stabilize it – and this, in particular, by conjugating several modes of representation, such as statements, performances (in the theatrical sense), icons and gestures, between which correspondences are established. (Boltanski 2011:104)

While there is nothing inherently wrong with ceremonial tests, they are purely artifacts of confirmation. If a test of worth is ceremonial, it avoids the possibility of critique, the possibility that a state of affairs may not harmoniously overlap with a symbolic order. As we will see in the three empirical chapters, a formal organization may on occasion rely on ceremonial tests to avoid evaluative tests, beyond their ritual-like potential.

*Displacements.* The translation process “involves a two-tier space” where specific, particular characteristics of something are deemed relevant to, and therefore capable of being evaluated by, ideals that are applicable in many situations (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005:320). Displacement is the deformation corruption of the necessary translation process whereby things come to be viewed according to a particular justificatory regime's gaze. There is no such thing as a perfect test of worth, as no test can truly have perfect validity, testing exactly what it claims the way it claims.

“Displacements make it possible to restore strength by deriving less identified forces
from the new circumstances in which those who bring them about are placed. The established tests of status are circumvented” (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005:499).

Displacements transform tests of worth into tests of strength, where various qualities or resources beyond the one nominally under evaluation. A test cannot be effective (and therefore autonomous) to the degree that displacements occur during it. “The accumulating displacements help to undo the established tests, which are not only circumvented but have also proved ineffective, since they are less and less capable of furnishing access to the good that they promised” (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005:499).

In synthesizing the work of Boltanski and Bourdieu, it becomes clear that heteronomy, when identified with microsociological processes, will be seen as displacements, the deformation or a field's institutional logic.

SYNTHESIS AND AN OUTLINE FOR RESEARCH

The sociology of worth as developed by various sociologists is a multi-dimensional, process-oriented approach to studying actors' attempt to assign relative degrees of worth, using a multiplicity of definitions of worth and how one may test for it. It goes further, looking at how actors attempt to manage multiple forms of worth simultaneously, how they may attempt to exalt one form of worth over another, or how qualifying actions and tests may be dysfunctional and anomic.

As such, the sociology of worth's study of qualification is extremely useful for reconceptualizing questions regarding field boundaries and relative autonomy to engage matters of process and contingency. Rather than defining autonomy in terms of purity, it
may now be understood as the maintenance of a particular and local justificatory regime, and activity that may include the navigation of heterarchical situations. It allows research to investigate how actors treat something as an object “academically.”

*Sociology of Worth, Applied*

Through looking at qualification, we may gain a glimpse into both the organization and unfolding of processes that articulate the boundary of the field. In doing so, we may document the organization of processes that translate and incorporate various actors and objects into a given field. This can include the actors included in the general program of action, the forms of worth used, and the organization and application of various tests of worth to establish worth according to the field's standards.

This project has several advantages beyond adding conceptual machinery to facilitate the study of action and contingency. First, it is an approach that does not explain away culture, even if it does not use the specific theoretical approaches associated with the strong program of cultural sociology (Alexander and Smith 2001). Meaning in the form of worth is taken seriously, as is its consequences on social life. At the same time, the idea of justificatory regimes avoid the accusation of idealism by institutionalizing links between discursive and material elements, creating something that John Mohr would describe as having the duality of an institution and what Bruno Latour would describe as ontologically heterogeneous.

Second, while not centering analysis on power, it is not blind to the role power relations and inequality. For Boltanski, academic critique focuses the “path leading
towards a change in the relationship between the collective and institutions” (Boltanski 2011:157). The aims of the current research is only the first few steps on this path toward the opportunities for marginalization and exploitation to appear as part-time instruction is assembled as an academic endeavor within colleges and universities. Its primary interest is in identifying and describing distinctly “academic” forms of worth, if such things can be found, and looking at their consequences for the actors and organizations that deploy them.

Third, in terms of relative autonomy and field boundaries, the negotiation process matters. Indeed, part-time instruction is very much a hybrid, simultaneously an artifact of the economy and work on one side, and the academic world on the other. This hybridity suggests heterarchy, and it becomes an empirical question how organizations may manage the potential found in heterarchy.

It is certainly true that any occupational position within the academic field (tenured faculty member, etc.) would also be an academic-economic hybrid in some way. However, one could argue that normative claims (and by extension, an understanding of forms of worth, their use, and their consequences) may be closer to the surface for part-time instruction, given its the fluid and controversial character within American higher education.

Organizations and Institutions

This dissertation begins with a focus on three things within the academic field beyond worth and adjunct work: colleges and disciplines, and adjuncts. This dissertation
general treats colleges as formal, bureaucratic organizations. As such, they are “a cooperative system that serves to integrate the contributions of individual participants” using “an official structure [and] formal rules and sanctions” (Alexander, Thompson, and Edles 2011). Though formal organizations can often be treated as actors in their own right, this dissertation will generally treat them as the “terrain” for actors. Importantly, this dissertation also expects forms of worth to at least be partially institutionalized within organizations. Put another way, an organization may be organized around domestic or industrial worth, with resources for justifications and tests embedded within its structure.

Academic Discipline is also an important concern for this study, as it does not wish to assume that all adjuncts, from those who teach biology to those who teach accounting, have exactly the same experiences. Discipline must be accounted for. The most obvious way this can be done is by identifying departments, official organizational sub-units, within the larger college or university. However, the discipline itself can be considered an institution, a “linkage mechanism... that bridge[s] across three kinds of social divides—they link micro systems of social interaction to meso (and macro) levels of organization, they connect the symbolic with the material, and the agentic with the structural” (Mohr and White 2008:485). The study of worth and critique benefits from a discussion of institutions:

To institutions fall the task of saying and confirming what matters... In particular, institutions must sort out what is to be respected from what cannot be; what can only be considered once, in association with a context and as if it were accidental, and this by comparison with what it is appropriate to look at twice.” (Boltanski 2011:75).
This dissertation will look at two academic disciplines, English and math. The explanations for this can be found in the next chapter.

Conclusion

We are thus left with an empirical project with a theoretical engagement. Using the sociology of worth, one can trace the actions and associations that connect part-time instruction to the academic field. Doing so will allow the researcher to document the translation or refraction that occurs at the field boundary, or to put it another way, what allows part-time instruction to be seen as an academic position. The sociology of worth allows this to occur without resorting to materialistic reductionism, idealism, or a naïve blindness to power.
CHAPTER 3:

METHODS FOR COMPARATIVE CASE STUDIES OF WORTH

Through looking at qualification, we may gain insight into the processes that articulate the boundary of the field. In doing so, one may document the translation or incorporation of actors and objects into a field. Doing so will necessarily involve identifying forms of worth as well as the organization and application of tests to establish worth according to the field's standards. This creates a series of empirical questions regarding a field's autonomy and the heterarchical situation actors who must negotiate field boundaries find themselves. This chapter will outline the methods and research design of this dissertation.

THE INTERVIEWEES: ACADEMIC ACTORS

As this dissertation will be focusing on process and cultural claims, it shall rely on qualitative methods. Specifically, qualitative semi-structured interviews. Several different groups shall be interviewed.

Full-Time Faculty and the Justification of the College

The first group that must be interviewed is the full-time faculty. The chair of a department (the proposed research intends to interview the chair whenever possible) is directly involved in the hiring of part-time faculty in all cases. His or her views on the
relative worth of part-time instruction and faculty is, therefore, centrally important for this study.

Beyond their direct interaction with part-time instructors, full-time faculty members are an essential voice for this study. In most narratives regarding the rise of part-time instruction, they are the victims, their profession under siege by late capitalist flexibility. In some accounts (Shumar 1997), the senior, tenured faculty are essentially 'subsidized' by the existence of part-time faculty. It is therefore highly important to understand their justifications and criticisms of part-time instruction, especially since all six departments studied here rely heavily on part-time instructors. Do they believe this to be a legitimate arrangement? If not, what is their understanding of part-time instruction and its effects? Who does it benefit and hurt in the eyes of faculty? As we will see in future chapters, full-time faculty members generally have a stronger association with the university than part-time faculty. Consequently, when faculty justify the actions of their college and their department, they are not engaging in an impersonal and detached thought experiment. Rather, they are concerned about “their” college, which we will see is not only an employer, but also (at least rhetorically) a community which they feel some responsibility for.

Questions of quality, exploitation, and distinction are extremely important to full-time faculty accounts of part-time instruction. Colleges and universities need to reliably demonstrate the quality of instruction by part-time instructors is sufficient for the courses they teach. If an insufficient degree of worth is found, the college becomes vulnerable to criticism from various stakeholders (faculty, students, parents of students, etc.) for
engaging in a practice that undermines the quality of education at the institution.

Second, colleges must justify the relatively marginal position of part-time instructors, presenting their compensation as just and legitimate. They will open themselves up to criticism if it is seen as taking advantage of part-time instructors, paying them a paltry sum that is disproportionately small. Finally, the faculty must face a slippery slope if no significant difference is seen between the work done by full-time tenure-track faculty and the much cheaper have a problem if part-time instructors become so highly values that one cannot see a difference in the quality between a part-time and a Full-time tenure-track faculty member.

From the perspective of full-time faculty, positive worth can only be assigned to a college's use of part-time instructors (a successful justification) if all three matters of concern are effectively managed. If the first falls short, then colleges are actively promoting poor academic work. If the second fails, then the college is vulnerable to critique regardless of the quality of education offered. And if the third fails, the occupational threat to full-time faculty is an immediate thing. At the same time, there is no single way these matters must be managed. As formal organizations, we will see these colleges will have different responses to these matters institutionalized within their processes and structures.

Diversity of Part-Time Instructors

In line with higher education research, (Leslie and Gappa 2002; Gappa and Leslie 1993), this dissertation anticipated (and found) a large amount of diversity among part-
time faculty occupational trajectories at two of the three colleges. The fact that one, Orange University, actively avoided this diversity will be a subject in a later chapter.

Leslie & Gappa categorize part-time faculty in terms of four groups (Gappa and Leslie 1993:51 – 64). First, there are academics approaching retirement, seeking a mid-point between full-time and total retirement. Second, specialists and non-academic professionals often teach as a form of professional citizenship, where they see teaching as a way to ‘give back’ to society. Third, there are aspiring academics, including doctoral students “simultaneously employed as part-timers” (Gappa and Leslie 1993:55), academics who work part-time while looking for a full-time position, and people who take part-time position nearby where their spouse gains a full-time position. Gappa & Leslie argue these groups are functionally equivalent for part-time instruction because all wish to have a full-time career in the academic field. And lastly, there is a loose category of freelancers, who seek part-time instruction as an extra source of income.

Another way to make sense of the diversity of part-time instructors is to look at their occupational trajectories of part-time instructors. “The social trajectory is defined as the series of positions successively occupied by the same agent or the same group of agents in successive spaces” (Bourdieu 1996:258), intending this to be a replacement for overly individualistic biographies that attempt “to understand a career or a life as a unique and self-sufficient series of successive events without any other link than association with a subject,” something Bourdieu considered sociologically “absurd” (Bourdieu 1996:258).

The challenge for part-time faculty is not to defend or justify the actions of the
college. Indeed, one of the points mentioned above is that the departments always, through various methods, enforce a marginal status which denies part-time faculty “belong” as much as their full-time counter-parts. Rather, the challenge of part-time instructors is to find something worthwhile in their work. There is no guarantee they will use the same forms of worth as the full-time faculty. Furthermore, it is an open empirical question how the qualifications of part-time faculty regarding their work are coordinated with those made by full-time faculty, if at all.

*The Corroboration of Administration*

As administrators do not actively hire or evaluate part-time instructors in any of the three colleges within this study, they were not focused on as strongly as part-time or full-time faculty. Nevertheless, they are important to the operation of colleges, and efforts were made to interview administrators who were most directly linked with the decision making by department chairs. The benefit here was to get another voice with the potential to corroborate or problematize accounts of what goes on at the college according to faculty interviewees.

**THE CASES: THREE COLLEGES**

One should not assume part-time instruction, and undergraduate education more generally, will be organized the same way at all colleges and universities. For this reason, interviewees come from three colleges, each representing a different organizational form, or institutional type in the terminology of the Carnegie Foundation.
for the Advancement of Teaching. Research has chosen a public research university, a private teaching college, and a public community college. The comparison of these three cases allows not only for the identification and comparison of different cultural ideals, but also differences in the organization of structures around these principles.

**Orange University**

Orange University is a public research university in the Northeastern United States with over 17,000 undergraduate students and roughly 5,000 graduate students. Though founded over 150 years ago, it was only designated as a research university by the state in the early 1960s. The Carnegie Foundation has classified it as “Research University (Very high research activity)” (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching 2010), and its undergraduate program is considered more selective (top 20th percentile for incoming students' test scores). Over 80% of undergraduates are full-time, and over 80% of its undergraduate majors are in liberal arts disciplines (classifications: A&S-F/SGC, FT4/MS/LTI). Both the Department of English and the Department of Mathematics & Statistics are in the College of Arts & Sciences, the largest of the nine schools at O.U.

**Caussade College**

Founded in the early 20th Century, Caussade College is a private Catholic college in the Northeastern United States with roughly 3,000 undergraduate and 2,000 graduate students.
students. The Carnegie Foundation has classified it as “Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)” (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching 2010), and its undergraduate program is considered selective (60th to 20th percentile for incoming students' test scores). While it offers a liberal arts education, the majority of its undergraduates receive professional degrees. It has several programs that offer masters degrees. Its students are primarily residential, with a high amount of transfers into the college (classifications: Prof+A&S/SGC, Postbac-Comp, MU, MFT4/S/HTI, Master's/L).

Mahican College

According to the Carnegie Foundation (Carnegie Foundation for 2010), Mahican Community College is designated as “ASSOC/Pub-U-SC,” an associate's degree-granting public institution with a single campus that serves an urban area. According to its website (Mahican Community College 2010), MCC is an open enrollment institution with over 10,000 full-time equivalent students. In terms of pay, the minimum salary for full-time faculty is $48,981 a year, and adjuncts have a college-wide standard pay rate of $926 per credit hour until they reach 9 credit hours, and then it is $985 per credit hour. As introductory courses in both English and math at MCC are 3 credits each, and adjuncts are rarely hired for more than nine credit hours a semester, adjuncts in both departments can be expected to receive $2,928 per course per semester with no benefits for their work.
Academic Disciplines

Part- and full-time faculty direct themselves toward specific disciplines, or at least this dissertation is sensitive to the possibility it is the case. It is therefore necessary to consider disciplines as something distinct from colleges and universities that are composed of college departments, academic journals, grant offering foundations, and professional associations. Though Andrew Abbott (Abbott 2001, 2002) argues the disciplines form the stabilizing infrastructure of American higher education, they are treated as a secondary concern by many higher education scholars to both problems of part-time instruction, and the socialization of graduate students (Austin 2002; Golde and Dore 2001). When it is dealt with, it is usually discussed in terms of a demographic description (Benjamin 1998), or discussed in terms of their department structures within the university (Golde 2005). Neither looks at disciplines as structures in their own right.

This dissertation chooses to focus on two disciplines: English and Math. The reasons for this are threefold. First, they are common disciplines that can be found in all three colleges as their own department. Second, both English and mathematics are traditional liberal arts disciplines (Benjamin 1998). Third, both disciplines rely heavily on part-time faculty, with 53.1% of English faculty (Modern Language Association 2008:4) and 44.1% of mathematics faculty (American Mathematical Society 2005:51) nationwide, respectively. Together, the second and third points create a tension that puts normative questions regarding part-time instruction in stark relief.

The identification of differences between the disciplines is a two-step process. The first it to identify departmental differences within each college. After this work is
done, the comparative work can begin. By looking at English and mathematics across all three cases, one may begin to identify the differences associated with these disciplines / institutions.

RESEARCH DESIGN

*Sampling and Recruitment*

This dissertation attempted to rely on theoretical sampling to gain the needed interviews in terms of the three colleges (Orange, Caussade, and Mahican), occupational position (Full-time faculty, part-time faculty, administrators, etc.), and discipline (English and mathematics). Contact information for potential interviewees was acquired through college websites, where contact information was often readily available through department websites and course schedules. All interviews were done with a promise of confidentiality, and pseudonyms were given to all interviewees, as well as the colleges. A total of sixty two people were interviewed for this dissertation. A brief discussion of who they were will be categorized by college.

Twenty four individuals associated with Caussade College were interviewed for this project. The breakdown of who these people were can be found in Table 3: Master's College Respondents.

While this project strived for balance, it was more successful at interviewing people associated with the English Department of Caussade than its Mathematics Department. It is worth noting that there were, at the time of data collection, six full-
time tenured and tenure-track faculty were employed within the Mathematics Department of Caussade College, compared with sixteen faculty members within the English Department. The substantially smaller number of interviewees affiliated with the Mathematics Department must be understood in this context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Tenured / Tenure-Track Faculty</th>
<th>Visiting or Full-Time Non-Tenure Faculty</th>
<th>Part-Time Instructors</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Dept. Affiliation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Master's College Respondents

The case study of Mahican Community College is based on fourteen interviews. Regrettably, while English professors and adjuncts were generally able to be recruited, the English Department chair did not agree to be interviewed despite repeated requests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Interviewees from Mahican Community College

Twenty four individuals associated with Orange University were interviewed for this project. The breakdown of who these people were can be found in Table 5: Research University Respondents. Once again, the project strived for balance between interviewing graduate students and faculty, as well as between English and math academics (though it was less successful on this front). However, due to the fact that both departments heavily rely on graduate students as part-time faculty, there were
simply few non-graduate student part-time instructors to be interviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tenured / Tenure Track Faculty</th>
<th>Graduate Students</th>
<th>Non-graduate student part-time instructors</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Research University Respondents

ANALYSIS

Transcripts were made as text files and loaded into the qualitative analysis software program NVIVO. NVIVO's ability to search text and quickly rearranged coding schemes was invaluable for this research. When it became apparent the most significant divisions regarded the college under discussion, the researcher divided the transcripts into three separate NVIVO files, one for each college. As the transcripts were coded, several different tasks were dealt with, constantly overlapping with one another.

The first task for all three colleges was to identify normative statements that could be used to trace the form or forms of worth present in the transcripts and their respective justificatory regimes. These normative statements were then coded and organized in terms of the type of worth they related to (i.e., scholastic vs. market), as well as the element of a justificatory regime they most resembled (higher principle, relation of worth, etc.). This procedure required several iterations of coding schemes, each accounting for more textual evidence than the one before, until a relatively coherent picture of the normative landscape within a college began to emerge. Questions about what individuals
especially liked and disliked were often an effective way at getting towards this information.

Second, a picture of the organizational structure emerged. The procedures for hiring, course selection, and evaluation were documented. The number of full-time vs. part-time faculty, the salaries of part-time faculty, and a number of other matters that are not necessarily related in an immediate way to forms of worth but were nevertheless about how work occurred at that particular college, in either the Math or English Department, were recorded. A central point to the pragmatic tone to Boltanski's theory is that one may begin with forms of action as they occur, and “build back” into cultural structures and forms. In doing so, one may be deeply engaged with questions of culture, without becoming vulnerable to the criticism of idealism or ignoring the organizational context within which individuals act.

Third, a key area of interest, one that could be seen as an intersection of the above two tasks, is documenting the tests of worth present within an organization. It is important how colleges and universities evaluate part-time instructors. This is true in terms of their organizational form, the cultural forms behind them, and the ways they may not be fully functional. As Boltanski (2011) points out, a central activity for sociology is identifying ways institutions are imperfectly embodied and put in practice.

This last point that allows us to potentially build up from forms of worth to the relative autonomy of fields. As displacements increase in frequency and magnitude in relation to tests of worth that attempt to apply the field's form(s) of worth, one may find heteronomy. Or more specifically, one finds the processes of heteronomy and the flawed
processes of autonomy.

CENTRAL RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In summary, this study endeavors to answer the following questions:

1. Questions of Worth
   a) What forms of worth are deployed by interviewees? If an academic form of worth can be identified, attention will be focused on defining the following elements of the justificatory regime:
      • The higher principle
      • The state and relations of worth
      • The criteria for tests of worth
      • The definition of a testable object
   b) The deployments will be contextualized in terms of the following:
      • Organizational form of college (i.e., public research university, private teaching college, or public community college)
      • Department (English or Mathematics)
      • Occupational position (full- and part-time faculty, tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty, administration)

2. Questions of Quality.
   a) What are the matters of concern regarding the instructional quality of part-time faculty from the perspective of full-time faculty and administration at a given college?
   b) What organizational processes are used to evaluate the worth of adjuncts according to the forms of worth identified in question 1?
   c) How is the need to qualify the teaching of part-time instructors avoided or mitigated in the six departments being studied?
   d) What displacements of worth are possible and/or present within these tests as currently organized?
   a) What would interviewees consider exploitation of part-time instructors?
   b) Do interviewees believe part-time faculty members within a college or department are exploited?
   c) If interviewees deny the presence of exploitation, how is it avoided?
      What within the organization of part-time instruction serves as protection against it?

   a) Within the specific colleges and departments, what distinguishes full- and part-time faculty?

5. Qualifications by Adjuncts.
   a) How do part-time faculty members view their current role within the college as fitting into their larger occupational trajectory?
   b) What worth (if any) do part-time faculty members find in their work?

CONCLUSION

Through a set of case studies that allow for comparisons of three different colleges, two different disciplines, multiple occupational positions, this dissertation has the ability to identify specific, academic forms of worth. It can document how part-time faculty may use these forms of worth to qualify their work. Additionally, it can document how full-time faculty and the colleges they belong to use these forms of worth as they hope to ensure the quality of teaching done by part-time faculty, deny the presence of exploitation, and maintain the distinction between full- and part-time faculty.
CHAPTER 4:
DEFENDING THE ACADEMY AT CAUSSADE COLLEGE

In this chapter, we will investigate Caussade College, a small teaching college, and the relationship between its organization of part-time instruction and its justification/criticism. This is the first of the three cases because in many ways its findings most closely match the common image of adjunct work, in that adjuncts are clearly marginalized and kept separate from as much of the college as possible. Furthermore, the full-time faculty and administrators are willing to admit that the presence of adjunct faculty is not ideal, and its organization is explicitly done to minimize illegitimate and exploitative situations.

A form of worth, scholastic worth, will be described and identified as the primary form of worth used by the administration and full-time faculty. The faculty and administration are unified in an understanding that academic worth is grounded in the serious play of ideas, the inherent worth of knowledge, and one's contribution to an ongoing discussion. This understanding influences the way teaching is organized, and the management of adjuncts as liminal academics. The part-time faculty, on the other hand, are highly diverse, both in terms of the forms of worth they deploy and their occupational trajectories. Part-time faculty are evaluated using a combination student and chair evaluations, in a way that is more about assuaging fears than identifying problems.

A central finding in this chapter is that Caussade College's strategy to deny
exploitation can paradoxically be summarized as marginalizing adjuncts in order to not exploit them. By pushing them to the edge of the organization, Caussade College hopes to limit how much it can take advantage of any given adjunct. It is willing to accept the fact that this may decrease the potential quality of work for some adjuncts as its primary concern is whether or not it can be specifically criticized for exploiting them. Avoiding that is paramount. By actively discouraging one's ability to think of adjunct work as a primary occupation, Caussade hopes to prevent certain types of critique based on market worth.

ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE

Founded in the early 20th Century, Caussade College is a private Catholic college in the Northeastern United States with roughly 3,000 undergraduate and 2,000 graduate students, though it was substantially smaller until recently (this will be discussed in more detail below). The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has classified it as “Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)” (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching 2010), and its undergraduate program is considered selective (60th to 20th percentile for incoming students' test scores). While it offers a liberal arts education, the majority of its undergraduates receive professional degrees. It has several programs that offer masters degrees. Its students are primarily residential, with a high amount of transfers into the college (classifications: Prof+A&S/SGC, Postbac-Comp, MU, MFT4/S/HTI, Master's/L).

There are several differences between the departments of mathematics and
English at Caussade College. First, while the English Department offers both Bachelors and Masters of Arts degrees, the Mathematics Department only offers Bachelor’s degrees. Second, the English department, with its 16 Full-time faculty and 86 course sections, is substantially larger than the Mathematics Department which has 8 full-time faculty and its 43 course section (these numbers are current for the fall of 2010). Third, within the English Department has a faculty member who is also the Coordinator of Composition, organizing the general composition courses that non-majors are required to take. The Mathematics Department has no similar position for their introductory math courses. Fourth, the English Department, through the composition course meetings, indirectly has a form of professional development for part-time instructors since many of the composition courses are taught by part-time instructors.

Twenty four individuals associated with Caussade College were interviewed for this project. The breakdown of who these people were can be found in Table 6: Master's College Respondents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tenured / Tenure-Track Faculty</th>
<th>Visiting or Full-Time Non-Tenure Faculty</th>
<th>Part-Time Instructors</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Dept. Affiliation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Master's College Respondents

This project strove for balance, but it was more successful at interviewing people associated with the English Department of Caussade College than its Mathematics Department. At the time of data collection, six full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty
were employed within the Mathematics Department of Caussade College. The substantially smaller number of interviewees affiliated with the Mathematics Department must be understood in this context.

THE SCHOLASTIC REGIME AT CAUSSADE

This dissertation refers to the dominant justificatory regime invoked by interviewees from Caussade in both departments as “scholastic worth.” Full-time faculty and administrators rely on scholastic worth exclusively, while it is deployed by over half the adjunct instructors. Through the interviews, a coherent justificatory regime emerges that is defined by a particular state of worth (the serious play of ideas), relation of worth (intellectual engagement), and object to be evaluated (one's contribution to the ongoing discussion).

*Bourdieu and the Scholastic Point of View*

This dissertation's discussion of a scholastic form of worth is closely linked to Pierre Bourdieu's discussion of the scholastic point of view (Bourdieu 1990). Quite different from instrumental rationality, scholastic reason is “freed from the urgencies of the world, that allows a free and liberated relation to those urgencies of the world” (Bourdieu 2000:1). He goes on to describe this freedom paradoxically as serious play:

“The scholastic situation... is a site and a moment of social weightlessness where, defying the common opposition between playing (paizen) and being serious (spoudazein), one can 'play seriously' (spoudaiōs paizein), in the phrase Plato uses to characterize philosophical activity, take the stakes in games seriously, deal seriously with questions that 'serious' people, occupied and preoccupied by the practical business of everyday life,
Serious play is the defining emotional investment of the academic field, what Bourdieu calls the field's illusio, a field-specific expressive drive (Bourdieu 1996:272) and desire (Bourdieu 1998:78 – 79). As such, it influences the interests and practices of field members. Through the scholastic point of view, academics become interested in dealing with universal concepts, something he does not believe will happen if they are forced to be “practical” at all turns (Bourdieu 2000: 70 – 73).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen Valentin</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Dean of Mathematics &amp; Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Wells</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Dean of Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Beaudoin</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Visiting Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Curl</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Bello</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes Largent</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deanna Tolson</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff O'Malley</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelia London</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Aranda</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Bash</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Professor, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Stephen</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Buscemi</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Professor, Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Full-time Faculty Interviewed at Caussade College

The Difference between Illusio and Justification. Bourdieu writes about the scholastic point of view to warn social scientists that while they are influenced by it, it is a fallacy to assume non-academics function according to it as well. Scholasticism “cannot conceive of spontaneity and creativity without the intervention of a creative intention, or finality without a conscious aiming at ends, regularity without observance of
rules, signification in the absence of signifying intention” (Bourdieu 2000:136). As subjects use practical logics which are often less elaborated and explicit than theoretical ones, the scholastic fallacy exaggerates how intentional and deliberative subjects are.

Justificatory regimes are not, however, field-defined expressions of emotion and desire that influence actions. Rather, they are institutionalized ways to evaluate actions according to normative standards. They are part of how one could possibly make sense of an action, not necessarily what caused the action in the first place. If illusio informs practice, justificatory regimes inform reflection.

*The Serious Play of Ideas*

The worthy state of being (Boltanski & Thévenot 2006: 141) or the stance associated with scholastic worth is the serious play of ideas. Knowledge has inherent value, and scholastic worth is based on social interaction done in the name of that higher principle. The scholastic state of worth can be seen in associate English professor Sheila London’s discussion of course construction:

> I just teach the texts that I love and try to hope that the theme will come out the text. When I’ve tried doing theme classes I’ve been very excited putting the syllabus together and then find that, you know, maybe the students don’t like it, or by the end of the semester they feel like they’re having their vegetables crammed down their throat.

Serious play is no trivial matter. Through it, interviewees believe a deeper understanding of their world is possible. Erica Volz, an English part-time instructor, replied to the question of what she liked about teaching by saying, “I like the ah-ha moment for a
That’s got to be with the student who actually is trying and actually cares obviously, but that moment where you can put something to someone in a way that they really understand and then it’s like a light bulb goes off in their head and they get it. I think that’s probably the most rewarding thing for me... Obviously I like teaching things that I like doing. So writing, I liked a lot better than literature courses ‘cause I like to write. So I feel like maybe not necessarily that I know more about it, but that I’m better at it. So maybe I can impart some of what I love about that into it and then they’ll be more into it.

The 'ah-ha' moment highlights the fundamentally social nature of scholastic worth.

Melissa Vassel, a math part-time instructor, also commented on this, saying, “I really enjoy seeing that – the creativity... The light bulb does go off and they say, 'Yeah, I can do that. Let me try that.' I mean, that’s a good part of it.” This sentiment was also echoed by Jacqueline Hamill, a computer science professor at Caussade who often teaches additional math courses as a part-time instructor:

What I like is when you introduce a concept and you actually see that they grasp it, and it’s like – it’s a game for me. It’s like, “Can I get this through to them?” so I try to make it as simple as I can. And when you see the, like, “Wow, you know, this is easy,” that’s a really – I love that feeling. To me it’s like, you know, when a student at the end of the semester things, “Wow, what we did is really easy,” that’s good. I did a good job. So it’s competition for me. It’s like, “Can I get this across?”

Both full-time and part-time faculty members in both departments discuss their satisfaction regarding teaching and creating an environment where students learn the material they teach. To explain why teaching is a rewarding experience, interviewees invoked the scholastic state of worth.
The relation of worth (Boltanski & Thévenot 2006: 143) associated with the serious play of ideas is intellectual engagement, and a valuable teacher has the ability to engage his or her students. Carolyn Beaudoin, a visiting professor in the English Department, describes how an instructor's worth is embedded within classroom interaction:

Every semester you're sort of starting over. So you sort of have a chance to sort of start fresh, and sometimes it's a new class, or you're trying to figure out, "Okay, what are we going to do this class?" or you can add things, whatever. I like thinking about how to put a class together... And that's really a creative process. I like working with students on their writing. I really like it when they say they've become more confident as writers. I feel like, if they go outta my class more confident as writers, I feel like I've done my job. I mean there's a whole list of course objectives I have, and if they've done that, then I feel good. So there's definitely some personal satisfaction.

Teaching is a constant process where the instructor attempts to create a connection to students, to engage their students. Jack Newsome, a math part-time instructor, echoes these sentiments almost exactly:

It’s hard to say what exactly I like about math, it’s just awesome. It’s just a lot of fun. What I like about teaching is I love the – it’s hard to describe – the cognitive resonance that you get with another person when you get an understanding of what their thinking is on a particular topic, and you meet them where they are so that you say things that make complete sense to them based on their understanding of the situation. And then you go one step outside of their comfort zone, and then they come with you. I love that. I love... meeting the person where they are and then leading them through something. So you’re not just pouring information into some – you’re showing them how what they already know leads to what they’re learning now. And that’s a lot of fun. I enjoy doing that.

The relations of worth in these excerpts are defined by intellectual engagement. English professor Agnes Largent explicitly claims engagement (by both the instructor and the
students) makes for a quality course, defining it as being “present” and “curious about the text.... I think that makes for a good class because then you are there, you’re prepared to some extent, and then you’re able to build on what you know.”

One cannot be a quality instructor if one does not engage one's students, nor can one be a worthwhile student if one is apathetic or does not care about the inherent value of ideas. “It’s awful,” says Prof. Jacqueline Hamill about students uninterested in learning. “Students go, 'Is this gonna be on the test?' and I’m just like – if I say no, then they go on Facebook or whatever they do, because [they] don’t want to learn, [they] just want to get a grade.” Jack Newsome agrees with this frustration:

What I don’t like about teaching is students who are completely uninterested in what I have to say. I have a phrase that I use to describe those students. The phrase is, “What button do I press?” So I’ll explain a mathematical concept to a student, like, you know, this is a function, and you use the vertical line test to determine whether it’s a function or not; otherwise it’s just a relation, and this and that. And when you’re plugging a number into a function you have to take a look at the rule and replace the variable with that value in every situation in the rule. And they’ll listen and they’ll nod, and then they’ll hold up the calculator and say, “So what button do I press?” ...all that matters [to them] is that they at least look like they’re working so they don’t get in trouble, and that bothers me.

We can thus see interviewees' accounts find worth suspended in a web of social relationships based on the play of ideas. One must be engaged to be scholarly.

