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Segmentation in the
Academic Labor Market
Hiring Cohorts in Comprehensive Universities

The constituent determinants of faculty careers have been the subject of much scholarship since Logan Wilson [44] introduced the concept of self-study to the profession fifty years ago. Structural analyses have traced career pathways from entry into the profession through retirement, so much so that novices who aspire to replicate the successful careers of their research-oriented mentors have an almost complete map to guide them. For graduate students who aspire to top-tiered positions, securing entry into the professorial system means relying on sources of prestige external to themselves; the prestige of their institutions, graduate departments, and mentors plays a combined ascriptive role in securing the first academic position [12, 22, 25, 37, 38]. Following entry, responsibility for success reverts to the individual within the context of his or her academic environment [33]. Productivity, in the form of publications and especially citations, takes over as the primary mechanism to insure the appropriate rewards and, when feasible, mobility [1, 22, 36, 39].

Faculty have been alerted also to the modifying effects of fluctuations in the academic labor market on institutional recruitment and retention [12, 13, 32, 38, 43] and on institutional incentive and reward systems [33]. As the supply of faculty increased in the seventies, institutions de-
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manded a higher price in their exchange with faculty of resources for prestige [39, 45] and boosted recruitment and retention standards. Clearly, the paths by which faculty realize success in research careers have been demonstrated to be normative.

To obtain career counseling from these various lines of research, however, research-oriented faculty or faculty "wannabes" must synthesize for themselves the varied empirical results of "the individual determinants of career outcomes" [5, p. 37]. But careers are dynamic; they result from compounded individual choices and accomplishments. They also do not evolve in a vacuum. More than a compilation of singular incidents, actions, or interactions with institutions, faculty careers result from the ongoing simultaneous impact of external societal factors, such as the academic labor market, and internal organizational factors.

Moreover, the number of positions available in research-oriented universities are limited. Does the limited number of positions automatically mean that most faculty settle for positions other than their preference? What of the careers of faculty who play out their professional lives in other types of institutions? If faculty careers are a composite of continuous interactions with the labor market and with the institutions that employ them, then the essence of the missions must be taken into account. The quid pro quo faculty/university prestige compact that Sorensen [39] suggests drives academic careers in research universities is virtually inoperative in organizations that proclaim themselves as teaching institutions. Rather than relying on the mutually beneficial exchange of resources (to faculty) for prestige (to the university), teaching institutions orient their missions to and acquire prestige from student-related factors, such as enrollment, student retention and postgraduation success. Do the career aspirations of faculty who spend their lives in colleges and universities that are primarily teaching institutions match the mission and objectives of these organizations or have they been frustrated as a result of placing lower on a meritocratic line of candidates? Existing knowledge about the professional life of faculty in non-research university contexts is scanty [16, 24, 35, 46] and provides few answers to these questions.

The purpose of this article is to broaden the study of faculty careers by exploring the career patterns of faculty who are currently employed in two comprehensive universities. I will argue three points. First, the labor market is segmented by institutional type as suggested by Brown [11] and Clark [15], in that the majority of faculty in the study have chosen deliberately to work in this sector. Second, by applying the conceptual framework of career lines [40, 41] to the professoriate, I will demonstrate
that careers are not merely determined by singular incidents or a com-
posite of incidents, but rather evolve as individuals interact with the external
forces of the labor market, with continuous organizational choices made
by their employing institutions, and with other faculty hired before and
after them. And finally, I will establish that in this case study the norma-
tive career patterns for faculty in two comprehensive universities differ
from those of faculty in research universities because their employment
histories are intimately tied to different aspirations, fluctuations in the la-
bor market, and changing institutional natures.

The Field and the Field Methods

This research, a qualitative case study, contextualizes the study of fac-
ulty careers by considering both time and space. First, in terms of space,
I conducted my study at two New England universities categorized by
the Carnegie Classification [14] as Comprehensive I Universities. Per-
haps the most fluid in mission [9], this sector is the least often researched
and therefore less understood as a group. Historically, the majority of
the colleges were instituted to serve a single population or to deliver a
single type of curriculum. The sector consists of former normal schools
cum teachers colleges cum state colleges and universities, historically
black private denominational and public land-grant colleges, technical
institutes, women's colleges, and metropolitan and regional independent
and denominational colleges [17]. Throughout this century, these institu-
tions increasingly have broadened their original single-purpose mis-
sions by adopting multi-purpose objectives and an extended curriculum
[21].

Comprehensives have undergone profound changes through this cen-
tury, but more specifically in the past three decades. From 1960 to 1980,
more institutional change occurred in the colleges and universities that
offer the master's degree as their highest academic award than in any
other institutional type [8]. Dunham exclaimed that "in a nutshell, the
most salient characteristics of state colleges and regional universities are
rapid change of function and astounding growth" [16, p. 1]. Growth and
change in function were not only the experience of public institutions,
but have been features of the private colleges and universities in the sec-
tor also. These two characteristics were rather complex. Characterizing
institutional change between 1960 and 1980, Birnbaum found that institu-
tions with comprehensive programs "began with the greatest number
and proportion of institutions, experienced the greatest number and pro-
portion of newly founded institutions, [and] had the greatest number of
existing institutions change their programs into that category"[8, p. 113]. Today, the common characteristic across the sector is the provision of utilitarian education on the baccalaureate and master's levels.

In terms of time, within any institution, the current faculty were not hired at one time, but rather were hired over a stretch of thirty years or more. During those years, fluctuations in the academic labor market and student enrollments have affected the organization of the institutions as well as the opportunities available to faculty. Therefore, I sorted the continuous recruitment into three hiring periods that correspond with major transformations in higher education over the past quarter century. The faculty were selected to represent three hiring periods: Cohort I, the Academic Boomers, hired prior to 1972 during the expansion period; Cohort II, the Brahmins, hired between 1972 and 1982 during the academic recession; and Cohort III, the Proteans, hired since 1982 when the replacement period seems to have begun.

Cohort I, which nationally represents 37 percent of the nation's current comprehensive university and college faculty [29],1 comprises 36 percent of the faculty interviewed for this study. The Academic Boomers are so named because they were hired during the surge in enrollments due to the Baby Boomers. Only 27 percent of the national comprehensive university faculty belong to Cohort II [29]. In this study, Cohort II is also the smallest group, representing 27 percent of those interviewed. Many of Cohort II were hired for their eminent credentials with the organizational intention of raising institutional prestige; hence, the name Brahmins. Cohort III, which consists of 37 percent of the case study sample, comprises 36 percent of all comprehensive university faculty nationally [29]. The dominant characteristic of the junior cohort is their versatility, and therefore they have been dubbed Proteans.

Members of three departments — English, mathematics, and management — in both universities were selected to represent faculty hiring during the three time periods. Forty full-time, tenured, or tenure-track faculty employed across the six departments participated in semidirected interviews. Both genders and a variety of ethnic, racial, and foreign national identities are represented in each cohort, given the composition of the departments. Individual interviews averaged two hours and, organized to correspond to my application [18] of Spender, Otto, and Call's properties of career lines [40], covered family values and educational background, prior professional experience, professional and institutional affiliations and experiences (that is, recruitment and retention experiences and faculty governance), and satisfaction with professional and institutional life. In addition, department chairs, deans of the respective col-
leges, and the academic vice presidents were interviewed, and institutional documents were analyzed to add an institutional perspective to the three hiring times.

Typical of many private comprehensive universities, Merger University was established in the mid-fifties as a result of a fusion of three independent postsecondary institutions. The largest of the three institutions, founded as a YMCA evening school for urban working-class men in the 1870s, had offered a multipurpose curriculum combining liberal arts and professional programs as early as the 1920s. Regional State University was established first as a normal school in 1890 and subsequently was raised to the baccalaureate level as a teachers college. In the early sixties, the mission was broadened to include liberal arts. A decade later, professional curricula were added. Both New England universities today are multipurpose comprehensives, awarding baccalaureate and master’s degrees. The two universities emphasize slightly different curricula. In addition to the typical liberal arts, business, and education majors, Merger offers several technology-based and fine arts programs. Regional State continues its historical mission of education, but has added programs in health-related areas and social services. Today Merger enrolls 8,000 students, 70 percent of whom are undergraduates. One-third of the students are part-time. Seventy percent of Regional State’s 13,000 students are undergraduates, and slightly more than half are full-time.

