The Voiceless Majority: A Pair of Docs on Paradox and

Changing Demographics in the American Professorate

related to Shared Governance

Karen Krupar, Ph.D. and Susan L. Cook, Ph.D.

Metropolitan State College of Denver

Presented June 10, 2010

At the American Association of University Professors

Annual National Conference

Washington, D.C.

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the changing demographics among higher education faculty across the country and the impact of these changing demographics on faculty perceptions of assimilation, engagement, and participation in shared governance. Coupled for a review of the secondary survey and demographic data online, the researchers distributed an online 10-question survey to 281 faculty after posting a call for subjects through an academic listserv associated with a national professional organization for communication scholars. The respondents came from public institutions (59.6%), representing two primary regions of the country – SE Atlantic (34.4%) and Midwestern (29%). The professional focus of the respondents' schools was evenly split between teaching and research (43.8% vs. 42.3%). Over 35% reported having spent more than 10 years at their present institution. Dominant age groups mirrored the ACE data – suggesting a graying of the professorate (31% over 50 years of age). Ranked perceptions of assimiliation and engagement for the sampling indicate high levels of individual commitment across all age groups, but low levels of involvement in institutional decision-making. The lowest levels of individual power and belongingness were reported by the youngest age group (under 30 years of age). The number of years at an institution impacted the ranked perceptions of assimilation and engagement more than age, however.

Conclusions from this study focused on the paradoxes of group life related to structure, adaptation, power, belongingness and self-esteem. These paradoxes indicate changes for higher education as well as the world within which higher

education resides. More questions than recommendations emerged from this study

suggesting the ambiguous world of higher education and a need for further

investigations as this century unfolds. (Additional data in two tables).

Introduction

Despite the recession this year (and its accompanying high unemployment figures), the federal government estimates a shortage of qualified workers in the United States, primarily because baby boomers outnumber subsequent generations and are reaching retirement. All professions and industries will be affected. For example, approximately 40 to 60% of the current faculty at institutions of higher education will retire within the next five years. The l994 elimination of mandatory retirement (Allen, 2004) at universities has created an older faculty cohort resulting in fewer promotions, reduction in new-hires, and increases in labor costs. Adding uncertainties about retirement benefits accelerated by the recession of 2008 and we find that the average age of currently retiring faculty members is between 60 and 70 years (Berberet, Bland, Brown, & Risbey, 2005). Typically, universities and colleges apply two major strategies to replace aging faculty numbers --- *recruitment and retention,* using competitive salaries/benefits, research support/ resources, and quality working conditions. These two strategies (recruitment and retention) routinely work for typical faculty turnover but with sizeable portions of faculty retiring at a fast rate making replacement of qualified individuals nearly impossible, colleges and universities face a major dilemma.

Significantly reducing financial support to public institutions from both state and federal governments (with private institutions facing significant losses in institutional endowments) compounds the problem. Such budget deficits accelerate faculty loss through early retirement and buy-out programs. Institutions save money by decreasing

the numbers of faculty members. At the same time, they experience significant increases in student enrollment requiring additional qualified and diversified professors. Faculty retiring in significant numbers over short time periods in addition to annual turnover within faculty ranks threatens the reputations of universities and colleges. Institutional reputations suffer if courses are unavailable, and research projects are neglected.

Colleges and universities combat this institutional issue by hiring as many junior faculty as they can afford and augment the remaining positions with tenure-ineligible contract faculty. More than 50% of eligible faculty positions in universities and colleges today (including community colleges) represent tenure-ineligible employment (Plater, 2008). Ernst Benjamin (2010) reported in "The Eroding Foundations of Academic Freedom and Professional Integrity: Implications of the Diminishing Proportion of Tenured Faculty for Organizational Effectiveness in Higher Education" when he found only 134,826 probationary faculty were hired in 2007(an increase of 6.6% from 1975 to 2007) compared to 277,084 non-tenured full-time faculty hired in 2007 (an increase of 242% from 1975 to 2007). Stated another way, in 2007, 20.9% of all faculty were tenured; 9.7% were probationary faculty; 20% were non-tenure track, full-time faculty; and 49.4% were part-time faculty (p. 40). Using the United States Department of Education's National Center for Educational Statistics data, Plater (2008) reported that, tenure-ineligible full-time appointments account for 30% of the academic workforce. More than half of the new full-time appointments are in tenure-ineligible positions. More than 40% of the academic workforce is accounted for by part-time faculty (p.1). With little noticeable fanfare, the entire professoriate is profoundly altering its size, composition, behaviors, attitudes, and defined work objectives/responsibilities.

As long as tenured university faculty (pre-boomers or baby boomers) were the majority of the professoriate , (and the largest demographic among the tenure- track faculty), these faculties (protected professionally in part by tenure) engaged in debating/discussing/challenging administrative decision-making, shared governance remained not only a primary responsibility of faculty, but a conceivable and achievable reality. Today, many senior, tenured faculty have left or are leaving the university/college. They are replaced by large cohorts of probationary faculty and even larger numbers of contingent/contract full-time faculty. Both groups of faculty are a voiceless majority because they cannot afford to participate in shared faculty governance (Bradley, 2004) because they are professionally exposed and unprotected.

Purpose of the Study

This paper explores the impact that the demographic changes to the faculty have on the traditional functional model of the professoriate specifically faculty shared governance. This presentation examines the implications of junior/probationary and contingent faculty's paralysis to address the encroachments of power exercised by current and future university administrations.