Scholastic Contribution at Caussade

The tested object in the scholastic regime is one's contribution to the ongoing intellectual discussion. English part-time instructor Miriam Marcum, for example, describes her worth as an instructor in terms of making this sort of contribution:
When I see them making these cognitive leaps that they had never thought about before, thinking about something in a really different way, thinking about their own thinking, interrogating the way they view things – that makes me really excited, too, to see them sort of grow and expand and their eyes go, “Oh, well, I never thought about that!” And knowing that they’re sort of their own guide, in that way. I give them the tools, ask them the questions, but then they sort of take the leaps, which is really fun to watch.

For teaching, having a deep understanding of academic knowledge is not worthwhile if one cannot use that to create a positive learning outcome.

Math adjunct Jack Newsome says, “It’s a danger in math... [that] people think because they’re good at math that everybody else has got to be good in math too. So they talk to the board or they talk to the book or they talk to the wall. And the students don’t like that. And it doesn’t help them to like math, or even to tolerate it.” Later in the interview, he revisits this point by stating, “You’re not just pouring information into some – you’re showing them how what they already know leads to what they’re learning now.”

The central figure in scholastic worth is the ongoing academic debate, the scholastic relation of worth is intellectual engagement, and the object tested for scholastic worth is one's contribution to the ongoing academic discussion. Applied to teaching, the instructor's contribution invariably involves bringing his or her field's knowledge to bear in the classroom, while at the same time equipping his or her students to participate in (or at least follow) the ongoing academic debate.

TESTS OF WORTH AND THE QUESTION OF TEACHING QUALITY

Justificatory regimes have distinct approaches to test the worth of objects and actors (Boltanski & Thévenot 2006: 130-138). Boltanski & Chiapello (2005: 314-319)
discuss tests in terms of three characteristics. First, a given test grants a certain amount and type of legitimacy, qualifying actors, and defining their worth in the eyes of others. This worth is more than raw coercive power due to the legitimation process. It cannot, however, be permanently ensured; it is always at least theoretically possible for worth to be questioned. Further, the outcome of a test is “accompanied by a codification or, at least, an explicit formulation of valid proof” (Boltanski & Thèvenot 2000:212). A test that is unrecorded and not remembered is not a test.

Second, tests vary in the degree of their results’ clarity. Some tests only give vague hints of worth, some offer complicated results that must be interpreted by experts, and others offer blunt answers that anyone can understand. Third, the stability of participating actors and objects may vary. Depending on the test, a specific characteristic may be under examination, or the being as a whole. Additionally, some tests may question the worth of some participants without questioning the worth of others (i.e., the judged versus the judge), while other tests put all participants on trial (such as a theater performance).

In order to account for and justify its use of adjuncts, Caussade College has primarily relied on two forms of scholastic tests of worth regarding teaching at the college: credentials and teaching evaluation.

**Credentialing**

Both departments at Caussade College rely on credentials in the form of academic degrees as a test of scholastic worth. Generally, there is an expectation that an individual
with a graduate degree in a subject is more capable of making a contribution than one who does not. In both the English Department and the Mathematics Department, new full-time hires are required to have their doctorates. In the Math Department, part-time instructors are expected to have a Master’s Degree in math or related field. In the English Department, a master’s degree in English is required. English Chair Lori Bash was rather adamant on this point, saying, “Not education, not communications, not, you know, I always loved to read. [We only hire people with degrees in] English, okay?”

In line with Weick's (Weick 1976) arguments of certification and evaluation, the credentialing rules at Caussade College are convenient pieces of evidence to suggest that the adjunct faculty members are qualified to teach. Since their adjuncts have advanced degrees in their fields, they clearly have the knowledge relevant to teach (at least introductory) courses. While the college does not rely solely on this, it helps in their justification of adjuncts in terms of the quality of education.

_The Evaluation of Adjunct Teaching_

Credentialing is not the only test of scholastic worth deployed at Caussade, however. Regardless of employment status, the teaching of all instructors is also evaluated. There are primarily two ways the organization evaluates the performance: peer evaluation, and student evaluation. Both of these can be seen as scholastic tests of worth, but very different in nature.

_Chair Observation._ In both departments, instructors (both full- and part-time) are evaluated through peer observation. This is usually done by the department chair, though
other full-time faculty members (such as the Director of the Writing Center in the English Department) are occasionally observers if the chair is occupied. English part-time instructor Vera Campagna describes the process:

[The Chair] usually e-mails me what would be a good day to come, because obviously you don’t want them to come on a day when you’re showing a movie or something. Then we chat a little bit afterward and I get an e-mailed report a few days later... It’s like an overview of what the class involved – what the students were doing that day, how it was structured and what went well. Things I maybe could have done differently; suggestions. But I never really heard anything that I wasn’t expecting, or when I was reading it was like, “Oh yeah.” It wasn’t anything earth shattering.

Both chairs had general rather than specific goals of what they hope to find in instructors.

Math chair Allison Buscemi explains, saying, “When I go in there, I write down, I take a lot of notes. I note, I look at the examples they use and who they talk to and what the students are doing and how the students are acting.”

Both chairs discussed their criteria for these observations in scholastic terms. Math chair Alison Buscemi states this above, saying she looks for engagement in the classroom as indicated by a love of both math and teaching. English chair Lori Bash concurs, “[The key question is] do they make clear what they expect and when they expect it? Can the students understand the assignment? Do they return assignments?”

As a scholastic test of worth, classroom observation attempts to understand the contribution the instructor makes to the academic discussion that engages students.

English part-time instructor Curtis Laskawski calls them “nice” because they are “holistic.” He continues:

There is no, "Okay, check this box. He did this; he did that." There's no preconceived notion of what it should look like other than what that person brings of his or her own idea of what education should look like.
And the nice thing is that it's usually each time a different person, so even if you had a beef with somebody when you're an undergrad and they're evaluating you, it doesn't – it wouldn't play out, and it hasn't. I've had teachers that were my teachers evaluate me, and it was nice that they were definitely treating me like a colleague and a professional, not saying, "Hey, remember that time?" or anything like that.

The observation process as a personal interaction is echoed by Carolyn Beaudoin, a visiting professor in the English Department that used to be a part-time instructor there:

The director of composition evaluated me, and there were some issues that she brought up, and we talked about them, and we had a discussion about it. It wasn't like, "You have to do this." It wasn't presented that way at all. It was just that, "I wasn't sure about this," and, "Can we talk about this?"

The interviews suggest that the observation process is as bureaucratized as they could be, relying on the professional discretion of the evaluating faculty to evaluate the adjuncts.

*Student Evaluations.* The other form of evaluation is student evaluation, where students fill out standardized bubble sheets, rating their instructor's performance, preparation, etc. on Likert scales. There is also a space for students to write comments about the course and instructor. “We have a formal evaluation system,” says Math chair Allison Buscemi. “It tells [us whether] the instructor was prepared and both full-time and tenured and non-tenured faculty, adjuncts, everyone does this in their classes.”

Interviewees do not claim student evaluations are particularly effective or relied upon. The greatest praise Caussade's Dean of Mathematics & Science Allen Valentin offered was that “despite their problems, they're good at catching the worst case scenarios.” He continues, “A lot of questions on it are, like, why bother?” He then adds with an incredulous tone, “Are students really the best judges of my experience or my
preparedness” (emphasis in respondent's tone)? Interviewees see student evaluations as a less legitimate measure because of two reasons.

First, as Dean Valentin suggests, there is a doubt students can truly judge an instructor's performance in the classroom. According to English Assistant Professor Agnes Largent, the results of student evaluations are “mostly about grades,” and that those who do poorly will invariably give you poor evaluations. She continues, noting that while the evaluation forms ask students to state their expected great, “they don’t tell you how many hours of work [students] put in and then what their grades [were]... they probably received a B and then they’ll say, 'She was a really hard grader'.” Dean Valentin also mentioned that a professor had overheard undergraduates coordinating their evaluations to ensure a specific and negative evaluation of another instructor. This would also indicate that undergraduates, in the eyes of faculty and administrators, are not reliable testers of worth.

Second, faculty and instructors at Caussade worry the format of student evaluations with their formalized Likert scales are poor tests of academic worth precisely because they are bureaucratized. “They give you a mean and you get a 3.62 or something like that. Who knows about that [or what it means],” recalls part-time English instructor Jesse Tucker with a degree of confusion. “Then they give you [your evaluations] to keep because they already have it on file so then you get to read all the comments. And they don’t talk to you about that. I guess if there was an issue, but they just I guess hold that on your file about if you’re doing the right things in the class.” Tucker's comment expresses confusion over what a 3.62 actually means. It is formalized, quantified, and
easily recorded, but its validity is not guaranteed.

English assistant professor Jeff O'Malley also worries about the validity of student evaluations. “I think a bit too much weight is put towards student evaluations,” he says. “It becomes about the strength of your personality as opposed to actually [relating to] your knowledge of the field, as opposed to the knowledge that you have.” We can see here again that there is a concern that even if students acted in good faith, student evaluations are a poor test of worth which produces superficially concrete results and confuses what (Weber 1991) would refer to as education and demagoguery.

From the interviews, we can see that peer evaluation is highly legitimate, but not particularly formalized. A great deal of trust is put in the chairs to evaluate adjunct instructors. Meanwhile, student evaluations are not especially legitimate, and are highly formalized. Student evaluations are criticized as being too bureaucratic to be effective scholastic tests, and interviewees doubt student ability to effectively judge the quality of education. But the key difference is the question of subject stability. Students evaluate you every class, but the chair assumes that your teaching quality is relatively stable. Consequently, once she has established you are an acceptably good teacher, they stop the time consuming process of evaluating you.

The Interaction of the Tests of Worth. As we can see, Caussade College relies on two very different scholastic tests. One is highly legitimate, but potentially unclear and variable as it relies on the skills of individual department chairs. The other is highly formalized, but lacks legitimacy. Neither requires a particular action from the
organization, but rather leaves what to do in the hands of the department chairs. When taken together, one arrives at a picture where the chair evaluates an adjunct the first semester they teach, and then leaves it to student evaluations and student complaints to catch a problem teacher from that point forward. Thus, if one can teach satisfactory the first semester, their ability to teach is assumed to remain constant until proven otherwise.

The tests of worth are organized at Caussade College in such a way as to calm fears rather than discover problems. This arrangement is advantageous for a college that needs to use adjuncts. It would be a much more complicated process if every adjunct had to be carefully evaluated every semester, or if student evaluations were highly influential.

The consequence of this arrangement is that adjunct faculty members generally have a de facto probationary period lasting a semester or two where the chair comes to observe how they teach. Assuming they are judged positively, they are viewed as qualified to teach by Caussade from then on unless a concern emerges from student evaluations.

The teaching quality of adjuncts is not the only normative concern at Caussade College, however. In addition to the quality of adjuncts, the quality of their treatment by the college is also a target of normative scrutiny. As we will see in the next section, the question of exploitation creates a host of organizational responses.

THE PROBLEM OF EXPLOITATION AND DISTINCTION

Boltanski and Chiapello argue “a theory of exploitation must demonstrate that the success and strength of some actors are in fact attributable, at least in part, to the
intervention of others, whose activity is neither acknowledged nor valued” (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005:360, italics in original). This understanding of exploitation is compatible with a neo-Marxist critique of higher education that argues that the incomes and freedoms enjoyed by tenured, senior faculty are only possible because of the alienation and uncertainty that part-time instructors face (Shumar 1997, 1999). English adjunct Curtis Laskawski voices the concern over exploitation clearly:

The way the system works and the way it uses adjuncts, for instance, is seriously flawed, especially because of the inherent hypocrisy that’s in the system, where on one side you’re not qualified enough to get a full-time position, but you're qualified enough to teach.

The question therefore becomes how adjunct work is organized in such a way to avoid the accusation of scholastic exploitation.

_The Necessarily Stated Inferiority of Adjuncts_

Paradoxically, Caussade College's path to legitimacy and away from exploitation depends on strongly defining adjuncts as marginal, inferior members of the academic field. In doing so, interviewees limit the contribution they claim adjuncts are capable of making, and consequently make claims of exploitation more difficult. Interviewees, particularly the full-time faculty, do not believe adjuncts are or can be their equals through teaching quality. English Assistant Professor Jeff O'Malley described this in the starkest language:

To put it in a really kind of loaded and crappy way... it’s almost as if you have the patricians and the plebeians, the nobility and the commoners, the dukes, the counts, you know, the barons or whatever and their servants. So it’s like they still work in the house ... I mean I think that’s an artificial kind of – the distinction’s always gonna be made, like, but the division
doesn't necessarily have to be as extreme as it is.

Among the full-time faculty, there was a degree of consensus over the problem with part-time instructors. In short, part-time instructors are not tied strongly to Caussade College. “It's hard for adjuncts,” says English Chair Lori Bash, “because they do live out of their trunks, you know, that old idea, and go from place to place, so they're not always here.”

Professor Bash continues:

Typically, adjuncts move on their own, in like two and three year cycles. We have a few who've taught for us for a long time, and they tend to be people who have other careers who are adjuncting in the evening and that kind of thing, or women with young children who want to be part-time while their children are young. But generally speaking, the other adjuncts would prefer to have full-time jobs elsewhere, and we hope they do. I do everything I can to support that, you know? We had an adjunct leave in the middle of the semester, in the fall, because she, a full-time job in a writing center came along, so we supported that. I got another adjunct to take her place, and they met, and you know, shared the syllabus and all that kind of thing. So you certainly hope that the younger adjuncts are gonna find that full-time job, because you can't support yourself on adjunct pay forever.

Because they have contingent and flexible employment positions, they are not anchored or invested in any particular college, Caussade College included. “In terms of professionalization,” Professor O'Malley says, “[part-time instruction] is almost the opposite because you never really begin to understand the workings of each particular institution and how it actually functions.”

While seen as scholastically inferior as a group, full-time interviewees are concerned with the fair treatment of part-time instructors. Though they don't like talking about it, they recognize they need part-time faculty to effectively run their departments, and the college more generally. Dean Valentin, both chairs, and the director of the writing program all agreed they would like to pay adjuncts, the implication being that
they may not be fully compensated for their contribution to the school. In short, there is a concern over exploitation.

*Differences between Full- and Part-Time*

The difference between the full-time faculty and adjunct instructors at Caussade College is strongly embedded within its organization. While few of these are surprising, it is necessary to document them to see how extensively Caussade has differentiated between the two groups. It is worth noting at this point that these differences are generally college-wide, with both departments generally operating the same.

**Pay.** The most easily anticipated difference between full-time and part-time faculty is a matter of pay. The average annual salary at Caussade was $80,200, in addition to benefits such as healthcare, $65,200 for an associate professor, and $37,600 for an assistant professor (Glenn 2010). Meanwhile, part-time instructors throughout Caussade were paid $735 per credit hour with no benefits. In English, where many of the courses are four credits, this amounts to $2,940 before taxes per course per semester. Meanwhile, the lower level math courses are three credits, and part-time pay is therefore $2,205.

*Limit Courses.* Caussade College limits the number of courses an individual adjunct can teach to 9 credits. Dean Valentin explains that this helps avoid exploitation of part-time faculty:
But no matter, there is a rule that is always followed: an adjunct will never teach more than ½ a load. More than that is exploitation. Sometimes I'll get into an argument with a chair who thinks he's helping, but no, no matter why you think it's a good idea, making someone work that much at that pay is exploitative, and Caussade doesn't do that.

Scholastic worth is concerned with the contributions one makes. Bluntly limiting adjunct's ability to make the attempt to contribute limits the organization's ability to exploit them. While this does not eliminate the image of a “road scholar” (Ludlow 1998), it allows faculty and administrators at Caussade to claim that there is a limited opportunity for exploitation.

This rule, especially with Dean Valentin's commentary, suggests exploitation does not scale in a linear fashion: What is appropriate compensation for 15 credits of teaching is much more than five times what a 3 credit teaching load deserves. At Caussade College, one is either full-time or part-time, and there is not a continuum between those two categories. The active capping of credit hours adjuncts can teach reinforces this binary.

*Academic Service.* Full-time faculty members were given exclusive responsibility over professional service activities such as committee work and advising undergraduates. “We [the full-time faculty] are all expected to be on both committees inside the department and college wide committees,” says English. “So until I got tenure I was always on at least one college wide committee as well as on one within the department. Since I’ve gotten tenure I’ve slacked off on the college wide committees, [but] I’m still very active within the department and not as active college wide.” Assistant English professor and Director of the Writing Program confirms this is not the case for part-time
instructors. “I don’t think there were any other duties that they were required to participate in,” she says. “They come, they teach their class. If they’re teaching writing, they often hold conferences outside of and in addition to their course time, one-on-one writing conferences. Now they can do that upstairs, because they’re very dedicated.”

Math Department chair Alison Buscemi confirms this is the situation in her department as well:

Adjuncts have no responsibility beyond teaching except to be available occasionally for help. And I have found that all of our faculty members are here for help. Some of them unbelievably. You know, an hour before class and an hour after class and the class starts at 8:00 in the morning, gimme a break, that’s kinda tough. We have one person now who’s usually an adjunct but has been hired for a one-year position, temporary to fill in, and his evaluations consistently said that even though I didn’t have him last year, he always was available for help for me. He was an adjunct. I thought that was so terrific, to give your time to do that. But they don’t have any formal responsibilities except that. As far as faculty members, your responsibilities involve advisement, which is a big chunk and that’s what I’ve been struggling through this week with people who need to get in classes and can’t. Committee work, we’re expected to belong to some committee or two or three or whatever.

Performing academic service in the form of student advising or sitting on committees are important because, aside from credentialing, it is one of the few issues where the distinction between full- and part-time faculty is one of exclusivity as opposed to degree. As such, academic service may serve as a professional ritual, something that participation within indicates your membership in the professional field (Thomas B. Lawrence 2004; T.B. Lawrence and Corwin 2003). If so, the exclusion of adjuncts is significant.

The Isolation of Part-Time Faculty. Adjuncts have minimal interaction with full-time faculty and other adjuncts. Unlike full-time faculty, adjunct faculty must deal with
the issue of invisibility, or the segregation and isolation (Church 1999; Shumar 1999). In both English and math, the department chair has the responsibility to hire and evaluate part-time faculty. A consequence of this is that the department chairs are two of the few full-time tenure-track faculty members in either department that have regular or frequent contact with the part-time faculty. “I tend to have about as much contact with them as I would with a full-time faculty member, which means a little,” says Math chair Alison Buscemi. “You know, you see them and talk to them.” In the English department, the only other full-time tenure-track faculty member with regular contact with part-time is the director of the Writing Program, as the low-level but required for all undergraduates composition courses are usually taught by part-time instructors. “I think with the exception of the chair and myself, I feel like [in] the rest of the department there’s a huge disconnect between our adjuncts and the rest of our department, which is unfortunate,” Director Deanna Tolson says.

Beyond Tolson and the two chairs, however, there is very little contact between part-time faculty and the full-time faculty. Assistant English Professor Kenneth Curl refused to even hazard a guess how many part-time faculty his department hired on average. When asked if he had frequent contact with part-time instructors, math professor Carlos Stephen responded, “No, no, no. It’s the responsibility of the chair, and then the chair reports it to the dean.”

Interviews with part-time instructors confirm this separation. Math part-time instructor William Breedlove offers a description of his situation which is common:

[In terms of contact with other part-time instructors, I have] virtually none, [but I] did last year. There was one guy who taught over here last year,
and the guy was in the same room I was and we got to where we’d talk during the change. But there’s nobody [now. The person] who is in here before me has a class over in the other building, takes off right away and nobody’s in here now and there’s just, there’s very little contact. Once a year the department has a party so I go just so I can kinda meet some more people but I don’t even know who the people are... I know one guy and I know the department chairman and that’s it, the other people from the party. Okay so I don't know anybody.

Though Breedlove takes this separation in stride, others find the situation rather unfortunate. “I don’t really feel like I’m part of the community,” Math part-time instructor Jack Newsome says. “The problem is they say you can be part of the community, but I have so many other irons in the fire, I just – I mean, if this is all I did maybe I would come at night and do stuff with them. But life gets in the way.” English part-time instructor Wally Perrine echoes this sense of separation:

I see them around every now and then maybe in the hallway, maybe at a function, but no, there’s no interaction. Except with Willow, my office mate. I really like her. That’s about it. That’s because we’re here in the same office. There’s no interaction whatsoever. [Sometimes,] there’s an event somewhere you know. And even if I’m at an event I feel out of place, you know, part-time. You know, I’m kind of part-time status. Even when we’re at an event together, I don’t feel like there’s any connection. They kinda see me, they know me, we don’t know how to relate.

We are presented with an image of part-time instructor that involves individuals who are not only marginal but whose presence is partial at best. This isolation reinforces the disconnection of adjunct instructors from the departments, the students, and the college more generally.

From the perspective within the scholastic regime, the potential for the instructor to truly make an impact is severely limited if the course content was predetermined. Prof. Largent continues on how scholastic worth is necessarily an incredibly personal and contextual matter:
Say it’s my own class that I’m teaching and I set up a certain number of texts and then I use the same text the following year and then I use it again in another class. I can’t expect the same results because you’re dealing with real people, different students who are responding to texts in different ways... You might say, okay, these three things [should be understood] but then based on the class, you say, “All right, two things,” or, “Okay, one thing. Please know how to define Orientalism for me before you finish.” You know, it could be as simple as that.

One's contribution to the ongoing discussion is a highly contextual thing; if one changes the students, the character of the course can change dramatically. From the scholastic stance, there is a danger that one can formalize learning outcomes too much, designing a course that does not actually engage the students in a meaningful discussion. Such a course would qualify as an example of the banking method of education (Freire 2000), where students are expected to passively accept knowledge as it is deposited in their minds.

*College Growth & Offices.* “A lot of problems come from Caussade bursting at the seams,” says Dean of Math & Sciences Allen Valentin. “We've been experiencing a population explosion here at Caussade, over the last ten years. Well, definitely over the last twenty years, but possibly the last ten.” Math professor Carl Stephen confirms this statement. “When I joined, it was only – actually, I was the fifth person hired when I joined it 19 years ago. Now, there are nine of us... [The college has been] growing, from 2,000 some students to 6,500 now graduate and undergraduate students altogether. So it’s grown tremendously since I joined.” Math Chair Alison Buscemi puts this bluntly, saying, “We have a space problem around here. We have pretty much run out of room. We have too many students, too many courses, too many faculty members, too many
everything else for the rooms that we have.

Caussade College's physical size, however, has not kept pace with its population. “The problem is that the college is land-locked,” explains Dean Valentin. “I don't know if you saw when you came in here, but we don't have any extra land. We can't expand without buying more land.” In addition to a handful of large buildings for classrooms and offices, much of Caussade is housed in two story, residential homes and apartment houses.

One quickly sees the lack of physical space present itself regarding part-time instructor offices, as neither department has ample office space. The Math Department, having its offices on part of one floor in the large Core Hall, deals with the question of where to put part-time instructors in a different way, as Chair Alison Buscemi explains:

So we did make a little arrangement, it’s not much, it’s not a place where you can sit and have a cup of coffee and relax, but out where the elevator is, there’s space. And we have computers that are set up on a desk. And there was a table over on the side and so I went after the dean and I said, “Don’t we have a white board somewhere that we could put on the wall there?” Well they couldn’t find a white board, they finally found a moveable whiteboard. They were afraid it was gonna disappear. Somebody was gonna take it off into a classroom and we’d never see it again, so they have it actually chained on. So that’s fine. And then I said, “Now we need chairs, we’ve got a table there, we need chairs.” And actually the adjunct was very happy that now he had a place he could say, “I’m gonna be out there in the hallway in the little math center and I can work with you there.” And I noticed that some calculus, or pre-calc I guess it is, up on the board and there are people who work there, students work there but there’s a little sign that says, “If the professor wants this spot, you have to vacate.” But it has provided them with a place where they can sit. And I know at least two, three of the adjunct faculty meet their students there. So it’s a start.

While the majority of the Math Department offices are located in Core Hall, the English Department is spread across three adjacent houses along the street. Within these
houses, the kitchens have become office lounges and the bedrooms have become offices
for faculty, with the living room as either additional office space or a waiting room. The
English Department has put aside the third floor of one house for use as office space for
their part-time instructors. “It's a fairly nice space,” says English chair Lori Bash. “It's
the attic of the house next door, but it was an apartment. It's not like an attic, and it
has computers in it, and it has a place where they can hang their coats, and have students
meet them and that kind of thing.” Writing Program Director Deanna Tolson agrees that
it providing part-time instructors with office space was a positive thing to do, as the
department was “really creating a dedicated office space with computers and a work area
for our adjunct instructors, which was both symbolic and actually very important to just
have a place to go, literally.”

Citing an inability to physically grow, faculty and administrators at Caussade
College explain that they do not have the room to give part-time instructors personal
offices. Instead, the English Department allows all part-time instructors to share a
converted attic, and the Math Department offers their part-time instructors a furnished
alcove in a nearby hallway. Even if one accepts the idea that the college is attempting to
deal with the problem of office space in as sincere a way as possible, the difference
between the facilities available to full- and part-time instructors is significant, and has an
effect on the part-time instructors.

The lack of office space negatively impacts the availability of part-time
instructors to students, and their presence on campus more generally. Several
interviewed part-time instructors agree with this sentiment. Math part-time instructor
Jack Newsome explains why a lack of effective office space is a problem for him working at Caussade:

There’s no time for me ever to be on campus just to have office hours. I don’t like that. I like giving students the opportunity to, if they want to go the extra step and meet with me and get help, to give them that, and I don’t have the opportunity to do that this semester... It would be nice if I had a space on campus, even if it was like a shared stuff with a bunch of other adjuncts, to have office hours... It’d be nice to have, like, a base of operations.

Meanwhile, some like English part-time instructor Curtis Laskawski redouble their effort to make themselves available:

I like to think that I’m as accessible as I can be. Granted, here it’s harder because I don’t have office hours and things like that. I do hold office hours, just not in an office. I tell them to come and see me over here between classes... On days like this, because my first class ends at 4:10, my second class doesn’t begin until 6:15, I just hang out over here in between time. When my classes are over early, I will go hang out there and tell students that’s where I am and they can come find me. So it all depends on if the classroom’s free, the class before. Like, my 6:00 class, it isn’t. There’s a class in there until 6:15. So normally, I would just sort of get something to eat and then go hang out in the classroom, but I can’t. But I always make sure they know where to find me so they can come and chat if they need to.

However, the negative impact of office space problems goes beyond the mere logistics of students. As math part-time instructor William Breedlove explains, lacking office space reinforces the sense of separation that many part-time instructors experience:

The number one thing they could do to make adjuncts feel like more a part of the college is very simple, give em an office. The only place where they can see me. I get here; my first class is at 10:30. I’m here at 9:00 in the morning and I stay until the last kid wants to leave. I’m here on Sundays because I can’t come down and have a meeting anyplace. I can’t tell em I’ll be here if you need help, okay? But not this class, the other class I have, one of the girls on the soccer team, and of course they’re number two in the nation, and so I go to her soccer games. So the kids know they can catch me there but it’s just not as easy for students to get to the adjuncts for help because they don’t have the space. Okay and they
say well we have this one office that’s good for all the adjuncts. That’s just a room. It’s a community room... I don’t even need much space, just enough space that I could have a desk. Kids can know that I’ll be there in the morning at this time and they can come over in the afternoon, this, that and whatever. That would be – and then you feel like you have a home. Without that you don’t feel like a home.

As office space becomes scarce and the number of adjuncts increases, the discussion of office space at Caussade College highlights the marginalization of adjuncts.

*Course Selection.* In terms of course selection, the full-time faculty members choose their courses first, and generally pick upper level courses. This leaves the basic, introductory courses for part-time instructors to teach. “I set up the schedule,” says Math chair Alison Buscemi. “I put in all of us, all the full-time staff exactly where they’re gonna be. And [I] make sure that’s okay. And then I try and put the adjuncts in where they would most prefer to be.” In the Mathematics Department, part-time instructors tend to teach courses such as algebra, pre-calculus, and calculus I. A similar situation is true in English, where part-time instructors most commonly teach oral composition, or communication and research as described by English Chair Lori Bash:

The typical course that an adjunct or part-time instructor would teach here is a lower level course, such as composition, which we call here expository research, oral communication, and expository writing...[and] oral communication and research... We also use adjuncts for 100 and 200 level courses, depending on what we need in a particular semester, and they typically are generalized literature classes, you know, something like, we have one called Text in Context, where the instructor inserts the topic, or Diverse Voices in Literature, which fills the diversity requirement here, and the instructor inserts the topic.

Thus, beyond the requirements for being hired and the pay, part-time instructors are often hired to teach the lower level courses. A similar situation is present in the Mathematics
Department, though chair Alison Buscemi says there is the occasional exception where an adjunct instructor is allowed to teach an upper level course:

Most of them are lower level but we rarely have an adjunct teaching an upper division. Although that has happened in some cases with people who have said to me, “Please can’t I teach differential equations?” Or, “Please can --?” So that they, we’ve tried to arrange for them. We have one adjunct right now who asked if he could teach pre-calc and then calculus one and then calculus two to see the whole sequence through with one group. So we arranged that. And a couple of people were a little uncomfortable, you know, with that, but they got over it. You know, we try to accommodate them if they want to do that.

From the perspective of the full-time faculty the current arrangement at Caussade's English Department results in a large amount of freedom to teach on a diverse range of topics. Associate professor Sheila London describes this in more detail:

[The courses offered] would be a free for all and everybody could just teach whatever they felt like teaching in any given semester, which is the system we’re under now. So people don’t even necessarily stay within their fields of specialization, full-time faculty just teach whatever they feel like any semester, and then our board chair has to try to figure out what is not getting taught, what is needed, and find adjuncts to plug in the holes. So that’s the current system.

The relegation of adjuncts to primarily introductory courses once again reinforces the hierarchical differences between full-time and adjunct faculty at Caussade College. In a separate but related point, the use of adjunct faculty members frees all full-time, tenure-track faculty members to teach more upper-level courses and courses faculty feel a personal connection for.

Teaching Communities. To support the claim that adjuncts are scholastically qualified to teach, the English Department instituted “Teaching Communities,” where adjunct instructors who teach composition can come to professional development
meetings every other week for a semester. In exchange, the adjunct instructor earns an extra $250 dollars. Director of the writing program Deanna Tolson explains this in more detail:

What we’ve done now is we got money, which is always the first step, so we now have professional development workshops, we have bi-weekly meetings called conversations for – and it’s primarily adjunct instructors. It’s primarily non-tenure track, temporary, contingent faculty. So my concern was about what are we doing to provide professional development for our frequent flyers, who teach often two or three different schools in the area. What can we do here at Caussade, with our history and mission is about education and teaching. What can we do here to make their experience better, which then also translates into the classroom? The research is how do – how do we improve student writing? Well, we put teachers in there who are active writers and know a lot about pedagogy. So what are we doing to support that? So by creating the program, we have professional development, we have – we can provide remuneration for faculty who attend these, we have the bi-weekly conversations, which I said, the workshops.

The stated goal of teaching communities improving adjunct instructors' ability to teach is echoed by English adjunct Erica Volz:

[Teaching communities] are mostly geared on teaching. They do have a – almost like a focus group for teachers who are teaching the freshman comp class, where they get together in small groups and talk about issues that are coming up in freshman writing. Things like academic honesty, the issue with grammar and spelling, and the students that are coming that don't have the skills that you would expect, what do you do with the kids who stop showing up. Things like that.

English adjunct instructor Jesse Tucker also gives a few examples. “We talk about things [and] look over syllabus things. We also – I’m using blogs in my class for the first time in the department – and all colleges now with the media and using technology, and so we had a day where we set up a blog and work through that.”

Importantly, training is not the only effect that teaching communities have on the adjunct instructors in the Caussade College's English Department. They also serve to
help give part-time instructors a sense of connection, at least to each other if not the larger college. “We can get together as teachers of 105 and talk about issues, problems, assignments, you know, what things to do with student which are nice and so that gets you kind of in touch with other part-time,” says Jesse Tucker. “Otherwise, you don’t really see a lot of them [the other part-time instructors].” Erica Volz agrees, saying, “[Teaching communities] are nice because it’s almost like a support group for adjuncts.”

Teaching communities at Caussade College can be viewed in relation to adjunct instructor teaching quality, as the purpose of the teaching communities is to improve the teaching skills of adjunct instructors. At the same time, however, the additional pay for attending them, and their position as a fully optional program, help to inoculate the program from accusations of exploitation. Furthermore, the teaching communities also help ameliorate the sense of disconnection adjunct instructors may feel. Finally, one could speculate that by connecting it to the teaching of composition rather than to adjunct instructors directly, a degree of the scholastic egalitarianism mentioned above is retained.