This article presents each of the three cohorts within their hiring-time periods. In each time period, I analyze the interplay among the individual cohort characteristics, the institutional mission and organizational priorities, and the general characteristics of the academic labor market during the faculty’s initial recruitment. As each time period unfolds, the careers of residing faculty are affected by the new priorities, the fluctuations of the labor market, and the characteristics of the new cohort. In the conclusion, I discuss the implications of my findings vis-a-vis a leading labor market theory to argue that the academic labor market appears to be segmented.

First Period: The Expansion, pre-1972

Responding to an increase in postsecondary enrollment of almost six million students between 1960 and 1972, full-time faculty positions increased by 226,000 [2, p. 114]. More than half of those faculty positions were initiated after 1964, with annual increases of 18,000 to 33,000. Needless to say, employment opportunities in the professoriate abounded
for persons with graduate degrees. Typical of comprehensive public institutions, Regional State's 1966–70 enrollments jumped by almost 5,000 students with a 60 percent increase in the FTEs. Among the Regional English and mathematics faculties, 61 percent (30/49) of the current faculty were hired during the period between 1962 and 1971.

The expansion, albeit welcomed, created a variety of headaches. Regional's physical plant could not adequately handle the record number of students, so the college operated on three-day shifts with faculty stacked in offices, sharing desks. The need for faculty was so great and the available supply of faculty so small that at first the demand for doctoral credentials was ludicrous. When possible, the institution tried to hire faculty with Ph.D.'s, but faculty with master's degrees were also engaged to ensure that the throngs of students were instructed.

Equally typical of private comprehensive universities, the enrollment expansion at Merger was not as dramatic. At Merger, however, the late sixties' expansion significantly improved FTEs as the historical pattern of part-time students was converted into full-time enrollment. The head count increased by only 1,500 students, but the conversion meant a 38 percent FTE increase. As the revenue stabilized with more full-time students, the institution was able to employ more full-time faculty, foregoing its reliance on part-timers, and simultaneously to build an entirely new campus. So the university was not forced to compete for quite as many faculty as Regional State during the labor market crunch of the mid-sixties. Among the English and mathematics faculty at Merger, 44 percent (13/29) were hired between 1962 and 1971, with the greater bulk hired at the end of the sixties.

Through the sixties, the number of graduate students pursuing doctoral degrees nationally increased on an annual basis so that the pool of potential faculty expanded year-by-year. Between 1955 and 1959, 1,699 English and 1,265 mathematics Ph.D.'s were awarded. During the five year period between 1965 and 1969, English and mathematics graduate departments produced 4,330 and 4,563 doctorates respectively [30, pp. 232, 269]. The number of doctorates earned in the liberal arts did not peak until the early seventies when graduate faculty and students began to realize slowly that the number of available academic positions was decreasing. As the academic labor pool widened, the course-way began to narrow. The employment choice shifted from an individual choosing one position from a variety of offers to the institution seeking one candidate out of a pile of applicants. By default, the universities were able to make demands for credentials by the early seventies that would have been unreasonable in the mid-sixties.
On an institutional level, the role requirements for faculty at both universities were relatively simple. Teaching was prized; service, in the form of intracollegiate committee participation, was assumed. On a departmental level, the liberal arts faculty were hired to teach the variety that comprised the average disciplinary set of courses. They were recruited to teach their specialties within the disciplines, but the curriculum offered to students was neither developed nor diversified. In general, the curricula at both institutions were marked by breadth, not depth. In fact, an expectation at recruitment was the expansion of the departmental curriculum. In both English and mathematics departments, the courses of study were organized to follow the traditional canons or components of undergraduate education and were thus expanded.

Few professional programs existed at Regional State. Those in place were related to the historical teaching mission of the college, such as library science. The business program was only an inchoate hope of the president and a few economics faculty. At Merger, with its history of business courses for part-time local residents, the faculty required were those who had an applied orientation and background themselves in addition to their doctoral preparation. They brought stability and progressive, applied dimensions to the curriculum that had not been possible previously.

**The Academic Boomers**

Interestingly, both institutions originally were access institutions; that is, they provided opportunities to students who might otherwise not have been able to attend postsecondary education. They apparently served this same function for the members of Cohort I. The teaching mission of the institutions coupled with the fluid nature of the labor market during this period opened a window of opportunity to faculty who might otherwise never have entered the professoriate. With one exception, the entire hiring cohort were first-generation college students. One-third of the cohort were the children of immigrants. Unlike many of their colleagues employed in more selective colleges [23], they came from working- and middle-class families with no personal or professional experience in higher education. Only one man’s parents were associated with education — they were high-school teachers. The faculty’s pre-employment aspirations to the profession of teaching were formed either in college or in graduate school, mainly as a result of encouragement from their faculty and/or a discovered passion for learning and teaching. College teaching had not been a vocation within the realm of their ken or kin. Many of the cohort never even considered college
teaching but were recruited from the high-school level through the sheer need for adjunct faculty.

The marked characteristic of this cohort was their deliberate choice of employment in this sector. The faculty in the sample, with one exception, chose deliberately to apply to and/or accept positions in a teaching institution. Half of the faculty were college-teaching hopefuls. These faculty were attracted to the profession either by role models or from their experiences as teaching assistants in their graduate programs. Because the labor market was so open during the sixties, all of the hopefuls easily secured full-time faculty positions when they went on the market. Those who had finished their degrees found assistant professorships, while the ABDs were hired as instructors at institutions located near their doctoral programs. Convention dictated that these instructors would move on after three or four years when their degrees were finished. As a result of the fluidity of the labor market, the older faculty in this group had the luxury of teaching at several colleges prior to settling at their current university. Several resigned from their previous appointments at either liberal arts or regional teachers colleges when their ethics clashed with those of the administration.

The Merger management faculty fall into this first sub-category of college-teaching hopefuls, yet their original aspirations and work experience followed an entirely different pattern. These faculty spent more than a decade in managerial positions before returning to graduate school for their doctorates. They entered their doctoral programs assuming that they would teach on the collegiate level. Therefore, they not only had a considerable amount of industry experience prior to their first (and only) academic position, but they also maintained an applied professional orientation, which was manifested in the classroom as well as in their professional accomplishments. Their professional writing took the form of trade manuals for managers.

The other half of the cohort aspired to teach in secondary schools, not to the postsecondary level. A few were convinced during their doctoral programs of their ability to make a greater impact on education if they sought college teaching positions. One Boomer explained that he planned to write curriculum materials when he returned to high-school teaching from his doctoral training, but was persuaded by his mentor that he would have more support to accomplish that end on the collegiate level. These transformed college-teaching hopefuls were additionally attracted to the opportunities promised by the institutions. Teaching was rewarded, curriculum development was an imperative, and service to the institution was considered a natural part of their citizenship.
Those who stopped their formal education with the master's degree left teaching positions in high schools only after being offered instructorships after a year's stint as adjuncts.

Recruitment

The Boomers' recruitment to their current institutions was influenced by structural forces as well as by personal preferences. The latter was characterized by personal and career values and included bounded employment searches, networking in the sector, and domestic issues. The former represented the intersection of the labor market with the needs of the two institutions and included multiple job offers and institutional hiring patterns.

First, as the labor market tightened through the late sixties to early seventies, the qualifications demanded for employment increased. Regional sought a great number of faculty throughout the entire second half of the sixties. The closer the hire to the mid-point of the decade, when the largest class of freshmen entered college, the more the market was open to faculty with only a master's preparation. Nineteen sixty-seven appears to have been the credential watershed for the former teachers college. In that year, only ABDs were hired and within two years, only doctorates. By 1971, the last Boomer, a Ph.D. with full-time teaching experience and publications, was hired.

At Merger on the other hand, the majority of the hiring began late in the sixties. Due to the swollen labor pool, faculty with doctorates were easily recruited, and the majority of faculty began the appointments with some teaching experience behind them. The fact that Merger was a university, was dedicated to teaching, and was still in the process of constructing its curriculum and its new campus attracted many of these faculty.