Literature Review

Current literature on higher education today focuses on the ever-increasing numbers of universities and colleges that are transforming themselves. Numerous factors --- such as new learning environments based on professional networking, lifelong learning, "Just in Time Education," technology-based remote education, and global reach that permeates national borders --- comprise the driving forces behind this

transformation. "Different approaches peculiar to academic organizations have developed in the literature. These differentiate between structure and authority concepts leading to bureaucratic models " (Ulukan, 2005, p. 75). Universities are unique systems possessing special features such as the division of power between faculty and administration in all governance structures /processes, the ambiguity of institutional goals, the fragmentation of different groups and an absence of systemic strategic directional consensus. Birmbaum (l989), Bradley (2004), and Cummings & Finkelstein (2009) list the features of a university in contrast to a corporate environment. These factors include:

- Less specialized work

- Less control over input

- Less visible role performance

- Low accountability

- Flatter hierarchy

- Greater specialized expertise

In the *loosely coupled* (Weick, 1985) university system, relations among levels, brokering across operational units, decision-making processes among other functions are characterized by ambiguity and uncertainty. This *loose coupling* allows the university to react only to those external changes in the environment that pose serious or unusual situational responses without loosing the university's identity and uniqueness of its parts (Ulukan, 2005). Literature on higher education addresses the institutional movement from a stable, elite organization to a mass, open, and unstable organic one "driven by the contradictory needs of its customers, clients" (p.75).

In an effort to stabilize the "uncoupling" features of institutions, state legislatures and regional accrediting bodies have simultaneously gained command of higher educational programs and fiscal factors ensuring increased economic efficiency, accountability for specific educational outcomes, and greater student accessibility to educational experiences. These changes are not fine-tuning the status quo, but basically altering the underlying assumptions about how such organizations function and relate to their external environment. Universities/ colleges require organic structures, teamwork, participative and decentralized decision-making, specialized areas of knowledge, personnel engagement in the decision-making processes, reform of task obligations, horizontal forms of communicative interaction, coaching processes and a solid commitment to the larger social organizational interests (Carroll, 2000, p.1). But as the pressures to transform higher education to a more managerial model evolve, continuing conflict between managerial and academic cultures causes tension and distrust. One of most significant areas of controversy involves the concept of shared governance (Carroll, 2000). Waugh (2001) writes,

> The difficulty is not simply the dislocations and uncertainty arising from resources and accountability but the acceptance of managerial values at the expense of academic values. While cost efficiency and customer satisfaction should be important objectives, there are fundamental academic values that should take precedence. Letting managerial assumptions dominate creates an organizational culture that is inhospitable to democratic processes such as shared governance, both structures and processes (p. 61).

Issues of shared governance and the role of faculty. Considerable demographic data regarding the status of professional faculty exist in the literature, especially on the probationary and contingent/full-time contract faculty in institutions of higher education in the United States. Because significantly fewer probationary/tenure -track faculty have been hired compared to large numbers of full-time contingent/contract faculty, the entire system of American post-secondary education is profoundly transforming. Although most universities/colleges reflect elements of professional bureaucratic organizations (a hierarchical structure of middle managers and an apex of vice-presidents and presidents/chancellors), they also have features on the academic side reflecting emphasis on expertise power, decentralized decision-making, committee structures, etc. that allow for collegial forms of shared governance.

> Indeed, the collegial practices and structures have been regarded as the most salient --- the defining cultural artifacts of universities. In discourses reflecting the changes in higher education, the term managerial is often applied to emphasize the negative effects of such change on those below the level of management in the institutional hierarchy. Prominent features of managerialism in higher education are the focus on efficiency and effectiveness, quality assurance, accountability, and cost-savings and an increasingly centralization of decision-making power and authority along with the growth of additional layers of management (Anderson, 2006, p. 579).

Morginson and Considine (2000) noted the adoption of less consultative management styles. The capacity to control academic workers, with the adoption of low-trust relations replacing the high-trust relations, features of previous forms of shared

institutional governance (Anderson, 2006; Pilkington et al., 2001). Mass enrollments in

higher education may have prompted these practices. However, increased monitoring of

academic output (Barcan, 1996), the spread of performance indicators in post tenure

reviews (Newton, 2002) and demands for entrepreneurial effort even among

comprehensive university/college faculty for external funding (Metro State College of

Denver, 2009) emphasize orienting to the "market" and the metaphors of students or

consumers or clients. In short, while previous processes and structures in academe

operated in an organic, natural, whole and untreated manner, what we now have are

systems that function by fiat or mandate, spasmodically accountable in an artificial

framework of governance. The movement to a more managerial bureaucratic system

pressures the practice of shared governance by exacerbating fears in new junior faculty

members who are haunted now by significant paradoxical changes in their professional

lives.

   The Junior Faculty. The January-February 2008 issue of *Academe* reported that

full-time tenured and tenure track faculty have been reduced from almost 60 percent of

total faculty to just under 32 percent in all degree granting institutions in the United

States. Contingent full time appointments during that same period rose to almost 70

percent of the national total. In their book, *The American Faculty,* Finkelstein and

Schuster (2006) write that higher education is being destabilized. Plater (2008) reports

that the work usually designated as *faculty conducted* in such fundamental areas as

curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, and faculty status

increasingly is completed by specialists who either instruct, conduct research, perform

professional service in the academic or civic community or graduate to the

administration. "The holistic, integrated career of most of us professors is being relegated to a decreasing minority in most institutions and remains intact at only a relative few elite colleges and universities" (Plater, p. 1). Several factors account for this radical change.