While teaching communities help to create a sense of connection among adjunct instructors, it does not fully integrate them into the college. Adjuncts remain segregated, participating in their own workshops while not participating in the professional service done by the full-time faculty (advising, committee work, etc.). Furthermore, being additional pay for attending the teaching community meetings reinforces the idea that part-time instructors are expected to teach and only teach, while teaching is only one activity of many for full-time faculty at Caussade.
Summary of Exploitation and its Denial through Distinction

The use of scholastic worth at Caussade requires both the justification of adjunct teaching quality and their position in the organization. This section has attempted to outline the organization of Caussade College has responded to the potential charge of adjunct exploitation. This becomes seemingly more complicated since interviewees often admit it is exploitative to have a full-time employee who works in adjunct working conditions, in other words, someone who is paid by the credit hour (at a substantially lower rate than tenure-track faculty), has no benefits, little job security beyond the semester, and (allegedly) no connection to the college as a whole outside the narrow obligation of teaching a specific course. These people would obviously be putting more into their work, and contributing more to their departments, than they were being compensated or recognized for.

The organizational response, therefore, was to ban “full time adjuncts,” since the college can fully recognize the (relatively) meager contribution of people who adjunct part-time “on the side.” The organization is therefore riddled with rules, processes, and arrangements that make sure that adjuncts stay on the side and squarely marginalized precisely as a way to avoid the claim of exploitation.

Despite being an imperfect arrangement, the adjunct instructor position is considered (at least by the administration and faculty) as legitimate enough and is seen as having positive scholastic worth. Caussade's legitimacy relies on maintaining a thorough marginalization of adjuncts as partial members of the academic field. They cannot justify their treatment of adjuncts if adjuncts are seen as true academics seeking a full-time
academic career. Consequently, the organization of adjunct work actively discourages this perspective.

ADJUNCT INSTRUCTION AS HETERARCHICAL BOUNDARY OBJECT

The organization of instruction at Caussade College allows full-time faculty and administrators to scholastically justify the use of adjuncts both in terms of educational quality and their treatment. The interviewees present adjunct instruction as a marginal position that is nevertheless within the academic field. In this context, being within the academic field means that one can legitimately apply an academic institutional logic to the position, including an evaluative scheme to determine the degree of worth presented by a particular actor, arrangement, or event.

There is great diversity among adjuncts, both in terms of their occupational trajectories and the forms of worth they deploy to qualify their experience as adjuncts. The discussion of quality and treatment primarily that of the full-time faculty and the “party line” of Caussade College. As such, it does not deal with adjunct views on how worthwhile their job is and why. Additionally, adjunct instruction is rarely understood as a purely academic endeavor.

Discretion, Boundary Objects, and Heterarchy

Rather than being purely within the academic field, adjunct instruction is a boundary object, which Star & Griesemer define as follows:

[Boundary objects] have different meanings in different social worlds but their structure is common enough to more than one world to make them
recognizable, a means of translation. The creation and management of boundary objects is a key process in developing and maintaining coherence across intersecting social worlds.” (Susan Leigh Star and James R. Griesemer 1989:393)

A boundary object may help establish field autonomy by separating fields. At the same time, boundary objects connect fields together. In the context of this project, an effective boundary object is one that can be judged and qualified according to multiple justificatory regimes, including both academic and non-academic ones.

David Stark refers to this situation as heterarchy, where “units are laterally accountable according to diverse principles of evaluation” (Stark 2009:19). Stark argues that heterarchy and the friction it creates are potentially productive when one is not “confident that you know precisely what resources your organization will need in the indefinite future to meet stable and predictable markets (or continue to get grants to meet your unchanging mission as a nonprofit or a research operation)” (Stark 2009:4). While embracing this uncertainty by accepting multiple forms of evaluation is often full of paradox and “friction,” Stark suggests this does not mean that heterarchy is necessarily a threat to a given organization:

[F]riction is not something to be avoided at all costs. We all prefer a smooth ride, but as you and your tire dealer know, when taking a sharp curve, we count on friction to keep us on course. Friction can be destructive. But, as the designers of the U.S. Constitution well understood when they built the friction of checks and balances into our system of government, it can also be a principled component of a functioning system with productive outcomes. (Stark 2009:4)

Instead, innovation and entrepreneurship when one has “the ability to keep multiple evaluative principles in play and to exploit the resulting friction of their interplay” (Stark 2009:11).
In their discussion of multiple regimes of justification, Boltanski & Thévenot suggest several possibilities: An actor may attempt a compromise between the regimes, the actor may denounce one regime using another, or the actor may claim there is no need to justify things in this instance and instead locally avoid the need for justification (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006:217-340). Stark suggests organizations may be able to coordinate their activities through “misunderstandings” rather than shared meanings. “[T]hrough unshared typifications, through uncommon attributions, through divergent or misaligned understandings that problematic situations can give way to positive reconstructions” (Stark 2009:192, italics in original).

Importantly, these misunderstandings are not necessarily contingent, random, or momentary. Just as an organization can stabilize itself around a set of shared understandings, it can also do so with a set of unshared meaning. Misunderstanding “is structured, we could even say 'organized' so long as we see organization as something that could be an emergent process and not necessarily the result of deliberate design” (Stark 2009:191). This can allow for an organization to act in ways that would not be possible if consensus was required:

If the parties in a situation would be forced to come to an explicit agreement on the meaning of objects, or the 'rules of the game,' or even what game is being played, their understandings might be so disparate as to forestall an agreement, resulting in the breakdown of coordination. Although communities do not agree on the meanings of rules or the nature of the game itself, through the circulation of objects with disparately ascribed meanings, each community can arrive to its own understanding of the situation without jeopardizing cooperation from others.” (Stark 2009:195)

A boundary object is explicitly not about shared meaning. Rather it is an object that can be viewed (and evaluated) in radically different ways by different people. As a boundary
object then, adjunct instruction can simultaneously be seen as academic or not, depending on the program of action at hand.

*Discretion & the Lack of Distinction.* The large amount of discretion given to instructors described above helps establish the organization of teaching at Caussade as having a relatively low amount of hierarchy or vertical accountability. All instructors, regardless of employment status, are given a large degree of professional discretion all instructors. “We don’t require the same texts or anything, but we have guidelines that we can show them,” says English chair Lori Bash. “I have a huge packet of materials that we send anyone who's doing a course that fulfills the liberal education requirement here, so they understand what is involved in that.” English part-time instructor Erica Volz agrees this is the situation:

I’ve had really considerable freedom to do what I felt was appropriate from the direction of the course, the text that you adopt, the kinds of assignments. They have some pretty simple guidelines for if this is a writing intensive class you have to have x number of pages per student from the end of the semester, and things like that, but really with the material itself there’s a lot of flexibility and a lot of freedom.

Courses are roomy frameworks that allow for a great deal of discretion in how they are assembled. English Professor Agnes Largent explains this with a concrete example:

The postcolonial studies [course]. I teach it and I’m more contemporary and postcolonial as in African and Asian. I mean like Indian and those kinds of postcolonial [topical areas], whereas there is someone who teaches it who is a British lit person who teaches it from – the approach is very different... But the way we wrote the description is that he could teach it and I could teach it as well. Yeah, so it’s sort of that amorphous, so then you can claim it and make it your own.

In other words, the course is explicitly left undefined in some way, as this allows the
instructor to maximize his or her personal contribution (the object of scholastic worth) to the course. Jack Newsome confirms this with the Math Department as well, claiming, “[No one] ever looks at my assignments, my grading, anything like that. [I am] pretty much an entirely independent entity.”

By saying all courses, regardless of instructor, are organized according to the same standards, Caussade is encourages a certain scholastic egalitarianism. If the college established formalized rules that treated adjunct instructors in an overtly different way in terms of how they could teach in the classroom, the challenge of claiming sufficient instructional quality could become greater.

This leads to a diversity of adjuncts that manifests in two ways: a multiplicity of worths adjuncts deploy to qualify their work, and a multiplicity of occupational trajectories. Table 8: The Diversity of Part-Time Instructors at Caussade College summarized this information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Market Status</th>
<th>Career Goals</th>
<th>Justificatory Regime(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vera Campagna</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Aspiring</td>
<td>Spouse of professor, Part-Time Instructor at multiple colleges</td>
<td>Looking for Full-Time Tenure Track Work</td>
<td>Market – Scholastic Hybrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis Laskowski</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Aspiring</td>
<td>Spouse of professor, Part-Time Instructor at multiple colleges</td>
<td>Looking for full-time tenure-track work</td>
<td>Civic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Logan</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Aspiring</td>
<td>Physics Masters student, Part-Time instructor at multiple locations</td>
<td>Get PhD somewhere, then find teaching position</td>
<td>Market – Scholastic Hybrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse Tucker</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Aspiring</td>
<td>Part-Time Instructor at multiple colleges, Bachelors from Caussade</td>
<td>Become Community College Teacher</td>
<td>Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Hamill</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Computer science professor who helps out occasionally by teaching math courses PT</td>
<td>No immediate plan</td>
<td>Scholastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica Volz</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
<td>Pregnant, Teaches PT, Masters from Caussade</td>
<td>Dream vs. Money</td>
<td>Market – Scholastic Hybrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Wine</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
<td>Charter School math teacher, PT instructor</td>
<td>Get out of teaching / academia as soon as possible due to politics</td>
<td>Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Newsome</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
<td>Teacher, PT @ multiple colleges</td>
<td>Get down to 1 job, no preference for higher education</td>
<td>Market – Scholastic Hybrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wally Perrine</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
<td>Teaches PT @ multiple colleges, English Masters from Caussade</td>
<td>Be a writer, not a Part-Time Instructor</td>
<td>Market – Scholastic Hybrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriam Marcum</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
<td>Retired high school teacher who teaches math PT</td>
<td>Become a writer, possibly grad school</td>
<td>Scholastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Breedlove</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Has non-academic FT job, English Masters from Caussade</td>
<td>No immediate plan</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Vassel</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Former certified K-12 teacher</td>
<td>No immediate plan</td>
<td>Market – Scholastic Hybrid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Market Worth: An Alternative among Part-Time Instructors

The market-based regime of justification was common among part-time instructor interviews. Rather than defining the state of worth in terms of playing seriously with ideas, “actions are motivated by the desire of individuals, which drive them to possess the same objects, rare goods whose ownership is inalienable” (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006:196). Realizing one's desires through competition is the higher principle of market worth, rather than the scholastic principle regarding the inherent value of knowledge. According to a market argument, if there's no demand for knowledge, it would have no value:

“The competition between beings placed in a state of rivalry governs their conflicts through an evaluation of market worth, price, which expresses the importance of converging desires. Worthy objects are salable goods that have a strong position in a market. Worthy persons are rich, millionaires, and they live the high life. Their wealth allows them to own what others want, valuable objects, luxury items, upscale products.” (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006:196, emphases in original)

The market test of worth is the deal where prices are set on exchange occurs. Unlike the graduate students of Orange University, the part-time instructors of Caussade discuss teaching part-time as a job rather than training for a job, and they use market worth to discuss part-time instruction's quality as a form of employment.

Market Qualifications of Pay. In line with previous research on variations of alienation among part-time instructors (Benjamin 1998) the interviewees who rely on
part-time instruction as a key source of income judge it less favorably. For example, Wally Perrine is an aspiring writer who teaches part-time Caussade's English Department. However, he admits, “I think I’m in my weaning sort of years with [part-time instruction]. I’ve had a lot [of enthusiasm], [but] there’s not much – I mean, there’s enthusiasm, but there’s not much anymore. I kinda want to get on to more affordable things, you know? Higher paying jobs so I can support myself better.” Joyce Wine, another part-time English instructor, repeats this sentiment:

I’m looking for another job. I took a state test last year. It’s very sad. I would love to stay in it, but with the economy – my husband – actually this is the first time in my – I’m 51 and I never had to work before with my husband’s job. But I really need to now. I have two kids in college and we really can’t afford our house right now... I can’t afford to do this for one thing. I’m just not – I’ve had enough that I need to leave.

Both of these interviewees criticize part-time instruction based on a lack of market worth, as it simply does not pay well enough to warrant continued effort. While one claims that one is paid well as a part-time instructor, one may find some worth in part-time instruction through lowering their monetary expectations and/or connecting it to scholastic worth.

Unsurprisingly, people who desired teaching at the college level to be their primary or sole form of employment had higher standards in their tests of worth regarding part-time instruction as an occupation than those who saw it as an additional but secondary source of income. For example, Melissa Vassel is a retired elementary school teacher who is now a part-time instructor in the Math Department at Caussade. She says that teaching at Caussade “doesn’t take up much of my time, and I enjoy it that much that it gets me out of the house. I mean, as I said, I’m obviously not in need of –
I’m not in it for the money, obviously. My goal was, when I retired, was I wanted something to do that would pay my health insurance, and it does. That was my goal.” She is still using a market formulation (she's selling her labor to gain financial means to satisfy a goal), but her standards for what is acceptable are dramatically lower than either Mr. Perrine or Mrs. Wine.

It should be noted that this is in some ways analogous to the argument Dean Valentin made for limiting the number of credit hours an adjunct instructor can teach. Those who wish adjunct instruction to be a primary source of income are more likely to view it as falling short and not being worthwhile at the same time that Caussade College is explicitly admitting that employing an adjunct to teach for a full-time commitment of time would be exploitative.

*Market Qualifications Beyond Pay.* Market based justifications and criticisms need not limit themselves to money (price, salary, etc.) if one can treat an object or event as having a monetary value. Interviewees gave several examples of an element of part-time instruction other than financial compensation that makes it more or less desirable. These include uncertainty, a fragmentation of work focus, time demands, and flexibility.

Some interviewees voiced concern over the lack of job security associated with being a part-time instructor, as it is a contingent position. “We don’t have any job security so why be sort of loyal to what you’re doing when you know, it’ll probably end at any time?” asks Wally Perrine rhetorically, who works at both Orange University and Caussade as a part-time instructor. He continues:
I’m only hired on semester by semester basis. So at the end of every semester, the college has the option of letting me go or keeping me, depending in their enrollment needs. Next semester at Orange I’ve been laid off you know, so I won’t be able to work here next semester, so I have to go to Caussade and try to scrounge up whatever work I can there. So it’s really an unstable sort of business you know.

There is no guarantee current part-time instructors will be offered the number of courses they wish to teach, let alone which courses or the times they are scheduled. All of this makes working as a part-time instructor less attractive, less desirable, and therefore it lessens the job's value to the potential instructor.

Other interviewees expressed displeasure with the amount of time and effort they need to put into teaching. The most common topic of complaint in this regard is grading. “The worst part [is] probably grading,” says English part-time instructor Jesse Tucker. “Not that there’s any way around that they can alleviate that but... like midterm times, final times, it’s pretty hectic.” The basis of this complaint is that the amount of time it takes to grade makes teaching a less desirable job. Mr. Perrine also speaks to these concerns: “Sometimes I like it, you know, but generally I’ve got – this semester I’m teaching four courses total, you know, [and] I’m overloaded. So every weekend I’m grading papers you know. I don’t have time to write my own books or anything like that, so basically I’m like a sort of full-time adjunct teacher.” Once again, we see how the specific elements of part-time instruction make work harder or more demanding.

A third concern people voice in terms of market worth is the problem of having multiple employment positions in various locations, and the logistical problems that may arise from that. Interviewees were often were part-time instructors at several colleges, not just Caussade. Alternatively, they were attempting to juggle working as a part-time
instructor with a different full-time job. For example, Jack Newsome is a part-time math
instructor, a tutor, and a teacher at a local charter school. When I asked him what his
future career plans were, he said, “I’d like to focus. I’d like it to be one thing that I could
concentrate on. Right now that’s high school teaching, so my plan is to get to the point
where I’m pretty much just doing the high school teaching.” His preference for teaching
at the charter school has less to do with intellectual stimulation and more to do with its
promise of stable work, where he has one job and need not feel like he is juggling
responsibilities. Focus for Newsome is a desirable trait that would make a position more
worthwhile to him.

Finally, not all of these qualifications of part-time instruction were negative.
Several individuals stated that one of the things that made the job more attractive was its
highly flexible schedule. Part-time instruction and a great deal of academic work in
general does not have the rigid hours that other jobs may have. Thus, some see this as
desirable, even if the job pays less. Jesse Tucker makes this point, saying “The freedom”
and “the flexibility” of part-time instruction are what he likes most about the work. He
continues:

I’m not a nine-to-five person. I don’t like doing the same thing every day.
So I like the freedom, class schedule you know. I can do my work at
home, grading, planning, things like that, not having to be at work clocked
in, so that’s nice. Today I only have one class, it’s at 4:00. So usually we
have a teaching community, freshman development in the morning.
Usually I just go home because I live like 10 minutes away and I do work
for a couple of hours there and then come back. So you’re only actually
here a couple of hours a day, something like that. That kind of flexibility
is nice.

When Mr. Tucker talks of the freedom of academic work, he is definite it in terms of
work conditions where he can work at home without a fixed schedule. This is quite
different common expressions of academic freedom, or anything else that has been judged valuable according to a scholastic justification. English part-time instructor Vera Campagna concurs, stating “I’ve worked retail and pretty much everything that you can work. And I like to have that freedom to structure it the way I want as opposed to having someone telling you, from 9:00 to 5:00 you’re doing this.”

Other Alternatives: Civic and Domestic Worth

While market and scholastic worths were the most common, two interviewees relied heavily on justifications based on entirely different regimes of worth.

Curtis Laskowski & Civic Worth. Curtis Laskowski is married to a professor at Caussade and teaches English at both Caussade and Mahican Community College, and the form of worth he primarily relied on in his interview was what Boltanski & Thévenot called civic worth. “In the civic world, the worthy beings are the masses and the collectives that assemble and organize them... persons or collectives gain in when they work toward union” (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006:186) In other words, through collective action, citizens can make their society a better place.

When asked what was rewarding for him about teaching part-time, he responded, “Mainly just helping people improve themselves, helping the world be a better place.” In his view, quality college teachers ought to instill in students a desire to be more engaged in their communities, making them a better place. He offered the following anecdote as an example of what he meant:
I usually tell a lot of stories in my classes. It's just the way I teach. And one of those stories I was sharing actually was about when I was a college student and getting involved in service opportunities here at Caussade, working in a soup kitchen and things like that. And I shared a story about that with one of— with my class, and one of my students ultimately was so impacted by that that she got a group of her friends together who were all working with Shakespeare Limited. I don't know if you're familiar with it. It's a local, pretty renowned theater company. They have a young persons program. And she'd gotten involved with them, and she decided that she was going to turn that story, the crux of that story, into a play. And her friends produced it, advertised for it, put it on, and it was amazing. I saw, like—it was that proverbial, again, cheesy thing where one comment, one story in a class had this magnifying ripple effect until they were putting this on for hundreds of people. And that was something that—it wasn't even directly tied to writing.

Laskawski initiated a series of events connecting theater and civic engagement together through teaching, and this was his quintessential example of what made teaching important. Higher education is, in his view, at its best when it acted as a civil institution.

“If you treat people in the right way and you create the right environment,” he suggests, “people will become better writers, people will become better communicators, and people will become better citizens and humans.” For Mr. Laskawski, attempting to organize higher education around cost and competition is problematic:

The way the system works and the way it uses adjuncts, for instance, is seriously flawed, especially because of the inherent hypocrisy that's in the system, where on one side you're not qualified enough to get a full-time position, but you're qualified enough to teach and, in many instances, more qualified than some of the people who have Ph.D.'s, or at least better at it. But thou shalt not ever be able to do this. And really, we all know why. It's because it's not financially feasible, and we've gotten our culture used to the idea, which is somewhat right and somewhat wrong, of that everybody needs to go to college and that this is the only option for everybody, one size fits all, everybody will go to college. So we have a huge demand, and we don't wanna pay to meet that demand, so we have us.

In his view, depending on market or scholastic justifications creates unreasonable
contradictions regarding how professional, academic work is structured. Furthermore, focusing on the cost of education and attempts to minimize it distracts people from problems with their underlying expectations about higher education.

In this third form of justification, teaching is seen as important to the degree it encourages the student to be an active citizen in civil society. Mr. Laskawski actively denounces the use of a market-based evaluation of higher education, believing doing so encourages hypocrisy and worsens education.

*William Breedlove and Domestic Worth.* William Breedlove is a retired public school administrator who teaches math part-time at Caussade, in addition to several other jobs. His interview is based primarily in what Boltanski & Thévenot call domestic worth, where “people’s worth depends on a hierarchy of trust based on a chain of personal dependencies. The political link between beings is seen as a generalization of kinship and is based on face-to-face relationships and on the respect for tradition” (Boltanski and Thévenot 1999:370). These personal relationships, fueled by respect, create a hierarchy where people's worth is established through relationships “to worthier beings by whom they are appreciated and valued, beings who have attached them to their persons.” (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006:195) Domestic worth is worth based on one acting according to one's position.

Mr. Breedlove most values the rapport with students in his teaching experience. Two anecdotes he offered during the interview illustrates what this means. “I have a grandfather image and I know it,” he says. He continues, giving an example of how this
image interacts with his teaching:

[This one student] had to tell me when her birthday was at one time. I was like, okay, it must be important that I know it. So, I want to remember to say happy birthday to her. You know it’s that kinda stuff you deal with. Which is not bad. I mean if... you look like their grandfather, the grandfather they wish they had or whatever, it’s kinda cool you know?

The second anecdote involves two students who just finished taking a test for his class:

After their test was over, I was talking to one of them because he smiled all the time. He’s a student teaching and I wanted him to be aware that it’s a great trait but not great when you’re student teaching. So we were talking about it, the other guy came out and joined us. I mean that’s not – he could have just walked down the hall. Every single kid you saw join me out there did it by choice. Okay, so you’ve – and that’s some, and that’s trust. It’s an experience of trust.

Several things become evident in these two excerpts. First, quality teaching for Breedlove involves going beyond the specific content of his courses. Both of these anecdotes suggest a broader personal relationship with students is the source of worth, rather than narrowly engaging academic knowledge. This attitude is an expression of domestic worth, which claims “a well ordered world is... first of all a world in which the children have been well brought up,” as this is necessary to ensure one is in the company of people with appropriate habits (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006:172 - 173).

Second, he sees the respect the students give him as proof he is a quality instructor. He builds personal relationships with his students that suggest a high degree of trust (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006:166). Respect is not based on his intellectual or academic prowess, and for Mr. Breedlove quality instruction does not emerge from an exclusive focus on course content. Quality instructors can create that personal relationship, even if the students are hesitant. “Because if you bend a little bit to them, they’ll bend twice as far for you,” he says, regarding teaching, specifically holding non-
required review sessions for tests.

The difference between scholastic and domestic worths is almost the inverse of the difference between scholastic worth and genius. Where scholastic worth requires a social context pure inspiration may not, domestic worth does not require the relationship between people be intellectual in nature. Breedlove consistently talks about enjoying his role helping students, but at no point in the interview did he discuss this help in distinct terms of intellectual stimulation. While Breedlove does not explicitly denounce academic worth, he does find most of the faculty wanting when judged by his domestic criteria. He says repeatedly that he is uninterested in the politics of academia. “I don’t even know what they are or care about, you know,” he remarks. “I’m here, I come here and teach and go home.” He is happy with this, because he believes faculty do not understand how good their job is because they’re too busy being concerned about the wrong things. For example, talked about a day early in the spring semester where it began to snow heavily.

I was out here by 8:30 cause I really get here really early to plan and all that stuff, to go over my plans. I’ve already planned but I’m going over em again. So I’m sitting there and this teacher came in, professor came in and she goes, “The classes are canceled until 10:00.” I said, “Oh, good.” Then I hear all the professors ranting and raving about they didn’t know they drove here and they don’t have class till ten and they’re bitching, moaning and groaning. You got the greatest job in the world. What are you complaining about? Do you think that whoever was in charge of closing woke up this morning and said, “I wonder how I can screw up everybody’s life?” But because most of them never done anything else, they don’t appreciate what they got. That’s the part I find most offensive.

When asked what made college teaching the greatest job in the world, he responded, “you’re dealing with intelligent people who want to succeed, who – they’ll try anything and these two come to my review classes regularly, okay, that voluntary review classes...
It’s a very rewarding experience because they want to do well. They really do wanna do well.”

Breedlove is offended at how many faculty members do not realize that enthusiastic students are what makes working in academia so worthwhile. The difference between Breedlove and other faculty who talked about the value of engaged students is that, for Breedlove, you are supposed to care about the student and build a personal relationship, whereas other faculty and part-time instructors value the engaged student first and foremost for their intellectual engagement. Scholastic worth does not value personal connections per se, as these do not necessarily equate to intellectual stimulation. Instead, faculty care about the wrong things, leading to their “moaning and groaning,” as Breedlove put it.

We can thus see a fourth justification based on personal relationships, respect, and trust. It is a domestic conception of worth where one needs to know one's place and both inferiors and superiors have roles to perform. Attempts by Mr. Breedlove to judge other academics according to this justificatory regime results in his opinions that many academics care about the wrong things and engage in petty politics.

The Diversity of Occupational Trajectories

Bourdieu defines social trajectory as “the social trajectory is defined as the series of positions successively occupied by the same agent or the same group of agents in successive spaces” (Bourdieu 1996:258), intending this to be a replacement for overly individualistic biographies that attempt “to understand a career or a life as a unique and
self-sufficient series of successive events without any other link than association with a subject,” something Bourdieu considered sociologically “absurd” (Bourdieu 1996:258). By studying the series of positions a given actor takes over time and their relationships to the field, Bourdieu hopes to effectively contextualize careers.

The occupational trajectories of the part-time instructors at Caussade College are very diverse, something that can be quickly noted by looking at the different ways part-time instructors are positioned in terms of both employment and the academic field. In the English Department, three interviewed part-time faculty had received Masters Degrees from the English Department, and one received a Bachelor’s degree. In addition to the four who had a prior connection to the college, there was also a certified K-12 teacher, an aspiring writer, and the wife of a professor at another nearby college. In the Mathematics Department, there are two retired high school teachers, a current teacher at a charter school, a physics Masters student, and a professor in Caussade's Computer Science Department who occasionally teaches a course in Math if there is an unmet need for an instructor.

The majority of part-time instructors at Caussade fall into two categories. First, there are aspiring academics who wish to one day become full-time tenure-track faculty. Second, there are freelancers, individuals who have come to teach part-time but are not interested in becoming full-time faculty for one reason or another.

*Diversity among Aspiring Academics.* Four of the twelve interviewed part-time instructors stated a desire for full-time, tenure track positions, and would consequently be
categorized by Gappa & Leslie as aspiring academics. There were, however, significant differences in their academic career trajectories. In the case of Vera Campagna, she never finished her doctorate, despite getting both a Masters in English and Medieval Studies, due to her husband getting a job elsewhere and having a falling out with her adviser “I would love to finish my PhD someday,” she says. However, “teaching seven classes a semester doesn’t make that very feasible at the moment.” She feels she must teach a large number of part-time courses as “the mortgage is riding” partly on her income as a part-time instructor. Additionally, her marriage complicates matters, as her husband is a history professor at a nearby college:

A lot of my plan is governed by my husband’s plan, since he’s the full-time, tenure-track person. If he decides to move elsewhere, I sort of go as the wind blows. So it’s more of a collective plan rather than having one individual. At the moment, it’s just do what I can and try to do a good job and keep coming back every semester as much as I can.

Ms. Campagna thus finds herself in a bind where immediate economic realities are hindering her ability to seek a better academic employment relationship, as her ability to complete her doctorate is hindered by the amount she teaches and her husband's employment trumps her desired career development. This is hardly an unusual story for part-time instructors, as academic women disproportionately experience a negative effect on their careers from the demands of family and marriage when compared to their male counterparts (Benjamin 1998). The interview thus presents her as a married woman, concerned about money, whose wish to become a full-time tenure-track is undercut by her family and economic circumstances.

Second, Curtis Laskowski is an English part-time instructor who received both his Bachelors and Masters in English at Caussade before becoming certified to teach English
in New York City. “I made myself a promise... I would then try every academic format that I could find before I make a decision about where I land,” he said. “So I taught in a private high school, an independent boarding school, a public school, at Marcy Community College, and then finally stepped back and said college is where I wanna be.” Since then, he has settled into teaching a number of courses each semester at both Caussade College and Mahican Community College.

Mr. Laskawski enjoys teaching at the college level. “I would like to be a full-time faculty member at one location and stop being schizophrenic,” he says. However, he immediately quips, “But if schizophrenia is what I need to be, then, well, I'll drink a little absinthe [and continue teaching part-time].” In other words, he is more interested in teaching than in teaching full-time. He also admits he is able to take this view because his wife is a full-time tenure-track professor at Caussade in a physical science. “She had her doctorate by the time she was 27. She is brilliant and focused, and that's great. I think that [she is a professor] is awesome, and it helps me too, because I can be an adjunct. If she didn't have that, I wouldn't have benefits. We wouldn't be able to survive on what I make. So it's not a bad thing in our situation.” When asked about how his work related to their marriage, this was his response:

I wish I was contributing more money into the situation, to our finances and stuff. But it also – it's one of those weird benefits of being an adjunct, that if she wanted to go somewhere, I could be like, "Go. Anywhere you want, let's go." And we [part-time instructor] are a dime a dozen, but our field is required. Everyone has to take English, and I'm pretty sure that I'll find a hole to plug into. So I have a lot more flexibility than, say, somebody where the family is comprised of two full-time academics. There are people that I know that are on opposite coasts trying to have a relationship, and it's not working. So in some ways being an adjunct, again, is that issue of being free.
Like Campagna, Curtis Laskawski is a part-time instructor in English who wishes to be full-time and who is married to a full-time faculty member. Unlike her, Laskawski is satisfied with the combined income of him and his spouse, and does not see his marriage as an impediment to his career (West and Curtis 2006). Furthermore, Laskawski's acceptance of being a part-time instructor is expressed quite differently. Despite similar aspirations, they are on substantially different trajectories.

The third aspiring academic is Jesse Tucker, who is in his late twenties and received a Masters in English from Caussade. Upon completing his degree, he began making his living as a part-time instructor at Caussade as well as a nearby community college. He prefers teaching college as opposed to primary or secondary schools because undergraduates “want to be” at Caussade. Undergraduates, he says, are “paying a lot of money to be here, and so you know, I don’t have to hold [their] hand... I did a little substitute teaching in the high school, middle school and it just wasn’t for me, I didn’t like it... I never wanted to teach kids, I never wanted to be a babysitter. I wanted to teach at the college level.”

At the same time, however, he would prefer to avoid further graduate study for two reasons. First, he says, “I didn’t know if I had more years in me and you know, after debt piling up. So I wanted to get out there and actually get some experience... It was already six years in college [Bachelors and Masters Degrees] and it was like, I actually need to make some money.” Second, in addition to financial concerns, “now I feel like I’m getting old,” he says. “I don’t know if I have another five, six, seven years [of college] in me.”
Consequently, Tucker's current career goal is to become a full-time, tenure-track faculty member of a community college, as he hopes this will allow him to avoid going back to graduate school to get his doctorate. “Now I feel like I’m getting old,” he says. “I don’t know if I have another five, six, seven years [of college] in me. So saying that, so that was my goal to teach at a community college.” This makes a great deal of sense for someone who is drawn to academia solely for the flexibility the work offers, rather than the intellectual matters associated with scholastic worth.

In Mr. Tucker we have an individual who aspires to academic work but does not aspire to a terminal academic degree. This puts his in stark contrast to both Ms. Campagna and Mr. Laskawski, who assume that a doctorate is at least expected if not required to find work as a full-time tenure-track professor.

Finally, Adam Logan is a graduate student in Orange University's Physics Department with a math undergraduate degree who teaches at both Caussade and Mahican Community College. “I applied some years ago, and it turned out there was a person that applied for the adjunct position before me, and... she didn’t want to get up early in the morning, early class. So, I took the early morning class, and my first class I taught here was a Statistics course.”

“I’ve always wanted to teach,” Logan says. “Even with a Ph.D... I’d look for a teaching position.” In many ways, Logan's outlook is quite similar to the interviewed graduate students in the previous chapter. The largest difference is that rather than having a teaching position in his own department.

We can see a substantial amount of variability in the trajectories of these
individuals. Despite all wishing to be full time tenure track faculty, there are substantial differences in their family life, their specific career goals, what they would accept as a secondary goal, and their domestic circumstances.

**Diversity Among the Freelance Part-Time Faculty.** There were five interviewed part-time instructors who were part-time instructors but were fully employed or seeking full employment elsewhere. As one would expect, there is a substantial amount of difference among these people.

Jack Newsome and Joy Wine both were teaching for the money. Mr. Newsome was a tutor, a part-time instructor, and charter school teacher. “I’d like it to be one thing that I could concentrate on,” he says. “Right now that’s high school teaching, so my plan is to get to the point where I’m pretty much just doing the high school teaching. But on the other hand, you know, if I won the lottery, I wouldn’t be teaching high school anymore.” Ms. Wine, on the other hand, became a part-time instructor to spend time with her children and is now leaving it to find better paying work:

“I’m 51 and I never had to work before with my husband’s job. But I really need to now. I have two kids in college and we really can’t afford our house right now. We have this really nice house... I really need to work and my daughter had a baby at 20 which was a surprise, so he’s kind of like a third kid now. I can’t afford to do this for one thing.