Second, the Boomers had recruitment opportunities yet to be equaled again. The fluid nature of the labor market furnished numerous options so that their quest for teaching positions was fairly effortless. The degree of mobility and of choice, though, was directly related to a combination of the person's highest degree, discipline, specialty, and recruitment year. Several senior Boomers had had tenured appointments at other colleges prior to arriving at Merger, for example. They had the luxury of resigning without fear of being locked out of academe. Other Boomers, finishing their degrees late in the decade, had multiple offers when they sought permanent positions. But yearly, the number of options decreased. One Merger mathematician explained that two doctoral classes above him received bids from all seven colleges or universities to which they
applied. The class directly in front of him received offers from only five of the seven. In 1968, he only received three offers. The Ph.D. Boomers all reported having between two and seven offers when they went on the job market.

On the personal side, the striking characteristic in the recruitment stories is that the faculty with doctorates, save one, limited their searches to teaching institutions. Teaching was (and remains) their dominant professional value. Some Boomers consciously eliminated themselves from the top-tiered sectors, whereas other deliberately sought and accepted positions based on the existing institutional cultures that supported teaching as the dominant faculty role. A Regional Boomer hired in 1968 explained: "I ended up here through a conscious decision not to have the pressure. I was a pretty good researcher during the dissertation, but I came to Regional specifically for the teaching. When I came, the Board of Trustees wanted teaching." With few exceptions, they limited their applications to liberal arts colleges with regional reputations and to comprehensive colleges, both private and public. Essentially, the Boomers were attracted to their current positions specifically because of the missions of the institutions. At Regional, many of the mathematicians were drawn to the prominent secondary education teaching emphasis of the college and their department. The English faculty at both universities were lured with the opportunity to teach in and elaborate courses for a traditional genre/period English major.

A second, but related trait that characterized the Merger Boomer's recruitment was the use of professional acquaintances to secure a match. Both the faculty within the department (to recruit) as well as the recruits (to hunt) solicited information from former colleagues. In several cases, Boomers were recruited as a direct result of recommendations from friends already employed by the university. The recruitment efforts of the university, especially when the labor market was still fairly tight, were facilitated through informal networks arising from the faculty's graduate programs and professional contacts. Rather than the vertical lineage that characterizes the research university mentor-student recruitment pattern [12, 22, 33, 34], many of the Boomers were recruited through a lateral colleague-to-colleague or former graduate student-to-graduate student linkage.

When hired, the Boomers' professional interests ranged from an active involvement in research and publication to the complete avoidance of publication. Those who wanted to pursue scholarship were attracted to their institutions because productivity was not required. A Regional State Boomer who has written several textbooks was offered a tenure-
track position in his doctoral research university department but, "it was a publish or perish [position] and that would have been suicide. I was naive and would have been eaten up." The range of attitudes toward scholarly activity is reflected in the faculty's institutional and professional affiliations throughout their careers. In some cases, these attitudes as well as the activities of faculty were modified as the institutions changed and as other faculty were hired.

Finally, as a result of the availability of positions, the Boomers were able to choose their positions on the basis of domestic or geographic criteria that included family ties and the proximity of major metropolitan areas and of major research university libraries. Several Boomers, native to the state or to New England, were able to stay, or in some cases return to the region after graduate school as a result of the open labor market.

Retention

The Boomers were hired to teach. Many of the later hires were also recruited to develop the curriculum, both on the undergraduate and the graduate (master's) levels. Their teaching loads were uniformly twelve hours with three, sometimes four preparations. Meyer, Scott, and Deal have found that "the lowest levels of organizational policy are [delineated for] the type of curricular materials to be used and instructional methods or techniques teachers use." Schools (K-12) have, they continued, "few policies in the areas of greatest significance for their central goals and purpose" [26, p. 59]. While both universities declared themselves as teaching institutions, policies existed to outline the basic role requirements for the faculty, but criteria and standards for evaluation were minimal. "Good teaching" was cited by every Boomer as the primary requirement for retention during their pretenure years. Yet, reputation, perhaps hallway gossip, student praise or complaints, and other informal mechanisms served as the institutional means of faculty performance appraisals. Both institutions began to regularize faculty evaluation by the mid-seventies. At Regional, state-mandated collective bargaining drove the first specifications of policies and procedures for evaluation, albeit the criteria remained somewhat loosely defined. After having been hired by a reportedly authoritarian president who retired in the early seventies, many Boomers felt that unionization prevented further arbitrary personnel decisions. At Merger, the specifications of criteria for faculty evaluations resulted from a faculty-generated task force arising out of the senate.

The second most important role that faculty played was in service to
the institution. At both universities, the Boomers generally played significant organizational roles both in temporary administrative roles, when the universities were caught short-handed, or in department, college, or university-wide governance positions. Although not selected to participate in this study on this basis, most Boomers reported having served as senate representatives or leaders at various times through their careers. At Regional, "bargaining agent" was an additional role that carried great prestige, influence, and power for a few Boomers.

At neither university was scholarship an important criterion for retention or promotion during the first time period. At Merger, publications were acclaimed but not stressed. At Regional, scholarship was originally a covert activity, a thing disdained by many and hidden from colleagues and supervisors by others. As the number of doctorates increased, the production of creative professional work became legitimate by sheer force of numbers. As late as the early seventies, one Boomer, who had already been published in a European Royal Society journal before recruitment, was told that his continued theoretical writing was not an activity that was respected at Regional; the assumption was that this type of activity diverted his attention from the classroom. Publishing took the form of textbooks, non-scholarly writing, and non-refereed articles and presentation at both institutions, with only the occasional exception toward the more scholarly side. Faculty clearly did not have the monetary or affective support, the research facilities, or the released time from a demanding teaching and service schedule to generate much scholarly work. Nor were they particularly rewarded for these activities.

The Regional Boomers were all tenured within three years — an institutional policy that stayed in force until the union was established. By the mid-seventies, hiring in the liberal arts programs had ceased. Had there been a need for qualified faculty, the supply was so great that a short tenure-track was no longer a necessity to entice faculty to stay. By that time, however, all of the Boomers had been tenured and generally had been promoted to associate professor. All, that is, except the master's-prepared faculty. By 1970, with the probationary period set at three years, the faculty with master's degrees were tenured to positions for which, had they been in competition, they would no longer have been qualified. Many of them had to wait for several years before a higher rank was granted. The probationary period at Merger abided by the norm of the time for smaller institutions, that is, five years of probation, tenure awarded for the sixth year. Because so many Merger Boomers arrived with some teaching credit, all were tenured and promoted to associate professor by the mid-seventies.
As the Boomers were being tenured, the climate in higher education was changing and was changing dramatically. By the early seventies, the pool of potential faculty had overflowed its natural boundaries, while simultaneously students clamored for vocational curricula. In response to the early projections for the next decade's decline in the size of the traditional-aged population, many institutions looked for ways to increase their admission market-share. In light of these external forces, the nature of the institutions changed, and with it, the nature of Cohort II.


National postsecondary enrollments continued to grow through the seventies, but at an inconsistent and slower rate. The enrollments that had been just under six million in 1965 topped eleven million ten years later. It took ten years before the 1965 record for the single largest entering class was broken; most of the other yearly gains during this timeframe were much smaller [27, p. 90; 28, p. 126]. In terms of growth, the seventies belonged to the community colleges, with the comprehensives tagging along behind. By 1976 the community colleges registered more than one-third of the students, the highest proportion in all of the sectors. During the same years, liberal arts colleges lost 23 percent of their enrollments, while comprehensives increased their student rolls by 26 percent [14, pp. 3–4].

A burst of new professional and vocational programs was established in both the community colleges and in the state colleges. No longer were the latter institutions dual-purpose as they had developed in the sixties, adding liberal arts to their previously singular mission of teacher preparation. The comprehensive public college finally had emerged. Across the nation, fewer students were graduated from liberal arts programs as increasingly more and more students elected applied programs. English baccalaureates halved from 1971 (65,000) to 1981 (33,200); mathematics baccalaureates decreased by an even greater proportion (25,000 to 11,000) [30, p. 244].

The national complement of faculty increased by 212,000 during the seventies. Superficially, the labor market appears to have been fairly open. But the proportion of new doctorates who reported having been hired by colleges and universities declined [29, p. 92]. Two conditions explain the situation. First, 100,000 of the new positions were hires in the community colleges [30, p. 219]. During the decade, doctorates among community college faculty only increased by 2 percent [3, p. 188; 6, p. 26]. Therefore, at least one-third of the new faculty hires during this pe-
period held master's degrees and were employed in community colleges. The opportunities for Ph.D.'s obviously were reduced. Second, while the number of doctorates produced annually began to decline after 1973, the numbers had grown so much during the late sixties that it took most of the decade for the Ph.D. five-year outputs to dip below the comparable time periods in the previous decade. In other words, far too many Ph.D.'s were still being graduated throughout the decade.

