

On the tenuous track: Unionization efforts among contingent faculty at private colleges and universities

Christopher T. Bennett

RTI International

Author Note

Christopher T. Bennett  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8910-8098>

Christopher T. Bennett is a research education analyst in the Education Practice Area at RTI International. His research focuses on the ways that higher education policies can influence the trajectories of individuals and institutions, with an emphasis on topics related to college access, graduate education, labor market outcomes, and the academic workforce. Please send correspondence to cbennett@rti.org.

I am grateful for the support of the National Academy of Education/Spencer Foundation Dissertation Fellowship. The views expressed are mine alone and do not represent the official position of the National Academy of Education or Spencer Foundation.

Abstract

This study examines unionization efforts among contingent faculty members, who now account for the majority of the academic workforce. Drawing on data from the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) and other sources, this paper uses an event history analysis to identify factors associated with efforts to establish a contingent faculty union at private, 4-year institutions. Even after accounting for other state and institution characteristics, this study finds increased odds of contingent faculty unionization at institutions located in states where the legislature is more liberal and where more contingent faculty union certification elections have been held previously.

Keywords: contingent faculty, adjuncts, academic workforce, unionization, event history analysis

On the tenuous track: Unionization efforts among contingent faculty at private colleges and universities

In recent decades, the composition of the U.S. academic workforce has undergone a stark shift in terms of the proportion of faculty potentially eligible for tenure protections (Kezar & Maxey, 2012). Part-time and full-time non-tenure-track faculty, who accounted for 34 percent of the academic workforce in 1975, had expanded to 57 percent by 2015 (Shulman et al., 2017). In recognition of the increasingly large role of such contingent faculty members in the higher education landscape, members of one prominent advocacy group for contingent faculty named their organization the New Faculty Majority.¹

Several rationales help explain this shift towards contingent positions as the predominant faculty classification. From the individual agency perspective, contingent faculty may see their role as a gateway to a more permanent position, an opportunity to share expertise while holding a different primary job, a form of flexible employment, or a way to transition to retirement (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). With 70 percent of part-time faculty indicating that they would prefer a full-time role (Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012), the quest for a more secure position clearly motivates a substantial share of contingent faculty and, all too often, proves elusive.

At the same time, there are multiple structural rationales for colleges and universities to hire contingent faculty, including long-term decreases in state funding, increases in enrollment, and a desire for staffing flexibility (Gappa, 2000; McNaughtan et al., 2017). Perhaps no motivation for increased hiring of contingent faculty is stronger than the financial one, however,

¹ I use “contingent faculty” as an umbrella term to encompass all non-tenure-track faculty, who may hold any of a variety of titles and classifications (e.g., adjunct, instructor, lecturer) and may work on a full- or part-time basis.

ON THE TENUOUS TRACK

with institutions incurring lower costs for contingent faculty than tenure-track faculty members on several dimensions (Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2004; Zhang et al., 2015). For instance, in 2010, the median pay per semester-long course for part-time faculty was just \$2700 (Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012). After controlling for individual and institutional characteristics, full-time and part-time contingent faculty members receive 26% and 64% less per hour than their tenure-track counterparts, respectively (Monks, 2007). Contingent faculty members also typically receive few, if any, health or other benefits from their employers, leading to a series of new reports in recent years about adjunct faculty who receive food stamps and other means-tested benefits (Brennan & Magness, 2016; Hurlburt & McGarrah, 2016; Patton, 2012).

In response to their relatively low compensation and substantial precarity, contingent faculty members have increasingly sought to improve their working conditions through collective bargaining. This movement comes amidst a renewed push for unionization more broadly, both elsewhere in academia (e.g., Kroeger et al., 2018) and beyond (e.g., Kochan et al., 2019). These unionization efforts take two fundamentally different paths depending on whether an institution is public, in which case state laws apply, or private, in which case federal statutes dictate the process (AAUP, 2022). While many states have long permitted unionization among faculty at their public institutions, the growth in contingent faculty unionization over the past two decades has been most pronounced at private, nonprofit institutions, in part spurred by concerted campaigns, such as SEIU's Faculty Forward initiative (SEIU, 2019). At these private institutions, two-thirds of faculty members—over a quarter of a million faculty—are in positions where they do not have the potential to earn tenure (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2019).