Both Mr. Newsome and Ms. Wine have enjoyed teaching but are likely going to leave it in the near future in search of better paying work outside higher education.

Erica Volz is different in that she does not teach for financial gain, as she manages the patient transport department at a nearby hospital with thirty employees under her. Once, she intended to teach full time in higher education, but after receiving her Masters
from Caussade, she entered the work force and find it hard to leave it:

I’m really torn right now between doing what I love and working for a company that’s constantly promoting me and giving me raises, and has good benefits... I like what I do in the healthcare arena and I’m good at it, but it certainly isn’t the plan that I had for my life, and part of me just really wants to hold onto this because it is what I wanted to do. Maybe someday I can afford to actually go back and finish my degree, so I’d love to get a PhD I just didn’t have the time and the money.

Ms. Volz finds herself experiencing a division of labor where she works one job for money and another for personal fulfillment. It is unclear how long she can continue this.

Finally, both Miriam Marcum and Wally Perrine are English part-time instructors who are attempting to become writers. The main difference between them occupationally is that Ms. Marcum is expecting to support herself through teaching, while Mr. Perrine has decided to leave teaching to find a less demanding job until his writing career takes off.

The Lack of Alienated Adjuncts

Only two interviewed adjuncts, Wally Perrine and Joy Wine, were critical of their work to the point that they were planning to leave teaching. Mr. Perrine states he no longer has enthusiasm for the work and is increasingly frustrated regarding the pay. In other words, pursuing adjunct instruction does not optimize his utility from a market worth perspective, the form of worth he relies on. Ms. Wine has experienced a similar dual problem of the rewards are not enough and her interest in adjunct teaching has decreased. Once again, this is a market-based criticism. Ms. Wine has interests that cannot be effectively pursued through adjunct instruction. It is not satisfying either
financially or as a form of work.

Less specific criticisms are offered by Laskawski and Breedlove. Grounding his argument in civic worth, Laskawski argues that while he has the ability to fight for change through teaching, the overall system of higher education does not encourage this. Breedlove, for his part, is frustrated that faculty are not more appreciative of the position of respect they occupy, rather than complain about petty matters such as weather.

This begs the question why there were not more adjuncts that fit the common image found within academic work and opinion pieces of the oppressed adjunct aside from the possibility that adjuncts were not fully honest during their interviews. The fact that the two critical adjuncts were rather attempting hobble together a full-time income from adjunct instruction at Caussade and other colleges is noteworthy as this is precisely the type of work orientation that Caussade College actively discourages. Additionally, as adjuncts are re-hired after each semester, one would imagine those who do not find their work worthwhile will leave if possible soon after making that determination.

DISCUSSION

In this chapter, we see faculty's responses to the challenges of adjunct quality, the accusation of exploitation, and the need for distinction. Caussade College finds itself in a situation where it marginalized adjunct faculty in order to not exploit them and maintain a degree of legitimacy. Table 9: Forms of Worth at Caussade summarized the various forms of worth and associated justificatory regimes used by interviewees from Caussade
In this table, the scholastic regime is the distinct form of worth that arises from the interviews that invokes a Bourdieu-like notion of seriously playing with ideas. The other three forms of worth are all discussed at length by Boltanski & Thèvenot (2006) and are used by interviewed adjuncts at Caussade. We can see how the scholastic ideal, state of worth, relations of worth, and other aspects of the scholastic justificatory regime differ from a regime that attempts to assign value based on market price, the greater good of society, or knowing one's role. The scholastic regime is explicitly a local and professional form of worth, with the actors using it as such with little pretense to its universality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Higher Principle</th>
<th>Scholastic</th>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Civic</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inherent Value of Knowledge</td>
<td>competition</td>
<td>The preeminence of collectivities</td>
<td>Engenderment according to tradition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Worthiness</td>
<td>Serious Play of Ideas</td>
<td>desirable</td>
<td>Rule governed &amp; representative</td>
<td>Hierarchical superiority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objects</td>
<td>One's Contribution to the Ongoing Debate</td>
<td>wealth</td>
<td>Legal forms</td>
<td>Rules of etiquette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations of Worth</td>
<td>The Social Engagement of Ideas</td>
<td>possess</td>
<td>Relation of delegation</td>
<td>Respect &amp; responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figures</td>
<td>The Ongoing Academic Debate</td>
<td>markets</td>
<td>The democratic republic</td>
<td>The soul of the home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test</td>
<td>Professional Discretion</td>
<td>The deal</td>
<td>Demonstration for a just cause</td>
<td>Family ceremonies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Forms of Worth at Caussade
Three Questions Revisited

Regarding the matter of quality, the college relies on a combination of two tests of worth. Both tests, peer review and student review, examine scholastic worth. However, the combination of the two tests is of a form that allows the college to assuage fears about the teaching quality of its adjunct faculty. It engaged the concerns of exploitation and distinction in a unified matter, arguing that precisely because adjunct faculty members are different (and less invested) than full-time faculty, they are not exploited. They offer a substantially smaller contribution, and they receive one.

New Question: On Teaching and Research. It is worth noting the similarities between teaching and research in the ways scholastic worth are deployed. One's mastery of one's academic discipline and its knowledge is the basis of one's teaching ability and the potential for a contribution to the academic debate. The fact that Caussade College (and Orange University in a later chapter) attempt to establish an equivalency between teaching and research is notable, and this will be discussed further in the final chapter. It is therefore an open question (which will be revisited in the conclusion) on the virtues and potential problems with treating regarding attempting to use the same justificatory logic for both teaching and research.

Autonomy. Regarding autonomy, Caussade's situation appears tenuous. On the one side, it appears relatively stable for the time being. On the other hand, it relies on hobbyists and non-academics (in a paradoxical attempt to avoid economic criticism), and
its peaceful co-existence between adjuncts and full-time faculty appears to rely on an unsustainable growth of the undergraduate population.

We are therefore left with a picture that is complicated, but not incoherent. Sincere attention to scholastic value occurs, though this happens in a highly compromised context, and with many potential pitfalls, as one should not assume their evaluative system works perfectly.

Significance

Whether one is talking about the pay per course taught, the limit on how much one person may teach a semester, the arrangement of space, etc., it appears quite clear that working as an adjunct is not an occupation individuals ought to use as their primary source of income. Consequently, those who attempt to teach enough courses (at Caussade or elsewhere) to be a primary income source find themselves in an unfortunate situation.

At the same time, it does not suggest Caussade College exploits people. Because of the way Caussade goes to great pains to regulate the potential worth of adjunct work in an effort to make it proportional to the financial compensation adjuncts earn, we can make the paradoxical summary that adjuncts are marginalized by Caussade's efforts to not exploit them. It is unsurprising therefore that the two respondents who expressed frustration are the two attempting to make a living from being an adjunct. Caussade would rather hire retirees who want to cover monthly health insurance costs or someone with an unrelated career who enjoys the opportunity to engage academic
It is also noteworthy that scholastic worth was treated as applicable to both teaching and research. Both are seen as fundamentally scholastic activities that dealt with the serious play of ideas, and both judged individuals on their ability to contribute something to an ongoing conversation. It is an open question how this influences the organization of education, and one the conclusion chapter will engage through a comparison of the three cases.

Caussade College's justificatory strategy therefore involves a binary: either one is a professional, or a (compensated) amateur. If one assumes the integrity of the academic profession is necessary for the autonomy of the academic field. Amateur's work is arguably similar to the professionals (both are teaching courses), a substantial credential is required of the amateurs (a master’s degree), and both professionals and amateurs are given a large amount of discretion in how to teach, this may be the source of potential problems. All of these reasons create a constant and precarious danger to the ability to make effective distinctions between adjunct and full-time faculty in a way that allows for full-time faculty to seem worthwhile.

Caussade's ability to justify its use of adjuncts in a way that actors can accept as legitimate therefore appears to be a fragile balancing act. This justified arrangement is delicate and is threatened on several fronts. First and foremost, adjunct instruction must remain an effective boundary object. This likely requires the high degree of discretion given adjunct instructors in how they teach. Some authors (Gappa and Leslie 1993) see this variation as a symptom of a problem that can be solved through the
professionalization of adjuncts in some fashion. However, at least at Caussade, the lack of formalization allows for the discretion necessary to allow adjuncts to evaluate their work by whatever justificatory regime they see fit.

Second, the current path to legitimacy used by the full-time faculty and administration requires adjuncts to be seen as minor contributors to the overall academic environment of the college. Consequently, the list of elements that enforce the marginality of adjuncts (or something approximating it) must be maintained. If the administration, the departments, or the adjuncts begin to move in the direction of greater integration, the current order may be destabilized.

Due to both this and the first point, one would also expect, in the name of legitimacy, the general isolation of adjuncts to continue in terms of sociality, facilities, and their limited interaction with the full-time faculty of their respective departments. Any changes that would lessen the severity of Caussade's discouragement of adjuncts other than people who wish to make a minor contribution will have far-reaching consequences. Additionally, anything that creates more ambiguity and flexibility (such as a relatively high state of isolation and invisibility) will help sustain its boundary object quality.

A fourth and possibly understated point is that Caussade's continual population growth has likely helped maintain the justification of the current organization. The new students (and the tuition they bring in) allow the real (as opposed to relative) number of full-time tenure-track faculty to not be threatened. As long as this remains, then full-time faculty will continue to appreciate their ability to teach more upper level and personally
satisfying courses, gaining an immediate benefit from adjunct reliance rather than being threatened from them.

This leads to the final point, that the erosion of scholastic worth as the central form of worth deployed by full-time faculty and administrators will hinder its ability to maintain an advantageous heterarchical situation involving adjuncts. The institutionalized reliance on scholastic worth allows for compelling normative claims that would not be possibly if the organization was not as homologous to the regime of justification. An organization that attempted to actively cater to multiple forms of worth simultaneously would run the risk of pursuing them all poorly.
CHAPTER 5:
MAHICAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE, INTEGRATION, AND ADJUNCT AS JOB CANDIDATE

In the previous chapter, we saw that Caussade College depends on people who do academic worth for a multitude of reasons aside from it being their primary career. Their justificatory strategy therefore involves a binary choice: one is either a professional within the academic field, or one is an auxiliary with partial field membership. This assumes that the integrity of the academic profession is necessary for the autonomy of the academic field. Auxiliaries’ adjunct work is arguably similar to a professional’s (both are teaching courses), a substantial credential is required of the auxiliaries (a master’s degree), and both professionals and auxiliaries are given a large amount of discretion in how to teach. These three issues may be the source of potential problems by creating an impediment to one's ability to make effective distinctions between adjunct and full-time faculty in a way that allows for full-time faculty to seem worthwhile.

One can view the next two case studies as variations of the themes presented with Caussade College. In this chapter, we will look at Mahican Community College, which differs in two key ways from Caussade.

MAHICAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE: A PROFILE

According to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
(Carnegie Foundation for 2010), Mahican Community College is designated as “ASSOC/Pub-U-SC,” an associate’s degree-granting public institution with a single campus that serves an urban area. According to its website (Mahican Community College 2010), MCC is an open enrollment institution with over 10,000 full-time equivalent students. The minimum salary for full-time faculty is $48,981 a year, and adjuncts have a college-wide standard pay rate of $926 per credit hour until they reach 9 credit hours, and then it is $985 per credit hour. As introductory courses in both English and math at MCC are 3 credits each, and adjuncts are rarely hired for more than nine credit hours a semester, adjuncts in both departments can be expected to receive $2,928 per course per semester with no benefits for their work.

This chapter is based on fourteen interviews with people associated with Mahican Community College. Regrettably, while English professors and adjuncts were generally able to be recruited the English Department chair did not agreed to be interviewed despite repeated requests. It is possible that the controversies surrounding adjuncts and part-time instructors discouraged the chair, but this is a purely speculative statement as the department chair did not respond to any request.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Interviewees from Mahican Community College
Service Departments

Mahican Community College has no stand-alone degree for either English or math. Rather, MCC offers associate’s degrees in “Liberal Arts & Science: Humanities and Social Science,” and “Liberal Arts & Science: Mathematics and Science.” As their names suggest, these degrees involve an introduction to several disciplines. As English Assistant Professor Harriett Right explains, both the English and Mathematics Departments are “service departments”:

This department is important on campus because everybody in every degree program has to take at least Freshmen Composition, so in that way we are really important. But in another way, which makes us not so important, our Department doesn’t actually offer any degrees. We are nothing but a service department. And so our Department often needs to get out there and be on committees that makes decisions about other curricula to make sure that everyone’s still co-linked into English Comp. We kind of need to stand behind our Department and make sure that everyone values the writing curriculum that we offer.

Mathematics Chair Noreen Rumble explains this situation in detail for the Mathematics Department:

Four thousand students take our classes every semester and only 200 of them are in our programs, the math and engineering programs. So obviously the others come from somewhere else. So we have to meet the needs of a lot of different departments. We designed a course for students that have significant difficulty in math, especially with algebra. So we designed a non-algebra course that is transferable for some programs – that type of thing. People come to us with needs, and then we look for trends as well, like nanotechnology or bioinformatics. If we see some hot item out there that we think we should offer a course in, we’d consider doing that.

This highlights why English and Math were attractive for this study; they were both traditional liberal arts disciplines that have come to rely heavily on part-time instruction due to the need to teach general elective courses.
Like Caussade College, adjunct instruction at Mahican Community College is a flexible boundary construct involving a highly diverse group of people with different occupational trajectories; there is diversity both in their current occupational positions and in their future goals. This diversity can be seen in Table 11: Diversity of Adjunct Instructors at Mahican Community College. The adjuncts within the English and Mathematics Departments at Mahican Community College are diverse in terms of their occupational trajectories. A total of eight adjuncts from Mahican Community College were interviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Career Goals</th>
<th>Justifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allyson Gess</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
<td>State Employee, Adjunct</td>
<td>Continue job, continue working to 'give back'</td>
<td>Civic &amp; pedagogical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Averette</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Writing Center Specialist (FT), Adjunct</td>
<td>Keep Job, continuing adjuncting when available for extra $$</td>
<td>Market &amp; Scholastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabatha Coachman</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Aspiring</td>
<td>Move to area w/ husband</td>
<td>Raise son, become full-time</td>
<td>Market - Pedagogical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis Laskowski</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Aspiring</td>
<td>Spouse of professor, Part-Time Instructor at multiple colleges</td>
<td>Looking for full-time tenure-track work</td>
<td>Civic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Direnzo</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Retired Math Teacher / Principle</td>
<td>Keep teaching</td>
<td>Market - pedagogical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Dubray</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Aspiring</td>
<td>Unemployed engineer</td>
<td>Wants to be FT</td>
<td>Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benita Raatz</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Formerly full-time</td>
<td>Gradually phasing out</td>
<td>Pedagogical - scholastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan Schultz</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Same as now</td>
<td>Pedagogical - scholastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margery Spurrier</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Aspiring</td>
<td>academic</td>
<td>Former K-12 teacher</td>
<td>Animal-assisted therapy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Diversity of Adjunct Instructors at Mahican Community College
Two Mahican adjuncts are what Gappa & Leslie (1993) refer to as freelance. Allyson Gess is a state employee. “I like my job [at the state],” says Gess. “But I needed something to do that made me feel like I was giving back or helping. I miss that now, having a full-time job and a family [have limited my opportunities to do so].” Similarly, when asked why he enjoys adjunct instruction, Schultz comments, “I’d like to make a difference. I always wanted to teach and this sort of gives me a platform to explore that possibility without really, totally engaging myself by becoming an assistant professor. So far it’s been really good. It’s been a good experience.” When he elaborates what he finds important in teaching, his answer seems more scholastic in character than pedagogical:

[It has been a good experience because of my] the ability to impart some of my knowledge to students and to, and just also keeping myself active in terms of trying to remember certain things that I’ve learned in school and not forget about them cause I do treasure those things. And just the interaction of the students. It also makes you feel pretty young knowing that you always see incoming students, keeps your mind active, your brain active and you know, gives you sort of this how do you call it, feeling of youth, youthfulness I see. Be surrounded by young minds or inquisitive minds I should say.

Mr. Schultz sees value in teaching because it affords him an opportunity to play with knowledge and keep things fresh in his mind. Importantly both of these people see teaching as a way to give back, and are not looking at it in terms of employment as they are both employed elsewhere in well-paying jobs.

It is important to note that when Schultz and Gess talk of “making a difference,” their comments are slightly more vague and distinctly less political than Curtis Laskawski from Caussade. We will discuss what forms of worth are or are not in play at Mahican
Aspiring Academics

Three interviewed adjuncts at Mahican Community College can be categorized as aspiring academics, though there is a great deal of variation between them. Hugh Dubray, a laid-off engineer, describes how he came to MCC:

I was out of work at GE and I was networking with the Chamber of Commerce... and they told me that there was an engineering curriculum job open at MCC and they would get me an interview. Well, it turns out they got me the interview the next day... They kind of knew what they wanted, but they didn't know exactly... In the process of conversation, they said something about an opening in the math department for an adjunct, and I said, “Well, maybe I can talk about that.” And so, things happened very quickly. The first interview was on a Tuesday, they got me an interview with the math department head on Wednesday, the next day, and he checked out my references on Thursday, called me back, said he would like for me to start the following Monday and he would have the Board of Directors approve it on Friday.

Dubray would like to become a full-time faculty member at MCC, but he lacks the necessary Masters in math to do this.

Tabitha Coachman came to teach at the college when she moved to the area with her husband who was starting a new job. She taught English composition at a large southern state university before moving, and consequently she found work at MCC doing the same thing. In the future she would like to get a tenure-track job at the college, but only after her infant son is older:

Now with our son... this early in his life we’ve kind of decided we really want one of us to be with him for the primary, you know, day childcare person, rather than bringing him someplace, and so we don’t really know how long we want to approach raising him in that way. Eventually, you know, I would love to, you know, secure a full-time position in this kind of
job some place. I really enjoy the community college position. I really enjoy this type of teaching, but in the immediate future I don’t know.

This is different still from Margery Spurrier, a math adjunct with a Master's Degree in curriculum and working on a Ph.D. in education who hopes to one day an

animal-assisted therapy facility for students:

I have a math major. My B.A.'s in math. My Master's is in Curriculum and Instruction, 'cause I wanted to learn more about teaching. The more I get into teaching, the more I like teaching. So I'm really interested in starting a school for at-risk students that uses animals as a mediation, to help them learn respect and responsibility. I'm a big animal lover, too, so I had to mix it in. I know what animals can do for people. So I thought that by pursuing my Ph.D., I'd be able to learn more about that, learn more about how to structure instruction so that kids, at-risk students, disenfranchised students who've been kicked outta schools, expelled from schools, have terrible backgrounds can come, be someplace safe, go back as far as they need to in their education, and work their way back up.

While one could categorize all three of these individuals as aspiring academics, the larger point is that they are substantially different from one another.

*Retirees*

Among the interviewed adjuncts, there are two retirees. Benita Raatz was a full-time faculty member at MCC until five years ago. She is now gradually moving into retirement, though she finds the transition difficult at times:

“My husband’s considering retirement, and that may change my future. I’m gonna be here at least through next semester, and at this point, I’m still signed up for the Poetry class in the fall of ’10. And after that, it’s a question mark. So, I’m not sure. I would miss teaching. I mean, I – I don’t like to think of not doing it at all.”

Nelson Direnzo is a retired high school teacher and principal who was hired several years ago to teach introductory math courses at MCC. “I moved here about four years ago and
basically I needed something to do again. And I saw an ad in the paper for an adjunct professor and I thought I like that. So I applied and got a job.”

Diversity along the Boundary

Similar to Caussade College, the adjuncts employed by Mahican Community College are a diverse group that are difficult to categorize into tight categories, other than that all but one interviewed adjunct were Caucasian. Thus the question and challenge for Mahican Community College is how to effectively organize this cacophony of individuals on different occupational trajectories in a way that allows the college to justify its use of adjuncts. The first step in understanding their response is to begin by identifying the primary form of worth at Mahican Community College, and then to describe how adjuncts are integrated into the organization of MCC using (cynically or sincerely) that and other forms of worth.

PEDAGOGICAL WORTH AT MAHICAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The dominant form of worth at Mahican Community College is pedagogical rather than scholastic worth. While there was a degree of diversity among the adjunct faculty, this pedagogical worth was strongly promoted by the full-time employees of Mahican Community College. While these forms of worth are similar, they are anchored on different higher principles: the inherent value of knowledge in the case of scholastic worth, and the elevating potential of knowledge for pedagogical worth.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Swager</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Vice President of Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Wellman</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonita Raine</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Mosca</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriett Right</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Strohmeyer</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noreen Rumble</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Full-time Interviewees at Mahican Community College

*Similarity and Departure from Scholastic Worth*

To review quickly, the state of scholastic worth is the serious play of ideas, and academic activity (including both teaching and research) was considered scholastically justifiable at Caussade College (and Orange University in the next chapter). The central scholastic figure is the ongoing intellectual discussion, a scholastically meaningful event that must be both intellectual and social. The object to be evaluated scholastically is one's contribution to the ongoing conversation, and a positive scholastic judgment occurs when one makes a contribution that present revelation to others. In the previous chapter, an interviewee referred to this as the “light bulb effect”: the moment where an undergraduate student experiences a moment of realization where a student understands the material taught in class and sees its inherent value.

Similar things can be found at Mahican Community College, such as in math adjunct Margery Spurrier's comment about what he enjoys most about teaching:

For me, [the most rewarding part is] the interaction with the students, helping them achieve their goals, leading them to something more. Personally, for me, I get a lot out of taking someone who has struggled with math. They believe, "I can't do math. I'm stupid at math. I can't."
And taking them to the point of saying, "Yeah, I can do this. I enjoy this. Maybe math is actually just a little bit fun." And gaining their confidence back to be able to keep going. For me, that's the biggest thing is seeing them achieve their goals and move on with confidence. I could do that all day. I could do that forever.

Spurrier appears to be discussing the light bulb effect in this quote, as she enjoys it when students realize they can understand math or gain any enjoyment from it. However, the emphasis on this realization “leading them to something more” was not emphasized at either Orange University or Caussade College. At those institutions, the moment of realization was the end in and of itself. We can see this shift again in retired English professor turned adjunct Benita Raatz's interview:

I think teaching is sort of the ideal blend between human interaction and a kind of social service feeling that you are helping people. You are advancing their lives. You are able to, you hope, improve their skills, make them more intelligent, educated people. Sometimes you also deal with personal problems, which sometimes is a nice – if you can; if it’s not a huge problem, you can sometimes help people. Be a mentor. And then there’s the intellectual part of it. I’ve always loved my subject matter. I love reading. I’m a voracious reader; I read all the time. And I’m able to use that interest that I have intellectually in the classroom. So, it’s not a chore for me to teach this stuff. I reread every short story every semester that I teach it. And as odd as that sounds, I don’t really mind it.

She values both the interactive element of teaching, as well as the material itself.

However, her goal is to advance lives through English education, not to make students appreciate English as a discipline. This shift suggests a larger issue, as such a claim can no longer be characterized as the serious play of ideas.

Responsibility to Educate as State of Worth

Mahican Community College relies on the responsibility to educate as the state of worth, not the serious play of ideas. Margery Spurrier highlights this:
I know that the vast majority of the professors in that department really care about the students. That's what a community college is all about. You've got kids there who, for whatever reason, couldn't go to a four-year school, whether it's academics or whether it's finances. They're willing to serve that whole – what do you call that? – one into the other, spectrum, there we go. They're willing to serve that whole spectrum of students. They're gonna stay. They're gonna help them. There is the rare few heard like, "Here it is. If you don't figure it out, tough," and I respect them for that. That's why I would like to be a part of that. I would like to be there full-time for a time if I could.

The worthy teacher is capable of transforming students using knowledge as a tool toward this goal. This is effectively a reversal of the logical priority found in scholastic worth, where the focus is on knowledge and facilitating students' desire to engage it and play seriously.

Object of Evaluation

Building on this, the object for pedagogical worth is the instructor's ability to better connect with students, as opposed to one's contribution to the ongoing academic debate being the object of scholastic evaluation. Benita Raatz discusses how she relies on various pedagogical techniques in order to be an effective teacher:

I think I’m fairly good at keeping variety going in the classroom. I use a variety of teaching methods, [such as] group work. Today, for instance, in one class I showed a movie. In my other class today we’re gonna all go to the library so I can sit down one on one with them and look at how their research is going.

We can also see this in comments by Margery Spurrier:

Most of your math professors… at Orange University, they're going to get up [and] they're going to lecture to you for the course. You're going to do some examples, whatever. Come back with questions, and that's the standard. I very rarely lecture to my classes. I do a lot of project-based, problem-based, activity-based [education].
In addition to being an adjunct at MCC, Spurrier is also a graduate student at Orange University. Contrasting the way she teaches with how things are commonly done at Orange, she then mentions her teaching style “doesn't always go over so well with people who think the only way to teach math is just to put it on the board, do the problem, for example. But I'm okay with that. That's the way it is. So that's all right.”

*Form of Positive Judgment*

If a positive scholastic judgment involves a new insight being given to another during discussion, a positive pedagogical judgment similarly means the advancement of students. Math adjunct Nelson Direnzo makes this clear when he says, “It’s fun to teach because it is real life and they can see where it fits into their world.” We see this idea of advancement from English professor Harriett Right in an anecdote from a journalism course she taught:

This one student in particular I’m thinking of came into my course, kind of weak writing skills, but got through the course, and by the end he was doing really excellently, and there’s just something about his personality and his own drive, that he really learned and picked it up. A few years later I ended up getting an email from him that he had just gotten a job at the Chicago Tribune... So, that was fabulous. And he’s writing for them now. So, somebody that came in, kind of out of high school, not sure what they wanted to do, not great skills, and then so many years down the road ends up thanking me and saying, “Hey, I got a great job doing this, and you inspired me.” So that’s the thing I love about my job... It’s a really nice thing to be able to help people.

We can see her taking responsibility for the education of this student, uses the anecdote to demonstrate her improving the lives of students in concrete ways through education. The student's advancement into a successful career is a positive judgment on her actions as a
college instructor. Math associate professor Allan Strohmeyer echoes this sentiment as well:

One thing we would see here that other places don’t [have] is we get to see a lot of movement... I would love to be a professor at Harvard. But one thing for sure though, you don’t see any movement. They come in as A students. They’ll leave at A students... Here, I’ve had some great – I’ve had some great experiences with having students who’ve just gone places they might never have dreamed. It’s wonderful. They started out with developmental mathematics and they became a physicist. That’s remarkable.

Here we see an interesting application of pedagogical worth to teaching at MCC: As community college students have more to learn, one has more of an opportunity to demonstrate one's teaching ability pedagogical worth there than one does at an Ivy League university.

Though similar, the normative character of pedagogical worth is significantly different from that of scholastic worth. Through the lens of pedagogical worth, an instructor is expected to educate students in a way that helps them advance in life (generally but not exclusively in a socioeconomic sense) using academic knowledge. The relative focus and ordering of knowledge and students is thus inverted.

*Care as Relation of Worth*

As an institution with open admission, there is a wide range of students at Mahican Community College. “Mahican offers a great variety of students,” says Math adjunct Margery Spurrier. She continues, “You've got kids right out of high school, and you've got adults who are 60 coming back to school.” Many of these students, however, will not necessarily have a high degree of academic achievement. “The college will see
students who might have struggled to finish high school, eventually, earning the GED, say, and might not be able to get into the college of their choice because of enrollment standards and such, admission standards rather. So they’ll need the open enrollment kind of policy that we have here,” says Math professor Allan Strohmeyer.

The faculty members at Mahican Community College are prepared to teach more remedial students. In their view, educating students, particularly remedial students, requires compassion in addition to a knowledge of the course material. “The vast majority of our students need a little more nurturing,” says math chair Noreen Rumble. She continues:

[Students here] need a little more concern for their progress. They need to believe that things are confidence-built. And math is a real weak area that way. Very hard to undo 13 years of [a student believing,] ‘I can't do math... We have to deal with the whole gamut, the whole population. Some instructors aren't used to that. They've only taught say at the upper ten percent or something. That's a different population.

Math professor Allan Strohmeyer reiterates this point when he says it is important that someone who wants to teach at Mahican Community College “realizes that a lot of what we do is not just delivering the material, so to speak. There’s a lot of persuasion going on. Come on board. Pointing out resources. Offering a lot of supplemental assistance, extra office hours and such.” Simply knowing academic ideas is not enough; one must care about the students in a way that goes beyond the specific academic conversation to develop their self-confidence.

Harriett Right explicitly states the role caring for students has in her teaching. “I love teaching because I like helping people, and I like seeing them grow, and I like seeing them improve, and I like seeing them and really take delight in finding out that they are
and discovering what they want to do.” She then goes farther, suggesting that English courses often approach “counseling” for some students:

> You’re reading people’s writing, and people spend a lot of time with their feelings and things happening in their lives and they put their hearts out on the pages sometimes. And so what comes across my desk is often very personal and full of emotion and a side of students that I think other instructors probably don’t get to.

Recalling the comment by chair of the Math Department at Caussade that “I’m looking for two things: First the knowledge of the math and secondly, enthusiasm and connection to kids,” one can see how comments about the centrality of compassionate care for students differ from the scholastic worth found at Orange University and Caussade College. The focus at MCC is on the student lives being improved substantively through education, rather than focusing on their actions in the classroom and their appreciation of the material at hand.

Noreen Rumble acknowledged this compassion is necessary for a large proportion of Mahican Community College's student body. “I went to Orange University, I functioned very well in classes of three and four hundred, and I didn't need that individual attention. I knew I could do it. I didn't need that. But there's a lot of students here [like that], like a lot of our engineering students. They don't need warm fuzzies. They get it and they got it the first time. 'Don't need to tell me again.' But I'm talking about the other half” (Noreen Rumble).

English Associate Professor Neil Mosca teaches three sections of English Fundamentals, a remedial English course. “The class is basically teaching students beginning at the sentence level,” he says. “What is a complete sentence, what is a subject, what is a verb, what constitutes a sentence rather than a run-on or comma splice
or a fragment. That class is just very basic sentence structure. Then moving on to paragraphs and topic sentences and ending up with a very short research essay.”

Importantly, Mosca does not feel coerced into teaching these developmental courses. He explains:

I am the most experienced person in the department teaching the developmental course. That’s part of the reason that I like to teach that course. I feel responsible to this – I feel a certain sense of responsibility to the students.

The desire to teach lower level students can be seen from retired principal and Math adjunct Nelson Direnzo, who says, “Honestly and truly I love teaching this lower level course that I teach.” He then goes on to explain why:

When I first started out teaching in regular public school, I really liked the low levels. Though I went all the way through calculus, it just gets boring after a while because math’s not exciting. But I like what I’m teaching... I’m teaching adding, subtracting, multiplying, dividing with whole numbers, decimals, fractions. You know, and they need it for whatever they’re going into and either they had it 20 years ago or they never had it or whatever. I think I do pretty well.

Taking the responsibility to educate, Direnzo actively seeks out which courses will benefit the most from the new understandings he has to offer. This is not an act of altruistic charity (Boltanski 1999:6, 77 – 95), but rather a display of his (pedagogical) worth as an instructor. Because he enthusiastically and successfully helps students, he is a worthy instructor.

We do not see a stated desire to teach basic and remedial courses at Caussade among tenured faculty. In both of those cases, students are valued to the degree they can participate in the intellectual discussions within the course, and teaching upper division courses is without exception seem as a higher status task (more sophisticated academic
knowledge presented to students who are more engaged).

*Other Forms of Worth at Mahican Community College*

Though the most frequently deployed form of worth at Mahican Community College is pedagogical, it is not the only form.

*Market Worth, Money, and Flexibility.* Adjunct instruction is employment. As such, it involves pay for work, and it should therefore be unsurprising that some interviewees deploy a market worthwhile discussion their work as an adjunct at Mahican Community College.

Similar to adjuncts at Caussade College, some adjuncts qualified their work experience at Mahican Community College in market terms explicitly related to financial compensation. Matthew Averette began as an adjunct in the English Department, and has since found a full-time position in the college's Writing Center (separate from the English Department), though he continues to adjunct most semesters. He explains his choices in terms of a need for income:

I was working for a publication firm in Albany full-time and I was teaching one course per semester as an adjunct. Then that particular job, I got laid off. Because I was enjoying the teaching so much, I looked into full-time employment here. It took a while, but then this job opened up, so I applied and here I am... My daughters are in college so I needed to pay the bills. It was a financial decision.

Though Averette is more or less content with his current situation, others are less satisfied, offering criticisms of work at MCC based in market worth. Hugh Dubray puts it simply, saying, “I wish the income were more.” Benita Raatz, however, describes
things in more detail:

What [working at Mahican Community College] does is force you to decide whether you're teaching for money or for love. And if you're teaching for money and you need the money, you can't do this job. It just doesn't pay squat. You know? It's just not worth it. I mean, it's better than McDonald's, but it's unfortunate that the communication to -- the psychological communication, as it is to nursery school teachers, is you aren't really that valuable, and we're not gonna pay you very much. And this college can't -- no college could run if they didn't have a lot of part-time people.