The seventies proved to be a dynamic recruitment period for faculty in the right fields of study and seeking the right type of institution. For others, especially in the liberal arts, the period was a disaster. Both the community colleges and, especially for the purpose of this case study, the comprehensives continued to hire faculty through Period II, but primarily in professional or applied programs.

On the institutional level, both universities responded during this second time period to external forces in a manner that altered the role of faculty significantly. At Regional, two major occurrences affected the faculty. As noted above, the collective bargaining imposed by the state in the mid-seventies resulted in a waged battle among the Regional faculty to determine the bargaining agent. Some faculty on the losing side were severely damaged by the process. The winners went on to lead the faculty at the negotiation table. By this time, a state college consolidated system had been implemented and a board of trustees established to oversee the multiple organization entity. The trustees approached the negotiations with the assumption that faculty should demonstrate evidence of scholarship — a significant departure from the existing role definition. The faculty were able to stem the tide to separate scholarship from service within the criteria defined for tenure and promotion and to negotiate for a program of released time from classroom obligations. This new program, a radical departure from the previous contempt for scholarship, served as an incentive system for involvement in scholarship.

The second external force was the shift of student interest toward vocational programs. The president of the college enabled some existing faculty with applied tendencies to secede from their liberal arts departments to develop vocational/professional programs. Throughout the seventies, the major emphasis in curricular design and, therefore, in faculty hiring occurred in applied programmatic areas. Very few faculty were hired in liberal arts and education, the former mainstays of the institution.

At Merger, a new president was appointed by the board of trustees with the charge of implementing a strategic long-range plan. The protégé of a controversial national educator, the new president took advantage
of the over-supply of faculty in the labor market to "upgrade" the existing faculty. From 1978 to 1982, the university substantially raised the criteria for both recruitment and retention. The consequential effects were enormous and long-term for both the existing faculty and the newly recruited faculty.

The Brahmins

The Brahmin cohort within the two universities reflects the national group composite; that is, in comparison with the Boomers, the proportionate size of the cohort is smaller, the number of women is higher, and more professional specializations are represented. The seventies academic labor market proved to be field-sensitive [42]. Faculty in professional fields had little difficulty obtaining positions; liberal arts faculty had to possess impeccable credentials to stand out in the crowd. At Regional State, only two faculty were hired to the mathematics departments from 1972 until the mid-eighties, and both positions were entrenched within two years. In the English department, literally no new liberal arts faculty were hired after 1972 until the mid-eighties. The only addition was a journalist who shortly defected to a newly established professional department. During the same time though, a plethora of professional programs were established throughout the state college; the management department arising out of economics, was started in the late seventies in an effort to serve the needs of the region's population. At Merger, already a comprehensive university, hiring continued across the board. In the liberal arts, however, new faculty were employed to replace retirements. In the business school, a few new positions resulting from a modest expansion of the programs and a number of replacement positions due to a "blood bath" over the future direction of the school created a need for new faculty throughout this period.

The Cohort II sample faculty range in age from 40 to 56 with a mean of 46.6, just short of the national average for all comprehensive university faculty. As might be imagined, these faculty are Baby Boomers, who earned their baccalaureate degrees in the mid-to-late sixties. One-third of the sample are women and all but one are American-born Caucasians. All were hired between 1978 and 1982. The few faculty hired after 1972 and before 1978 were not retained by either institution — albeit for different reasons. Thus, the cohort spans the three departments at Merger but only includes faculty from management at Regional State. All are tenured and all but one have been promoted to associate professor.

The families of the cohort members reflect the upward mobility of the
post-World War II era. All but one were raised in middle-class, native-born families; the parents of the exception were immigrants from a northern European country. At least one parent in the majority of the faculty’s families was college-educated, more often the father. In general, the women’s fathers have attained more education and have a higher social-class standing than the fathers of the men. College for the children was assumed, and most of the faculty’s siblings pursued postsecondary education.

In contrast to the Boomers, all but two of the Brahmins earned their bachelor’s degrees at selective private universities or liberal arts colleges; the exceptions were graduated from public research/doctoral universities. Some were accepted on early admissions; many had full scholarships. None went to college with the intention of a professorial career, but they were guided by their faculty advisors. The undergraduate faculty “pushed the better students and assisted them in getting into graduate school,” explained one Brahmin.

All but one of the Cohort II members are research-oriented. In contrast to the Boomers’ joy of finding teaching, most of the Brahmins expounded during their interviews about their discovery of research interests in graduate school. The exception is a management faculty member at Regional, who was the first member recruited to the newly established program in the late seventies and has a definitely applied perspective. The sample is very small across the cohort and especially in certain departments. As a result, implications can be discussed rather than definite patterns demonstrated.

**Recruitment**

Two recruitment characteristics arise from the faculty’s stories: some, although highly qualified with graduate experience in research, shied away from the perceived scholarly pressure of a research university and deliberately sought employment in the comprehensive sector; most, however aspired to and prepared for research positions, but were mixed in a pool of qualified applicants who sought positions in research universities. Neither faired well in the high-supply and limited-positions labor market. These traits cross-cut the departments at Merger. One Brahmin explained, “Originally, I thought I was a hot-shot academic. My fantasy was teaching the kind of student that provided grist for the academic mill, to be able to share my work, present research, and I wouldn’t be teaching four courses a term.” But those type of positions were few and the competition was great. “While in graduate school,” she continued, “I thought that I’d teach in a great liberal arts college, small, like the one I
went to, possibly a women’s college. It was my image of teaching. Then, for many years, any job would do.”

The cohort could not have hit the academic labor market at a worse time. Without significant accomplishments, the Ph.D. alone bound the Brahmins into a pool of applicants identical to every other newly minted doctorate. Similar to many of their contemporaries, the cohort members initially took less-than-satisfactory or insecure positions as temporaries in order to practice their profession. Unlike many contemporaries though, these faculty pursued their scholarship during the interim, so that their credentials eventually did stand out from the crowd. The Merger administration deliberately sought faculty across-the-board with prestigious credentials during this period. Faculty hired to the liberal arts departments brought moderately superior credentials than their colleagues in management. One Brahmin, slightly above the norm perhaps, arrived at Merger after having earned his D.Phil. at Oxford, supported by a Fulbright, having started his second monograph, and having taught for four years at a historic, mid-Atlantic research university as a junior faculty member in an unofficially nontenure track position. The university, in his words, was “a Kleenex school — use ’em [junior faculty] and throw ’em away.” Other faculty brought resumes with numerous refereed articles and funded textbook-writing experience in addition to years of teaching as adjuncts or as temporary replacements.

The management faculty at Regional present a slightly different picture. Rather than containing one group of faculty with homogeneous professional background, two subgroups are present. Because of the establishment of the business school, the department's development (and faculty credentials) was compressed into one short four-year period. Cohort II is comprised both of faculty hired in the late seventies who resemble the applied, industry-experienced-turned-academic of Cohort I at Merger and faculty hired in the early eighties with industry experience with a research-based orientation. These extremes were recruited over a four-year period and today are mixed together in one department. The philosophical arguments are extremely disruptive.

Retention

Within a few short years, both institutions were radically changed as a result of the recruitment of the new faculty. For Merger, the type of faculty recruited was intentionally modified in order to alter the professional orientation of the existing faculty. At Regional, the curricular offerings were consciously diversified and faculty were recruited to new and expanded areas. Once the second cohort was hired, the careers of
the Boomers and the Brahmins became entangled. The Boomers characterize themselves as teachers. Scholarship for many of them has been an extension of their teaching; often textbooks, articles, and papers seeped out of their class preparations. In contrast, most of the Brahmins embraced scholarship as a primary value, either in graduate school or during their "waiting period" prior to their current position. The interactions between the two cohorts have been largely dependent upon the ethos of their departments and are much too complicated to pursue here. Suffice it to say, the more the departments accommodated and supported the interests of both groups of faculty, the more positive the interactions. Those faculty who feel that their primary professional goal (either teaching for some Boomers or scholarship for some Brahmins) has not been sufficiently rewarded are alienated or disaffected.