This study examines the recent unionization efforts among contingent faculty at private colleges and universities, in the process contributing to literatures of both the academic

workforce and unions. Prior research on faculty unions has largely examined events that occur during or after a union certification election: an individual's decision about whether to vote in favor of the faculty union and the impacts of faculty unions once they exist (e.g., Bornheimer, 1985; Hemmasi & Graf, 1993; Porter, 2013). Less is known about the determinants of a union certification election in the first place. Therefore, this study empirically assesses this underexamined aspect of contingent faculty unionization, seeking to better understand the extent to which institutional attributes and organizational contexts may be linked to the odds of holding a union certification election. By emphasizing institutional attributes and organizational context, this study's aim is to identify broad structural forces that may promote or inhibit opportunities for union certification elections. Accordingly, it seeks to address two primary research questions:

- 1) How many 4-year private, nonprofit institutions held a union certification election for a contingent faculty union between 2001 and 2018, and how do the characteristics of those institutions compare to institutions that did not hold a vote?
- 2) How did the likelihood of holding a certification election for a contingent faculty union vary according to institutional attributes and organizational context?

In exploring these questions, I draw on two strands of literature from organizational theory and sociology: institutional logics and isomorphic pressures. These theories suggest several contextual factors that may differentiate institutions where unionization votes occurred from those where votes did not occur. Using an event history analysis based on data from the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), which certifies union elections for all private-sector organizations, and other institution- and state-level sources, this study examines the relationship between organizational attributes and the propensity to hold a contingent faculty unionization election. Findings from this effort provide additional context for the burgeoning movement

towards unionization of contingent faculty members at private colleges and universities, suggesting the types of institutions where such unionization efforts are more or less likely.

Literature Review and Background

Faculty unions

There is extensive evidence on the motivations that individual faculty members express for participating in collective bargaining. Some of the most commonly identified motivations for collective bargaining in academia include increased salary and compensation levels, as well as a desire for greater equity in salary and compensation between faculty at different ranks and in different fields (e.g., Brown & Stone, 1977). Bargaining goals for faculty extend beyond salary and compensation, as well. For instance, Ponak and colleagues (1992) examined Canadian faculty members' preferences for bargaining on three types of issues: traditional bargaining goals (e.g., salaries and job security), academic bargaining goals (e.g., promotion and tenure decisions), and policy bargaining goals (e.g., availability of facilities). Overall, they found the vast majority of faculty surveyed were in favor of traditional bargaining goals such as salaries and benefits (80 percent), whereas a minority were in favor of using collective bargaining procedures for academic issues such as the design and use of teaching evaluations (31 percent) and policy goals such as the use of office facilities (27 percent). In a study of faculty members at an institution where union membership was optional, researchers found that faculty were more likely to join a union if they were dissatisfied with their position, identified themselves as liberal, and perceived the union to have a high degree of efficacy (Goldey et al., 2010). Such rationales for faculty union membership align closely with more general theories of support for unionization, which posit that factors increasing one's motivation to join a union include deprivation (i.e., a gap between experiences and expectations in workplace conditions), anger

ON THE TENUOUS TRACK

(i.e., intense animosity towards the employer as a result of the deprivation), perceived utility and efficacy of the union, and feelings of solidarity with fellow employees (McClendon et al., 1998).

Research examining the impacts of unionization for faculty members as a whole has revealed mixed findings. For example, in a study of four-year institutions that had unionized by 1975-76, there was no significant change in faculty salary and compensation following unionization (after accounting for national trends), no reduction in the difference between the salary and compensation of different faculty ranks, and no change in the growth rate in the number of upper-rank faculty members (used as a proxy for promotion potential) (Brown & Stone, 1977). In contrast, looking at a range of domains over which faculty may exert some degree of decision-making authority, Porter (2013) found that the effect of faculty unions was, in fact, largest on setting faculty salary scales. Porter also found strong positive impacts on faculty unions in a range of domains beyond compensation, including their role in tenure and promotion processes, determining the curriculum and types of degrees offered, setting teaching loads, and making decisions about faculty governance. One notable constraint of Porter's study, however, is that it relies on administrators' perceptions of faculty decision-making authority rather than objective measures that indicate the level of control faculty exert on these domains.