First, a chasm exists already between full tenured professors and newly hired junior or probationary assistant professors. Structural problems of academic employment shape this chasm. For example, junior faculty, surviving the "job talk" process, find that the hiring process has proved to be more difficult than previous evaluation processes where an advisor's simple "phone call to colleagues in other institutions represented the straightest path to employment" (Dronzek, 2008, p. 2). As Bradley (2004) reports:

> As graduate student activists have pointed out for years, the rather dismal employment situation in some areas of academe, particularly the humanities, is a result of not a job market but of a labor system. Attributing the problem to a job market implies a simple issue of supply and demand: Too many PhDs are produced, but there aren't enough jobs to go around, so job seekers are forced to piece together a living from a patchwork of part-time positions. Looking at the problem as a labor-system issue acknowledges its complexity. The same institutions both manufacture and consume the *PhD* product. There are too few tenure-track jobs for all the PhDs in some disciplines because graduate students or faculty on fixed-term or part-time appointments teach so many courses. If full-time tenure-track faculty taught most courses, there might not be a job shortage (p. 2).

In addition, the tight job market has ratcheted up expectations and requirements at every step of the academic career ladder so that,

> ...undergraduates are expected to have presented and published papers in order to simply gain admittance to graduate school and the expectations for junior faculty is to have more publications when they are appointed than full professors in their departments had when they received tenure. These junior professors need to generate more [publications and presentations] before those same full professors review their [junior faculty's] portfolios and recommend the juniors for tenure (Dronzek, 2008, p. 2).

Second, junior or senior faculties are not at fault if the glut of academicians on the job market or mission creep has forced institutions to select their new hires based on their research as well as their evidence of instructional ability. So junior faculty,

> in their attempts to get jobs, thirty-something faculty have had to professionalize or die --- go to conferences earlier, publish papers earlier, and develop the arts of schmoosing and self- promotion earlier. As many have pointed out, these presentations and publications have not always added greatly to the field of knowledge. What they have created, however, is a different sense of self for junior faculty from that of their full professor colleagues---a sense of oneself as a professional in a profession that, in the view of senior faculty has begun to adopt the values of a corporation rather than the altruism of a vocation (p. 3).

Demands for evidence of junior faculty's publishing efforts has not only accelerated among those graduates from elite research universities but now

comprehensive universities and colleges also require professional publication in order to obtain tenure and navigate promotion (Yuon & Price, 2009). As Armstrong (1996) reported in the *Chronicle of Higher Education,* "Scholarly work appears to be the primary consideration for professional advancement in the academy" (p. B3-4). Creamer (l999) summed up the prevailing attitude toward scholarly productivity stating, "Faculty publishing is often used as an index of departmental and institutional prestige and is strongly associated with an individual faculty member's reputation, visibility and advancement in the academic reward structure" (p. 1).

> Administrators know that the stature of their faculty as scholars significantly affects the reputations and rankings of universities and colleges. Faculty also understand that their tenure and mobility within the faculty labor market is affected by their scholarly accomplishments (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics, 200l, p. 1).

Junior faculty experience difficulties in addressing these increasingly strict rules for accessing advancement in the professoriate via publishing their research. Previous generations of academicians controlled their disciplines' publication processes by housing publication processes in major universities. Insufficient budgets forced the institutions to relinquish publication control (Walthers & Jones, 2007 NCA Conference). Faculty now submit their research to publishing corporations (Sage, Routledge, etc.) whose focus is a profitable bottom line. These corporations print research topics, themes, and methodologies that are most likely to be read by the traditional, disciplinary members and libraries. Publication depends on close adherence to traditional topics and to traditional research methodologies. Bunz (2005) reports,

The nature or methodology of a particular scholar's research may have made

it more difficult for him or her to place the manuscript in a select group of

journals if editorial emphases did not favor the scholar's particular approach

no matter how high the quality of the work (p. 717).

Backlogs in the peer review process of disciplinary journals also exist (Walthers,

2008). Submitted manuscripts often take more than two years to review (Walthers, 2009).

Such slow review generates frustration. Junior faculty are handicapped in demonstrating

research competence and their ability to meet the institution's requirements for tenure,

promotion and retention (Yuon and Price, 2009). The institution's need to strictly enforce

rules governing tenure, promotion, and retention gives rise to frustration because, "the

institution always places its own needs before those of individual faculty" (Dronzek.,

2008, p. 2). Junior faculty see the disparities between the currently accelerating demands

for research and the relatively minimal historic research requirements that senior faculty

met. The result produces and intensifies the group "storming " (Tuckman & Moneth,

2001) of faculty and widens the gap between the junior faculty and the tenured faculty

(Nelson, 2008) who regard the new hires as disloyal to the institution which the tenured

faculty generation built (Dronsek, 2008).

The pressure of job security for junior faculty and the threat of tenure rejection

based on escalating publication requirements, teaching excellence reflected in students'

evaluations and peer reviews, increasing demands for technological competencies and

community service investments have resulted in a seven year (the average length of time

it takes to achieve tenure in most institutions) *silent self-censorship* of thousands of junior

faculty held hostage by the very system designed to protect their academic freedom. Yet

governance ---

shared responsibility for the success of the institution --- may be the defining

characteristic of the professoriate as a profession and the major differentiating

factor between contingent full-time faculty and tenure-track/tenured faculty. It is

through shared governance that the values and attitudes of our work take form and

have consequence in the context of practice in a particular locale. It is through the

collective action of the faculty that the results of faculty work---teaching,

research, and service--- acquire weight and meaning, since faculty still control

hiring, promotion, tenure and approval of policies that determine the role of

faculty [full-time contingent and probationary] (Plater, 2009, p. 3).