Raatz sums up a central argument of this entire dissertation: adjunct instruction does not appear to be a particularly worthwhile form of work if it is judged in purely economic and market terms. Rather, it can only be justified in terms of “love”.

Finding value in adjunct instruction because of one's love for it can be taken several different ways. One could move away from market worth and towards pedagogical worth (the love of students), or toward scholastic worth (the love of knowledge). Alternatively, one can continue to think instrumentally about one's adjunct work, but value other things beyond financial compensation.

Similar to Caussade College adjuncts, several adjuncts at Mahican Community College find value in the flexibility of adjunct work. Math adjunct Margery Spurrier succinctly describes this:

I wanted something that would give me a little bit more flexibility and time. I've gotten my Master's degree part-time. I knew that to get my Ph.D. part-time, gonna be a lot of work, and the schedule of a high school teacher isn't as flexible. You have to be there when the bell rings, whatever, but as an adjunct, I like the idea that I could go and say, "Hey, I can't work Mondays from 4:00 to 7:00 because I have class. I can't work here," and I can schedule things around that. So I was looking for something where I could keep working in my teaching field but still have that flexibility.

Spurrier views flexibility as a worthwhile work condition. Based on her quote above, one
would imagine she would be willing to work as an adjunct for less money than she would be as a high school teacher. While not being financial compensation, flexible work is a (partial) form of compensation in and of itself.

_Scholastic Worth._ Though it is not as dominant at MCC, scholastic worth is also present, often woven into other discussions. For example, when English adjunct Matthew Averette discussed what he enjoyed about teaching English, he responded:

> I’ve just always enjoyed reading and writing, and then talking about reading and writing. Sharing what I’ve learned, what I’ve noticed, what I’ve observed. Just the interaction with other people who are like-minded. Now, granted, some of your two year students don’t have that same passion, but they pretend that they do for two years, anyway, right?

Though at other points in the same interview Averette uses more pedagogical language, this passage is clearly grounded in the ideal of seriously playing with knowledge. He wishes, personally, to find value in teaching based on his passion for the material.

Another example of scholastic worth being deployed in the qualification of teaching at Mahican Community College comes from English Adjunct Benita Raatz. Soon after describing teaching as “the ideal blend between human interaction and a kind of social service”, she adds, “And then there’s the intellectual part of it.” To elaborate, she states the following:

> I’ve always loved my subject matter. I love reading. I’m a voracious reader; I read all the time. And I’m able to use that interest that I have intellectually in the classroom. So, it’s not a chore for me to teach this stuff. I reread every short story every semester that I teach it. And as odd as that sounds, I don’t really mind it. You know? I mean, yes, I’ve read _The Cask of Amontillado_ 16 times, but it’s okay. I mean, it’s – they’re wonderful works. They’re – the sentences are lovely. So, I enjoy that. I enjoy being able to be in touch with different intellectual minds, with people who are, I think, really brilliant. So, they become part of my mind
by having that in my head, and I think I’m very fortunate in that, that life doesn’t get too boring.

Once again, there is a play with knowledge, which has value in and of itself. Ms. Raatz blends together both pedagogical and scholastic concerns as she discusses adjunct instruction at MCC.

Benita Raatz explicitly uses both scholastic and pedagogical qualifications, and uses one immediately after the other. We can see, at least for her, that there is no perceived exclusivity between the two forms of worth.

Summary of Pedagogic Worth at Mahican Community College

Two things may be said about pedagogical worth. First, pedagogical and scholastic worth differ substantially from one another, beginning with the reversal of the priority of students and knowledge. The distinctiveness of the responsibility to educate, the advancement of students, and caring for students all come back to this key difference. Second, pedagogical worth is central in the interviews with Mahican faculty, as opposed to the scholastic worth at Caussade.

Pedagogical worth is also common among the adjuncts of MCC, though there are several other forms of worth present among them. It is important to note that few people, even those who deployed market worth, attempted to evaluate adjunct instruction as a primary form of employment. Rather, they described a cost-benefit analysis where they wanted something (some income, a job with flexible hours) balanced against costs (low pay, uncertain hiring next semester)).

With pedagogical worth in mind, we must now turn our attention toward how
adjunct instruction was organized with the ability to make pedagogical justifications.

ADJUNCT INSTRUCTION AS GATEWAY

The interaction of its status as a community college and frequent deployment of pedagogical worth results in an organization of adjunct work at Mahican Community College that differs substantially from Caussade College or Orange University. If adjunct instruction is segregated at Caussade and part of graduate education at Orange, it is a gateway at MCC.

Adjuncting as Elongated Job Interview and Test of Worth

One of the most distinctive elements of adjunct organization at Mahican Community College is many of its English and mathematics full-time tenure-track faculty started work at the college as adjunct faculty. Math associate professor Allan Strohmeyer associates this trend with “the Sputnik group is retiring.” He then explained what he meant:

Right after the Russians had launched Sputnik in ’57, a lot of people in America all went into the sciences and mathematics, college. They got their graduate degrees in the early sixties, started working in the early to mid-sixties and now they’re retiring. So I call them the “Sputnik group.” I’m probably aging some of them by doing that. But yeah, there’s like this mass exodus. Two or three people – in a department of science, twenty or so, to lose two or three a year. I like fresh blood and all, but sometimes if you lose too much in one shot; that sucked. I don’t want to be the old gray one already. I’ve been here since ’91, but I’m not ready for the senior faculty kind of feel. I’m too young for that. So there’s been a lot of – but because of this exodus, we’ve had a lot of search committees. I’m finding on the few search committees I got on, since they’re all in recent history here, they’re always some of those familiar faces who have been going to meetings and have been engaging in some of the departmental activities,
even getting on campus committees in some cases.

Strohmeyer's comment focuses on the Mathematics Department exclusively, but the phenomenon is found in both departments.

According to Math Chair Noreen Rumble, adjuncts who are interested in full-time jobs are monitored more closely:

I usually in the fall if I know I'm going to have openings in the spring for full-time positions, I ask the part-time faculty to let me know if they think they might be interested in a full-time position. Because I definitely want to observe them during that year before they apply – so – just so that I have good information to share with the committee.

Through the course of conducting interviews for this project, several issues matters regarding the hiring of adjuncts for full-time tenure-track positions. As we will see, one could argue adjunct instruction at Mahican Community College is, in part, akin to an elongated job interview.

Sustained Teaching. “I found that, having been on search committees and such, that we place a lot of value on the candidate having experience, actual experience, in the classroom,” says Allan Strohmeyer while discussing the hiring of adjuncts as full-time faculty. He continues:

And what a great way to get it but as an adjunct. So we value that a lot, I found, when we’re in a search process. It speaks volumes to us. If they’ve done their work here, it’s all the more impressive because we have a special population. We’re a public community college. We have open enrollment. Not all people who going into higher ed appreciate that. A lot of people think, “I’m gonna have a bunch of hungry academics in all of my classes.” If you’re at a public institution with open enrollment, it’s gonna be very mixed. We like knowing that people coming into our positions here have some firsthand experience with that actual reality. So if they’ve been an adjunct here, we say, all right. They know what they’re getting into.
The Math Department wishes those they hire to have teaching experience, this teaching experience is valued more if it has been done at Mahican Community college, as the quality of the instructor can be better ascertained at that point. Instructors who work as an adjunct at Mahican Community College will be known quantities to some degree to the college, and this is an advantage in employment searches.

English professor Neil Mosca made sure the department chair was aware he was doing a good job at teaching as an adjunct before he became full-time:

[It was] only because I was trying to go for a full-time position [that] I had actually asked my department chair if she’d mind sitting in on my class. She had heard good things about what I was doing in the classroom, but I thought, “Well, maybe if I’m looking for a full-time job, maybe she should see what I do firsthand, and then she’d have something to go by.” So, I think I asked her to be in there just to, you know, observe and check me out.

Mosca's comments cleanly fit into an understanding of working part-time at Mahican Community College as an elongated job interview. He desired a full-time job, and made sure to do what he could to present himself in a positive manner to the chair.

Many interviewees discuss teaching in terms of a longstanding relationship, as a commitment to students over time is seen as valuable. This suggests a commitment to teaching, as Neil Mosca explains, “I was here for two years as a part-timer and I did well at the interview. I proved myself in the classroom. I was evaluated by my department chair and [did well].” Harriett Right confirms this:

I’ve been on several hiring committees, and we get a lot of people that apply from all around the country. But by and large the hiring committees are more comfortable with people we already know... I think that any part-time person here would see their part-time job as part of their interviewing for a full-time job if they want that. I did in the three semesters I taught part-time. I saw that as getting my foot in the door.
It is one thing to teach Composition once, it is another to continue teaching it for several years. A candidate who has demonstrated their ability to teach consistently and maintain a commitment to the students at the college has done a great deal to increase his or her chances of being hired full-time.

Valuing Service. Professional service for the college done by adjuncts is much greater in scope at Mahican Community College than at the other two studied colleges. Harriett Right offers examples of adjuncts participating in professional service at MCC are much more broad than at the other two colleges:

Well, you take, for example, the Academic Senate, one of – I think one or two of the Senators have to be part-time, representing part-time faculty. I’ve been on several committees over the years where we had somebody representing part-time faculty, or that was important that we have someone in part-time. Our Faculty Association has several part-time delegates that represent them. [However,] most part-time people are not on committees, and most committees are looking to have full-time people.

Indeed, the faculty senate bylaws of MCC (Mahican Community College 2007) state that there are three elected representatives within the faculty senate are to be adjunct faculty representatives. Later, Harriett Right also assures me that adjunct participation is accepted as legitimate:

[Adjuncts who wish to volunteer for service are] treated, I think, just as – the same as anybody else. They can get involved as much or as little as they’d like. They can serve on committees if they want to. They can serve on, particularly, department committees. They can serve on those, and no one seems to think – in other words, no one looks at them as any less because they’re part-time, because eventually they could become full-time.

Adjunct professional service is much more robust at MCC than at either of the other two colleges. At Caussade, there are teaching communities, and little else. Indeed, much
more would potentially upset the isolation that their attempts at justification require. At Orange University meanwhile,

At the same time, Allan Strohmeyer insists there is no general expectation adjuncts ought to volunteer to sit on committees; they are expected to teach, and little else is required of them:

There are always some [adjuncts] who do go to departmental meetings. Generally, they don’t because they probably have a day job or something. There’s a lot of that. There’s always been a few who actually go to departmental meetings. They’re familiar faces. They get on departmental committees. But by enlarge, they come in, teach their class, leave.

If someone is interested in only teaching part-time, Mahican Community College seems quite willing to let that individual teach and have little connection to the college as a whole. In this regard, it is comparable to Caussade College.

However, if one is interested in becoming a full-time tenure-track faculty member, then participating in professional service at Mahican Community College becomes a recommended activity. “I know that they don't have as much time,” admits Math chair Noreen Rumble. She continues:

I certainly know that they don't time to be on committees and show a lot of interest in the department. However, if they're interested in full-time job here they should do that. Because that is something I consider when someone gets an application for a full-time job.

English professor Neil Mosca concurs with this statement:

It depends on how badly they want full-time work here at the college. Generally speaking, those people who get involved in extracurricular, let’s call them extracurricular initiatives tend to be – I don’t want to put this the wrong way, but they tend to have more of a favorable outcome in terms of getting full-time employment when positions open up because they’re more known to the department and at the college.

English professor Harriett Right echoes this sentiment as well, saying, “If you’re here
part-time because you want that full-time work, then you should be acting like a full-time faculty member, participating in extracurricular stuff.”

To the degree that adjuncting is a job interview, it is a test of worth that attempts to assign an amount of worth to an adjunct. It is a probationary status during which the college may evaluate individuals regarding their potential as full-time employees. If individuals are found worthy, they may be hired.

Not a Pure Test: Fit and Uncertainty. Mathew Averette points out that while adjuncting at Mahican Community College is a test of worth, it is not only this.

I know one time, we had an opening and they needed somebody to teach some of the technical courses or a writing course for the auto mechanics, for example, or a writing course to foreign students. Again, somebody who has experience in the field would be much better qualified than somebody who’s been – like me, who’s only been teaching composition, let’s say. I guess my point is you want to match the qualification to the need, whatever it happens to be.

We can see here that the needs of the department, not merely a raw measure of the adjunct's worth, are part of the decision to hire. “I’d hate to see somebody get the job just because he or she has been an adjunct for ten years,” Averette adds, who works both as an adjunct in the English Department and in the Writing Center to help students with written assignments. “[Hiring a specific adjunct for a specific job] may not be a good fit... I would like to think I would feel that way even if it went against me if I were in that position.” If an adjunct is excellent at teaching creative writing, but the college does not need that instructor, it is likely that that adjunct will not be hired regardless of their pedagogical worth.

Aside from fit, the decision-making process over why certain individuals are hired
and others are not is not always clear to the adjuncts. “[Hiring is] definitely not automatic,” Hugh Dubray confirms. “I have a friend who’s been here longer than I have as an adjunct and, in my opinion, should have gotten one of the first positions that they advertised just because of his capabilities, and the fact that they really didn’t hire is fairly surprising [to] me.”

At Mahican Community College, adjunct work is a gateway into the profession. As such, it is a test of individual adjunct's pedagogical worth. Both sustained teaching and professional service are indicators of pedagogical worth rather than scholastic worth or a mere technical skill, as both demonstrate a commitment to the college's learning community, and therefore an expression of their desire to educate and care for students. However, it is not purely a test of worth, as decisions over who to hire must take the employment needs of departments into play,

Limited Trust in Credentials

There is a relative suspicion of doctoral degrees that is not be present at colleges such as Caussade or Orange University due in part to the faculty and adjuncts of Mahican Community College valuing the responsibility to educate and the skills necessary to establish a rapport with students.

A master’s degree is required to teach at Mahican Community College. However, the credentialing requirements for being an adjunct or a tenure-track faculty member are the same in both departments: One requires a master’s degree to be a full-time tenure-track faculty member in the English and Mathematics Departments at MCC, though there
is a more specific requirement in that the degree must be in English or math. Hugh Dubray, a retired engineer with a doctorate in engineering, discovered this to his dismay: “I have heard it said that they’re looking for somebody with at least a Masters in math – why a Ph.D. in engineering doesn't cover that – or Masters in math education, which I have even worse things to say. Why am I teaching all these courses and getting good evaluations and can't even get an interview?”

While one could attempt to correlate the relatively marginal position community colleges occupy in American higher education with the presence of lower credentialing standards, this does not predict the normative stances of faculty at the college toward the question of credentialing. Indeed, Math Chair Noreen Rumble claims graduate students – often from Orange University – commonly lack a concern for undergraduate students as a result:

The people that I see that probably most in our some of our graduate students who are coming here because the purpose is just to make money to help their own studies and they're busy. They're working on their own dissertations and they're trying to teach at five schools to get enough money to live. But still in the classroom in that 50 minutes, you can indicate an interest....So to me if they were hired, they would continue to do the same thing. I need people that are interested in what's going on.

Neither a need for money nor a love of knowledge equates to care of the student.

The responsibility to educate is the state of pedagogical worth. “If you don't like anything about teaching, you shouldn't be there,” says Margery Spurrier. “Unfortunately, there are those who are in it because they get summers off, and they think it's good money, and whatever.” When specifically asked what makes for a poor instructor, Mathematics Department Chair Noreen Rumble replied, “The one I look for mostly is a lack of concern for student progress.” She continued:
I'm looking for people who are dedicated professionals... I'm looking for someone who is worried about that student that hasn't come for two weeks. Why aren't they coming to class? So if I – if I see somebody who's just disseminating information and there's not a connection, not a rapport with the class, not a "How ya doing? Do I know –?" I believe teachers should know student's names. We don't have lecture halls of 400 like I sat in at Orange University... We have a large class is 33 here, the largest class. So I expect that people will take the time to learn students' names to – to be involved in their progress.

Teaching is about rapport in the name of advancing students through education. Merely “disseminating information” is not enough from this pedagogical stance. One must demonstrate care for students and their futures in a way that in unnecessary for scholastic arguments.

This relatively low trust in credentialing feeds into the understanding of adjunct work as an elongated job interview. If one cannot fully trust advanced degrees to ensure teaching ability (as opposed to research ability), then the idea that an organization would wish to have an elongated job interview becomes more plausible.

Chair Evaluation as Incorporation

Like Caussade, Mahican Community College relies on a combination of student and chair evaluation. According to Vice President Katherine Swager, the point of all evaluations is to look for rapport.

Each department has a different formula to guide them. They're looking for teaching, they're looking for rapport, they're looking for knowledge, course knowledge, content knowledge. They're looking for the use of technology in the classroom. We want our students to be exposed to technology. We have a lot of web-based courses. We have a huge online program. We have hybrid courses. It's very important for students to have that experience. So we're looking for a lot of different things from the instructor. But generally, those are the kinds of things that are on top.
Pedagogical worth is the basis of this comment by Vice President Swager. It is important for teachers to have experience teaching that hones their skill at disseminating knowledge to students and their ability to develop a rapport with students.

**Limitations.** While there are evaluations of adjuncts, they are limited in scope. First, the formal evaluation process is different for full-time faculty vs. adjuncts.

“[Adjuncts] are evaluated differently,” says Math chair Noreen Rumble. “[To evaluate] the full-time people I have to send an evaluation form, with specific pieces to it through to the dean and it goes up through the president yearly. The classroom observation is the same for both full-time and part-time faculty.” This is different than the evaluation process at Caussade College, where the process is the same, or at Orange University, where there is no chair evaluations.

Second, Math Chair Noreen Rumble explains that adjunct evaluation in her department is less formalized than full-time tenure-track evaluation. Furthermore, they only occur once every three years, due to resources.

The full-time people I have to send an evaluation form, with specific pieces to it through to the dean and it goes up through the president yearly. The classroom observation is the same for both full-time and part-time faculty. So I do at least – well, I have to do one evaluation and one observation a year for full-time faculty. But I have, as I said, forty some part-time faculty plus another 25 to 30 that are teaching in the high schools for us in our college in high school program. They are approved adjunct instructors here. So there's about 80 people or 70 people – 45 and 25 – 70 people. I can't possibly do all that and observe everybody. So we have kind of a cycle where – and it's over a three-year period I try to see everybody at least once. So about 20 or more a year I have to do of adjuncts in college and high school. So – but that's all they get.

Vice President Swager concurs with Rumble's assessment that frequent evaluation of
Adjuncts is logistically prohibitive. “We have a lot of adjuncts,” she says. “So we try to evaluate them on a third, a third, a third in any given year because there is no way any person can do... We can't find a way to observe 100 adjuncts [for one department] in a semester. It's impossible.”

Degraded Test vs. Incorporation & the Option for Feedback. Adjunct evaluation at Mahican Community College is less thorough than at Caussade College, and it does not rely on credentialing as a partial substitute for evaluation in the way Orange University does. In other words, the evaluation of adjuncts at MCC is a problematic test of worth at best.

However, while Caussade College is concerned with evaluating the work done by adjuncts as adjuncts, Mahican Community College is interested in that and also using adjunct work as a whole as a test of worth in itself, to help determine who would be worthy of becoming a full-time faculty member. Akin to the matter of professional service discussed above, adjuncts who take the initiative when it comes to instruction demonstrate a commitment to the school (and by extension, the students). Stan Schultz is a math adjunct who is not interested in pursuing academic work full-time. This is his description of chair evaluation:

It’s usually just a paper report. I mean I would imagine if you, if I want to I could schedule a face-to-face meeting but usually just a paper report. And I don't know this personally but I would imagine that if he or she identifies a really serious flaw or problem with my instruction that I would expect her to call me in and say, “Talk to me privately,” or whatever and not just hand me a sheet of paper and say this is not good.

Mr. Schultz is not interested in the most immersive review of his teaching possible, as he
does not wish to become anything more than an adjunct. Hugh Dubray, a math adjunct who would like to become full-time but has been frustrated in his attempts so far to become so, also shows minimal interest in meeting with the chair:

[After the chair evaluation.] you get a form back that – it has some check marks and it has some comments, and you’re asked to sign that and return it, that you have read it. And then, down at the bottom of the form, you can request to have an in-person discussion of that. I’ve found that the evaluations – I’m so pleased with the evaluations that I’ve just signed it, returned it, and said, “I don’t need to have a personal discussion on this subject.” Of course, that’s the math department. I don’t know if all departments here work in the same way, but I suspect they do.

Because his evaluations are positive, Dubray sees no reason to see the chair. However, if wanting to discuss his teaching is a way to demonstrate his commitment to teaching, then he is actually hurting his prospects of being hired.

On the other hand, there is English adjunct and aspiring academic Tabitha Coachman's description of her last chair evaluation:

For me, [The Department Chair] observed my class the first spring I was here, so that was two years ago now, and she was, you know, very willing to come to the class that I wanted her to come to – you know, the one that I felt like was a really good display of my teaching and had a good rapport with that semester. She was very willing to come to that class. And, you know, she stayed for pretty much the whole class, took notes, and then afterward – I really don’t remember exactly... I mean, she basically just said, you know, “It looks great.”

The chair evaluation is less an evaluation of one's teaching and more an opportunity to demonstrate one cares about teaching.

**Organizational Control and the Freedom to Teach**

The above sections all relate to adjunct work as a gateway to full-time employment as a faculty member at Mahican Community College. Another noteworthy
consequence of pedagogical worth on the organization of instruction at Mahican Community College is that it leads to a greater degree of organizational control over course content than was found at either Caussade College or Orange University. However, the adjunct (and full-time) faculty do not see this as a lessening of their discretion to teach in courses. This allows Math adjunct to state matter-of-factly, “One of the phrases that gets used is 'it’s all up to the instructor.' Now, within the scope of that comment, there's a lot of power there.”

Organizational Control of Course Content. Given the above comment, it may be surprising that Mahican Community College is the only one of the three colleges within this study to use formally standardized syllabi for both its English and Mathematics Departments for lower-level courses. Vice President for Academic Affairs Katherine Swager explains this is a common occurrence at MCC:

For multiple section courses, we have course outlines. And a course outline is the meat of this course ought to be. Can you add to it if you wish to? Yes. But there are certain learning outcomes that must be achieved, and the faculty must demonstrate students have learned XYZ. So we follow course outlines, we have common finals. A certain percentage of the final is common to multiple section courses. We have a standardized textbook that is chosen by the department, and the adjunct faculty members have to adopt that book. So we are – we're pretty firm about those kinds of things only because we're responsible for the learning outcomes for students for students, and we're accountable. We have to demonstrate they learned what we say they learned. So we're pretty strict about that.

English professor Harriett Right confirms this for the English Department. “Each course will have a departmental outline that is a basic outline of the curriculum,” she explains. “The general topics that have to be covered if you handle this course.” Math Chair
Noreen Rumble also states this is the case, explaining a committee meets every fall to choose textbooks and design course outlines for courses with multiple sections. She then elaborates:

> Our courses are pretty set. We have a course outline. Everyone has to use the same textbook, the same outline. They're given suggested assignments. They don't have to use those. They don't have to use tests. There are departmental finals for day classes so everybody has to get the common final or within – it has to 70 percent the same. Evening instructors have to write their own because it's given at a different day and time.

Nelson Direnzo, an adjunct in the Math Department, adds, “There’s very little leeway, very little leeway. There is a curriculum.”

If one can avoid teaching low level courses with multiple sections, one can avoid content control. English professor Benita Raatz discusses her experiences regarding this:

> I was able to kind of claw my way up to these [upper-level] courses over the course of the years – there are – I can do what I want. In fact, the Women’s Lit class I started, and I’m the only teacher teaching it. So, I can do whatever the hell I want to do. You know? It’s kinda nice... The Theater class, I generally just follow the textbook, because it’s a good textbook, and it makes sense to me to teach it just basically the same stuff that’s in the textbook. Short Story, we have an enormous book, and you can teach any stories you want out of the book. So, that gives me quite a bit of flexibility.

Generally speaking, full-time tenure-track faculty members at Mahican Community College are the ones who are able to teach the upper level courses.

*The Pedagogical Justification of Content Control.* No full-time faculty or adjuncts in either department criticized these course standardization policies, a fact that is particularly noteworthy given its non-presence at the other two colleges, save a limited degree in Orange University's Mathematics Department. Math adjunct Hugh Dubray
praises the policy:

What I've seen – like I say, for the probably ten different courses or more that I've taught – is, in general, the textbooks are very well-chosen; and once in a while I'll grouse about one of the chapters being presented not the way I would want to present it, but overall the textbooks that are chosen are very well-picked.

The question thus becomes how do individuals at Mahican Community College qualify the practice of course content standardization, be it to justify it or criticize it.

The full-time faculty and adjuncts at Mahican Community College, unexpectedly to at least the author, a pedagogical justification of course content control. When asked about the policy, Professor Rumble gave this explanation:

Courses, especially in math, just due to the nature of the subject area have to be pretty specific. [It] has to be laid out because if you take Elementary Algebra I, you've got to be ready for Elementary Algebra II. And so if the person doesn't finish we've got a problem. So it's very, I would say very rigid in that you can put more in but you can't put less in than what's in those course outlines and it's expected that you will complete them.

The responsibility to educate is not merely some long term project where one hopes students will find success or happiness ten years after they leave one's classroom. As an instructor, one has a responsibility to prepare students for courses they will be taking next semester. Math adjunct Stan Schultz agrees with this sentiment. “I think classes need to have structure because otherwise then you know some students may learn less in one class and some a little bit more in the other classes,” he says. “That’s just not fair to the students.” Tenured English professor Neil Mosca offers a similar argument for his department as well.

Now within the curriculum, I mean do I want to spend three weeks on this [topic], one week on this [other topic], I have it, but I have to cover what is in the curriculum because there are other, there are other sections of the courses that I’m teaching, plus the sections they take after mine. People
are depending that I have taught [a given course] so they know when the kids get there, they have had whatever. So there’s very little leeway.

Where the deployment of scholastic worth at Orange University and Caussade College defended an idiosyncratic arrangement that emphasized the freedom of the professor to select his or her course's content, the deployment of pedagogical worth at MCC supported a standardization of content that facilitated the integration of courses into a larger educational community. No instructor is an island, and thus no course is an intellectual conversation detached from the college's overall curriculum.

*The Freedom to Teach through Pedagogical Worth.* At the same time, instructors at all three colleges can be seen as having professional discretion over elements most highly valued in teaching. At Caussade, where teaching is another form of playing seriously with ideas, instructors had a great deal of freedom in syllabus construction. At MCC on the other hand, interviewees sought worth within teaching ability. The result was that instructors at MCC considered themselves to have a satisfactory amount of freedom and discretion despite the content control, as they could still teach as they wished.

“Beyond those requirements [for course design], the faculty member is allowed to teach how they want and what the details of what those topics are is up to the instructor,” says Harriett Right, ending with, “So, there’s a fair amount of freedom.” Math adjunct Stan Schultz concurs. “The college does have a certain syllabus that you need to cover. So they do give a lot of freedom to the instructors to interpret those syllabi. Teaching styles can be very different from one instructor to another but they basically cover the
same thing.”

Math adjunct Margery Spurrier goes one step further, suggesting quality teaching can actually circumvent the limitations of content control:

You can deviate from [the material covered on the department final] as much as you want to, as long as your students are prepared to cover that stuff on their final. If you can get in more, then great. If not, you're – that's what you're stuck with... So you do have to cover what's in the syllabus, what's in the course outline that's given to you, but you have a lot more freedom to branch out in that area, but every other course has a course final.

If an instructor is skilled enough, they will be able to cover all the required material and more, creating an opportunity for them to teach the material they personally care about. In this way, content control at Mahican Community College is less a hindrance for quality instructors, as they can cover more material and advance their students further.

_The Multiple Uses of Adjuncts and Adjunct Hiring_

At the same time, Schultz acknowledges there are some potential pitfalls to this approach:

I think it’s definitely a possibility because I’ve seen it happen, but it’s not always a guarantee either. I mean, I’ve seen people who are adjuncts for a long time and when openings occur, they didn’t get the position. Of course, that leaves them frustrated and... I would guess a quarter to a half, just off the top of my head [but] I have no official statistics.

We are then left with an image of adjunct instruction which is more complex than it is at either Caussade College or Orange University. As at Caussade, part-time instruction at Mahican Community College is organized as a boundary object, a site where economic and academic matters are actively, constantly, and overtly negotiated and balanced by actors. Its system of evaluations is set up similar to Caussade's, with student
evaluations supplemented by chair evaluations, and therefore the goal of assurance is once again a possibility. However, at the same time, adjuncting at MCC is a boundary check-point into the academic field, as it welcomes part-time faculty to apply for full-time positions.

DISCUSSION

The Question of Worth

Regarding the question of worth, it appears that Mahican Community College primarily relies on pedagogical worth, a significantly different form of worth than the scholastic regime present at Caussade College. In Table 13: A Comparison of Pedagogical and Scholastic Worth, we can see this difference clearly:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scholastic</th>
<th>Pedagogical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common Higher Principle</strong></td>
<td>Inherent Value of Knowledge</td>
<td>The Elevating potential of Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State of Worthiness</strong></td>
<td>Serious Play of Ideas</td>
<td>The Responsibility to educate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objects</strong></td>
<td>One's Contribution to the Ongoing Debate</td>
<td>A well sounded set of teaching skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relations of Worth</strong></td>
<td>The Social Engagement of Ideas</td>
<td>Care of the Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Figures</strong></td>
<td>The Ongoing Academic Debate</td>
<td>The Educational Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test</strong></td>
<td>Professional Discretion</td>
<td>Professional Discretion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: A Comparison of Pedagogical and Scholastic Worth

The divergence between these two regimes begins with the higher principles differing over knowledge's importance being intrinsic or extrinsic. Does one view the end of knowing in terms of a measurable, practical effect, or is having the opportunity to
play with knowledge an end in itself? That difference leads to conflicting priorities of
student and knowledge: are students to be shown how to intellectually engage in an
ongoing academic debate, or are students to advance due to the caring effort of instructors
in an educational environment?

There is certainly an overlap between these two ideals, an overlap found in several
interviews, but they are not the same thing. The virtues of an instructor in one regime
will not be the same as the virtues in another. It significant, for example, that Neil Mosca,
the full-time English faculty member, brings pedagogical worth to the foreground while
arguing he wants to teach remedial courses and feels responsible to do so.

New Question: Worth and Course Choice. This brings a new question to the
foreground regarding the two forms of worth: does form of worth create a link between
the quality of an instructor and whether he or she will be teaching a lower- or upper-level
course? One could argue scholastic worth value of “better” (more sophisticated,
advanced, abstract) knowledge suggests that better teachers (who are inevitably full-time)
ought to teach the upper-level courses, leaving the lower-level courses with their more
basic information to less esteemed (often part-time) instructors. At the same time, one
could argue that quality instructors according to a pedagogical understanding ought to be
the ones who teach the students who most need attention, leading in some cases to more
senior faculty teaching lower-level, possibly even remedial, courses? As this question
springs from a comment from one faculty member, there is a danger of making too strong
of a claim. However, the conclusion will revisit this matter.
The Question of Evaluation

Evaluation at Mahican Community College appears very similar to evaluation at Caussade College in that it involves a combination of student and peer evaluations. There are, however, two notable differences. First, while there are credential requirements, there appears to be greater suspicion over whether or not credentials are an effective measure of pedagogical worth. In other words, can one reasonably expect an individual who has finished a masters or doctorate to be a quality instructor as defined by their care for students and their ability to help their students develop and grow through learning? According to several interviews, the answer is not a confident yes. This is quite different than Caussade, where scholastic worth is used in a way that defines the ability to conduct research. This creates a new challenge for Mahican Community College, in that they do not trust a test of worth that Caussade department chairs have a degree of confidence in.

At the same time, Mahican Community College relies on a practice that would be anathema at Caussade: formal standardization of low-level courses. Both departments at Caussade state the importance for the (full- and part-time) faculty to have control over their course in terms of teaching and course design. Both chairs claimed to have made themselves available for consultation, and even if one views that as potentially informal syllabus control, it is still a far cry from formalized rules. As pedagogical worth is focused on the act of teaching students, MCC appears able to target course content for control in ways that do not call the legitimacy or quality of teaching into question, but which indeed do quite the opposite.
New Question: Worth and the Collectivity of Teaching. Another striking difference between interviewees at Caussade College and those at Mahican Community College is the degree to which instructors think of themselves and their courses as atomized units versus part of a larger group. At Caussade, while there was a great deal of discussion about helping students understand the course content and making them realize the importance of the material, no interviewees spoke of preparing students for future courses at Caussade. Meanwhile, MCC interviewees did speak of the responsibility of preparing students for future courses, relying on pedagogical worth as they did so.

This raises a question of the relationship between forms of worth and the continuity between courses. Can one suggest that scholastic worth encourages a treatment of courses as more separate from one another, allowing faculty the freedom and discretion to organize their courses as they see fit? Similarly, can one suggest that pedagogical worth, with its interest in the advancement of students in a larger educational environment, facilitates a greater amount of connection between courses? Using examples from all three cases, the conclusion chapter will posit that the answer to these questions is no, scholastic worth does not necessarily lead to atomized courses.