Contingent faculty unions

A narrower range of studies have looked at the potential motivations that contingent faculty members in particular have for seeking to bargain collectively. Some of the most common goals of unionization for contingent faculty include receiving higher pay, greater job security, health benefits, family and medical leave, administrative support, and office space (Gehrke & Kezar, 2015). Gehrke and Kezar (2015) found that academic deans generally express that they are supportive of policies and supports that align with these goals for contingent

faculty, but most commonly cite budgetary reasons for not offering the benefits mentioned. Prior research has identified the absence of job security as a particularly acute concern, given the short-term nature of employment contracts for contingent faculty (Waltman et al., 2012). This lack of job security can also motivate contingent faculty to take on additional, uncompensated responsibilities in the department (e.g., serving on committees, advising more students) as a strategy to convey their commitment to an institution (Waltman et al., 2012), further expanding the gulf between labor provided and compensation received.

Faculty governance is another area in which contingent faculty members have expressed dissatisfaction (Waltman et al., 2012). Contingent faculty members typically lack a vote in decisions related to faculty governance, leading to concerns that experiences and viewpoints of contingent faculty members are not adequately represented in university decision-making processes (Dobbie & Robinson, 2008). In some cases, contingent faculty members are not even permitted to attend departmental or institution-wide faculty meetings, further reinforcing feelings of exclusion from university decision-making processes (Waltman et al., 2012). Based on interviews with faculty at universities with some of the most extensive policy supports in place for contingent faculty, researchers found inclusion in faculty governance to be a key mechanism for implementing policies to benefit contingent faculty (Kezar & Sam, 2013).

Even when contingent faculty members are unionized, prior research has found variation in outcomes based on whether a union consists of contingent faculty only or both tenure-track and contingent faculty. Contingent faculty members may receive short notice—sometimes just several days or weeks—about whether they will teach a course in the upcoming semester (a model known as “just-in-time” employment), which results in limited preparation time and high degrees of uncertainty (Rhoades & Rhoades, 2003). Examining language in collective bargaining

agreements related to such “just-in-time” employment, Rhoades (2017) found that 39 percent of contingent-only unions’ agreements included clauses that require some compensation in the event of class cancellation, compared to just 20 percent of joint contingent/tenure-track unions’ agreements. This finding suggests that issues of interest to contingent faculty may be underrepresented in unions where there are multiple employee classifications.

Additional studies have also focused on the patterns and outcomes of unionization for contingent faculty members in particular. On unionized campuses (primarily at public institutions), Gehrke and Kezar (2015) found that contingent faculty are more likely to receive medical benefits, medical leave, and multi-year contracts, and less likely to serve on committees than contingent faculty elsewhere; there were no clear patterns regarding the relationship between unionization and administrative support and availability of office space for contingent faculty. In terms of compensation, there is some evidence that part-time contingent faculty members at unionized institutions experienced a significant wage premium relative to their non-unionized counterparts, while full-time contingent faculty members did not (Monks, 2007). Dobbie and Robinson (2008) observed that in Canada, which has a higher level of unionization among contingent faculty than the U.S., there has not been a decreased reliance on contingent faculty in the wake of unionization efforts. Notably, they also found substantial variation in reliance on non-tenure-track faculty members by province. This finding regarding province-level variation emphasizes the importance of accounting for geography in the present study.

Organizational context and unionization efforts

The prior research outlined above offers a variety of motivations for unionization among contingent faculty, and identifies a number of (frequently positive) outcomes associated with these unionization efforts. Why, then, has unionization among contingent faculty members at

private colleges and universities only recently gained substantial momentum? One distinct possibility is that, even in the presence of substantial individual-level reasons to pursue unionization, institutional attributes and an organization's broader context play important roles in shaping the odds of unionization. Although I am not aware of previous published work regarding the larger environmental factors associated with faculty unionization efforts at private colleges and universities nationwide, evidence from elsewhere in the private sector suggests that the likelihood of unionization may be related to institution-level attributes and broader context. For example, Dinlersoz and colleagues (2017) explored overall private-sector unionization activity from 1977 to 2007, finding unionization efforts were associated with establishment size, productivity, and age. Additionally, looking specifically at hospital unionization, past research has examined factors such as the number of beds in the hospital, the number of hospitals in the same city, and the region of the country (Freeman & Kirkman-Liff, 1984). These types of prior analyses highlight the potential value in considering how contextual factors may relate to the expansion of unionization efforts among contingent faculty at private institutions.