However, though (Bradley, 2004, p. 2) service which includes institutional

governance is a traditional academic responsibility, this area is often discounted.

Teaching and research are considered much more intellectually taxing and more

impressive. From the junior faculty perspective, engaging in discussion and open debate

in committees is critically risky. "The fact that there are fewer tenure-track faculty means

that there are fewer faculty willing and able to participate in shared governance. If the

trend is not reversed, institutional governance will shift increasingly to administrators"

(Bradley, 2004, p. 2).

Full-time Contingency Faculty. Another more alarming statistic has emerged in

the discourse over the voiceless majority during the past decade. This involves data on

the full-time, contingent faculty appointments that are often made at the departmental

level and hidden under other names such as "post doctoral fellowships" or "visiting professorships" (Bradley, 2004, p. 1). Despite their numbers (these full-time contingent faculty increased from 13 to 18.3 % of total faculty from 1975-2004) according to Williams, Poole, & McCready, (2009), tenured faculty hesitate to include these contingent faculty in shared governance. "Contingent faculty are perceived as more vulnerable in their dealings with the administration and thus unable to participate freely and openly. At institutions where such faculty are included in institutional governance structures, their inclusion is often token" (Bradley, 2004, p.2). "These full-time faculty serve in the same roles as tenure track faculty including teaching, research and service"(Williams, Poole, & McCready, 2009, p.1). "At any given moment, [we are] virtually 'at will' employees. This means that disagreement with our tenure track and tenured colleagues is expressed publicly (or even privately) at great risk" (Berry & Hoffman, 2008, p. 1). These faculty are silent because they cannot afford to participate in faculty governance. In the managerial university in which they currently reside, they are treated as the operational mass that needs "increasing levels of supervision" (Waugh,1998, p.63).

Summarizing the Issues

In our current world of higher education, we are experiencing significant changes in demographics among faculty who deliver the "product" to the students we now call "customers or clients". The "we" includes now more contingent faculty, more junior tenure-track faculty, and increasingly fewer senior faculty who hold the reins to shared governance and the keys to tenure, odd bedfellows in the best of worlds. Academic organizations (both private and public) are changing structures as

well, adopting more managerial hierarchies while creating more silos with solipsistic foci that compete for scarcer resources. And, finally, the traditional organic culture that can adapt and grow naturally while embracing change is now rigidly structured with anxiety, frustration, and fear as the primary emotions. The result? A voicelessness (elective mutism) pervading our institutions of learning that bodes poorly for shared governance of the future, unless we understand how to bridge the silos and create a cohesive group, overcoming some of the paradoxes of group life.

The Data that Shapes Academic Group Lives

This study began as an exploration – focusing on demographic changes and trends in faculty makeup – with an eye to hypothesizing about the impacts of these changes on shared governance. To explore this focused topic further, we gathered survey data within the communication discipline using an online listserv, CRTNET (Communication Research and Theory listserve; hosted through the National Communication Association). We also gathered secondary data provided through government websites and agencies that traditionally gather information about the state of higher education. We examined these data for descriptive factors as well as analyzing the data for inferences of significance. Finally, we sought to understand these descriptive and inferential insights through the literature on group dynamics. What follows are the results of these explorations with our concluding observations.

Secondary Data Constructing Changing Faculty Demographics

The American Council on Education (www.acenet.edu) gathers data annually to monitor the demographic makeup of the professorate across the country. As already noted, the majority of faculty has trended toward contingent appointments with a shrinking group of tenured faculty at American institutions. The gendered factor in faculty roles is also critical; more females are contingent faculty while fewer females are tenure track or tenured. So the notion that faculty are primarily male continues to exist according to the data. And, though diversity is given lip service at many institutions of higher education today, especially in job postings, the professorate remains primarily white non-Hispanic (81.3% for four-year institutions, 2008). The graying of the faculty at four-year institutions is also prevalent with roughly 21% of the 52% of tenured or tenure-track faculty over 55 years of age. Thus, characterizing the faculty within the last two years in general terms, we can describe them as graying, male, primarily white, and tenured.

The survey we conducted online through SurveyMonkey.com provided supportive data and additional data regarding perceptions of shared governance and engagement as well. The 10-question survey generated responses from 281 people over seven days. The respondents came from public institutions of higher learning generally (59.6%). They represented two primary regions of the United States – Southeastern Atlantic (34.4%) and Midwestern (29%). Respondents came from either small institutions (fewer than 3,000 students; 30.6%) or large institutions (more than 20,000 students; 26.6%). The professional focus of the respondents' schools was evenly split between teaching-focused (43.8%) and research plus teaching-focused (42.3%). Over 35% reported having spent more

than 10 years at their present institution. Notably, the dominant age groups of

respondents mirrored what the ACE data suggested – a graying of the professorate.

Over 31% reported being over 51 years of age. However, the gender data suggests

that more females responded to this survey (over 66%), though the remaining male

gender data nearly matches the number reporting more than 10 years at an

institution and those over 51 years of age.