The Question of Exploitation

Finally, Mahican Community College attempts to deny exploitation in almost the opposite way to Caussade's strategy. Rather than marginalizing adjuncts in a way to maintain an academically legitimate core, MCC treats adjunct work as a job interview, a way to find people it may wish to hire for full-time positions. In doing so, it turns adjunct
work into a test of worth in and of itself, thus making it not truly an occupation.

Alternatively, for those adjuncts who are not interested in becoming full-time faculty, MCC looks quite similar to Caussade: adjuncts look to teach for a variety of reasons, but generally are not interested in adjunct work as a primary career.

Closing

We now have a comparison of two different colleges. While both are focused on teaching, they differ in many other ways including public/private, the degrees granted (associates vs. bachelors and masters), and admission (open vs. selective). In addition to these more organizational differences, they also differ in terms of which form of worth seems institutionalized within the organization of each college: Mahican Community College relies on pedagogical worth, whereas Caussade College relies on scholastic. Through comparing these colleges and their forms of worth, two questions have emerged regarding how forms of worth may or may not affect the organization. By turning now to a third college, the public research institution Orange University, we will gain more information that will allow us to answer these questions along with the previous research questions.
CHAPTER 6:
ORANGE UNIVERSITY, SCHOLASTIC WORTH, AND APPRENTICESHIP

In this chapter, we will explore the English and Mathematics Departments of Orange University. While scholastic worth is dominant, the organization of part-time instruction differs from that at Caussade College in substantial ways. Most importantly, Orange University's part-time instructors are almost always graduate students in the same department. Faculty and graduate students are unified in their use of not only scholastic worth, but grounding an ideal of apprenticeship in scholastic worth to strongly couple part-time instruction and graduate education.

INTRODUCTION & PROFILE

Twenty four individuals associated with Orange University were interviewed for this project. The breakdown of who these people were can be found in Table 14: Research University Respondents. The project strived for balance between interviewing graduate students and faculty, as well as between English and math academics (though it was less successful on this front). However, due to the fact that both departments heavily rely on graduate students as part-time faculty, there were simply few non-graduate student part-time instructors to be interviewed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tenured / Tenure Track Faculty</th>
<th>Graduate Students</th>
<th>Non-graduate student part-time instructors</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Math</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Department</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Research University Respondents

Orange University is a public research university in the Northeastern United States with over 17,000 undergraduate students and roughly 5,000 graduate students. Though founded over 150 years ago, it was only designated as a research university by the state in the early 1960s. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has classified it as “Research University (Very high research activity)” (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching 2010), and its undergraduate program is considered more selective (top 20th percentile for incoming students' test scores). Over 80% of undergraduates are full-time, and over 80% of its undergraduate majors are in liberal arts disciplines (classifications: A&S-F/SGC, FT4/MS/LTI). Both the Department of English and the Department of Mathematics & Statistics are in the College of Arts & Sciences, the largest of the nine schools at O.U.

The Rise of Part-Time Instruction

According to Orange University's Office of Institutional Research, in the 2007-2008 school year there were 600 full-time equivalency (FTE) full time faculty members who are instructors of record, versus 151 FTE part-time faculty instructors of record. At
Orange, FTE part-time faculty member teaches four courses, while a FTE full-time faculty member often teaches 2 or 3 courses. Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs Simson reports Orange University began relying on part-time instructors in the last twenty years for economic reasons:

In the '70s and '80s, programs were delivered predominantly by full-time faculty. Then we went through a period in the '90s where we lost 100 full-time faculty positions because of budget cuts. They would reduce our budget, more or less by the amount of attrition and resignations over the first half of the 1990s. And that's with the expectation that we would not decrease our enrollments, and our tuition at that point was at a level where we were still largely a state-supported institution... So a certain reality sets in that on some level, we're going to continue being dependent on part-time faculty.

While the state was decreasing O.U.'s budget, it was also ceding more control to the university's administration:

Prior to 1988, the [state's college system] was administrated [and] managed by the state as they managed every other state agency. It was just another state agency as far as the budget was concerned. It was highly centralized... The campus would receive its appropriation, all laid out, by what we called object category. You've got so much money for personal service [and] regular salaries, you get so much money in temporary service to give people you engage on a temporary basis, so much money for supplies and expenses, so much money for equipment, and contractual considerations... If a secretary on campus was to resign or retire, again, the President would need to apply to the State's director of the Division of Budget to get that position filled. It was highly centralized... [Now] the state supplies to the [college system] central office a single, just one big pot of money. It's several billions of dollars; it's not a trivial sum. And then it's up to the System Central to divide it up amongst the campuses. And in addition, we now get to keep our own tuition revenue, so and we no longer have to apply for approval to any central authority to either fill positions or to move any money into the various object categories accounting scheme in order to pay our bills.

In Simson's view, the adoption of part-time instruction as a common practice at Orange required the state lowering its financial support of the institution coupled with increased
flexibility. This is in line with the College of Arts & Sciences' Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs Steve Raisik, who describes the use of part-time instructors as an “accordion,” as they allow the university to expand and contract quickly to react to changes in enrollment that can occur quickly.

*The Departments*

In both the Mathematics & Statistics Department and the English Department, graduate students on assistantship begin teaching introductory courses in the fall of their second year, and then hire them to teach part-time as their assistantships ended. As a result, neither department hires many people from outside the university to teach. Assistant Dean Raisik observes the use of graduate students as part-time instructors has been a trend over the last five years for many departments in the college.

Generally speaking, graduate students are given four-year graduate assistantships. The salary for these positions was $8,000 a year with health insurance for the regular school year, during which they are contractually obligated to have no other form of employment. In both programs, part of the first year is spent tutoring, but by the beginning of the second year graduate students are expected to begin teaching as the instructors of record for courses. Upon the completion of their graduate assistantships, many graduate students become employed as part-time instructors within their departments. In both departments, teaching as a part-time instructor also gives the graduate student a tuition waiver, and teaching two courses gets them health insurance.
Both the English Department and the Mathematics and Statistics Departments offer courses required for the general undergraduate student body. Undergraduates are required to take a minimum of three credits of Humanities and six of natural sciences. There are also several Communication and Reasoning Competency general education requirements that can be fulfilled by English courses, including lower- and upper-level intensive writing courses, an oral discourse course, and an information literacy course. According to the O.U. Undergraduate Bulletin, mathematics students are required to take
“one semester of collegiate study, or the equivalent, of mathematics at or above the level of pre-calculus and/or probability, statistics, and data analysis.” Despite their mutual connection to general education, the two departments vary in several ways. Table 16 is a comparison of the two departments over a five year period (fall 2003 – spring 2008):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FTE Undergrad Students</th>
<th>FTE Graduate Students</th>
<th>FTE FT Faculty</th>
<th>FTE PT Faculty</th>
<th>Fall FTE TA</th>
<th>Total Doctorates*</th>
<th>Total Masters*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>101.2</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>583.4</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>24.26</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total number of degrees given, rather than average.

The Department of Mathematics and Statistics is smaller, both in terms of undergraduate and graduate enrollment, than the English Department. In terms of undergraduate enrollment, the English has roughly 110 more FTE undergraduate students on average a year than math. For the graduate program, the Mathematics & Statistics Department has under half as many FTE graduate students enrolled on average, and it has given out about a third as many doctorates during the same period of time.

THE SCHOLASTIC REGIME OF ACADEMIC WORTH

Like Caussade College, the primary form of worth at Orange University is scholastic worth. To illustrate this, we can turn to Cindy Smith, an English graduate student I interviewed who used to teach English in Hong Kong before enrolling at Orange University. When I asked if she enjoyed teaching, this was her response:

I enjoy teaching. And I think it comes from your enthusiasm for a subject that you can share with other people. I mean, teaching English is something I did because, to be honest, it pays well. But it also means you
get to read to kids, you get to discuss books with kids, and whether you're talking about primary or college level, being able to go into a classroom and go, 'You know, this is the most fantastic thing. Can't you see why this is great?' and they go 'Yeah, it is!' I guess it's their enthusiasm, and you read something and, 'Wow, you really changed the way I see things,' and then share that with a group of people. Of course, some of them will always look at you and go, 'Well, I don't know,' but, you know, some of them will go and say 'Yeah, that is fantastic.'

In Cindy's view, understanding literature is fun and exciting, and it does not need to serve a more pragmatic purpose to be a legitimate interest. Similar comments appear in interviews with math graduate students. Anne McCoy is a second year math student at Orange University who appreciates math because, “To me, math is a big game. It’s a puzzle, it’s fun.”

Comments like these are in line with scholastic worth. It is legitimate and acceptable to tell others that math is a fun puzzle. As such, academic content from mathematics and literature does not need an instrumental purpose (related to the “the urgencies of the world”) to have value. At the same time, rote memorization of factual information is not particularly legitimate according to the scholastic regime. Engaging knowledge for the sake of deeper understanding is what is valuable, worthwhile, and legitimate.

*Departing Wisdom: Relations of Scholastic Worth*

One cannot make a valuable academic contribution through nothing but abstract thought detached from an academic community. In research, one attempts to make an intervention into an ongoing academic conversation through presentations and publications. This engages both an audience as well as those in charge of the venue.
(organizers, editors, etc.). In teaching, instructors attempt to introduce students to academic discourse, giving them the opportunity to understand it.

For example, English ABD (all but dissertation) graduate student Clara Amberson describes her social strengths as an instructor: “I get in there – I'm definitely one of those people who like gets in there, the brain goes, and thinking out loud – I'm pretty good on my feet, where I can really bring student's work spontaneously [in] if I'm prepped enough so that there's sort of an organic conversation.” Additionally, ABD Math graduate student Jack Michaelson suggests what is good in teaching involves the intersection of intellectual and social processes: “I like the idea of bringing the clarity of the knowledge I have to the students as well. I think it’s probably an ego-based thing: I like to imagine that if the way I know it and the way I teach it allows a student to learn it that much better.” Both of these graduate students claim the act of teaching is worthwhile because it engages the students in an academic conversation.

When I asked mathematics graduate student Anne McCoy what teaching's appeal was for her, she replied, “Well, I guess if you're going to teach, you need to be a complete narcissist, don't you?” She continued:

To stand up there and enjoy being the center of attention, and enjoy passing this knowledge... There's definitely that, “I'm up here, I'm in charge, I'm passing this knowledge to you.” That's a pretty cool feeling. I guess that appeals to me. And also the idea that I can make a difference. Not that I really think that math is going to change many of these student's lives, at least not the kids I've been teaching now. But I'd like to think one day I might influence somebody to say, “Hey, maybe math is for me. Maybe this is something I can pursue.” Or even to encourage someone to think, “Wow, math isn't the worst thing in the world. It's not the bottom of my list of things that are terrible. I'd rather do math than get a root canal.” So, you know, that idea that I can change the world through students through students is kind of nice.
Beyond the humor, Anne is making the claim that the instructor is legitimated through engaging students to pass knowledge to them. In this context, there is nothing wrong with being a “narcissist” as long as one is imparting wisdom to students and convincing them of the value of math. Furthermore, her comments are more associated with serious play with knowledge than its instrumental use. The only way she wishes to change the world is to make students think math can be interesting, and that is enough.

The discussion of education at Orange University is similar to the one at Caussade College in that both heavily rely on scholastic worth. The ongoing academic debate expresses the principle, and is the figure of scholastic order for the regime (for a description of harmonious figures of natural order, see Boltanski and Laurent Thévenot 2006:143). Things have the possibility of scholastic worth if they are somehow part of the ongoing debate. Second, the object that is tested for scholastic worth is one's contribution to this ongoing conversation. Improving the ideas under debate and introducing new people to the conversation in a way that gives them the chance to understand and participate are therefore both scholastically worthwhile activities (Boltanski and Laurent Thévenot 2006:131). Third, the social engagement of ideas is the type of relation to others that allows for presence of scholastic worth. One cannot make a contribution if one is either not engaging academic ideas or not engaging other people. Thus, engagement is the relation of worth for scholasticism.

THE QUESTION OF QUALITY AND GRADUATE EDUCATION

Like Caussade College and Mahican Community College, the departments
Orange have student evaluation forms for their courses. Both departments require standardized questionnaires, where students fill in bubble sheets to answer questions on a Likert scale about the instructor's ability to teach, preparedness, availability outside of class, etc. The questionnaires are then processed by Orange University's Office of Institutional Research, with the aggregated results given to the instructors and the departments, who file these in their records.

The English Department occasionally has faculty observations of teaching. However, according to English Chair Cal Jackson, there are “a lot of sections [of low-level courses], and you really couldn't visit classes two times a semester, or really regular, because we just don't have the person-power in order to do that.” This limits observations to being more of a “spot-check” than a regular form of evaluation. In the Math Department, this is not present. In practice, it sounds quite similar to how chair evaluation is done at the other two colleges.

_Evaluation, Hiring, and Apprenticeship_

In some ways, this looks similar to Caussade College and Mahican Community College in that chair evaluation takes place (at least in English), and student evaluations are used to detect problematic teaching. However, while the filling of positions may respond to evaluation in some ways, it is a distinct organizational process that does not reflexively react to evaluations.

Professor Gary Reynolds of English expressed reservations over student evaluations:

167
You don’t [use formalized evaluations to] study how best to get first year students to understand, appreciate, or even ask why they should, because if you did, you might not do it. So, I guess I’m saying I think most – if you have to impose and evaluation apparatus, the first rule would be do no harm. If it’s not organic, then it’s going to suck. Just try to make it suck as little as possible.

Professor Reynolds clearly is concerned that evaluating first year graduate students in a formalized way will impede their ability to understand and enjoy academic work.

Indeed, one can make a general argument that Orange University sidesteps the question of adjunct teaching quality partially by suggesting graduate students are learning how to teach, and this is a worthwhile end in itself. In doing so, the hiring of part-time instructors uncouples partly from evaluation in order to become associated with the graduate programs of the two departments.

“We've never had to say, you can't teach any longer,” explains English Professor Max Farmer, Director of Graduate Studies:

When there are issues or problems, or if there are student complaints, undergraduate complaints that are particularly notable, we will sit down and talk it out and see what’s going on. Talk to the mentor, and talk to the student in question, just to see what's happening, and what might have transpired. And usually it’s sorted out at that level.

The decision to re-hire a graduate student as a part-time instructor is not strongly linked to their evaluated quality as instructors. Rather, graduate students in good standing are hired as part-time instructors. Math Undergraduate Studies Director Aaron Benson concurs:

Certainly the people who get hired first as adjuncts are graduate students who are making progress. That’s, in theory, who we’re supposed to be – that’s who we wish to support first, so once those people have their courses, then what’s left over would be maybe grad students that aren’t really making any progress but they’re good teachers, so we use them.
When asked what qualifies as progress, Professor Benson replied progress was “actively working and maybe in their adviser’s eye are at least making positive progress towards some thesis.” The following was his answer for how hard it was for an ABD graduate student to get one or two courses as a part-time instructor:

From what I’ve been told, pretty much up until this point it happens. You get – sometimes they give you a fifth year of being a TA if you’re really lucky, if you beg a lot. What we’ve been told recently is that absolutely will not happen anymore, and so you’ll probably be hired as a lecturer. I think it comes down to funds. I think that there is probably a little bit of a chance that it could not happen, that you could be told, “Well, you can stay here and do you Ph.D., but we can’t hire you, but I don’t think that it’s happened often. I guess it’ll depend in three years where we’re at with funds.

English chair Cal Jackson also acknowledges this coupling between graduate education and teaching as well:

One of the ways that people are trained to go on and become professors is that they do supervised teaching themselves... They’ll come in and do a year of training at the writing center, or work with a specific mentor. And then they're in the classroom. And so they teach as part of their TA line every year... Then they have, say, four years of support at their graduate student TA stipend. Then in their fifth year, they're going to see part-time instructorship that's amount per course is far less.

We can see from these interview excerpts that part-time instruction within Orange University's English and Mathematics Departments is heavily linked to its graduate program in a way that goes beyond mere coincidence.

We can see from these comments that the faculty of Orange University's English and Mathematics Departments rely on the ideal of graduate school as apprenticeship (Lee et al. 2004; Rhoads 1999) to help justify their use of (graduate student) adjuncts. In doing so, two things occur.
The Correlation of Research and Teaching. First, the test of worth for part-time instructors who are also graduate students shifts partly from student evaluations to their progress in the program. If a student is progressing as expected, then they may be rewarded with teaching, which will give them an opportunity to improve their teaching skills, and offer some financial compensation.

This suggests that Orange University relies on an apparent link between research and teaching in the sense that both are seen as scholastic activities, i.e., things that can be legitimately evaluated using the scholastic justificatory regime. Clara Amberson of English believes faculty members are better instructors because they have more research experience:

I think that [full-time tenure-track & tenured faculty] may have executed their research in their area, and therefore have greater access and are more nimble and prepared to respond, and interpret, and work with higher level students. So it's not necessarily the teaching. For me that's where the research is really at play. I mean I know people teach courses all the time on material that they don't know, but I do think in certain instances – like they just have already done a lot of the work.

Candice Gleason, another ABD English student, makes similar comments: “If I want to keep teaching in my field, I have to continue to do the research in the field. I mean, otherwise all kinds of the stuff is going to flow right by me.” Interviewees therefore see a relationship between teaching and research. Being an expert in one's field can prepare one to deal with a class, not just teaching experience, as both teaching and research are scholastic activities.

This equivalency runs both ways. Just as skill at research can improve teaching, teaching can improve one's academic knowledge on a subject. Jack Michaelson explains:

[Teaching] keeps your brain active... If you want to learn something, you
teach it to somebody... So, I like relearning and perfecting my knowledge of the subject. It’s social, and therefore fun. I get to improve my knowledge and relearn it, increasing the depth of my knowledge, and therefore it is fun.

We can therefore see an association between research and teaching as it is discussed at Orange University. It is not that teaching and research are exactly the same, but rather being good at one suggests one may be good at the other. Such a view rejects the notion that someone could truly teach Shakespeare on the college level with a superficial understanding of its deeper meanings and position in the Western Canon. This is, at its core, the “G model” of teaching and research, where “the values associated with both good teaching and good research are... high commitment (perseverance, dedication, hard work), creativity (imagination, originality, inventiveness), investigativeness, and critical analysis” (Hattie and Marsh 1996:511). Boltanski & Thévenot use the word equivalence to describe the achievement of making different things subject to the same justificatory regime. “In order to criticize and to explain to somebody else what is going wrong, one has to bring together different sets of people and objects and to make connections between them” (Boltanski and Laurent Thévenot 1999:361).

**Graduate School as Credential.** One can also argue the English and Mathematics Departments of Orange University treat enrollment in graduate school as a credential in and of itself. The organization of part-time instruction at Orange University is in line with Weick's (1976) statement that schools will often prefer certification over inspection, as direct inspection of teaching quality can be difficult and problematic. If an individual has enough mastery of a subject to be accepted to a graduate program, one could argue
they therefore have enough understanding to teach basic, introductory courses. This also invokes a connection between teaching and research.

After looking at the question of worth and the question of teaching quality, we can clearly see the degree to which the justificatory organization of part-time instruction at Orange University revolves around graduate school and an ideal of apprenticeship. This becomes only more clear as we move to questions of exploitation and the ways the faculty deny or defuse those accusations.

JUSTIFICATIONS FOR USING (GRADUATE) PART-TIME INSTRUCTORS

Like Caussade College and Mahican Community College, interviews with individuals at Orange University, particularly the faculty, often wrestle with the question of exploitation. How is it legitimate and not exploitative to use graduate students as part-time instructors?

The answer given, at least for the English and Mathematics Departments, is that part-time instructors are generally graduate students whose employment is a form of support. Assistant Dean Raisik explains the university hires graduate students as part-time instructors “because we want to make sure grads get out with degrees easier and more often.” Furthermore, “it's good faith to offer them work. It's good to give them an opportunity to teach because it also gives them a credential”. Similar views are stated by the directors of undergraduate studies of both departments. Professor Aaron Benson describes how much the Mathematics and Statistics Department relies on its graduate students to teach as part-time instructors:
In the old days people would get support for several years after that but not anymore, so once our graduate students are no longer supported as teaching assistants, then those that are still active and we want to encourage and support financially, then they become instructors, so I guess that’s an adjunct. A fair number of our instructors are, say, fifth year, sixth year graduate students. That’s most of our instructors, and then I think I would say we have maybe four – I don't know, I’m guessing – three, four adjuncts who are not graduate students.

Professor Peter Royce of English continues, argues hiring graduate students as part-time instructors is, in part, a good faith effort to support their graduate education:

Well, the advantage is programmatic, in the sense that, you know, the department has an investment in its graduate student, PhD students, to professionalize them in the most effective way and to allow them to complete the degree that they’re here to complete. The sad truth about the funding situation at here is that it’s virtually impossible to complete a degree during the years where you’re fully funded as a TA. We don’t have many. There’s an occasional research assistantship in English, but most of our lines are teaching lines. Very few fellowships, very few research assistantships.

Orange's faculty and administrators here are attempting to claim their use of part-time instructors is scholastically legitimate in spite of budgetary restraints because it can still have a positive effect on graduate students. Though technically employment, part-time instruction is seen almost as a form of financial aid to help students through the program, and to help develop their teaching skills.

Once again, it is noteworthy that this tact strongly couples graduate education with graduates teaching as part-time instructors. This blurring is further facilitated by the fact that most graduate students at Orange University's English Department begin teaching their second year, while on a teaching assistantship.
Debt, Delay, and Concerns Over Exploitation in English

Members of the English Department at Orange University were willing to acknowledge a large potential for exploiting graduate students as part-time instructors, both in general and specifically in their department. Peter Royce, the English Department's Director of Undergraduate Studies, describes the exploitative character of part-time instruction:

I think that all the officers of the department, [and] most likely all the tenured faculty, recognize the inherent sort of labor exploitation that takes place with graduate students teaching in the program and with adjuncts teaching in the program. It makes perfect sense for the university to hire graduate students at $2,800.00 per course, two courses a semester. You know, what does that work out to? $11,000.00, $12,000.00 a year, as opposed to a tenured faculty line, which is going to average $50,000.00, $60,000.00, $70,000.00 a year.

The Chair of the English Department, Cal Jackson, was even more blunt. “I don't think if it's anything short of a crisis, frankly” he says. “It's not a very equitable situation, in terms of what they're paid and in benefits and all the rest of it. I don't think that it’s an exaggeration to say it’s an exploitative situation very often.”

Debt and Delay. Before I turned on the digital recorder, Clara Amberson jokingly referred to herself as a “disgruntled graduate student.” Toward the end of the interview, I asked her why she described herself that way:

Only because I think – I know that adjuncts elsewhere even make more money than I do, and, you know, just a cycle of debt and delay... I mean I think some people – I think if maybe I was more focused I would have shot through if I had a dissertation topic and it would have just been like boom, boom, boom. I don't think I'm that disgruntled, but – yeah, we're just – I mean everyone knows that the department hired tons of adjuncts and so they don't have to hire actual professors.
A key phrase here is “debt and delay,” as this suggests that the problem is not purely a matter of low wages, but how this may cause problems for getting one's degree. English Department professor and Director of Graduate Studies Max Farmer explicitly states this is exactly the problem:

The main reason [it is a problem] in this program is because while you're an assistant, you teach only one course a semester. And typically, when you become a part-line instructor, you're teaching two courses a semester. You actually have to work twice as much to earn approximately, in the neighborhood of the same amount of money. And the other bad news is that this happens at precisely the moment you need to spend perhaps your greatest effort and intensity on the project that is your dissertation. You need a lot more time by yourself to write. So, it's always an issue, and it's typically what slows people down. Typically. So that, if they were going at a certain pace before that, unless they are relatively unusual, they will just inevitably have to spread their time out, and therefore they won't make the same kind of progress they made before.

Importantly, the critique made by Amberson and Farmer is grounded in the ideal of a good faith effort of helping students through graduate school.

In English, part-time instructors are paid $2,800 per course, the university-wide minimum, and a salary many departments pay according to both Assistant Dean Raisik and Associate Vice President Simson. Assuming a graduate student teaches one course each both semesters of a given school year, they will make $5,600, which is notably less than the $8,000 they were paid for the exact same work the previous year when they had a teaching assistantship. As assistantships generally end when people's coursework ends, graduate students face increased economic pressures at the moment they are to begin work on their dissertations, and this economic pressure results in scholastic challenges. In other words, there is a concern that the department is failing to make a good faith effort through its financial compensation of graduate students.
The English Department finds itself in a situation where many people within it fear they do not have the ability to financially support their graduate students, leading to concerns over exploitation through a bad faith effort to help graduates to their degrees. Its response has been to find other ways to bolster the argument they are making a good faith effort to help graduate students. It does this in a number of ways, all of depend somewhat on the idea that teaching and pedagogy are a legitimate, scholastic activity for academics to do as much as research is. References to the Orange University Mathematics Department will be common in this section as it often does not have similar programs in place.

**Mentoring.** Mentoring and its role in teaching are more formalized in the English Department than the Mathematics & Statistics Department. I asked Professor Benson what resources were available to math instructors. “They would probably just come to me [as Director of Undergraduate Studies]... Yeah, pretty much they just either come to me or they go to one of their colleagues who has taught the course before. That’s pretty much it. For instance, they can come to me if they wanted some – to see past exams or that sort of thing so they get an idea of the level they’re pitching it at. That I’ve done occasionally.”

The matter is handled quite differently in the English Department, where official teaching mentors are assigned to graduate students. When graduate students begin at Orange University, they are assigned teaching mentors based on the research interests of
the students, though graduate students can change teaching mentors as they move through the program. Graduate Studies Director Max Farmer discusses this in more detail:

By and large we can find ways to put professors and students together in a way that will be mutually beneficial, and not a totally new subject matter if at all possible... Sometimes it can be a choice about an area they want to study, or teach and therefore they want somebody like that. Sometimes, they want people whose style or way of teaching is more of interest to them, and so they pick them on that basis. And most of them will have at least two before they're done, which I think overall is a good idea that you get exposure to at least a few different people.

We can see here that teaching is once again viewed as part of graduate education.

According to undergraduate director Peter Royce, a teaching mentor “goes and observes the class, writes up some brief comments and talks with the student teaching questions.” The faculty observations of a course happen between once a semester and once a year according to Professor Royce. According to ABD English grad Tom London, the discussion with his teaching mentor usually dealt with “class dynamics, and... maybe handling the class, maybe how the students react to the teacher. You know interaction, presentation of knowledge and stuff like that.”

The relationship between a graduate student and one's teaching mentor is a flexible one, allowing for the faculty and graduate student to use their discretion to build the relationship most suited for the graduate student's situation. Max Farmer explains this further:

One is that a student may have a particular strength that they don't need much help working on, but on the other, they need help with lectures. We leave it up to the faculty to decide. And also it depends on the class. One semester you get a different group of people, and the interactions are such that something else needs to be worked on. So, we generally leave it up to the student and faculty member to decide what needs most attention, though we do ask that there be as broad a spectrum of consideration possible. It’s not just how well do you connect or click in discussion, but
it includes how are your assignments looking, and etc. So, we really lead it up to their discretion, and it gets reflected in the end that mentor is supposed to submit by the end of the semester, summarizing what he or she saw, how things were going, suggestions, things like that, and we do this not just to have a documentation of how things are going, but also because in the last two years let’s say, that helps that faculty member remember what he or she saw for purposes of writing letters. So, they could actually go back there and go, 'oh! Yeah, that's right. I saw her classes so that their professorial memories can be jogged, given that we're famous or infamous for forgetting too much.

In other words, the English department is presenting the mentoring relationship to be a professional one that should not be overly bureaucratized. Once again, student evaluations seem, at most, to be loosely coupled with the judgment. Rather, a larger apparatus is built to help graduate students learn how to teach.

*English 226.* As mentioned above, there is a link between teaching and research that Orange University returns to time and time again as it relies on an apprenticeship model to organize part-time instruction in such a way as to establish a degree of scholastic worth. We return to this theme again with the course English 226, Focus on a Literary Theme, Form, or Mode.

According to the department website, the official course description for English 226 is “Exploration of a single common theme, form, or mode using varied texts to promote fresh inquiry by unexpected juxtapositions of subject matter and ways of treating it.” It is a course for undergraduate non-majors that graduate students can submit proposed syllabi for. If their syllabus is selected, then they may teach that course. Cindy Smith was enthusiastically looking forward to teaching her 226 course the coming fall:

*My class is called 'literary cannibalism', and it's basically, like, looking at how authors rework classic texts. So we have, what I'm planning is have
the students read Jane Eyre, and then look at another novel called White Sargasso Sea, which is the story of Rochester's first wife, which is written by a Caribbean author. So, we're going to pair up these reworkings, and look at how the classic mixes with or inspires the new one.

*Interviewer:* So, something like *Le Morte D'Arthur* and *Mists of Avalon*?

Right! So, you know how they look at a classic text, and they say, well, this is only a minor character, but I could probably make something out of it. And minor characters are often sad to say women, or you know, people from minority races or whatever, and then another author comes along and does something with that character. So we're going to be looking at that.

Through this course, the department is encouraging the scholastic equivalence of teaching and research described above, and therefore encouraging graduate students to teach the materials they are most comfortable with. In doing so, they hope to have graduate students enjoy their teaching more, and think of it in closer relation to their graduate studies.

*Professionalization.* In addition to the teaching mentors, the English Department also offers professionalization courses and workshops, and these take the form of official graduate courses. “This department is very good at trying to professionalize us,” says Cindy Smith. “So they give a lot of workshops and things, where we learn how to build a resume, we learn how to have an interview, we learn how to publish papers.” These courses are English 810 (English Internship) and English 815 (English Workshop). The internship is a required course, which can be fulfilled several different ways. Fourth year graduate student Kelly Sanders co-taught a course with a tenured professor to fulfill his internship requirement, though there were many other ways one could do so, including “literally taking a position of intern at SUNY press, for example. Some people present a
The workshop, which is not required but can count as credits for one's doctoral degree, includes matters such as writing curriculum vitae, giving effective job interviews, and publishing scholarly work. ABD Graduate student Tom London describes the workshop course as a “pedagogy class.” He continues:

We workshop our syllabus, and talk about ways – teaching strategies in the pedagogy. You know, kind of – you know how you would structure your class and different examples of ways to approach the class from different situations. So, I mean, that's pretty – my best – so that's like a whole semester [that is] intense... that's definitely useful. Yeah. That's what's going on, and usually that class is in co-relation to like your first semester of teaching. So you come in and you talk about what happened in your class.

Courses such as these are an attempt to codify the department's effort at training graduate students to be English academics, a goal that includes preparing them to be active participants in the academic in addition to teaching them relevant information. Codifying them as official courses makes the attempt more visible, which is a useful benefit if one wishes to demonstrate the quality of one's effort to help graduate students professionally develop.

Two Responses. To see a response to these attempts to reinforce the English Department's commitment to graduate education through graduate teaching, we turn back to self-described disgruntled graduate Clara Amberson:

Over the last few years people have clambered about needing support for their teaching. I think grad students take their teaching very seriously, and they will turn to each other and to professors quite a bit... I mean it's less explaining and – but I mean I've been really stressed that there's a real earnestness about – across the board about people just wanting to do a good job, you know? It's not like, "How can we cut corners? How can we
“It really is just an earnest pursuit of like – I mean there's definitely commiseration in terms of students and stuff like that, but I think there's a sense of really being colleagues in this department and trying to teach together.

Even though Clara continues to be concerned over the economic exploitation of being “in the lowest rung” of the “the capitalist public university system,” she accepts that the faculty in her department and possibly the administration more broadly are making a good faith effort to give her a graduate education. Therefore, despite her concerns over her economic conditions, she was still willing to accept the academic legitimacy of the department with the illegitimacy of the economic system being leveled at 'capitalism,' the economic system everyone found themselves within but no one in the department was responsible for.

Cindy Smith more or less agrees. “And this department is very good at trying to professionalize us. So they give a lot of workshops and things, where we learn how to build a resume, we learn how to have an interview, we learn how to publish papers. My sense is there's a lot of people coming out, looking for the same sort of job, so, you know.”

*Summary of English's Effort.* Ms. Amberson and Ms. Smith's reactions highlight several points about English's response to potential criticism and the apprenticeship model. First, the apprenticeship model attempts a justification of part-time instruction as part of a larger whole. It doesn't seek to justify part-time instruction as much as it seeks to justify a graduate program that includes part-time instruction as a common activity among the graduate students. Second, it attempts a justification based on promises of
future reward; even if the instructor is not well paid in the present, the program is doing what it can to help them become a successful, fully-employed academic in the future. Third, the apprenticeship model works within budgetary parameters more than it challenges them. It seeks to compensate for low pay with opportunities of mentoring, professional development, and the opportunity to express one's own research interests in the classroom. Based on interviews with graduate students, they appear at least somewhat successful.