In the late seventies, both universities began to modify their incentive and reward systems in an effort to support scholarship. The formal and informal reward systems were grounded almost exclusively in effective teaching and service to the institution with a secondary concern for the loosely defined activity known as scholarship. Almost overnight at the end of the seventies, the Merger administration raised the criteria for promotion and tenure. By the time the Brahmins began to approach their tenure decision during the early eighties, the requirements were solidly divided between teaching and scholarship. One Brahmin, who has recently returned, originally was hired in 1978. He left the university before he would have been denied tenure:

I was doing no research. When I came, one guy, [named], had just gotten tenure with no publications. He was a great thinker, but had no publications. The next year, another [program] faculty was denied tenure. They looked at his dissertation, but he had not published. The next year, another was denied tenure and he had a book, an article, and a piece in a special edition of [a prestigious business journal], but that case was somewhat political. You could see the ante was being raised.

For many of the Brahmins, the additional requirements for tenure posed few problems. But few have felt supported to conduct the type of professional lives for which they prepared and for which they thought they were being hired. Many continue to teach twelve hours a week. They are expected to be concerned with the retention of students, with service to the university, and with a continuous research agenda. Exhaustion comes from the need to

disassociate teaching from research. Teaching is over here and research is over there. It is not good distinguishing between teaching graduates and un-
undergraduates. There is enormous guilt when I do. And it is hard for me to do, given my background. What I should do for [the undergraduates] is summarize plots.

On the other hand, many of the Boomers, hired and tenured into an organization with a strong, embedded value of teaching, advising, and institutional citizenship, did not possess the desire, the preparation, or the stamina to change. For some of these tenured faculty, promotion became a situation of publish or languish, a slightly different commonplace. Several Boomers have been held in rank — at Merger, generally as associates — due to their inability to meet the new requirements. To one dedicated teaching Boomer, hired in the late sixties after struggling to complete his dissertation, it has been made very clear that he will remain an associate professor for the rest of his career. “I accept that. I am dedicated to this place and I think that I deserve [promotion] as much as some others, but I’d rather be doing what I am doing [teaching]. I wouldn’t like myself — it’s not worth it.”

The requirements for promotion and tenure did not change at Regional during the second time period, but the introduction of the incentive system of released time signaled the advent of change. Faculty who could develop scholarship-based proposals were supported and relieved for a term of three of their twelve-hour teaching load. Other faculty, primarily but not limited to those who had master’s degrees, were locked out of competing for this “perk.” The more new faculty who had more training and experience in research were recruited, the less competitive the existing faculty became. A certain cumulative disadvantage began. A Regional Ph.D. Boomer explained:

The push for publications and research is coming from the university, not the faculty. In a place like this, a no man’s island — it is stuck between a teacher’s college and a research university. Just because the name is changed. . . . They have supplied funds, but I can’t get into it. To get money, “What’s your project? What library will you work in?” Forcing research onto the faculty who don’t want to do it. Fabricating projects to get the semester off. It becomes more difficult as the language of the contract evolves. The soft criteria is good teaching. The hard criteria is how many publications with a quality hierarchy and numerical scales. Lunatics!

Similarly, a number of senior faculty are languishing in rank with no hope of promotion at Regional. Unlike Merger, no merit system exists. Promotion is the only way to increase one’s base salary beyond the cost-of-living increases. Therefore, not only are many of the senior faculty stuck in rank, but they remain at the top of their salary scale, unable to
move into a new strata. As these changes were beginning to take hold at
the two universities, a third cohort with entirely different backgrounds
and values were beginning to be added to the mix.

Third Period: Reevaluating Missions, 1982–90

Nationally, the third time period has been characteristically a patch-
work of new developments and concerns: increased faculty disciplinary
specialization; recently acknowledged racial, age, gender, and sexual di-
versity among various constituencies; program accountability; and dwin-
dling fiscal resources. These collective factors provide the backdrop for
the operation of the labor market, the institutional articulation of mission,
the recruitment of new faculty, and the retention of existing faculty.

Probably the most dramatic changes in enrollment through the late
seventies and the eighties were concerned with the composition of na-
tional postsecondary enrollments rather than their size, as had been the
case for the previous fifteen-plus years. Gradually the gender participa-
tion ratio shifted so that by 1988 the number of women matriculants
surpassed men [31, p. 10]. Attendance patterns also shifted from 73 per-
cent of the undergraduates who were full-time matriculants in 1969 to
only 59 percent. Finally, the number of students enrolled as freshmen
dropped through the eighties [28, p. 129; 30, pp. 176, 181].

The comprehensive sector, however, showed the strongest enrollment
increase among four-year, non-specialized colleges in the eighties, aug-
menting their rolls by 4.2 percent overall and by almost 10 percent in the
private comprehensive colleges and universities.7 Research and doctoral
institutions grew only by 2-3 percent, whereas liberal arts colleges were
forced to replace their shrinking full-time enrollments (~2.3 percent)
with part-time students (18 percent) [28, p. 126].

On the graduate level, the number of doctorates in the liberal arts
awarded annually continued to decline. Twelve hundred mathematics
doctorates were awarded in 1970, but only 752 were earned in 1988.
Likewise, English doctorates halved, declining from 2,170 in 1973 to
1,180 in 1988. Business and management surpassed mathematics in the
mid-seventies and approached the English awards by 1988 with 1,100
doctorates [30, p. 246].

Between 1980 and 1987, another 107,070 faculty were added to the
professorate. More than two-thirds of the new members were full-time.
For the second time, half of the entire complement was employed in
two-year colleges. By 1987 comprehensive colleges and universities em-
ployed 26 percent (128,000) of all full-time faculty in the United States
[30, p. 220–21]. Many of the 53,500 new four-year college and univer-
sity faculty positions created since 1980 were in comprehensive universities and colleges as a result of the enrollment growth in that sector. The career stories of these new faculty help to establish the existence of a segmented labor market when faculty choice and institutional mission, rather than organizational aspirations, coincided in recruitment and retention of faculty.

_The Proteans_

Fifteen faculty comprise the third cohort sample (37 percent) and reflect the national composite of faculty hired to the comprehensives since 1982. Seven are female. Of the thirteen American citizens, eleven are native-born to the white majority, one is a native-born African American, and one is a naturalized citizen from the Middle East. Two foreign nationals came to this country originally to study for their doctorates and have stayed. One is Asian and one is a Western European. Eight of the cohort are married. Of the single faculty, five are male and two are female. Five of the spouses are academics. The three associate professors have been awarded tenure; one of the assistant professors was denied tenure last year as a result of a lack of publications.

More than half of the thirty parents of the faculty pursued formal postsecondary education. Mothers were slightly more likely to pursue a college education, but less likely to finish. Eight of the fathers received bachelor’s degrees, four went on for graduate work, and one earned a Ph.D. The majority of families are middle-class, although three of the women came from either socially or educationally above-average families. Several of the women were raised in multigeneration academic families. The Proteans grew up with the implicit assumption that they not only would attend college, but that college would have a lasting and broadening effect on them. Only one faculty member indicated that his father assumed that college attendance was directly related to an occupation.

The Proteans, save two, received their baccalaureate degrees after 1971, with the majority having spent their entire undergraduate career in the seventies. Interestingly, therefore, most of this cohort were taught primarily by Academic Boomers in their respective colleges or universities. The faculty’s education was decidedly more dispersed among the various institutional sectors than that of the other two cohorts. Two did not go straight to college after high school but experimented with alternative life-styles instead — not unusual in the late sixties and early seventies. Among the cohort members, there appears to be no pattern that links the type of control between undergraduate institutions and present employment; that is, those working in the public university are just as likely to have attended private colleges. The spread of colleges demon-
strates that entry ports into the profession are no longer limited to university or elite educational patterns as they were for the Brahmins. Represented are selective and less-selective liberal arts colleges (including one Ivy League and three Catholic colleges), and research, doctoral, and comprehensive universities.

Almost half of the cohort believe that they received less career advice than they would have liked. One Protean voiced the frustration of many:

When I was a senior, I was very active in the department, as a student rep to the faculty and in the literary club. I like classes, especially literature. I like talking about it and asked the faculty, "How can I continue?" They told me graduate school. I didn't understand what that meant. . . . I had done the research [about different graduate programs] but didn't know what to look for. My teachers' recommendations were haphazard really. Nobody said to go to the name [go to a prestigious department]. I hate that, so I am glad they didn't. I just wanted to continue. [Name of doctoral university] was the alma mater of one of my three favorite teachers.