The focal point of this survey beyond the demographics examined personal

perceptions of the respondent's assimilation into the academic community as well

as participation through committee work in shared governance. To understand the

impact of demographics on group dynamics, these data were analyzed by separating

out the under 30 and 30-40 age groups in these questions. Respondents were asked

to rank (from 1 to 5 with 5 being the highest) their perceptions of sense of

collegiality, sense of belongingness, involvement in professional sharing,

involvement in institutional decision-making, individual commitment, and finally

sense of individual power. Table 1 summarizes the overall average rankings for all

respondents while comparing theses rankings for the two younger groups.

Table 1.

Perceptions of Assimilation and Engagement, Comparing the Group as a whole (n = 281) to those under 30 (n = 19) and those 30 – 40 years of age (n = 85)

	Average for the Group	Average ranking Under 30 years of age	Average ranking30 – 40 years of age
Sense of Collegiality	3.69	3.89	3.53
Sense of Belongingness	3.44	3.05*	3.34
Involvement in Professional Sharing	3.15	3.26**	3.06
Involvement in Institutional Decision-Making	2.74	2.74***	2.64
Individual Commitment	4.04	4.16	4.01
Sense of Individual Power	3.05	3.00****	2.90****

Notes:

* 36.8% in this age group reported SOMEWHAT LOW regarding their Sense of Belongingness.

** 36.8% again in this age group reported SOMEWHAT LOW regarding their Professional Sharing.
*** 26.3% in this age group reported VERY LOW regarding their Involvement in Institutional Decision-Making.
**** Both age groups (under 30 and 30-40, respectively) reported either NEUTRAL (31.6%) related to Individual Power or SOMEWHAT LOW (27.9%).

These data suggest that the younger age groups responding to this survey feel less assimilated and less powerful related to shared governance in their institutions, though across nearly all age groups the reported individual commitment remains the highest consistently ranked item in this matrix. Generally speaking, this indicates that most responding faculty are highly committed to their institutions and their faculty roles, though younger faculty feel less involved in decision making and perceive that they have less power as well than the responding group as a whole.

Faculty mentoring often plays a part in assimilating new faculty *into the fold,* so to speak. Thus, the survey asked respondents to designate faculty mentoring according to one of two options – formalized as a program versus informal through voluntary support from faculty. Over 71% responded that faculty mentoring was informal and voluntary, though four respondents skipped this question. One person who obviously skipped this question sent an email, noting that at five institutions where he had worked, faculty mentoring did not exist in any form, suggesting that a third response to this question would have been wise. Within the younger age groups, similar data were reported regarding mentoring, suggesting that voluntary and informal mentoring is likely prevalent for this sample in total.

Finally, the survey asked respondents to report the number of committees in which they participate. Table 2 reports a comparison again to the group at large and the two younger groups.

Table 2.

Committee Involvement, Comparing the Whole Group (n = 281) to those under 30 years of age (n = 19) and those 30 – 40 years of age (n = 85)

Number of Committees	Group as a Whole %	Under 30 years of age %	30 – 40 years of age %
1 to 3	61.3	78.9	68.9
4 to 6	30.8	10.5	24.4
More than 6	7.9	10.5	7.0

These data suggest that more people are engaged at the three-committee level in institutional decision-making. One needs to remember that committee involvement occurs at two levels – that of being a member and that of chairing the committee. Thus, fewer tenured faculty are required to chair committees than membership alone would involve.

Analyzing the data using inferential statistical processes uncovered a few, but interesting significant differences in perceptions by age groups. By combining the two younger and the two older age groups, t-tests were performed to check for significant differences in the mean rankings for Individual Commitment and Sense of Individual Power. Both the younger combined groups (n = 105) and the older combined groups (n = 176) demonstrated a significant different (p < .000, 2-tailed)

between commitment and individual power. For both groups, the mean difference Individual Commitment was higher than the Sense of Individual Power, though the mean ranking for Sense of Individual Power for the combined younger groups was markedly lower (mdiff = 2.914) than the mean ranking for Sense of Individual Power for the older groups (mdiff = 3.131). Thus, regardless of age for these respondents, individual commitment ranked higher than individual sense of power – faculty are more giving then the institution appears to respond back to them. As well, combined younger groups (less than 40 years of age) report lower power perspectives than the combined older groups (over 40 years of age).

Last, the impact of age compared to length of time at current institution was checked for a significant relationship between either of these variables and perceptions of assimilation and power. One-way ANOVAs were performed to evaluate the possible relationships. Only when "years at institution" was used as the independent variable to check the impact on the six perceptions of assimilation and power did significance emerge. Across the total sample (regardless of age group), sense of collegiality ($_{.95}F_{3,277}$ = 3.256), sense of belongingness ($_{.95}F_{3,277}$ = 5.903), involvement in professional sharing ($_{.95}F_{3,277}$ = 4.631), involvement in institutional decision-making ($_{.95}F_{3,277}$ = 4.608), and sense of individual power ($_{.95}F_{3,277}$ = 3.485) suggest a significance difference in variance between groups as noted by years at the institution. The sense of individual commitment failed to demonstrate significance probably because reported levels of commitment were uniformly high across all groups. Thus, the length of time one spends at an institution affects one's perceptions of assimilation and sense of power significantly.