Theoretical Framework

In seeking to better understand this phenomenon, I apply two frameworks that have the potential to be illuminating in my examination of factors associated with contingent faculty unionization. First, the institutional logics approach offers insight into the link between macro-level norms and the demonstrated micro-level behavior of organizations and individuals (Friedland & Alford, 1991). Through a consideration of institutional logics, it may be possible to discern expectations about the role of individual agency in shaping responses to the conditions contingent faculty members face across institutions with various attributes. Second, the neo-institutional concept of isomorphism contends that institutional structures arise not merely

through rational-bureaucratic attempts at efficiency, but also through cultural components such as myth and ceremony (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Incorporating the role of isomorphism may therefore offer additional insight into the expansion of unionization efforts across the 4-year private, nonprofit university sector.

Institutional Logics

Institutional logics comprise the norms and modes of interpretation that underly an institution's basis of authority (Haveman & Rao, 1997). For instance, Skelcher & Smith (2015) offer seven examples of institutional orders, each with their own unique systems of logic: family, community, religion, state, market, profession, and corporation. Depending on the institutional order to which an organization belongs, it will derive legitimacy, authority, and identity in systematically different ways. For example, whereas an institution within the religious order may derive its legitimacy through faith and sacred texts, an institution under the professional order will tend to derive legitimacy from its expertise in a content area (Skelcher & Smith, 2015). Yet modern universities frequently defy easy categorization into a single institutional order. For religiously affiliated institutions, some domains of the university may operate under logics associated with religion, while still other components of the private universities may exhibit logics more typical of a profession or a corporation.

Under such conditions, it may be most fruitful to consider private universities as hybrid organizations. Prior research suggests that hybrid organizations strategically deploy aspects of their competing institutional logics in a bid to increase legitimacy within the field (Pache & Santos, 2013). The institutional logics approach envisions a strong role for individual agency in interpreting and interacting with the competing logics within an organization. In aggregate, such agency helps shape the prevailing institutional logics within the organization. Consistent with

this notion of individual agency, then, particular institutional attributes may be more or less conducive to responses that include unionization efforts. Additionally, this study proposes that private universities may convey various institutional logics internally to shape the perceived legitimacy of contingent faculty unions, thereby minimizing the likelihood of union formation.

Isomorphism

Meyer & Rowan (1977) contend that the formal rules and structures of organizations are often decoupled from the primary activities the organizations undertake. Relying on myths and a “logic of confidence,” organizations within a field tend towards conformity with other organizations, even when the prevailing structures and rules are not the most efficient means of achieving an organization’s technical goals (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Extending this argument, DiMaggio & Powell (1983) identify three types of isomorphic pressures: coercive, which primarily arise from political and cultural influence; mimetic, which concern attempts to navigate uncertainty within the environment; and normative, which reflect professionalism. Coercive isomorphism can reflect both formal and informal pressures within an organization’s environment, with political and legal contexts serving as prototypical examples of coercive forces. Under conditions of uncertain goals and objectives, mimetic isomorphic pressures can promote organizational adaptation towards conformity with existing organizations in the field, particularly those deemed most prominent. Finally, normative isomorphism results from a shared sense of professional identity for members in an occupation, which spread through professional associations and inter-organizational movement of employees. This paper suggests that all three isomorphic forces may promote a tendency towards unionization under certain conditions.

Together, the institutional logics approach and isomorphism offer several hypotheses for the anticipated predictors of union certification elections for contingent faculty members. I propose seven specific, testable hypotheses regarding these relationships, outlined below.

Hypothesis 1. *In states with more liberal legislatures, there will be a higher propensity for holding a contingent faculty union election.* This expectation is rooted in the longstanding, mutually reinforcing “labor-liberal coalition” between unions and the Democratic party (Battista, 2008). In addition to reflecting stronger underlying support for and exposure to collective action among residents of the state, more liberal legislatures may also be less likely to institute policies that present barriers to union operation, such as “right-to-work” laws (Garcia, 2019). Consequently, such states would likely present fewer coercive or normative isomorphic pressures discouraging unionization. However, it is also possible that a more liberal legislature would fund a social safety net that would benefit contingent faculty who receive low pay and few benefits from their work, thereby decreasing some motivations for collective bargaining.

Hypothesis 2. *In states with a greater number of contingent faculty union elections, the odds of holding a contingent faculty union election will be higher.* In states that have held a previous contingent faculty union vote, I anticipate that there will be fewer normative isomorphic pressures against unionization. Similar to Hypothesis 1, in such environments there will be fewer normative isomorphic pressures discouraging unionization behavior, and in fact some contingent faculty at the institution may have participated in one of the previous union certification votes.