However, many of the faculty independently researched possible types of doctoral programs available in their chosen fields. Some selected their programs specifically for the specialized nature of the faculty, for example, in mathematics, applied programs rather than theoretical. Others relied on the professional networks of their undergraduate or master's degree faculties to narrow the choice. All of the Proteans supported themselves in graduate school by teaching or research assistantships or adjunct positions and through these positions learned that teaching was a primary value to them. In many ways, the Proteans resemble their more senior colleagues than the cohort directly above them. Their recruitment patterns explain the relationship.

Recruitment

By the time the third cohort began their graduate studies, the labor market for liberal arts faculty was not promising. Nor was it any better once they approached completion. None of the faculty reported having been discouraged from entering the field by their graduate faculty, however. Like the Brahmins, most of the liberal arts faculty "hit a brick wall" when they began to search for positions. Unlike the Brahmins though, they amassed teaching and administrative experience rather than augmenting their credentials through publications. The search for an appointment took two forms. Graduates in one group waited until they had finished their degrees before going on the market. When they could not find openings, their graduate faculties continued to support their career choices by hiring them to temporary positions in the department.
During this time of abeyance, they were encouraged — although few took the advice — to publish. One typical Protean explained her odyssey:

In 1982, I began looking for tenure-track jobs. There were expectations that everybody did it. I never got a job. So I stayed at [her doctoral program] as a lecturer in composition and continued to apply. There were no positions. I was one of 500 applications — a glut on the market. The faculty encouraged the best students to publish and the others to go to law school. They tried to help with letters, phone calls, and recommendations for my dossier. I spent two years in the lectureship. I figured that at least the pay was better, and I was not a student anymore.

She then accepted a two-year temporary position in an American university in Europe and a three-semester temporary but full-time teaching/staff position at a doctoral university. The second pattern was for these “would-be faculty” to take full-time temporary positions as instructors while ABD, teaching freshmen service courses in mathematics or composition. Two characteristics bind these subgroups together. The Proteans were willing to go almost anywhere for these temporary positions in order to stay in their chosen fields. And while in these positions, they assumed administrative responsibilities, thereby gaining a more diversified experience. For both subgroups, temporary teaching positions allowed these individuals to stay in the profession until the demand for faculty opened ever so slightly. By this time, their resumes displayed some teaching and administrative experience, enabling them to flow to the top of the pool.

From an institutional perspective, the recruitment requirements also seemed to approach a more rational basis. At Merger especially, the departments began to seek candidates who espoused the extant values in the mission and objectives of the university rather than their organizational aspirations, as had been the case for the Brahmins. One chair, himself a Brahmin, explained that he asked a primary question of all preliminary applicants during the “meat-market” interviews at national meetings. “Would you describe yourself as a teacher, a teacher/scholar, or a researcher?” If the answer was anything other than the second, applicants were immediately eliminated.

The Proteans were attractive to the two universities as a result of their field specialties in addition to their varied backgrounds. Possibly the most significant change in this period on the departmental level had been the diversification of the curriculum through the introduction of subspecialties. In both universities, journalism had seceded from English departments, for example, in the early eighties. By the mid-eighties, both English faculties had begun to develop programs in and to hire fac-
ulty with quasi-applied specialties, such as rhetoric and composition, cinematic studies, and creative writing, in an effort to recapture student enrollments. Many of the new faculty brought with them the new theoretical perspectives of feminism, deconstructionism, and critical theory [see 7]. In management, new specializations reflected the maturation of the field and the expansion of student interests and industry needs. Whereas one Boomer remembers teaching for three departments in his early days, Proteans were hired to specialize in organizational behavior, production management, and management information sciences — all in one department.

Most Cohort III members looked for an institution that valued teaching but also supported scholarship. Similar to most of her cohort members, a woman and her fiancé, also an academic, deliberately applied only to teaching institutions.

I was looking for a place that would allow me to have a good life. I have the capability to be in a high-powered research institution, but the last six years have been unbelievably intense and I don't want to live like that. . . . [Fiancé’s name] and I talked about this issue for two years. What kind of place do we want to be at? We decided that we wanted a balanced life. We didn't want the research university, not the straight teaching institution, unless we could be virtually involved, for example, at a Jesuit college.

The oldest of the cohort, in addition to his ABD adjunct teaching experience, was an industry analyst prior to his academic conversion. He deliberately sought a position in a comprehensive university:

When I was leaving [Research I university doctoral program], I eliminated myself from the top tier. The publish or perish . . . you have to be a researcher, not a teacher. You are known by publications. Making a name for yourself like an actor. That was not my reason for coming into this profession. When I went to [a flagship university’s extension center], there was a research emphasis to some extent, but they couldn't have hired a young graduate with no experience to stand in front of MBA students. They needed someone who was credible, and I was the right kind of person for them.

Each cohort member values a combination of all three role responsibilities — teaching, research, and service. And each expressed a desire to pursue all three areas. They were recruited for the combined talents and are already assuming responsibilities that few junior faculty would be offered normally.

Retention

While Merger has begun to reevaluate the emphasis it placed on scholarship in the early eighties, Regional State only recently has divided the
combined standard of service or scholarship and now, by contract, requires faculty evaluations to assess separately teaching, service, and scholarship in promotion and tenure decisions. The emphasis on scholarship at both universities surprised many of the Proteans. Some early candidates feel that they were misled during their interviews. "I got the impression at the start that teaching is the primary responsibility — that they weren't big on publications, that other activities could take place," explained one Protean. Another voiced a similar misinterpretation, "I did get the wrong impression in my interview though. I got the impression that teaching is more important than publications." Now, especially at Regional, some faculty find themselves "caught in the bind" felt by senior colleagues.

The values are teaching as the most important thing and then publishing and service next. I took them at their word and worked on my teaching. It gives me personal satisfaction. And, in fact, this was the case. I was allowed to come up for promotion within five years and was actually promoted in four years. . . . [But,] the contract has changed; research has moved up. It used to be combined with service, now it is a step above. It is going to be harder to get to full [professor] as a result of what I didn't do in publishing. So I am a little more anxious about getting something in writing.

Most of the Proteans are active scholars, though. They differ from the Brahmins in that much of their work is not limited to theory. Many are attracted to pedagogical or applied research or to creative endeavors. They are also pushing the definition of service at their institutions in new directions as a result of their experience and interests. Some of the women are intensely involved in developing women's studies curricula and extracurricular programs. Others are heavily concerned with the professional development of their students and are formalizing mentoring programs. Finally, some are exploring funding for regional scholarly programs to be sponsored and accommodated at their universities.

At Regional, the trustees have recently pushed the system toward more emphasis on research because the colleges assumed the title of university in the early eighties. Merger, on the other hand, has recently inaugurated a new president who appears to be returning the university to its comprehensive mission and redefining the concept of "service" to the advantage of both the university and the faculty. In addition to assuming that service is an intramural activity, he has invited a variety of faculty from across the university to participate in university-sponsored consulting activities on an international as well as regional level. Faculty are called on to share their professional expertise in a variety of applied projects and are encouraged to vie for research grants. Unlike in pre-
vious years, the university provides them with seed money for the start-up phase. They also are supported to retool when necessary so that they may participate in local projects.

One Brahmin, experiencing the first phase of what could have been a severe burn-out was encouraged to learn the mechanics of computer graphics. Like so many of his colleagues in both universities, he adopted what I would call a cosmo-local pattern of productivity. Although time and resources are a premium, many faculty collaborate professionally with colleagues in their own departments or in other departments in the university. In this case, the Brahmin contacted an art specialist to assist him in learning computer art composition and in turn, is teaching her about computers. The pair are cooperating on a project to assist local primary and secondary teachers to integrate computers into their schools’ curriculum.

All of this is not without critics from within the faculty ranks. Since some of the Boomers are left out of the incentive and reward systems, alienation and envy are natural consequences. Many of the senior faculty who are frozen in rank are suspicious of the junior faculty’s motives and feel hurt by the system’s persistence in providing a cumulative advantage to the research-experienced. At Regional, the emphasis has advanced toward scholarship, and those who have not participated throughout their careers in this type of endeavor are clearly left behind — seemingly with little concern from within certain departments or from an organizational level. Many of these faculty have several years before retirement and envision spending those years with little recognition for the activity for which they were hired and only the personal satisfaction that comes from their teaching. The values may be changing at Merger, reemphasizing service, but in no way are the incentive and reward systems equitably accessible or supportive across the three cohorts.