Discussion

And now we come to the "So what?" part of this study. Exploring the impact of changing demographics on academic shared governance is not a trivial activity. The world of education, specifically higher education, is in turmoil and chaos. For the first 10 years of the 21st century, colleges and universities have experienced paradoxically good and bad change. Good changes have appeared under the guise of largesse for building, construction of physical campuses, and a growing pool of new emerging Ph.D.s. Bad changes have come into focus in the latter five years as largesse turned to scarcity – constricted budgets, constrained campus sizes with overflowing enrollments, and technological mayhem as physical classrooms became virtual. Coloring all these changes are the changing demographics of the professorate, the physical and virtual population that is experiencing these changes. Thus, the question remains: "So what?"

Within the academy where the cerebral and physical lives of constituents is contained, a form of group life has existed that has long embraced the paradoxes of the very nature of groups. The changing makeup of the group bodes well for the paradoxical balance of both the good/bad – yin/yang – of group activities as we have suggested in the previous pages. The paradoxes likely to be in focus for the 21st century involve the structure (specifically how people participate and what is the democratic norm), adaptation (both internally, externally while maintaining individuality and group memberships), power (where the seat of power will exist, types of leadership, and more than anything else – how to voice resistance in the

face of change), and finally each individual's psychological needs for belongingness and self-esteem. Each of these paradoxes are inherent in group life (Smith and Berg, 1997), and each deserves some discussion.

Paradox of Structure. The study presents both secondary data and current survey data from a rather large volunteer sample suggesting that the structure of academia is changing. Trends in demographics demonstrate increasing diversity, but clearly not a diverse population to date. And if the structure within academia changes from an organic holistic administration comprised of multiple voices to a managerial model with only the fearless tenured faculty expressing their views, the outcomes from the system are in jeopardy of change. "The jeopardy of change" focuses on the inability of only a vocal few to represent the needs of the many regarding the direction of this change, not to infer that change in itself connotes jeopardy. The paradoxical nature of a changing structure is likely demonstrated in the balance of constraints and freedoms embedded in a framework that by its definition will create silos of work. The questions generated by this study remain connected to these issues of changing structure –

- How will people participate in this new structure?
- Will all voices be recognized and heard without fear of reprisal?
- Will new democratic norms for participation be established by the managers in charge or by the group as a whole?

These questions should guide further review and discussion as the 21st century unfolds.

Paradox of Adaptation. Academia is struggling with new mandates for adaptation as higher education commissions and state governments have requested measures of accountability at every conceivable level. Faculty are charged with assessing student learning objectives as well as research plans and goals – balancing the group needs/outcomes with professional (individual) needs/outcomes that demonstrate achievement and completion. Internally, these mandates are fostering confusion and conflict across diverse disciplines, individual skills and preparation, and chaos for administrators as they seek to create the "one size fits all" model for accountability. Faculty seek to collaborate and share professionally to balance the new models of responsible academic work, and yet the constantly changing demographics and turnover within the systems prompt a "storming" that precludes establishing norms for these activities. Faculty remain uncertain about investing in newly formed group activities with an approach/avoidance dance that occurs within the academic role system. One's status within the system controls these adapting behaviors until security and certainty are achieved, but will this security remain constant in the changing world?

The questions generated by this study remain connected to these issues of changing adapting behaviors (both internally and externally) –

- How can one assimilate into the group activities without putting oneself in danger professionally?
- How can a faculty member adapt to the rules of engagement and gain influence without being negatively influenced to remain silent?

- How will the different generations and diverse groups adapt to each

  other, remaining both separate and together for the sake of the group

  mission?

Paradox of Power. The concept of power would seem to be at the heart of

this discussion for highly educated people coming together for a committed task of

teaching, learning, and researching naturally offer powerful input and seek to retain

academic freedom in all of these activities. With new leadership models (e.g.,

managerial model) coupled with the changing makeup of the professorate suggests

that power will be redefined. Who controls what for whom will have to be

determined across the large group as well as subgroups functioning internally and

externally with the community at large. Different generations have framed the

concept of power differently in the workspace. One faculty member wants the

power to balance work/life issues to include raising a family, while yet another

faculty member of long standing seeks to engage in critical research that likely

subsumes a personal life. Does the new leader or managerial model permit these

freedoms to define personal and professional power? Linking this back to the

adapting behaviors noted in earlier text, can the institution adapt internally and

externally for accountability and still retain any freedoms or power to structure

individual and group behaviors? These paradoxes will need continuing dialogue to

determine what is momentarily appropriate and what is likely to become

appropriate long-term.

Within the concept of power is that which is central to this study's focus –

voices and voicelessness within the faculty. With the ongoing change in

demographics within the professorate, one expects to see ongoing change in norms,

mores, policies, and values – all driven by the diverse faculty roles within the

system. These changes prompt conflict by definition, and voicing this conflict (or

resistance to change for some) is critical to finding a normed way of functioning

over the long haul. The questions generated by this study remain connected to these

issues of changing power –

- Can different generations of faculty be simultaneously connected and

  separate? If so, how?

- What different approaches to voicing one's views might exist within the

  changing group?

- How can safety to express one's views be inculcated for the group such

  that voicelessness becomes a non-option?

- How can good conflict become a norm – focusing on the richness and

  robustness of the outcomes as the most powerful approach?

Paradoxes of belongingness and self-esteem. This paradox is perhaps at

the heart of this discussion for each individual participating in academic work today.