Higher Pay and Apprenticeship in the Math Department

Significantly, two elements central to the English Department case above are not found within the case of the Mathematics Department at Orange University. First, respondents did not mention formalized programs for graduate students such as teaching mentoring, a graduate student-oriented course, or professional development workshops. Second, we do not find the same amount of criticism, concern over criticism, or response to (anticipated) criticism in the Department of Mathematics & Statistics that we find in the English Department.

In fact, only one interviewee, ABD Graduate student Jack Michaelson, offered an elaborated critique of the department. His criticism, however, did not deal with the exploitation of graduate students. When I asked Jack Michaelson how long it takes to get a Ph.D. at Orange, he informed me that “was a loaded question.” Slightly confused, I asked him to explain, and he responded:

The focus of this department seems to be the importance of passing these four exams because some students will take four or five years to pass these
four exams... In addition to coursework, after four or five years, and then they get to do their research. The research is truly the touchstone of the PhD degree. So, where is the math department going to find the funding for a student to do really, really good proper research after they’ve already been here for four or five years? ... [It’s loaded because – what is the PhD degree? How is it defined at Orange? Is it spending three or four years passing these four exams or is it spending three or four years doing really, really good research? Which one is it?

While individuals in the English Department were concerned that economic exploitation was ruining the scholastic legitimacy of the university's actions, Jack is concerned that bureaucracy is undermining the Math Department's ability to effectively shepherd graduate students through the program.

A third difference was less about absence than a greater presence – of money. The Department of Mathematics and Statistics, pays its part-time instructors $5,000 per course. Associate Vice President Simson explains the math salaries as the result of a tight labor market:

We offer more courses, more sections of calculus than any other single course in the curriculum. It's because calculus is a prerequisite for so many majors. It's not just the sciences, it's business, and we've essentially exhausted the supply of qualified instructors of calculus within a 50 mile commuting radius of Albany... The stipends that are paid are competitive.

Math Department Chair Willis Coleman of the Math Department remarks that his department pays part-time instructors “better than anybody else does, I think, because it's a non-trivial skill, to be able to teach.”

The higher pay in the Math Department appears to satisfy general concerns regarding the University's good faith effort to help graduate students in accordance with an apprenticeship model. The reason for this is that it avoids the ill-timed economic pressure that English graduate students face. If an English graduate student teaches one
course a semester as a part-time instructor, they will do the same work as they did as a
teaching assistant, but lose their health insurance and their pay for the year decreases by
$2,400 ($8,000 for the assistantship vs. $5,600 for teaching two courses).

In the same situation, the math graduate student would lose health care but have
their pay increase by $2,000. Consequently, math graduate students do not find
themselves with the same economic pressures as English graduate students. Without this
economic pressure, there is less impetus for graduate students to criticize their
department's care of them, and less need for the faculty to react with new policies that
visibly demonstrate the department's commitment to graduate students.

Apprenticeships are not Jobs. It is important to remember the qualifications at
work here. Based on the interviews of individuals associated with the English and Math
Departments of Orange University, the justifications and criticisms of part-time
instruction at Orange University seem to consistently be grounded in scholastic worth,
with no alternatives. Furthermore, within this regime of justification, the question is not
whether or not part-time instructors are paid sufficient wages for work, but rather whether
or not the University apprentices sufficiently graduate students in good standing.

At Caussade College, adjunct work was less a job than it was a hobby or
something done for some additional money. At Mahican Community College, it was
possibly an avocation, or possibly an extended job interview for a full-time position. In
both cases, the faculty and administrations actively rejected the idea that the correct
standard involved thinking of adjunct work as a primary source of income. Similarly,
part-time instruction at Orange University is defined as something other than a job. We see this claim from Associate Vice President Simson that while there is a legitimate need to pay graduates and part-time instructors, there is a limit to what the University can legitimately pay:

I still hear stories of graduate students trying to put together a living by teaching not only for us, a couple courses from us so they may get benefits from us, but they also teach at [several other colleges in the area], where they can pick up another course in order to try and make a living... I think there is a certain argument that kind of situation is not good for the part-time faculty member, and it's not in the long term interests of the program. On the other hand, there's a counter-argument that is you don't want to set up a situation where you're essentially creating an alternative life – this is not a life-time job.

At Orange University, part-time instruction is to be thought of as part of graduate education, not a stand-alone job. It is not a life-long job, allowing for an alternative life where one does not need to finish one's graduate work. Consequently, the Department of Mathematics and Statistics need only pay its graduate students well enough to demonstrate functional support for their studies, a standard that links to scholastic worth exclusively and requires less money than if teaching was intended to be a “long term” job. Further, by paying them sufficiently, the Department does not feel the need to demonstrate their support of graduate students in other ways.

INVITED TO THE CONVERSATION: GRADUATE STUDENTS AND THE TEACHING – RESEARCH RELATIONSHIP

At Caussade College and Mahican Community College, adjunct work is not intended to be a form of gainful employment, and the adjunct is not expected to be a
“true” academic. In other words, adjunct instruction at these colleges is an overt boundary object. The college and the department faculty can evaluate the adjunct's work in scholastic terms while the adjunct has the ability to evaluate his or her work according to whatever regime of justification they wished, though as mentioned above it is unlikely to be seen as worthwhile if it is being judged in market terms as a primary source of income. This allows for a flexibility useful for the contingent of being an adjunct.

At Orange University, however, circumstances are quite different. Rather than part-time instruction being an occupational boundary object, it is instead an element associated with graduate education.

The Preference for and Resignation to Teaching

“I want to teach, definitely,” states math graduate student Anne McCoy before adding, “I’m obviously not here to do amazing research.” When asked why it is “obvious” why she is not at Orange University to do research, she explains:

Because this is Orange University. If you’re going to do major research, you pick a school that has that reputation. I’m definitely interested in doing research. I obviously have to get my Ph.D. I would love to pick a field where I could continue doing research after I get my Ph.D., but in the end, I’m in it to teach eventually. Currently, I would love it if in the end I end up at some kind of smallish college. I don’t think I wanna be at a big university. Like I said, I loved Livingston State [smaller state school she received her bachelors from]. It was the perfect size for me. I like small schools, so if I could end up somewhere like that where I’m teaching mostly undergrads and maybe there’s a couple of opportunities for me to advise some undergraduate research that would be ideal for me.

Ms. McCoy suggests there is a homology between her desired professional trajectory (teach in higher education), and the quality of Orange University's graduate program (not
elite enough to ensure one gains a position at a top research university).

Clara Amberson of English also prefers teaching over research, admitting to a lack of the necessary ambition: “I mean I'm not – I'm really not a killer academic. I think I'm good and I'm smart, but I'm not the most competitive. So what are – my job ambitions are more general quality of life.” Several more graduate students view themselves as better teachers than researchers. “I think I'm a better teacher than I am a scholar,” says Cindy Smith. “I don't think I'm a particularly – you know, I'm not going to publish the book that changes the world. I know some people are very into their research, they're very committed to theory. I'm not like that, I enjoy teaching.” Sofia Landau, a second year math graduate student, explains her preference for teaching over research by making an admission. “Research scares me. I’ve never done any yet, and I know I will have to soon, but yeah, I guess it’s fear of the unknown at this point.” Even Jack Michaelson who spoke proudly of his research achievements prefers to teach: “I don’t think I’m so ambitious as to want to go onto a university type position. I would be very, very happy with a four-year liberal arts college – and do my research when I can – in between teaching calculus classes.”

Professor Benson doubts Orange's Department of Mathematics and Statistics is one of the elite departments of the country, and suspects its doctoral students are more likely to be on a trajectory that primarily deals with teaching at non-elite colleges:

Most of our graduates tend to get positions, more than teaching positions. Our graduates are not going off to be instructors at M.I.T and that sort of thing. Most of them are – and that's what they're interested in [four-year teaching colleges] and that's what they get is four year positions, so their teaching record and their teaching recommendations are probably as important as their research.
While no English graduates or faculty described the Orange University English department as non-elite, graduate students in both departments were convinced that research more than teaching was responsible for one's job offers for tenure-track positions. English graduate student Clara Amberson explains:

Because there's such a glut of PhDs on the market in every discipline, even what are considered lower tier schools demand the same qualifications [for research]... It's not gonna get [easier] – maybe at a small liberal arts college. But you still have to have the other lines on your resume, I think, for your CV where you've been published or you've done certain research.

Interviewer: So you'd agree with the idea that it's research is kind of “the name of the game,” and maybe you get bonus points for teaching? Is that what –

(Interrupting): Yeah. Yeah.

We also see this sentiment expressed by math graduate student Jack Michaelson, who claims that “research is truly the touchstone of the PhD degree.”

Based on the interviews, it appears that the graduate students in both departments at Orange University seem to accept the idea of the apprenticeship model as the faculty members present it. Furthermore, there seems as mentioned above to be a homology between graduate student professional goals, the perceived rank of Orange's graduate program, and how graduate students discussed their personal worth as academics. They wished to be teachers, Orange University was a graduate program that could help them become teachers more than researchers, and they were personally better suited for teaching rather than teaching. The consistency upon which this was found suggests a strong degree of socialization, or more accurately normalizing (Foucault 1977), where individuals become academics of varying types and quality.

The interviews continue to uphold three themes for this chapter as well. First,
there is an exclusive use of scholastic worth to justify and criticize part-time instruction at Orange University. Second, there is a link asserted between the teaching and research (though the association is no longer presented in perfectly complimentary terms). And finally, there is an apprenticeship model presented where part-time instruction is viewed less as a form of employment and more as a part of graduate education.

A Critique of Orange University's Teaching – Research Relationship

Professor Gary Reynolds is a member of the English faculty who specializes in rhetoric and composition, and is a recipient of teaching awards. He is also a uniquely harsh critic of part-time instruction as it is organized in his department. His central concern is that, currently, research is illegitimately privileged over and at the expense of teaching. “In this department, and I’m sure any other, [research is called] 'My work.' [As in,] 'How is your work going?' Then they say, 'What about your teaching?' That’s separate. I mean, they don’t – people do not identify with it [teaching].”

For example, several graduate students said they actively tried to teach material related to their research interests (in both English 226 and other courses), as they know that material best. Professor Reynolds, however, disagrees with this tactic:

The route here lately, the phrase that I hear going around from my graduate courses is teach whatever you’re writing about. Teach your book in progress. And I’m like, 'Wow, that's dull, but alright.’ I can even see why that is. It’s efficient from a research point of view, and occasionally could be good for students, but I don’t, no, I don’t agree with it... I guess I would be more student centered in my approach to learning. It’s possible, but what the program promises the students will coincide with what I happen to be researching at the time, but there’s no guarantee of that. In fact, and I’m taking the odds are that it won’t, especially in the first couple years of the student’s program. My former mentor, now retired, always
said that he would like to forbid anybody from teaching students in the first two years in their specialty because you can’t see it the way they see it anymore and so you shouldn’t be trying.

This false relationship is problematic because it does not help teaching and it ignores how privileged research is within the academic field. Toward the end of the interview, he adds an anecdote about his academic mentor, “[He] always said that he would like to forbid anybody from teaching students in the first two years in their specialty because you can’t see it the way they see it any more. And so you shouldn’t be trying [to teach your specialty]. I mean, if you really worked at it, maybe you could, but you’d have to. Otherwise, you’re just like – you’re here. Whatever.”

_Overly Individualized Coursework_. The understanding of teaching being almost a by-product of research leads to a second problem in Professor Reynolds' eyes. In short, the English Department of Orange University allows for the individualistic expression of faculty teaching at the expense of structuring the undergraduate curriculum:

A curriculum, from my perspective, needs to be an ensemble performance by a group of people committed to some articulated shared goals. This curriculum, at least the undergraduate – graduate too I’d say, but certainly the undergraduate – goes so far the other way that it’s not an ensemble performance. There are course numbers, but the core – say the core course, English 210, which may or may not been described to you, everybody has to take it. You must pass it. But there is no agreed upon content, let alone delivery system. So, to me, it’s like at best paradoxical. So you have to take this class, but this class isn’t this class. This class is just a number...

There are no content-based requirements any more. Just numerical: 205, 210, 305, 310. That’s it. What happens in those, nobody knows, and you must take them, “X” number of credits at the 2, 3 and 400 levels, but not in anything. Just the right level.

The department, in his view, cannot organize an effective contribution to undergraduate
education without structuring course content more than it currently is. “As a practical matter, you talk to people and half of them will know something quite well, and the other half will not have heard of it before. And that’s, to me, irresponsible. It means that you’re an – to be an English major means nothing here. It just means you took some English courses.”

Instead, some form of standards is necessary to foster a worthwhile “ensemble performance” of instructors:

I’d be happy if we just said, “Look, there are 14 major schools of criticism,” or whatever. As many as you want to name. “Let’s all – let’s all agree that all the students who come out of 210 will have covered these three.” That would be good enough for me. Or at least the list of key terms, with which they will be familiar, so that when they take 310, which they also are required to do, I can say, “So you remember the fundamental tenants of Marxism or Neo-Marxism.” I don’t even care which set. It really doesn’t matter. And you can’t do that now. You can’t assume – you can’t assume anything with the class in front of you. Nothing. And you will find – I mean, as a practical matter, you talk to people and half of them will know something quite well, and the other half will not have heard of it before. And that’s, to me, irresponsible. It means that you’re an – to be an English major means nothing here. It just means you took some English courses. And I’m not saying it has to have a universal value, I understand it won’t. But it could have a local one. I’d be happy with that.

This argument echoes some of the sentiments found within Mahican Community College: an individual faculty member has a responsibility to prepare students for future courses in the department. This cannot be done if each faculty member is crafting a deeply personal expression of his or her research.

Despite his frustrations, Professor Reynolds does not appear to be rejecting scholastic worth per se. Rather, he critiques the current arrangement in terms that are simultaneously pedagogical and scholastic. He actively rejects scholastic worth in favor
of pedagogical worth, believing a central question for organizing undergraduate
education ought to be, “Do the students need it?”, and he would prefer a more “student
centered in my approach to learning.” His worry is that without the student's
advancement at the heart of coursework, coursework will always be a secondary concern
to research. He elaborates:

The model of the scholar in any field, I think, in a research university,
would be to not teach at all. Right? I mean, it’s all about getting research
time, and grant money. It’s not about, “How can I get to those first year
students.” It’s never that. It’s something imperative. And in rhetoric and
composition, it is. It’s like, how do I better – how do we better teach these
people. It’s never been how do we go away.

Because of this, he is dubious about claims that one's research abilities directly and
positively improve one's teaching abilities.

**Non-Graduate Student Part-Time**

The argument in this chapter is that one cannot understand the organization of
part-time instruction at Orange University's Departments of English and Mathematics
without noting its close association with the graduate programs of those two departments.
However, there are part-time instructors in both departments who are not graduate
students. This dissertation includes interviews with three of them.

We have met Wally Perrine before, as he is both an English adjunct at Caussade
College and a part-time instructor at Orange University. In some ways, he fits into
Orange, as one can detect the evaluation of courses in terms of scholastic worth in his
comments:

I love lecturing on some theory or some point you know. I love just being
with the students you know, have them listen to me. You know, in this world no one listens to you for anything, any reason whatsoever and the students, they have to listen to you, you know, so they’re the only people who listen to me really you know, and so I really like that. I like the fact I could talk to them about issues that concern of the course matter – the subject matter that we’re studying... I think the best interactions usually are discussions we have after either I lecture or one of the students lecture... Usually it’s in the discussions that we have afterward If a discussion is really good, then that makes me very happy where students are participating and engaged in what we’re talking about. That’s when I feel the most connection.

This comment fits easily into what one could say scholastically: the focus is the emergent discussion with engaged students, knowledge needs no justification beyond itself, etc.

At the same time, Mr. Perrine is interested in finding a different form of work that would take less time:

I don’t want to put in that much work and then, you know – my main function, my main goal is to be a published writer and sell my books and I don’t think the PhD in English, even if it’s in Creative Writing or anything like that, I’m not sure if it’s necessary. So I’m kind of iffy about the PhD in English, although it would allow me to teach full-time at a university... [And regarding] part-time teaching, I think I’m in my weaning sort of years with that. I’ve had a lot, there’s not much – I mean, there’s enthusiasm, but there’s not much anymore. I kinda wanna get on to more affordable things you know, higher paying jobs so I can support myself better.

To put it bluntly, Mr. Perrine views teaching as no longer worthwhile because he wishes it to be a primary source of income, a job as opposed to a side job.

Kendra Rawls is quite different. A wife of an administrator, she dropped out of graduate school over twenty years ago to raise their children. Describing how she became a part-time instructor, Ms. Rawls mentions meeting a previous chair at a party, after her children had gone to college:

At the time, I was really wrestling with this, do I want to go into – do I want to continue with a Ph.D. in this world or in the world of
...And we talked about being parents and that kind of thing. So it was kind of a short conversation. But then, it turned out they were low on adjuncts. They needed adjuncts, and maybe didn't know what to do, and he remembered me, and he suggested me. And it surprised me because I wasn't doing this for showmanship; maybe I can get a position here. It did not occur to me at all, so I was really surprised.

As a part-time instructor at Orange University, she has often taught writing intensive courses, and believes this occurs because graduate students prefer not to teach them. When asked why she believes graduate students prefer not to teach writing intensive courses, she responded:

They get burned out doing writing intensive so I think sometimes they just need to do something that's not as demanding... When they're at certain places with their dissertations, maybe they need to not have it be so demanding. Because you're expected to do revision work and take them through the process, so it's not just the 20 pages that they do, but a whole process. So I think that they like their areas of expertise and interests, so they might want to do a class in that area for instance because that's their favorite area, where I tend to do lower-level general things.

What is interesting about this remark is that it indirectly supports Professor Reynolds claim that there is a tension between graduate and undergraduate education. Where Reynolds sees graduate education being focused on at the expense of undergraduate education, Ms. Rawls sees herself (and potentially other non-graduate part-time instructors) as taking the courses that do not fit as well into the apprenticeship model.

Finally, though not currently a graduate student, graduate school looms large for Rawls, creating a theme the way she thinks about her work as a part-time instructor:

I really enjoy this. I really miss the actual stimulation of being in a classroom and learning, so I crave that. And I'd like to be in that situation just to have those neurons firing and learning, so I kind of do that in other ways. I'm taking a class on comparative literatures – or comparative religions, somewhere else. And that's a really good question for me because, also, my husband is older than I am. He's about to retire. So do I want to go spend quality time with my husband or continue in a path, and
it's just a big question mark. So it would only be for my personal satisfaction to finish, maybe.

Kendra Rawls does not look to part-time instruction as the basis of a career. Rather, it is a way she has kept her hopes of returning to graduate school alive, keeping her at least within close proximity of graduate school. Whether or not she in the end decides to return to graduate school does not change the fact that she is, in essence, accepting the fact that Orange University's English Department has coupled their graduate program and part-time instruction together.

Third, the only non-graduate student from the Mathematics Department that is part of this study is Oliver Street. A former graduate student, Oliver decided he was happy to end his graduate career with a master’s degree, rather than continue to a Ph.D. “Research just wasn't for me,” he says, making a comment similar to some of the other graduate students in the Math Department. At the same time, however, he enjoys teaching, and usually gets three courses a semester to teach. Consequently, he is also able to make an income ($30,000 with benefits) he seems quite happy with, though he admits he isn't sure what he wants to do after a few more years of teaching as a part-time instructor.

The interviews with non-graduate student part-time instructors help to highlight the degree to which the two departments at Orange University assume the coupling between part-time instruction and graduate education. In the case of Wally Perrine, this adds to his frustration at having limited courses at Caussade. For Kendra Rawls, it allows her to have an opportunity to reconnect with teaching on the college level and potentially returning to graduate school. And while Oliver Street left the program early, he makes
DISCUSSION

The faculty members of Orange University, like those at Caussade College, rely heavily on scholastic worth to justify and criticize the use of part-time instructors. However, part-time instruction at Orange is in senses less of a boundary object than it was at Caussade, in that virtually all part-time instructors also relied on scholastic worth in their interviews. Furthermore these part-time instructors were almost always graduate students at Orange University, and the faculty members, particularly in English, are quite explicit in coupling part-time instruction to graduate education as part of the apprenticeship process.

This apprenticeship ideal is the central defense against accusations of exploitation: in exchange for their work as instructors, graduate students are being given financial support and an opportunity to learn teaching skills necessary for academics. Between the compensation and the education, their contribution to the university is sufficiently rewarded. Thus, evaluation of part-time instructors is relatively indirect, as one's status in the graduate program has a great deal of influence on whether or not one is (re-)hired as a part-time instructor.

Apprenticeship also organizes the way that graduate students view their studies and their work as part-time instructors. They appear to accept the idea that their work as part-time instructors is part of their education, rather than a job that should be evaluated purely in terms of whether or not it is worth the immediate paycheck, or whether or not...
that paycheck is by itself an acceptable income.

*Apprenticeship, Heterarchy, and Time*

The apprenticeship model's attempt to “purify” an academic, scholastic space for graduate education and part-time instruction is, on some level, a temporary arrangement. It does not truly remove concerns over money and work from consideration by part-tie instructors. Rather, this concern is removed from the present and placed in the future; students hope that their experiences and education now will lead to an academic career later. The English Department, with its various forms of professional development relies heavier on this claim than the Mathematics Department, which comes closer to making a “purely present” justification by paying their part-time instructors almost double what the English instructors make. Because of this, there is not a pressure to organize the graduate program as much around future hopes. Though the link to graduate education remains, it remains more at the level of financial aid than on professional development.

*On the Difference of Departments.* It is significant that Orange University was the only college in this study where there part-time instructor pay differed by department. This will be explored further in the conclusion chapter. However, at this juncture it is worth noting the possibility that Orange University was the only research university in the study, and it is possible that an orientation towards research encourages a differentiation between departments.
The “Liquidity” of Teaching and Research

More than Caussade College, Orange University assumes and relies upon an “equivalence” (Boltanski and Laurent Thévenot 2006) between teaching and research as two scholastic objects that complement one another. Indeed, the apprenticeship model requires this relationship.

The consequences of this link are ambiguous. One the one hand, there is a strong tradition in rhetoric if nothing else that the three pillars of American higher education are teaching, research, and service. Additionally, there is some research that suggests a positive link between them (Feldon et al. 2011; Silverstein et al. 2009) On the other hand, the Mathematics Department has formalized little in terms of graduate education regarding teaching, and the English Department's teaching elements often take an ad hoc approach, where coursework is still about research, and then there are workshops and other activities that appear to be done as a response rather than something effectively integrated into the curriculum for graduate school.

CONCLUSION

The case of Orange University is distinct within this dissertation because it is the only one of the three colleges that does not anticipate avocational adjunct faculty. To the contrary, not only does it assume that part-time faculty members within its Departments of English and Mathematics are aspiring academics, but it assumes they are graduate students who are enrolled at Orange University. The university's entire understanding on how to effectively and legitimately organize part-time instructor work is based on this
premise.

It is important to note the interaction between this expectation and the presence of scholastic worth. Part-time instruction would be organized in a dramatically different way if either of these factors is changed. A research university department that hires most of its adjuncts from outside the university could not justify the work with the allusions to apprenticeship that are made at Orange University. Similarly, the apprenticeship model in place could not work the same way (if at all) if the dominant understanding of academic value made a hard distinction between disciplinary knowledge and pedagogical skill.
CHAPTER 7:
WORTHS AND HETERARCHICAL AUTONOMY IN THE
ACADEMIC FIELD

This project began with a theoretical claim, that Pierre Bourdieu's understand of
field autonomy and heteronomy is incomplete. While Bourdieu's work emphasizes the
importance of relational analysis and human agency, his research on fields of cultural
production does not focus on actors attempting to manage the demands of multiple fields
or the processes of boundary work. Instead, he relies on identifying field positions that
are homologous to positions within the field of power, a method that, while useful, does
not speak to the processes on boundary work actors must constantly balance.

In an attempt to reconstruct the concept of field autonomy/heteronomy, I turned to
the sociology of worth. As a theoretical approach for cultural and economic sociology, it
is multidimensional, focused on contingent action, and interested in actors balancing
multiple forms of agency, it is well suited to the task.

In my study of part-time instruction within the English and Mathematics
Departments of three colleges, I relied on this approach. This has allowed us to answer
four questions:

1. What higher principles and standards of evaluation (i.e. forms of worth) are
   used among full-time faculty and administrators to justify and criticize
   adjuncts and the college's use of them?

2. What tests of worth have been institutionalized to evaluate adjuncts?

3. How does the college avoid the potential accusation of exploitation? In
other words, how is proper compensation defined and matched to the worth of adjuncts?

4. Who are the adjuncts? What forms of worth do they use? What can be said about their occupational trajectory? How are they defined by the employing college in a way that is compatible with those forms of worth present?

The previous three chapters described the Departments of English and Mathematics at Caussade College, Mahican Community College, and Orange University. These chapters were descriptive in nature, attempting to capture an understanding of the “moral economy” of adjunct work at three colleges. This chapter, in addition to summarizing some of the key findings, will also attempt a comparison across cases. In doing so, the role of worth in questions of adjunct work specifically and heteronomy generally (hopefully) becomes more clear.

First, two forms of worth, scholastic and pedagogical, were dominant at the three colleges. In order to make sense of the role academic disciplines play (and do not play) in justifications of adjunct work, this dissertation suggests academic disciplines, as institutions, are embodied quite differently depending on whether scholastic or pedagogical worth is dominant. Additionally, forms of worth appear to be tied to universities more than individuals and their specific position within the academic field. Additionally, the ubiquity of a single form of worth suggests ideological control within the formal organization of the full-time (but not adjunct) faculty and administrators at each college.

Second, within the act of qualification, the form of worth interacts with the contextual details of each college, and the most important element for this dissertation is the understanding of adjunct faculty as either aspiring or avocational academics.
the colleges believe adjunct work can be justified as an occupation in its own right. Whatever adjunct work is, it is not an occupation. However, what adjunct work may be depends heavily on whether one believes adjunct faculty members aspire to become full-time tenure-track faculty.

Third, the idea that adjunct work is a boundary object of the academic field is affirmed. At Caussade College and Mahican Community College, this is clear from the extreme diversity among adjuncts regarding their occupational trajectories. At Orange University, the boundary-ness of part-time instructors is avoided by equating part-time instructor and graduate student.

Fourth, both Caussade College and Mahican Community College rely on tests of worth regarding adjunct faculty that are problematic in ways that render them either difficult to apply consistently (the frequency of chair evaluations), or practically ceremonial (as is the case with student evaluation. Orange University, due to its view of part-time instruction as part of graduate education and the third college has a substantially different understanding of how to evaluate part-time instructors, as they are expected to be graduate students.

Fifth, the autonomy of a field is reconstructed to mean a positive heterarchical relationship. Intuitively, the presence of adjuncts is to varying degrees autonomous or heteronomous depending on how much or little academic forms of worth actually organize their work and evaluation. The central heteronomous challenge adjuncts represent is the question of whether full-time professionals are necessary for teaching.

This chapter will then end with a short comment on potential future research.
ON THE DOMINANT FORMS OF WORTH

In the previous empirical chapters two regimes of justification, each promoting a distinct form of worth, emerged from the interviews as particularly important in the way actors qualified matters regarding to adjuncts or part-time faculty. Both were used heavily by full-time employees of colleges and universities to qualify discussions of part-time and adjunct instructors and their use. The empirical findings regarding these regimes are summarized in table 17: A Comparison of Academic Justificatory Regimes.

Summaries of Scholastic and Pedagogical Worth

Scholastic worth is anchored on the higher principle that knowledge can have intrinsic value in and of itself, and defines a highly scholastic actor as playing seriously with ideas. This serious play occurs by intellectually engaging others who are involved in an ongoing academic discussion. The goal of this is to make contributions to the ongoing discussion that facilitate new insights among participants. The merits of one's contribution can be judged through the professional and expert discretion of other engaged parties. The scholastic justificatory regime is necessarily social in nature, as one cannot conduct professional academic activity in isolation; one at the very least needs other academics who can acknowledge the value of one's work. Becoming a better participant in these conversations, be they in a classroom, at a conference, or in journal articles, requires a deeper immersion into knowledge.

In terms of the regimes of justification Boltanski and Thévenot developed, scholastic worth could be described as a specific, stabilized compromise between
inspirational and domestic worths. Like inspiration, the scholastic worth deals in revelation, vision, and genius. However, like domestic worth, it is hierarchically social. One is to know one's position in the ongoing debate; the academic world is not a debate among equals. As such, it differs from a “true” scientific ideal of skepticism (Owen-Smith 2001).

Pedagogical worth, on the other hand, is based in a different regime. Believing in the elevating potential of knowledge, instructors accept a responsibility to educate students out of a care for those students' future well-being. One can successfully advance students within an educational environment, if one's skills at communicating information are good enough. As with scholastic worth, the best judge of this requires professional expertise. To become a better teacher, one must develop a better rapport with and commitment to the students one teaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Higher Principle</th>
<th>Scholastic</th>
<th>Pedagogical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intrinsic Value of Knowledge</td>
<td>The Elevating potential of Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Worthiness</td>
<td>Serious Play of Ideas</td>
<td>The Responsibility to educate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objects</td>
<td>One's Contribution to the Ongoing Debate</td>
<td>A well rounded set of teaching skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Better understanding leads to better expression</td>
<td>Improving rapport with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations of Worth</td>
<td>Intellectually Engaging Others</td>
<td>Care of the Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figures</td>
<td>The Ongoing Academic Debate</td>
<td>The Educational Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test</td>
<td>Expert Discretion</td>
<td>Expert Discretion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment</td>
<td>Facilitate Revelation</td>
<td>Advancement of Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: A Comparison of Academic Justificatory Regimes
WORTH AND THE EMBODIMENT OF DISCIPLINES

A discipline must be embodied or have a representative of some sort to be present within a situation and influence a program of action (Latour 1994; Boltanski 2011). Based on the previous three chapters, this dissertation concludes a college's dominant form of worth influences the way a discipline is embodied and expressed at that college. Independent of whether there is a doctoral program within the department or whether adjuncts are seen as avocational, scholastic worth allows the discipline to be embodied by the instructor, whereas pedagogical worth encouraged the discipline to be embodied by course content.

Disciplines are not merely departments within the organization of a college. Rather, they are the infrastructure of American higher education (Abbott 2001), and are best thought of as institutions. Institutions can be defined as “linkage mechanisms that bridge across three kinds of social divides—they link micro systems of social interaction to meso (and macro) levels of organization, they connect the symbolic with the material, and the agentic with the structural” (Mohr and White 2008:485). The study of worth and critique benefits from a discussion of institutions:

To institutions fall the task of saying and confirming what matters... In particular, institutions must sort out what is to be respected from what cannot be; what can only be considered once, in association with a context and as if it were accidental, and this by comparison with what it is appropriate to look at twice.” (Boltanski 2011:75).

Institutions must manifest to influence the course of events. An institution “has no body, [and therefore] cannot speak, at least other than by expressing itself through the intermediary of spokespersons – i.e. flesh-and-blood beings like all the rest of us – such
as judges, magistrates, priests, teachers, and so on’’ (Boltanski 2011:84). An academic discipline, therefore, must be embodied. The text below suggests the form of worth helps determine whether academic disciplines are embodied as an actor or content in these cases.

Scholastic Embodiment of Institutions, and the “Equivalence” of Teaching and Research

Caussade College and Orange University, where scholastic worth is the dominant paradigm, look for the discipline to be embodied by the instructor. The instructor is the representative of English or Math (or sociology, philosophy, etc.) to the students, who the instructor invites to join the conversation. To the degree they represent their discipline well, they are a good instructor. Teaching undergraduates is a venue, an opportunity, and instance where one may represent one's discipline. The organization of Caussade College and Orange University suggests teaching is but one of several instances where one has an opportunity to “do English” or math. One could therefore consider conferences, publications, and field work as other venues for academics to perform their discipline. The research on whether or not teaching and research correlate is voluminous and themed by constant disagreement (Feldon et al. 2011; Harry and Goldner 1972; Hattie and Marsh 1996; Verburgh, Elen, and Lindblom-Ylänne 2007), but Caussade College and Orange University appear to encourage the view that teaching and research are both pillars (or institutions) of higher education.
At Mahican Community College, things are quite different. Here, the faculty members (adjunct or full-time) are responsible for using their pedagogical skills to transfer knowledge to the students. The academic discipline is primarily embodied by the course material. This is part of the reason why the standardization of syllabi at Mahican Community College is accepted. As their worth is not founded on their ability to represent the discipline per se, the ability to choose what from the discipline ought to be taught is less necessary. Instead, worth is in their ability to teach, and academic freedom defined as the freedom to teach in the method of their choosing. Mahican Community College then shifts that responsibility to a committee of full-time faculty.

WORTH, FIELD POSITIONS, AND ORGANIZATIONAL CONTROL

The findings of this dissertation speak to the relationship between the form of worth present at a college and various matters regarding its position within the academic field and its formal organization. First, the notion that scholastic worth would be more likely present at a research university as opposed to a community college is a rather intuitive finding. Armed with empirical evidence, one could surmise scholastic and pedagogical worths are, in institutionalist terms, elements of competing institutional logics associated with formal organizations (the colleges) that are likewise hierarchically ordered (Lounsbury 2007).