Discussion

First, this brief case study has explored the differences in the career lines of the three cohorts; each group possesses some distinctive and significant preemployment and employment traits. The family and educational background of the Boomers corresponds to Lipset and Ladd’s conclusion from the 1969 Carnegie and their own 1975 faculty surveys that “[a]cademics from working-class and farm backgrounds turn up most heavily in the lower-status colleges” [23, p. 323]. For many of the Boomers, children of immigrant and working-class families, their graduate education enabled them to become first-generation professionals.
Teaching institutions provided access routes into academe. But the second cohort, the Brahmins, broke the pattern that Lipset and Ladd identified.

As the academic labor market tightened in the mid-seventies the choice and flexibility previously available to prospective faculty in the mid-sixties reverted to the institutions. Had the academic labor market remained open, many of the Brahmins would [and probably should] have been hired by more selective, research-oriented institutions. Their employment at a comprehensive university matched the institution's aspirations, not theirs. Simultaneously, though, the participation rates for postsecondary education grew and achievement replaced the apparent former ascriptive advantage of class background. Although many of the Brahmins were raised in business and professional families, other families encouraged upward mobility through education in their children, which was characteristic of the post-World War II period. The academic achievements of the liberal arts Cohort II members — primarily in the form of postdoctoral productivity combined with the lack of research-oriented appointments — took precedence in this sector over the effect that ascribed class status had in determining academic placement.

By the time the Proteans were hired, entirely new patterns began to develop. The generic relationship between class background and institutional sectors has superficially all but disappeared within the cohort as an aggregate. The Proteans' families include as many working-class as professional parents. However, the family class standing of the Protean women on the whole, is higher than that of their male counterparts. Most, in fact, come from academic families. In the 1969 and 1975 studies, Lipset and Ladd found "the more prestigious, research-oriented institutions have drawn their professors disproportionately from the higher social strata. Faculty offspring do best of all. They are most likely to be found in the top schools, suggesting that family culture plays a major role in transmitting the ability to do well academically" [23, p. 323]. So, in the late sixties to early seventies, class background provided a cumulative advantage for faculty (when men significantly outnumbered women in the professoriate), as Lipset and Ladd suggested, promoting the value of academic achievement. Social class may still be an operative mechanism for some women entering and experiencing success in academe, but the interplay between the intrinsic values for the process of education held by the faculty member and the academic ethos of the institution appears to be of overriding importance in the recruitment and selection of both the men and women in this cohort.

The intrinsic values espoused by the Regional Protean faculty of both
genders are centered as much on student development and culture change as on research — parallel to the mission of their university. Many of the junior faculty at Regional view their role as one of consciousness-raising. They see teaching as a “subversive” or an empowering activity, that is, a means by which to encourage social mobility among their first-generation college-going students. The Proteans at Merger, on the other hand, were clearly attracted to the more aspiring ethos and newly acquired reputation of their university and to the combined role of teaching and research enacted by the administration and the Brahmins. They are teaching students from middle-class families — some actually mentioned “spoiled children.” In their interviews, the Merger faculty were more likely to value their disciplinary paradigms than the potential for empowerment. These patterns suggest that both the institutions and the faculty have reverted once again to seeking corresponding values (as was true for the Boomers) in the recruitment and selection process.

Certainly, the three cohorts’ recruitment experiences differed greatly and were highly dependent upon the state of the academic labor market when they finished their highest graduate degrees. Through the three periods, the capacity to define adequate proficiency for employment switched from the candidates to the institutions and largely depended upon the relationship between enrollment demands and faculty supply. Simplistically, the degree to which the faculty have had choice in type and location of their employing institution decreased with a larger supply of candidates and a smaller demand for their services. But in addition, the definitions of supply and demand have changed through the three periods.

During the mid-sixties, when the need for liberal arts faculty was the greatest at the public colleges across the nation and the pool of available doctorates was the smallest, faculty candidates in this sample had the greatest degree of leverage in securing their choice in employment. They could negotiate positions and security with minimal credentials or better rank and salaries with higher degrees. As the supply of liberal arts faculty increased, the pedigrees required for recruitment and retention escalated. When Regional extended its curriculum into applied areas in the seventies, the faculty-based leverage pattern was repeated — at least for professional field academics. As the supply of doctorally prepared applicants in these areas has expanded, the power to regulate credentials has passed back to the institution.

During the seventies, the number of doctorates in public institutions on the national level decreased slightly, while the number and diversity of fields represented among comprehensive university faculty increased.
For example, in the public comprehensives, health science (probably primarily nursing) faculty comprise 2.8 percent of Cohort I; whereas, by 1972–82, faculty in that area made up 9.2 percent of the national comprehensive sample. Less than half of the current faculty in health science have doctorates in comparison to 66 percent across the entire current faculty in public comprehensives [18, pp. 59–65]. During this time frame, the liberal arts departments in this study were either prohibited from hiring faculty or were limited to adding instructors in applied subfields such as journalism. Demand, then, was redefined in favor of applied or professional fields, and because the supply of faculty with doctorates at first was small in many fields, recruitment standards were lowered.

Currently, the national complement of private comprehensive university and college faculty is comprised of 71 percent doctorates, 24 percent master’s, and almost 5 percent bachelor’s degrees. In comparison to the publics, the proportion of doctorates at these institutions increased by almost 5 percent between the first two periods. The highest percentages of doctorates of the current private university faculty nationally are in the liberal arts, while as much as 30–50 percent of the faculty in the professional fields, such as health sciences, fine arts, and business, have master’s degrees [18, pp. 59–65]. During the two earlier periods, Merger, already a multipurpose university, hired faculty across more fields than Regional. The same pattern appears to have occurred on a national basis [18]. As such, one inference is that as the supply of faculty in the liberal arts increased nationally, the recruitment requirements also escalated for faculty hired to those departments. And, in fact, the case study shows that the Brahmins at Merger had credentials at recruitment unmatched by the other two cohorts when productivity is factored in.

Finally, the role expectations and their subsequent rewards for faculty through the three time periods have changed. Some faculty have managed to stay current with the changes, whereas others have not. The topic of satisfaction with their careers over time is an issue explored elsewhere [see 18]. This case study concurs with Queval [35] that institutional definitions of productivity have been transformed, and with them the criteria of the incentive and reward systems of the two universities. Again, each of the three cohorts is experiencing different reactions to the institutional expectations placed on them.

Some Boomers have continued to pursue a modest agenda of scholarship, although many have maintained their pedagogical orientation to publishing. Some, who chose to remain focused on their teaching and kept an arm’s length from publishing, have become less qualified and/or less competitive as the years and new faculty are added. At Regional, for
example, released time from coursework provides support for faculty to pursue scholarship. However, those who have not been publishing report that their proposals are not competitive with those of other faculty who have track records in publishing. These detached faculty, then, end up teaching the normal twelve hours each semester when the schedules of competitive colleagues reportedly are alleviated on a regular basis. At Merger, the merit system supports faculty accomplishment in any of the three areas — teaching, research, and service — but promotion is directly tied to professional productivity. At both institutions, without the terminal doctorate for some and/or a record of publications for others, promotion and the attending salary increment are out of reach. Ultimately, while the values of the senior faculty matched those of the institution at recruitment, for some, the disparity continues to increase.

For the Merger liberal arts Brahmins, hired for their established publication records, the increased demands are not the problem; they would rather spend more time at their research. They take issue, rather, with the institution's inability to uphold its part of the "bargain" stuck at recruitment. Many continue to teach twelve hours a semester; some no longer have access to graduate students as a result of cut-backs. Several feel "stuck" in their situations, not able to maintain a rate of scholarly production that would allow them to be competitive for the type of institution to which they originally aspired. They also feel undervalued because the scholarly orientation for which they were hired is expected but not fully supported by the organization, and neither understood nor appreciated by the students.

The Proteans are an interesting mix of faculty. On the whole, they value all three expected responsibilities of the faculty role, but each member of the cohort appears to emphasize one over the others. As noted previously, their values appear to correspond more closely to the mission or nature of their respective institutions than had been true in the previous cohort. As a result, they have already been very successful in translating their past experience into support for their professional and institutional agendas, much to the dismay of some of the isolated senior faculty.