Hypothesis 3. *In states with a higher percentage of workers who belong to a union, there will be a greater likelihood of holding a union certification election, all other factors being equal.* Since the proportion of workers in a union includes tenure-track and contingent faculty at public institutions in the state, this increased tendency towards unionization may be the result of

normative isomorphic pressures. Specifically, it may be the case that having elevated shares of the workforce in unions minimizes the stigma of such efforts and provides examples of peers within the contingent faculty members' networks who are engaged in collective bargaining.

Hypothesis 4. *Controlling for the number of faculty members, a higher number of full-time-equivalent students will be associated with an increased likelihood of holding a vote for a contingent faculty union.* This expectation relies on organizations' tendency to adopt increasingly bureaucratic structures as they grow in size and complexity (Mintzberg, 1980). With a shift towards increased bureaucratization, institutional logics based on the market and corporation are more likely to prevail. Under such logics, contingent faculty may view union formation as the approach most likely to secure compensation, benefits, and improved working conditions.

Hypothesis 5. *As the proportion of part-time faculty members increases, so will the likelihood of holding a contingent faculty union certification election.* As part-time faculty make up a larger share of faculty, there may be diminished concern about being perceived as not conforming to the professional norms of one's tenure-track peers. This increased pool of part-time faculty will also likely include a higher number of faculty who simultaneously or previously worked at institutions with contingent faculty unions. Through normative isomorphic pressures, with such an increased share of contingent faculty for whom unionized work environments are the norm, there may be a greater tendency to seek a contingent faculty union at the institution.

Hypothesis 6. *The presence of a religious affiliation will be associated with a lower likelihood of holding a contingent faculty unionization vote.* The rationale for this expected outcome is that such universities will be able to draw on institutional logics of religion and family, thereby encouraging loyalty and suggesting alternative means of dispute resolution than collective bargaining. Additionally, through more well-defined norms and obligations, there may

be a decreased potential for misalignments between expected and experienced working conditions. As just one example of a method by which some religiously affiliated institutions relay their values and priorities, half of tenure-granting institutions in the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities have required faculty to sign “statements of faith” as a condition of employment (Harris & Lumsden, 2006). More broadly, an institution’s religious affiliation often shapes its mission and guides key aspects of campus life (Currie, 2011).

Hypothesis 7. *The likelihood of holding a contingent faculty unionization vote will increase with greater organizational complexity, as proxied based on the university’s Carnegie Classification.* Special-focus institutions, which primarily focus on one discipline (e.g., art institutes), represent the least complex structure, with gradually higher levels of complexity (and unionization efforts) at baccalaureate, master’s-granting, and doctoral/research institutions. This hypothesis is rooted in the dominant institutional logic of the institution. At institutions that only serve undergraduates, for instance, the institutional logic of a profession, family, or religion may seem tenable as the primary logic within the organization. In increasingly complex institutions, however, contingent faculty may feel that logics of the market and corporation predominate, leading to a desire for more formalized agreements secured through collective bargaining.

Data and Measures

To address these research questions, this study draws on data from several sources. The final dataset has an institution-year format, with one row per year for each institution.

Dependent Variable

The primary outcome variable is a binary indicator of whether a 4-year, private, nonprofit college or university held a union certification involving contingent faculty members in a particular calendar year. In order to develop this list, I examined monthly and annual union

ON THE TENUOUS TRACK

certification election reports from the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), which oversees all union elections at private organizations in the U.S., for January 2001 through December 2018 (NLRB, 2022a). I initially identified candidate institutions based on employer names that included “university,” “college,” “institute,” or “school.” I further narrowed the list of potential contingent faculty elections to cases in which the bargaining unit designation was “Professional or Technical” in order to exclude other common employee categories at colleges and universities (e.g., “Guards,” which frequently identifies union elections for campus security officers). From this pool of potential union certification elections for contingent faculty members, I reviewed the description of the voting unit associated with the NLRB case number. When the voting unit description included “adjunct faculty,” “part-time faculty,” “non-tenure-track faculty,” “contingent faculty,” “instructors,” “lecturers,” or similar terminology, I designated the election as a contingent faculty union certification election and recorded the date of the election. For each case that I identified as a contingent faculty union certification election in such a manner, I used the NLRB case number and vote date to search for contemporaneous coverage in regional and national media outlets to assist in verifying my interpretation. Similarly, I searched higher education media sources (e.g., *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *Inside Higher Ed*) to identify contingent faculty unionization votes that I had not identified in prior steps; this step yielded additional votes at Pacific Lutheran University and the University of La Verne (Flaherty, 2014; Jaschik, 2015). Table 1 provides a list of private universities that held a contingent union certification election between 2001 and 2018.²

Institution-level Variables

² I focus on union certification elections as the primary outcome because the NLRB only conducts such elections when at least 30 percent of workers sign a petition or cards indicating they would like to form a union (NLRB, 2022b), suggesting strong pre-existing interest and organizing efforts. Results that are restricted to successful unionization votes (see Table 4, column 5) yield similar findings.