Belonging to the group denoted "faculty" carried a level of prestige and status for

previous generations. Walking the hallowed halls in the cloak of teaching and

learning prompted recognition and achievement. With the advent of the 21st

century, changing demographics, changing structures, new mandates for

accountability, and changing power issues, faculty often question their value,

prestige, and contributions to the profession. Tenure as a system has been attacked,

mocked, and challenged by local, state, and federal bodies who may have the power

to remove this artifact of the old academic culture. And if tenure defined the highest

level of prestige and status within the teaching profession, what is likely to replace

this to define belongingness and an individual's self-esteem? The questions

generated by this study remain connected to these issues of changing belongingness

and self-esteem –

- How can commitment to an institution and professional role remain high
  in a changing system that may demand voicelessness to survive?

- Can generational groups learn to embrace differences and redefine
  "belongingness" based upon other homogeneous factors?

- What will define prestige and status within the profession in the 21st
  century of higher education? And, how will new members to the
  profession assimilate into these definitions?

The future of higher education and the professorate is changing. We have

been on the cusp of major change for the first 10 years of this new century.

Professions, group constitution, external oversight, internal turmoil, and

technology have all changed in these short 10 years. Who we are as faculty

and who we will become remains in flux. This study sought to take the lid off

the Pandora's box of higher education. The direction we take from here lies

within and without – and only the voiced participants will shape this

direction.

References

Ailamaki, A. , & Gehrke, J. (2003). Time management for new faculty. *SIGMOD Record, 32*(2),

   102-106.

Allen, S. (2004). *The value of phased retirement.* Proceedings from the *TIAA-CREF Institute*

   Three R's Conference. New York City, NY.

AAUP (2008-2009). Report on Economic Status of the Profession, (December), 1-12.

   Retrieved May 2, 2010, from

   http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/comm/rep/Z/ecstatreport08-09/

Anderson, G. (2006). Carving out time and space in the managerial university. *Academe*

   Online, 19(5), 578-592. DOI: /0.1108/09534810610686698

Armstrong, J. (l996). We need to rethink the editorial role of peer reviewers. *The Chronicle*

   of Higher Education, 43(9), B3-4.

Barcan, R. (1996). The body of the humanities academic or what is an academic? *Southern*

   Review, 29(2), 128-145.

Benjamin, E. (2010). The eroding foundations of academic freedom and professional

  integrity: Implications of the diminishing proportion of tenured faculty for

  organizational effectiveness in higher education. *AAUP Journal of Academic Freedom,*

  1, 1-44.

Berberet, J., Bland, C., Brown, B., & Risbey, K. (2005). Late career faculty perceptions:

  Implications for retirement planning and policymaking. *TIAA-CREF Institute*

  Research Dialogue, *84*, 1-11.

Berry, J., & Hoffman, E. (2008). Including contingent faculty in governance. *Academe Online,*

  (November-December), 1-4. Retrieved May 16, 2010, from

  http://www.aaup.org/AAUPpubsres/academe/2008/ND/Feat/ber...

Blackburn, R., & Lawrence, J. (l995). *Faculty at work.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University

  Press.

Bilt, J. (2010). Hidden (and not so hidden) new threats to faculty governance. *AAUP Journal*

  of Academic Freedom, 1, 1-15.

Birnbaum, R. (2004). The end of shared governance, looking ahead or looking back. *New*

  Directions for Higher Education. 2004(127), 5-22.

Bok, D. (2003). Academic values and the lure of profit. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, B7-B9.

Bower, B. (2009). The disappearing tenure-track job. *Inside Higher Education News,* (May

  12, 2009), 1-7.

Bradley, G. (2004). Contingent faculty and the new academic labor system. *Academe Online,*
90(l), 28-31. Retrieved May 15, 2010, from Academic Search Elite database.

Braxton, J., & McClendon, S. (2002). The fostering of social integration and retention
through institutional practice. *Journal of College Student Retention, 3*(1), 57-71.

Bunz, U. (2005). Publish or perish: Professional and administrative concerns. *Southern*
Communication Journal, 58, 228-238.

Campbell, N., & Koretz, J. (2010). The demise of shared governance at Rensselaer
Polytechnic Institute. *Journal of Academic Freedom,* (1). Retrieved May 10, 2010,
from EBSCO database.

Carroll, L. (2000). Tenure and academic excellence. *Academe Online* (May-June), 1-4.
Retrieved May 17, 2010, from http://www.aaup.lrg/AAUP/pubsres/academe/
2000/MJ/Feat/caerr.htm

Clark, R., & Ambrosio, M. (2005). Recruitment, retention, and retirement: Compensation
and employment policy for higher education. *Educational Gerontology, 31*, 385-403.

Considine, M., & Painter, M. (Eds). (l997). Managerialists: The great debate. Carlton South
Australia: Melbourne University Press

Creamer, E. (1998). *Assessing faulty publication productivity: Issues of equity.* San Francisco,
CA: Jossey Bass.

Cummings, W., & Finkelstein, M. (2009). Global trends in academic governance. *Academe Online*, (November-December), 1-3. Retrieved May 5, 2010, from

    http://www.aaup.org/AAUPpubsres/academe/2009/ND/Feat...

Curtis, L. , & Jacobs, M. (2006). Consequences: An increasingly contingent faculty. *AAUP Contingent Faculty Index 2006*. Retrieved May 10, 2000, from

    http://www.aaup.org/AAUP?pubstres/research/conind2006htm

Dronezek, A. (2008). The academic generation gap. *Academe Online*, 1-5. Retrieved May 15, 2010, from http://www.aacup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2008/JA/Feat/dro...