Burke [12], in replicating the Caplow and McGee study [13], has found extensive differentiation in the recent academic labor market for disciplinary specialties in research universities; some subfields within a discipline can be less promising for employment than others or than the field in general. Indeed, this field-specific labor market pattern is evident in the Protean recruitment cycle also. But the argument here is that the academic labor market complexity goes beyond field supply and de-
mand. The case study demonstrates that the labor market is as focused within and for the comprehensive sector as it is within the research sector.

Because we have not understood the aspirations of individual faculty and institutional mechanisms of recruitment that operate within this sector (or those of sectors other than the research university), the assumption that the same formal and informal rules govern these processes across the professoriate limits our perspective and constructs the specifications of the models we use to analyze faculty careers and the academic labor market. One model, for instance, used in the analysis of the labor market called “institutional screening,” or “queuing theory” “advocates that jobs are differentiated according to their quality and attractiveness, regardless of the current labor market situation” [45]. The implicit assumption in the concept of “queuing” is that academic employment is a singular hierarchical competition that pushes “quality and attractive” candidates to the head of the line to be “snapped up” by “quality and attractive” institutions, schools and departments, leaving the rest of the competitors to be filtered into less attractive positions. In other words, less meritorious candidates are matched with less meritorious institutions.

This case study does not support queuing theory by demonstrating that faculty hired during two different periods specifically chose to seek employment within a particular type of institution. Not only did they not find the research university setting “attractive,” but deliberately avoided applying to the “quality” institutions as a result of their professional values and interests. Readers may ask if some would have been competitive for positions in the “attractive and quality” institutions. I would argue that this is an inappropriate question. The majority of these faculty deliberately chose, did not settle for, these positions. In a few cases, some faculty decided their initial career path based on what they wanted to avoid (publish or perish), rather than predicated on what they wanted [10]. In other words, the decision to seek employment in this sector appears to have resulted from the faculty member evaluating and subsequently eliminating what she or he perceived to be inappropriate role demands at more research-oriented institutions. Nonetheless, the majority of faculty in Cohorts I and III chose the mission and the role responsibilities advocated within the comprehensive sector. Hence the hierarchy of career sorting that exists in some minds does not exist in others.

Queues may exist and may regulate the acquisition of academic positions. However, I would argue that the queues operate within sectors rather than across institutional type, albeit modified by the condition of
the labor market. In periods of equilibrium — that is, when an adequate supply of faculty is present and/or institutions utilize rational recruitment processes based on their missions — candidates are selected from an apposite queue. For comprehensives, the queue appears to consist of faculty who are not in competition with those in line for research positions. Although the acquisition of the initial academic position in research-oriented institutions has been consistently demonstrated to be governed by ascribed status mechanisms, the same mentoring and prestige instruments seem not to apply for those faculty who were able to have some control over their careers when the labor market was favorable. Disequilibrium occurs when supply exceeds demand and when institutions recruit for aspirations rather than the reality of its resources.

Those faculty who were caught in the low-demand/high-supply labor market were exploited by the university and the system. They assumed to and were trained for an entirely different career than what was available at the time. All are grateful for having managed to secure positions during a time when many new doctorates were squeezed out of the system into taxi cabs [4, 19], but they lament the incongruity between their values and those of the universities and students they serve.

As we move into a new recruiting phase, replacing the faculty hired in the sixties, institutions should recruit and faculty should search judiciously. Institutions should evaluate their aspirations and resources, and articulate their mission and values for their new recruits. Faculty aspirants should heed the advice of a Protean who waited until March to earnestly begin his search for a teaching position. After having competed for positions in comprehensives for a number of years, he has divined the appropriate timing for the application process. His analysis is that candidates from elite graduate programs not only apply to prestigious positions but blanket a variety of institutions for the sake of safety. His experience has demonstrated that these candidates are not serious contenders — either from the applicants’ perspective or the university’s. The university cannot support the research-support demands of these candidates, nor are these applicants drawn to this sector. These “elite candidates” undoubtedly are being advised by mentors who well remember the severe lack of choice in the seventies. So they seek a safety net with little expectation on either side of the negotiation. Once these candidates have been hired by the elite or prestigious programs and thus removed from the comprehensive sector pool, this Protean knows that his application will be seriously reviewed. The unfortunate side of this vignette is that some faculty searches at the university would obviously waste their time and money on candidates whose aspirations are not suited to the mission of the institution.
Given the findings of this case study, comprehensive universities and colleges, if they conduct their faculty searches appropriately, should not have difficulty recruiting faculty even if there is a shortage in the years to come. Some faculty, not merely the cast-offs of prestigious institutions, want to make a commitment to a mission of access and teaching. A typical Protean was adamant about her values:

Teaching gives me a very definite high. I get results. I learn from the students. In their innocence, there are blinding insights. I learn more from them than by myself. There is serendipity in the classroom. Often I come to new insights from teaching. . . . My sense of the profession is that teaching is a political, subversive process and it is where I can do the most damage. I am not good at marching, making posters. Students here are educationally deprived. They respond to attention and are not snobs. They know that they are in an institution with the other institution down the road [an Ivy League university]. In any other town, Regional would be considered a good school. The faculty are generally good scholars.

Notes

1 The descriptive statistics from the National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty, 1988 (NSOPF-88) [29] are data that I generated from the survey data base for my dissertation [16].

2 Both universities have been assigned pseudonyms to respect the rights of the faculty who were interviewed and the confidential nature of the interviews.

3 Therefore, no management Boomers exist at Regional State.

4 Nationally, the mean age of the Academic Boomers is 54 years, seven years older than the mean for the entire composite of comprehensive faculty [29]. Within the case study sample, the faculty range in age from 48 to 65 with a mean of 58 years. Men comprise 84 percent of the group; the public comprehensives currently employ slightly more women in this cohort than men due to the substantial emphasis in education fields at the time [29]. The sample reflects the same gender distribution.

5 One faculty member wanted a research university position to pursue scholarship. Hired at the very end of the period as the labor market was closing down for liberal arts faculty, he was locked into this sector, having taught in several other comprehensive colleges while completing his degree.

6 Nationally, the comprehensive university faculty who belong to Cohort II differ from the first cohort in two distinctive ways. The faculty hired between 1972 and 1982 is the smallest of the cohorts, representing only 27 percent of the faculty. Their professional disciplinary or field distribution leans toward professional specializations rather than liberal arts. Demographically, the national mean age of the cohort is 46 years, but as of the fall 1987, 45 percent of those hired during this period were under 44 years old. Men still predominate in the cohort, but to a lesser degree. They represent 69 percent of the faculty. The private comprehensive universities and colleges gained more in gender diversity through this period but had been further behind in the previous cohort. Women comprised 12.5 per cent of Cohort I in the private institutions as opposed to 17 percent in the publics. In Cohort II, women in private universities and colleges make up 33 percent as opposed to 30 percent in the publics [29].

7 Full-time students increased by 8 percent and part-time by 12 percent.

8 Nationally, Cohort III is older than expected. Their mean age is 40.9 years, with 30 percent of the cohort over the age of 45. The cohort comprises 36 percent of the com-
prehensive sector faculty. Equally, 30 percent have been awarded a senior rank (either associate or full professor), and half that number had gained tenure by fall 1987 when the NSOPF was administered. The cohort does not then merely consist of young, fresh-out-of-graduate school doctorates. In addition to an age distribution, the gender mix of this newest group shows that more women are being hired than previously. They comprise 40 percent of the Proteans nationally [29].

9Diversity extends beyond gender. Fourteen percent of the cohort are members of minority groups. The reader is cautioned though. Forty (42 percent) of the historically black colleges and universities are classified as comprehensives and make up 7 percent of the total universe of comprehensives. While the proportion of HBCUs in the sector is small, the number of minority members at those institutions is quite high. As of the late seventies, about 71 percent of the black faculty employed in public institutions were concentrated in predominantly black colleges [20]. The aggregated racial percentages therefore, are possibly skewed [see 17].

10The NSOPF-88 [29] sample for comprehensive faculty consists of 1860 full-time faculty — 1362 doctoral, 434 master's, and sixty-four bachelors degrees. To stratify the data by cohort, highest degree, and field would produce cells too small to be useful.
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