ON THE TENUOUS TRACK

The source for several institution-level variables is the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), a series of studies conducted through the U.S. Department of Education. IPEDS variables come from direct downloads as well as standardized measures available through the Delta Cost Project and the Urban Institute (Hurlburt, Peek, & Sun, 2017; Urban Institute, 2021). One measure of interest from IPEDS is the number of students enrolled at the institution, expressed as the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) students in order to improve comparability between institutions. Along with the FTE student count, the Carnegie Classification serves as a proxy for the size and complexity of the institution. To measure the representation of contingent faculty members among the academic workforce at an institution, I also include the number of full-time and part-time faculty members. Because the counts for full-time and part-time faculty members were only collected every other year, I use the average of the preceding and succeeding years for each missing year. Another caveat in interpreting the outcomes for the variables representing the number of full-time and part-time faculty members is that some contingent faculty members have a full-time designation, and there may be conceptually meaningful differences between contingent faculty who work in full-time versus part-time roles. I also incorporated the religious affiliation measure from IPEDS based on preliminary information suggesting coordinated organization efforts among contingent faculty at Roman Catholic institutions (Pashman, 2016). I consolidated the numerous religious affiliations available through IPEDS into three classifications: not religiously affiliated, Roman Catholic affiliation, and other religious affiliation. An additional variable used for the descriptive summary is salary information for full-time faculty members; IPEDS did not collect comparable information for part-time faculty members.

Right-to-work Status of State

ON THE TENUOUS TRACK

As a measure of the strength of unions in each state, I tracked whether the state had passed “right-to-work” legislation by a given year. These “right-to-work” laws prevent unions from compelling workers to join as a condition of employment and prohibit arrangements through which employers automatically deduct union dues from an employee’s paycheck (NCSL, 2020). While they do not prohibit union activity altogether, such restrictions do present barriers to union activity. By 2018, there were 27 states with “right-to-work” legislation enacted, although only six passed such legislation during the years examined.

State Union Membership

In a related effort to measure how common union membership is among workers in a state, I added the percentage of workers in each state who were members of a union each year. Drawn from the Current Population Survey (CPS) of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), the value represents the percentage of wage and salary workers who were members of unions, among those who were at least 16 years old (U.S. BLS, 2020). The CPS also includes a measure for the percentage of workers who were represented by unions (including individuals who are not themselves members of a union), but in practice the two values are not substantially different. In the time period observed, state-level union membership rates ranged from a low of 1.6% in South Carolina in 2016 to a high of 26.1% in New York in 2005.

Prior Contingent Faculty Unionization Efforts in the State

In addition, I use a variant of the dependent variable to help account for prior unionization efforts specifically for contingent faculty. To do so, I control for the number of contingent faculty unionization votes previously held at private, 4-year colleges within a given state. The states with the most votes were California and New York, which each had 13 institutions that held unionization votes during the study period.

Political Ideology of State Legislature

As a broader measure of the state context, I relied on the NOMINATE measure of state government ideology from Berry and colleagues (2010), as updated in 2018 (Fording, 2018). This measure of government ideology is based on observed policy preferences rather than officials' self-identification. The rationale for using an ideological measure for the state legislature is that political actors at the state level oversee a range of policies that may affect contingent faculty members' propensity to unionize, such as means-tested benefits provided through the state. Broadly, scores closer to 0 correspond to more conservative legislative bodies, while scores closer to 100 correspond to more liberal legislative bodies. Arizona in 2011 and 2012 had the most conservative government ideology in the time period observed (with a value of 17.5), while Massachusetts in 2009 and 2010 had the most liberal (with a value of 73.6).