Elliot, L. (2000). Revitalizing universities through faculty renewal. *Research File, 4*(1), 1-9.

Fairweather, J. (l996). Faculty at work and the public trust. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Finklestein, M., & Schuster, J. (2001). Assessing the silent revolution: How changing demographics are reshaping the academic profession. *AAHE Bulletin, 54(*2), 3-7.

Fishinan, J. (2005). Tenure: Endangered or evolutionary species. Pace Law Faculty Publications, *Akron Law Review,* (787), 770-787. Retrieved May 4, 2010, from

    http://digitalcommons.pace.edu/lawfaculty/80

Gapp, J. (2007). Rethinking faculty work. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Guy-Sheftall, B. (2006). Shared governance, junior faculty, and HBCUS. *Academe Online*, (November-December), 1-5. Retrieved May 7, 2010, from

    http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2006/ND/Feat/G...

Harrison, H., & Hargrove, M. (2006). Aging faculty: Workforce challenges and issues facing

    higher education, *Business Perspectives*, 1-5.

Huston, T., Norman, M., & Ambrose, S. (2007). Expanding the discussion of faculty vitality to

    include productive but disengaged senior faculty. *Journal of Higher Education, 78.5*,

    493-518.

Myers, C. (2008). College faculty and the scholarship of teaching: Gender differences across

    four key activities. *Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 8*(2), 38-51.

Nelson, C. (2008). Across the great divide. *Academe Online,* (September-October), 1-5.

    Retrieved May 17, 2008, from

    http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsers/academe/2008/so/Feat/nel

Newton, J. (2002). Views from below: Academics coping with quality. *Quality in Higher*

    Education, 8(1), 39-61.

Pilkington, A., Winch, C., & Leiinsten, R. (2010). The limits of managerialism and the need

    for collegialism in assessment , in Harrison, E. and Meers, R. (Eds). *Assessing*

    Sociologists in Higher Education, 61-77.

Plater, W. (2008). The twenty-first century professoriate. *Academe Online,* (July-August), 1-

    7. Retreived May 4, 2010, from

    http://www.aaup.org/AAUP?pubres/academe/2008/JA/Feat/plat.htm

Porter, S. (2007). A closer look at faculty service: What affects participation on committees.

    Journal of Higher Education, 78.5, 523-544.

Rhoades, G. (2008). The centrality of contingent faculty to Academe's future. *Academe Online* (November-December), 1-4. Retrieved May 17, 2010, from http://www.org/AAUP/pubres/academe/2008/ND/Feat/rh

Rice, R., Sorcinelli, M., & Austen, A. (2000). Heeding new voices: Academic careers for a new generation. *New Pathways Working Paper, Series #7.* Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Schuster, J., & Finkelstein, M. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University press.

Shore, C., & Roberts, S. (1995). Higher education and the panopticon paradigm: Quality assessment as "disciplinary technology." *Higher Education Review, 27*(3), 8-17.

Siegel, D. (2006). Minding the academy's business. *Academe Online*, (November-December), 1-4. Retrieved May 1, 2010, from http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubres/academe/2006/ND/Feat/Si

Simmons, J., & Floyd, B. (2009). Responding to legislative interference in university governance. *Academe Online*, (November-December), 1-3. Retrieved May 12, 2010, from http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2009/ND/Feat/s

Smith, K. K. and Berg, D.N. (1987). *Paradoxes of Group Life: Understanding Conflict, Paralysis, and Movement in Group Dynamics.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Street, S. (2008). Don't pit tenure against contingent faculty rights. *Academe Online,* (May-

June), 1-4. Retrieved May 2, 2010, from

http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2008/MJ/Feat/stre.htm

Tam, T., & Jacoby, D. (2009). What we can't say about contingent faculty. *Academe,* 95(3),

19-22.

Test, J., & Cornelius-White, J. (2009). Governance and faculty sales faction. *Academe Online*,

(November-December), 1-2. Retrieved May 5, 2010, from

http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2009/ND/Feat/test.htm

Tinberg, N. (2009). A call for faculty re-engagement in governance. *Academe Online,*

(November-December), 1-3. Retrieved May 7, 2010, from

http://www.aaup.org/AAUYP/pubsres/academe/2009/ ND/Feat/tin

Trowler, P. (1998). What managerialists forget: Higher education credit frameworks and

managerialist ideology. *International Studies in Sociology of Education, 8*(1), 91-109.

Tuckman, B., & Moneth, D. (2001). Theories and applications of educational Psychology.

(3rd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

Ulukan, C. (2005). Transformation of university organizations: Leadership and managerial

implications. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education, 6*(4), 75-89.

U.S. Department of Education. (2004). Digest of Educational Statistics: 2004. *NCES*:

Washington, D.C.. Publication No. 2004-331.

U.S. Department of Education (2001). Digest of Educational Statistics: 200. *NCES*:

    Washington, D.C..

Walthers, J. (2009). Personal email in February 2009.

Walthers, J. & Jones, S. (2007). *Publishing costs of disciplinary journals.* Proceedings from

    the National Communication Association Conference. San Antonio, TX.

Waugh, W. (l998). Conflicting values and cultures: The managerial threat to university

    governance. *Policy Studies Review, 15*(4), 61-73.

Weick, K. (1995). *Sense-making in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Williams, K., Poole, K., & McCready, V. (2009). Hiring, promoting and valuing non-tenure

    track faculty. *Academic Leadership The Online Journal*. 7(3), 1-3.