Put in Bourdieu's language, American higher education is a relatively stable field, it is not surprising one would find homologies between institutional logics and worths on
one side, and types of colleges on the other. Furthermore, the field positions occupied by different types of colleges are not equal in weight. If research is privileged over teaching in the academic field, and if research universities are therefore central to field structure, it should be no surprise that pedagogical worth occupies a more marginal position.

Where teaching at both Caussade College and Orange University was understood in an atomized, individualistic way, teaching was understood by interviewees at Mahican Community College as something that ought to be somewhat coherent on the level of the department, not just the individual instructor or course. Mahican instructors spoke more of a responsibility to prepare students for the next course in a sequence, whereas instructors at the other two colleges spoke almost exclusively in terms of their students' experiences within the course and no further. While it may be tempting to make a causal claim regarding this state of affairs and the differences between scholastic and pedagogical worth, there is insufficient evidence for such a claim.

Scholastically justified instructors are singular representatives of their field, and a degree of idiosyncrasy is expected and possibly encouraged. We can see this in the presence of English 226, where teaching their research interests is a reward for good graduate student instructors. Codification in this arrangement is synonymous with low academic worth. Introductory calculus courses, for example, may be somewhat standardized precisely because it is basic information, and there is a limit on how much of the instructor's personality can be displayed within that. One is left wondering if it would be possible or desirable for a college or department organized around scholastic worth to think of the fact in that department as collaborating to educate undergraduate
students. Such speculation, however, is far beyond the empirical evidence this dissertation contains.

Second, there was a striking amount of conformity among full-time faculty and administrators at each college in terms of the ubiquity of the dominant form of worth. While it is possible that the focus on multiple institutions forced the study to have an insufficiently high resolution to identify intra-organizational fractures, it is also possible these colleges are relying on a form of normative or ideological control (Barley and Kunda 1992; Czarniawska-Joerges 1988). Barbara Czarniawska defined it as follows:

Ideological control targets the organizational members’ perception of reality by offering attractive goals and convincing interpretations. Ideologies are both targets and means of control: new ideologies should take the place of individual ones, and so on. Adhering to a ‘right’ ideology is a source of many social and psychological rewards: social acceptance, a sense of belonging, reduced uncertainty. Deviation produces corresponding punishment: a feeling of isolation, cognitive dissonance, possible open criticism. (Czarniawska-Joerges 1988:10)

Eve Chiapello (2003) argues that tests of worth or trials are necessary for ideology's deployment, and that it can either facilitate social integration and legitimation or hide power and domination.

The idea that something like justificatory regimes could maintain organizational control is already within organizational sociology. For example, Jason Owen-Smith (Jason Owen-Smith 2001) conducted a laboratory ethnography where he suggested that scientific skepticism is relied upon at the private laboratory H-Lab in a way that “solves the control problems facing intellectually diverse, uncertain, and reputation-based workplaces.” (Jason Owen-Smith 2001:447). However, at the same time, H-Lab is not a case of perfect scientific order. Rather, “In collegial but differentiated organizations like
the H-lab, the amount and character of criticism directed at a claim varies systematically with the claimant's social position” (Owen-Smith 2001, p.447).

Disciplines and their Lack of Explanatory Power

The original research design of this project dealt with two comparisons: a comparison of two traditional liberal arts disciplines (English and mathematics), and a comparison of three colleges representing different organizational forms (a public research university, a private teaching college, and a public community college). Within this study, disciplines did not differ in terms of which form of worth interviewees deployed. Additionally, faculty from different disciplines did not bring up discipline-specific problems that altered the general form worth or its testing would take.

This lack of disciplinary differences can be explained several ways. One tact would be to suggest a methodological limitation: an insufficient number of individuals were interviewed, and the focus on comparing three colleges obscured the disciplinary differences. However, it is also the case that research holds a privileged position within the academic field and that disciplines serve as the infrastructure for that field. It would therefore not be wild speculation to suggest that there may be pronounced differences in how different disciplines define quality research (Lamont 2010), but have those differences substantially muted regarding teaching.

This would mean that disciplines do have hold sway over the organization of teaching. Rather, the colleges and universities, as formal organizations and employers, have more immediate and direct control of teaching than they often do of research.
AVOIDING THE CHARGE OF EXPLOITATION

Defenses against the accusation of adjunct exploitation are embedded within the organization of all three colleges and their respective department. The challenge of exploitation differs substantially depending on if a college is dealing with freelancers (Caussade College), potential full-time hires (Mahican Community College), or future academics (Orange University). However, these defenses require reference to forms of worth.

Caussade College and the Exclusion of Academic Hybrids

Adjuncts are marginal and partial members of the academic field compared their full-time counter-parts. They rarely have doctorates, and the fact that they are adjuncts means they cannot be “invested” in the college, according to several interviewees. This is a problem at Caussade, where scholastic worth is dominant. Because the organization of the college looks for instructors to represent their discipline, the marginal status of adjuncts becomes a serious issue. In this light, adjuncts are necessarily hybrid and liminal due to their status as part-time professions.

Caussade's response to this is to segregate and separate the impure adjunct instructors as much as possible to protect the legitimacy of their college. If Caussade can demonstrate adjuncts do not contribute substantially or prevent this from happening, then the adjuncts in question cannot be entitled to substantial compensation or recognition. Through limiting the number of courses an adjunct may teach and relegating them to
lower level (and therefore, lower prestige) courses, the contribution any given adjunct can make the college is essentially policed in a way that prevents it from becoming too great.

According to Dean Vallentin, these limitations are a protection for adjuncts as well as the college. It is better, so goes the argument, for the college to rely on a several different freelancers interested in a small side job, as these individuals would be under no illusion they were anything like a full-time faculty member. While Caussade would benefit greatly from employing adjuncts to teach four or five courses each at relatively low pay with no benefits, it would necessarily be exploitative and illegitimate because Caussade could not pay them what their work was worth.

Such a tact is not, however, without flaws. First, like many attempts at purification, Caussade's strategy amplifies and reinforces hybridity (Latour 1993). The lack of office space and the omnipresent assumption adjuncts will not participate in the campus life of Caussade beyond teaching a course or two reinforces the lack of investment adjuncts feel toward the college. The boundary between the academic field and the rest of society now has a width (Eyal 2005), becoming a social space both within and without the academic field that is occupied by “hobby-academics”, adjuncts, whose ambiguity has been institutionalized.

Second, beyond the hybridity, there is a limit on how viable a strategy that can be summarized as “marginalization to prevent exploitation” can be to avoid exploitation. In our fluid, postindustrial world where “the realization of profit occurs through organizing economic operations in networks,” exclusion becomes a form of exploitation in and of itself (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005:355) as it denies one the ability to be mobile, or “the
ability to move around autonomously not only in geographic space, but also between people, or in mental space, between ideas” (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005:361).

The question of exploitation, then, becomes variable depending on the adjunct's particular situation: does being an adjunct at Caussade College increase or decrease one's mobility? It is difficult to argue that William Breedlove, a retired principal, tour guide, and author who adjuncts as much to have “something to do” and develop a rapport with young people as money is particularly stuck or immobile. For him, being an adjunct is an expression of mobility, not the lack of it. While Caussade College financially benefits from his contingent work, it is more difficult to make the claim they are doing so by maintaining large inequalities where Mr. Breedlove is a dominated individual. Things are very different, however, for Wally Perrine, as he does not enjoy the work much anymore and is frustrated that it takes away from his time to write. The same work that frees William Breedlove limits Wally Perrine.

This leads to another paradoxical statement: whether or not adjuncts are exploited has less to do with the work at Caussade, and more to do with how that works fits into the adjunct's general occupational trajectory. In the cases of Wally Perrine and Joy Wine, this immobility is related to their frustrated desire for full-time work, something that Caussade actively denies through their keeping of adjuncts at arms' length.

Orange University, Integration, and the Promise of Field Membership

Orange University presents a radically different case that is nevertheless still organized around scholastic worth. Where Caussade College follows a policy of
separation and purification, Orange University's departments of English and Mathematics follow one of integration due to their reliance on and assumption of graduate students as part-time instructors. While graduate students are still relatively liminal members of the academic field, the point of graduate education (which is inextricably intertwined with teaching part-time) is to allow students to become full members of the academic field.

Both departments at Orange attempt to justify their use of part-time instructors through a double linkage to their graduate programs. Specifically, it represents both professional development and a form of financial aid. Regarding departmental differences, the Mathematics Department pays dramatically more than the English Department, but the English Department offers dramatically more professional development workshops related to teaching. This is a sort of differentiation not present at Caussade College: the Mathematics Department finds itself in a situation where it emphasizes the financial aid aspect, while English emphasizes the education aspect. Sadly, a shortcoming of this study is that no satisfactory answer was found explaining why these differences exist. While comments were made about the pay being the result of fewer people qualified to teach math at the college level, this seems to contradict the fact that the majority of part-time instructors are graduate students. If one planned on pursuing this question, an organizational history would be required to understand the development of the graduate program in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics alongside the (assumedly) increasing role of part-time faculty.

Exploitation takes a different form at Orange University than it does at Caussade, as one cannot truly say exclusion is the theme. Instead, the question involves the fact that
Orange University's departments benefit, in the form of cheaply teaching undergraduates, from what they consider part of graduate education. At this point, two questions present themselves. First, are these graduate students capable of finding work within the academic field upon graduation? Second, if they are able to find work, does their teaching experience gained at Orange help them do this? To the extent that the answer to either question is negative, one could make the case for exploitation. If one's effort to join a profession results in advantages in the present for their college rather than future success for themselves, one may begin to develop a critique of this system. A key both to the justification and the accusation of exploitation is exactly how the relationship between the present, the anticipated future, and the actual future is managed by all actors involved.

*Mahican Community College and the Non-Job Work of Adjunct Faculty*

At first blush regarding the use of adjuncts, Mahican Community College appears to be a less stringent version of Caussade College. While adjuncts are still part-time professionals liminal field members, they have the opportunity to participate in professional service and do not appear as stigmatized in general. Mahican Community College appears quite comfortable with the idea that there are hybrid and borderline actors who nevertheless are included in academic work. Mahican Community College is able to do this precisely because they do not look for disciplines to be embodied by adjuncts. Consequently, careful management of the person of adjuncts is not as pressing a demand.
Once again, this does not mean all is harmonious. In many ways, the story of adjuncts at Mahican parallels the story of adjuncts at Caussade: as long as one does not think about adjunct work as a “real job,” an occupation that one can expect to serve as the primary source of income, then adjunct work is justifiable in a number of ways. Well paid state employees who teach as a civic duty (Allyson Gess) and faculty experiencing a gradual retirement at their desired pace (Benita Raatz) are not quite exploited. However, another individual who has the same job but wishes to treat it as a job find themselves in a much more problematic situation.

This highlights a central question for critique, namely the threshold of illegitimacy. Desiring or expecting a position to be sufficient employment to live off of is a much higher standard than looking for some supplementary income. In many ways, this issue is in higher relief at Mahican than it is at Caussade, because Mahican hires its adjuncts as full-time faculty. It is possible that one’s adjunct work is an elongated job interview, and one ought to demonstrate commitment to students and the organization in order to achieve that desired end.

ACADEMIC BOUNDARIES AND THE DIVERSITY OF ADJUNCT INSTRUCTORS

Looking at these three cases, it is clear that part-time instructors are a boundary object by Star & Griesemer's definition:

“Boundary objects are objects which are both plastic enough to adapt to local needs and the constraints of the several parties employing them, yet robust enough to maintain a common identity across sites. They are weakly structured in common use, and become strongly structured in individual site use. These objects may be abstract or concrete. They have different meanings in different social worlds but their structure is common
Adjunct work is a boundary object because of how it can simultaneously be defined and qualified in several ways according to an academic justificatory regime or institutional logic as well as non-academic ones.

In defining adjunct work, colleges tackle the issue of assigning worth to adjuncts, and by extension their own reliance on them. However, forms of worth cannot be imposed on reality in an automatic fashion; rather, each college defines adjuncts and adjunct work in a way that is consistent both with its dominant form of worth and with its particular circumstances.

The Diversity of Adjuncts and Part-Time Instructors at Caussade and Mahican

The occupational trajectories of adjuncts at Caussade College and Mahican Community College are diverse and heterogeneous, and given the small sample size of interviewees who were included in this study, little pattern can be discerned in them other than people who are self-identify as aspiring academics are clearly in the minority. Adjuncts at these colleges, it appears, rarely have working full-time in an academic setting as a goal they are striving to achieve.

Other Worths. While full-time faculty and administrators appeared to unify around a particular academic justificatory regime, there was no such unity among part-time instructors. Among adjuncts at Caussade and Mahican Community College, market worth is as common as the dominant academic worth (scholastic or pedagogical) present
among the full-time faculty. In interviews, they offered accounts involving cost benefit analysis regarding the benefits of the academic work (additional pay, flexibility, the pleasure of intellectual stimulation) outweighed the costs (effort, uncertainty). Their comments clearly fit the idea of market worth as striving to satisfy one's goals with the minimum of cost.

Other forms of worth were present as well. Scholastic worth is found among many adjuncts. Two adjuncts discussed their desire to give back and/or make a better world through teaching. One adjunct also used a domestic form of worth, which was unique to him in this study. However, his presence supports the idea of adjunct work as a boundary object as organized at Caussade College and Mahican Community College.

In addition to there being multiple forms of worth present among the interviewed adjuncts, it is also quite common for adjuncts to not rely on a single form of worth. While the full-time employees of a college seem to consistently rely on a single form of worth during their account of undergraduate education and adjunct work, adjuncts are willing to shift between two or three forms of worth over the course of the interview.

Through its lack of formalization and ambiguous character, it can fit into very different occupational trajectories and be qualified by distinct justificatory regimes. As such, the diversity of adjuncts at Mahican Community College and Caussade College strongly suggests adjunct work is a boundary object. This is, however, only half the definition of whether or not something is a boundary object.
The other half of the equation that adjunct work to be a boundary object is the ability by the academic field or a college to consistently make sense of it and treat it as a stable thing when necessary; purely chaotic things are not boundary objects. As we have seen, the central element for all three colleges' understanding of who is a part-time instructor or adjunct is essentially a negative one: they are full members of the academic professional field, and this lack of standing is homologous to their employment as contingent employees who experience a great deal of uncertainty and insecurity in their work. Whatever adjunct work may be, it is not considered “a job” the full-time faculty at any of the three colleges, meaning the full-time employees do not believe adjunct work should be judged as if it can be one's primary occupation. While this negative definition (not a job, not a full field member, not a full-time employee) is consistent through all cases, the positive definition of who they actually are changes in several important ways.

The distinction at Caussade College between full-time faculty and adjuncts is grounded in the notion that adjuncts cannot be as “invested” in the college as full-time faculty. Adjuncts are by definition not part of the college's intellectual community, a statement that is reinforced through numerous ways (pay, lack of benefits, teaching load limit, lack of offices, etc.). Though the term is never used by an interviewee, Caussade appears to expect adjuncts to be freelancing amateurs. They are people with a degree of ability and knowledge who “dabble” in higher education. As this is not their full-time job, they cannot be expected to be primarily committed to the college.

Though somewhat ambiguous, the concept of investment in the college and its
possibility is important. It either suggests teaching cannot be the only significant professional activity for faculty, or that the most effective teaching requires an intimate understanding and connection to the college which can only be expected to emerge through full-time employment. From the faculty's point of view many of the rules regarding adjunct work such as the teaching limit help make this expectation clear to everyone. Other work conditions, such as limited office space, are seen as a consequence. If adjuncts are not to be depended on, there is a limit on how much they should be embraced by Caussade's academic community.

It is at this juncture that Caussade begins to develop a stance that amounts to marginalization to avoid exploitation. We will discuss strategies for managing exploitation in detail below. However, at this point it is must be noted that while adjunct faculty may be viewed as partial members of the academic field, they are seen as fundamentally different in comparison to full-time faculty. Adjuncts at Caussade are not full-time faculty,

Though Mahican's full-time faculty members and administrators expect adjuncts to often be freelancers, they saw the distinction between part- and full-time faculty members as more permeable than those at Caussade College. The reason for this was the frequency with which their adjuncts were hired for full-time positions. This interest in adjuncts as a major source of full-time faculty likely has several consequences. One could hypothesize that such a move further disconnects Mahican Community College from the academic field, as it does not rely strongly on national or regional searches due to its focus on internal and local human resources.
At both colleges, adjuncts are defined in such a way that they are partly members of the academic field. At Caussade College, they are freelancers capable of teaching (at least lower-level) courses. At Mahican Community College, they are freelancers who may have the ability and desire to become full-time, thereby becoming full field members when they become full-time.

*The Graduate Student Part-Time Instructor at Orange University*

The organization of Orange University views part-time instructors as developing academics, as they are assumed to be graduate students. This differs dramatically from Caussade College, and it differs from Mahican Community College in that the faculty in the Orange English and Mathematics Departments believe it is their responsibility to help these developing academics successfully become full members. If the boundary at Caussade is a wall and a door at Mahican, it is a ladder at Orange.

Part-time instruction at Orange University does not appear then, at first blush, to be the boundary object that adjunct work is at Caussade or Mahican Community College. The reason for this is that exteriority does not seem to play as central of a role: the vast majority of part-time instructors in the English and Mathematics Departments are doctoral graduate students, and many of these students hope to become full-time faculty. It does not achieve this, however, through pure integration of the graduate students / adjuncts into the organization in an immediate way. Rather, graduate student / part-time instructors appear to be more than partial field members because the common non-academic concerns (such as economic security and income) have been pushed into the
future. Graduate students accept their situation with an expectation their experiences will allow them to become full-time faculty and academic professionals in the future. This orientation toward a future state allows them to find their circumstances acceptable, and is the basis of Orange University's claims to legitimacy, as we will see below.

TESTS OF ADJUNCT WORTH

There are three tests of worth present in the colleges studied: Student evaluations, chair evaluations, and credentials. There are, however, important differences between the colleges in how the tests of worth are organized, and there are even more dramatic differences in what the college's perceived obligations are towards worthwhile instructors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Credentials</th>
<th>Student Evaluation</th>
<th>Chair Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caussade College</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahican Community College</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange University</td>
<td>Yes / Enrollment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Use of Tests of Adjunct Worth

*Brief Summary of Adjunct Evaluation*

Caussade College requires a master’s degree in order to teach as an adjunct. Not only is this a form of credentialing, it is a test of worth grounded in scholastic worth in that knowledge of material is expected to correlate with the ability to present it to others. Caussade College uses student evaluations in a supportive role for the more trusted but less frequent chair evaluations. In doing so, they serve as a fail-safe that can catch
adjuncts who are teaching poorly after the attention of department chairs has moved on.

Mahican Community College's tests of worth are comparable to Caussade College's in that they rely on a mix of masters degrees as credentials, student evaluations, and chair evaluations. However, the faculty and administration at Mahican rely on pedagogical rather than scholastic worth. Because of this, they have reservations regarding the utility of graduate degrees as a predictor of teaching ability. Additionally, they are also looking for potential full-time hires, and there appears to be an additional level of activity an adjunct can perform to let the college know they are “serious” about joining the full-time faculty.

In one sense, Orange University relies exclusively on student evaluations as the institutionalized test of worth; chair evaluations are not a standard test of worth in its English and Mathematics Departments. At the same time, however, faculty members at Orange University acknowledge preferential hiring of graduate students as part-time faculty. Additionally, while there is not a universal requirement of a master’s degree to teach, there is an expectation that one can teach if one understands the material as well as a graduate student in their first or second year.

Displacements and the Flaws of Tests

Let us look more carefully at the three tests of worth present in these cases. No test of worth is perfect; it is always an open question how a test of worth can devolve into becoming a test of strength, where various characteristics, resources, and forms of power influence the outcome beyond the value officially being measured. Table 19: A
Comparison of Tests of Worth and their Displacements summarizes and compares these
three tests.

*Student Evaluations*

Student evaluations are not a truly evalutative test with the faith of academic
actors. Mahican Community College prefers Chair evaluations. An administrator at
Caussade wondered out loud during his interview on whether or not any valuable
information is gathered by them. At Orange University, there seems to be minimal
association between student evaluations and the re-hiring of graduate students as part-
time instructors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student Evaluations</th>
<th>Credentials / Graduate School Enrollment</th>
<th>Chair Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worth Assigned</strong></td>
<td>Pedagogical or Scholastic</td>
<td>Scholastic, possibly exclusively</td>
<td>Pedagogical or Scholastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Record</strong></td>
<td>Systematically by administration</td>
<td>Reported on CVs &amp; Resumes</td>
<td>Personally by Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarity</strong></td>
<td>Highly</td>
<td>Highly</td>
<td>Varies on chair-adjunct interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stability</strong></td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>Broad-Ranging</td>
<td>Holistic &amp; durable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Displacements &amp; Complications</strong></td>
<td>Ceremonial Tests</td>
<td>Validity Issue</td>
<td>Personal &amp; Relatively Informal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 19: A Comparison of Tests of Worth and their Displacements*

Rather, student evaluations are a form of ceremonial test ("truth tests" in
Boltanski's terms), a thing that is somewhere between an evaluative test and a ritual.

Boltanski succinctly describes them as follows:

"They strive to deploy in stylized fashion, with a view to consistency and
saturation, a certain pre-established state of the relationship between symbolic forms and states of affairs, in such a way as to constantly reconfirm it... The work of confirmation, whose main operator... is tautology, thus takes the form (to be brief) of a reapplication of forms of codification, which are duplicated, deployed, and transformed (depending on orders or structures) (Boltanski 2011:103–104).

Ceremonial tests do not systematically uncover the true essence of a thing. Rather, they “go through the motions,” and in doing so act out the social order. It is possible to fail a ceremonial test, but such an event is unexpected.

Student evaluations are a performance of the academic field, one where students, faculty, and administration all participate in acknowledging the importance of quality teaching. Participation is the primary benefit, not the actual measurement of teaching quality. In doing so, fears are assuaged and the danger of disruptive findings is minimized.

Credentials

Both Caussade College and Mahican Community College require master’s degrees in order to work as an adjunct within their English and Mathematics Departments. In doing so, it appears that master’s degree is taken to be a meaningful credential that suggests a degree of quality regarding one's teaching ability. As a test, then, its range is relatively broad, and it offers a relatively clear statement (the individual had completed all requirements to graduate with a master’s degree from a certain college). This information is presented by the would-be adjuncts to the chairs who decide whether or not to hire them.
To the degree there is a problem with this form of worth, there is a question of validity. In other words, does the degree actually imply the skills sought by the college? This concern is explicitly raised by the chair of the Mathematics Department at Mahican Community College. Despite her personal doubts, however, credentials nevertheless have an air of authority, and a requirement regarding degrees certainly helps to organize and make sense of the social environment Mahican Community College finds itself within, including its pool of potential adjuncts.

Things work differently at Caussade College, where a strong claim regarding the positive association between teaching and research underpins the interviews of all interviewed full-time employees, and several adjuncts as well. To the degree that one does not accept this relationship, credentialing as a requirement becomes a flawed test of worth. At best, it becomes a ceremonial test.

Chair Evaluations

Finally, both Caussade College and Mahican Community College use chair evaluations early in an adjunct's employment. Unlike student evaluations, interviewees generally accepted that chair evaluations were evaluative in nature. However, it is not without potential pitfalls. First, interviewees at Caussade and Mahican describe it as being time intensive and not something that can be done every semester, let alone multiple times a semester. The chair has many duties beyond monitoring adjuncts, and the amount of time needed to continuously evaluate adjuncts is prohibitive. This leads to a situation where it is done once or twice early in the employment of an adjunct, and then
are generally left alone. This state of affairs is compatible with the general assumption that the quality of one's teaching is more or less stable (i.e., good teachers remain good teachers over time), though this dissertation makes no claims regarding causality. It may be the situation (perhaps cynically) produced the opinion that a chair evaluation produces results that can be trusted over longer periods of time, just as it is possible that the organization of adjunct work was allowed to develop the way it did because the administration and faculty had faith in department chairs to assess the quality of instruction.

Additionally, there is a potential problem that the research design of this dissertation is not able to effectively address: the consequences of informality and reliance on discretion. Chair evaluations are not as standardized as student evaluations, nor are they as solidly blackboxed (Latour 1994) as a degree appears to be. While this dissertation gathered some information about what chairs say they look for in an instructor, and how this information is presented to adjuncts, one would require data from participant observation to make precise claims. As it stands, interviewees generally accepted chair evaluations as valid, and did not criticize them. However, this tells us more about their institutionalization as legitimate more than it tells us about the inner workings of chair evaluations as a test of worth for adjuncts.

HETERARCHY & AUTONOMY

An initial theoretical purpose of this dissertation was to develop a way to think about relative field autonomy in a more relational, process-oriented fashion. Bourdieu's
model of relative autonomy leads one to conclude isolation is preferable for science and fields of cultural production, as the only other choice is abject domination by the field of power. His measure of autonomy, mass- versus restricted production, privileges fields that not only are autonomous in action, but inwardly-focused. Importantly, it is unclear how his model of relative autonomy is compatible with some of his normative commitments, as he argued intellectuals must strive to “discover the privilege on which their claim to the universal rests” as part of the “perpetual struggle for the universalization of the privileged conditions of existence which make the pursuit of the universal possible” (Bourdieu 1991:669). This statement comes after defining intellectuals as follows:

The intellectual is a bidimensional being. To be entitled to the name of intellectual, a cultural producer must fulfill two conditions: on the one hand, he must belong to an autonomous intellectual world (a field), that is, independent from religious, political, and economic powers (and so on), and must respect its specific laws; on the other hand, he must invest the competence and authority he has acquired in the intellectual field in a political action, which is in any case carried out outside the intellectual field proper. (Bourdieu 1991:656)

This stance clashes with Bourdieu's theoretical modeling on this issue, as it focuses primarily on internal field conflicts to identify where dominant or dominated groups appear in the field. An actor explicitly transcending (as opposed to corrupting) the boundaries of a field is not something his model accounts for fully.

As a corrective, this project brought the sociological approach called pragmatic sociology of critique by Luc Boltanski and the sociology of worth by David Stark into contact with relative autonomy. This is useful for several reasons. First, Boltanski sensitizes us to the actions of individuals. In doing so, the pragmatic concerns of actors
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are given more credence, and we become better equipped to document the actions and forms of agency required to reflect and evaluate (Boltanski 2011:67). This helps the research achieve the desired goal of a more process-oriented approach to relative autonomy.

Second, Boltanski’s discussion of compromise and Stark’s discussion of heterarchy allow us to reconceive of relative autonomy in a relational manner that does not end is isolation. Stark’s analysis is studies the creative tension creative by the interaction of different worths and institutions. Using their work, one may say: the relative autonomy of a field is directly related to the beneficial consequences of its heterarchical relationships. Increasing autonomy can be thought of as “getting out of a bad bondage, not an absence of bonds” (Latour 2005:230). There is a role for flexible labor in higher education, and full-time faculty and the colleges that employ them are actively trying to make that role legitimate. Furthermore, there are people who appear willing and interested in being an adjunct, despite its inability to be full employment. Adjunct work’s status as a flexible boundary object can, in fact, be a virtue, as long it is accounted for and demonstrated as legitimate. It can be academically virtuous if it can be justified using a form of worth that circulates within the academic field.

**Heteronomy Reconsidered**

In this dissertation's understanding, heteronomy is not a state of affairs where there is a compromise between, for example, scholastic and market worths. If it was truly a successful balance, it would actually indicate a degree of autonomy. Heteronomy is the
corruption or avoidance of worth and tests. If one cannot effectively make critiques or hold others accountable, the field of power truly holds sway and we have entered a discussion of domination.

Domination could take the form of simple repression (Boltanski 2011:124), but in a late capitalist and democratic society, heteronomy and domination are likely more complex. In these more complex forms, tests of worth are first displaced, and eventually rendered inert due to their impossibility of application. “Invoking impersonal and inexorable forces makes it possible to subordinate the will of actors... [to] laws inscribed in the nature of things... such as it is modeled by experts, which makes it possible to, as it were, reduce the world” to create a claim to necessity (Boltanski 2011:131). Boltanski continues to suggest “the measures adopted have their principle of necessity in respect for a framework, most often accounting or jurisdictional in kind, without requiring any large scale deployment or ideological discourses... validating the coherence of an order at a symbolic level” (Boltanski 2011:134). At a basic level, this is similar point Zygmunt Bauman's (1992) argument that social order needs little in the way of legitimacy if consumerism has sufficiently seduced the population.

This can clearly be found within all three cases. Interviewees appear keenly aware that budgetary concerns create a need to look beyond full-time tenure-track faculty and toward adjuncts to teach undergraduate courses. These financial considerations served as the parameters within which the organization was forced to work, creating and maintaining as much legitimacy as possible. Total scholastic or pedagogical legitimacy, therefore, was never a possibility. Instead all colleges engaged in making the best
“Faustian bargain” that could be struck. Interviewees from Mahican and Orange make sure to mention how much control the state has over their funding, and the English Chair at Caussade makes sure to state the limiting problems caused by the lack of state funding.

At the same time, these economic parameters had become naturalized, and consequently difficult to challenge directly. Additionally, it is in the college's interests that adjuncts be seen as a legitimate (yet inexpensive) group to help teach courses, and the flaws within the tests of worth facilitate this to the degree the tests become ceremonial. Though not fully ceremonial, the general effect appears to be one of assuaging fears more than identifying problems. The result is the state of affairs is presented to stakeholders (full-time faculty, adjunct, administrators, not to mention undergraduate students) as legitimate.

DISCUSSION AND FUTURE PROJECTS

In this dissertation, one finds an attempt to understand the ideals of the academic field put into practice and conflict. Two forms of worth have been documented, and questions regarding adjuncts, evaluation, exploitation, and heteronomy have been pursued to develop three descriptive case studies. Comparative analysis in this final chapter has allowed more specific claims regarding the role worth plays in the organization of adjunct work.

The Importance of Disciplines

Academic disciplines become relevant in different ways at the three colleges.
However, this dissertation reaffirms Abbott's basic analysis that disciplines are the infrastructure of American higher education. Given this, one could suggest robust disciplinary presence is a necessary if insufficient condition for autonomy. Colleges and universities are not, based on the evidence presented in this dissertation, defenders of the academe by themselves, being analogous to the salons of the early literary field (Bourdieu 1996) in that they are sites where boundary work commences and movement into and out of the academic field occurs.

Regarding adjuncts, this dissertation affirms the notion that they are an extremely homogeneous group, and the way their work is organized can vary substantially between colleges. Adjuncts by definition occupy a position that is as ambiguous as it is liminal. As such, one can expect the organization of adjunct work at a college will be influenced by multiple factors, such as the college's type, its budgetary condition, and the surrounding population's education. One could see the lack of critical rhetoric by adjuncts as surprising, though this can be explained a number of ways beyond social desirability, including the fact many accepted their adjunct work was not a primary source of income. It is extremely unclear how generalizable or particularistic these findings are. Nevertheless, the claim that colleges seek justification by denying adjunct work is a real form of employment should be taken as a dismissal of adjunct concerns, or of the unionization movements underway.

Future Research

Based on this project, several new research opportunities present themselves. One
area of study is to focus more on the relationship between teaching and specific disciplines. How is teaching thought of by different disciplines? How do traditional liberal arts disciplines differ from other categories (i.e., professional, business, medical, STEM, etc.)? What support is offered from within discipline to facilitate better teaching? How are these activities related to professional associations and peer-reviewed journals? We are very accustomed to think of teaching in terms of college (i.e., what different forms of teaching are common place at a liberal arts college, a research university, etc.), and this may lead us away from noting how different disciplines define and evaluate teaching and learning.

Second, one could move in the direction of taking teacher evaluation more seriously. The forms of evaluation, their use, and the use of their findings are all interesting questions, especially with the looming shadow of “accountability” that haunts many policy discussions regarding education. This question moves from studying adjuncts exclusively to studying college instructors, and can bring in discussions of how teaching evaluations may be used to make decisions regarding pay increases and tenure review.

Third, as this chapter alludes to the naturalization of economic parameters without having a great deal of empirical information, one could focus on resource dependency issues and organizational decision-making regarding budgets and resource allocation. The question of how universities make budgetary decisions in the face of pressures brought on by the recent economic crisis is a compelling one, though there is likely more information available regarding earlier recessions. This question would
weave together the sociology of worth, a discussion of how the demand for justification
is recognized (or subverted, or avoided) with a focus on the decision-making processes of
organizations, rational and otherwise (Brunsson 2000; Cohen et al. 1972).


Chicago: University of Chicago Press.


Curtis, John W., and Monica F. Jacobe. 2006. “AAUP Contingent Faculty Index.”


Finucane, Margaret O., and Margaret E. Algren. 1997. “A Pilot Study Investigation of the Socialization of Part-Time Faculty Members in Academic Settings.”


Mohr, John W., and Harrison C. White. 2008. “How to model an institution.” *Theory and


242