Methods and Results

To explore the longitudinal relationship between institution- and state-level characteristics and union certification elections for contingent faculty members, I rely on an event history analysis strategy, also known as hazard or survival analysis. This approach focuses on an event of interest, which in this case involves a 4-year private, nonprofit institution holding a formal vote on whether to certify a contingent faculty union. In each distinct time period, a hazard rate measures the risk that the event will occur (i.e., the instantaneous risk), given that the institution has not previously experienced the event of interest (Chen, 2012). Here, the term "risk" is value-neutral and does not imply a negative or positive connotation for the event. As Doyle (2006) notes, the related concept of "survival" conveys the probability that an institution will reach the next period without reaching the event (i.e., the probability that an institution will reach the next year without holding a contingent faculty election).

Because I rely on measures taken at discrete intervals (e.g., yearly enrollment counts at institutions), I use a discrete-time approach (Jenkins, 2008). In order to implement this discrete-time approach, I structured the data to allow one observation for each institution at each time interval observed (i.e., an institution-year format). Thus, for institutions that existed from 2001 through 2018, there would be 18 observations for the institution. To properly account for this data structure, I include binary indicator flags for each year in my models and cluster standard errors at the institution level. The data in this study are right-censored, meaning that not all institutions experience the event (i.e., a vote regarding a contingent faculty union) during the observed time period. Additionally, there is the potential for left-censoring of 4-year private, nonprofit institutions that held contingent faculty union certification elections prior to 2001.³

The following equation represents the binomial logistic regression model for this analysis (Singer & Willett, 2003):

$$\log \left(\frac{h_{ij}}{1 - h_{ij}} \right) = [\alpha_1 D_{2001ij} + \dots + \alpha_n D_{nij} + \dots + \alpha_{18} D_{2018ij}] + \chi_{ij}\beta + \psi_{ij}\nu$$

In this model, h_{ij} is the hazard of an institution i holding a vote to certify a contingent faculty union in year j , given that such a vote has not already occurred. The set of coefficients α_1 through α_{18} correspond to binary indicators for each year from 2001 through 2018. $\chi_{ij}\beta$ represents a vector of state-level covariates, including the percentage of wage and salary workers in the state who were members of unions in a given year j , the state government ideology in a given year j (on a scale in which higher values represent more liberal positions), and the number of previous contingent faculty unionization votes in the state. $\psi_{ij}\nu$, meanwhile, represents a

³ I have identified the University of San Francisco, which unionized in 1983, and Columbia College Chicago, in 1998, as rare examples of private institutions with contingent faculty unions formed prior to 2001.

vector of institution-level covariates. Among the controls used at the level of each institution i are the number of full-time equivalent students at the institution (expressed in hundreds), the number of part-time and full-time faculty members at the institution (expressed in tens), the religious affiliation of the institution (with three possible categories corresponding to no affiliation, a Roman Catholic affiliation, or some other religious affiliation), and the grouped Carnegie classification for the institution (doctoral/research universities, master's colleges and universities, baccalaureate colleges, and special-focus institutions). Notably, since state ideology and percent of workforce unionized are only available for U.S. states, five institutions from the District of Columbia are not included in the event history analysis.

Results

Descriptive statistics

For the first research question, Table 2 provides a summary of 4-year private, nonprofit institutions, both overall and by unionization vote status. In total, only 69 of the 1568 institutions (4.4 percent) held a union certification election for contingent faculty members during this time period. Strikingly, although these institutions were located in all 50 states and the District of Columbia, contingent faculty union certification elections took place in just 14 jurisdictions. Four states accounted for nearly 60 percent of the institutions that held contingent faculty union votes: California (13 institutions), New York (13 institutions), Massachusetts (8 institutions), and Illinois (6 institutions). This strong concentration of unionization efforts in several states aligns with the Adjunct Action and, subsequently, Faculty Forward campaigns of the SEIU, which targeted organizing efforts in a limited number of metropolitan areas (SEIU, 2020).

Institutions that held contingent faculty unionization votes differed from non-voting institutions on several dimensions. First, institutions that held a contingent faculty union vote had

ON THE TENUOUS TRACK

a median full-time equivalent student count (2,991) that was nearly three times as large as institutions that did not hold a vote (1,031). Second, at the institutions that held a union certification election for contingent faculty, the median salary for full-time faculty was \$81,378, substantially higher than the \$60,504 median elsewhere (although institutions that held votes also tended to be located in urban areas with relatively high costs of living). Third, only two institutions that had held contingent faculty unionization votes by 2018 were in states with “right-to-work” legislation (2.9 percent), compared to 41.0 percent in the sector as a whole. Finally, the Carnegie classification of institutions that held votes differed substantially from that of non-voting institutions. Institutions with contingent faculty unionization votes were predominantly doctoral (32.4 percent) or master’s-granting (41.2 percent), while non-voting institutions were mainly baccalaureate (35.1 percent) or special-focus (34.3 percent) institutions.

Event History Analysis

The results of the event history analysis are located in Table 3, which includes both state-level attributes ($\chi_{ij}\beta$) and institution-level characteristics ($\psi_{ij}\nu$) as covariates. All results are presented in odds ratios, calculated by exponentiating the log odds results from the binary logistic regression, where 1 represents parity and values greater than 1 represent higher odds of holding a contingent faculty unionization vote. Overall, the results align with the expectations set out in Hypotheses 1, 2, and 7; provide partial support for Hypothesis 6; and do not offer evidence in support of Hypotheses 3, 4, or 5. The primary results from Table 3 are substantially affirmed in a series of robustness checks shown in Table 4. Across the robustness checks, I revise the main model in six ways: excluding states that added “right-to-work” laws during the study period, using the percentage (rather than count) of prior contingent faculty unionization votes in

the state, adding a control for urbanicity, remove all theological seminaries, excluding contingent faculty union votes that were unsuccessful, and adding a control for “right-to-work” laws.

State Government Ideology (Hypothesis 1). Consistent with Hypothesis 1, the results in Table 3 demonstrate a positive relationship between a more liberal state government ideology and contingent faculty unionization votes, even after accounting for other variables in the model. Specifically, each one-point increase on the ideology scale (with higher values representing more liberal viewpoints) is associated with odds of holding a union vote that are 1.051 times higher. For reference, the observed range of government ideology scores is roughly 55 points. This relationship persists in supplemental models that explicitly control for a state’s “right-to-work” laws (see column 6 of Table 4).

State Unionization Measures (Hypotheses 2 and 3). Two measures relate to unionization within the state context. The first is the share of prior contingent faculty unionization votes that had been held in the state. Providing support for Hypothesis 2, I find that each additional prior union certification election for contingent faculty in a state is linked to 1.080 times higher odds of holding a subsequent contingent faculty unionization vote. On the second measure, although Hypothesis 3 had anticipated a relationship between the percent of the state workforce that is unionized and contingent faculty unionization, I find no such relationship.

Institutional Composition (Hypotheses 4 and 5). I also included several measures related to the composition of the institution in terms of the number of full-time equivalent students (for Hypothesis 4) and the number of part-time and full-time faculty (for Hypothesis 5). Although I expected that higher number of full-time equivalent students and part-time faculty would be associated with elevated odds of holding a contingent faculty unionization vote, I did not detect such a relationship in either case. These measures are the most granular in the model

that relate to workplace context, yet this evidence suggests that they are not significantly associated with unionization efforts above and beyond other variables.

Institutional Classification (Hypotheses 6 and 7). The final two measures accounted for two broad institutional characteristics, the institution's religious affiliation and Carnegie Classification. For Hypothesis 6, I had anticipated that religiously affiliated institutions would have lower odds of contingent faculty unionization than institutions that were not religiously affiliated. In partial support for this hypothesis, I find that the odds of contingent faculty unionization at an institution with a religious affiliation (other than Roman Catholicism) are just 0.147 times those of an institution with no religious affiliation; the difference between Roman Catholic institutions and institutions with no religious affiliation is not significant, however. For Hypothesis 7, I predicted that organizational complexity as proxied by Carnegie classification would be correlated with the odds of holding a contingent faculty unionization vote. In alignment with this hypothesis, the odds of holding a certification election for a contingent faculty union at a special-focus institution were just 0.196 times that of a doctoral/research institution, after controlling for other variables.

Discussion

This study traces the phenomenon of contingent faculty unionization as it expanded from a rarity to a routine occurrence at private institutions. In contrast to prior research, which has tended to focus on individual-level measures such as workplace satisfaction to predict faculty union voting behavior (e.g., Bornheimer, 1985; Hemmasi & Graf, 1993), this study emphasizes the relationship between unionization efforts and broader structural measures of state- and institution-level context. As a result, the findings offer several key insights that are relevant for unions, current contingent faculty, and prospective contingent faculty members alike.

First, I find a significant association between state government ideology and contingent faculty unionization votes (Hypothesis 1), with elevated odds for institutions in states with more liberal legislatures. This finding reinforces the importance of state political context in shaping the likelihood of unionization efforts for contingent faculty, likely through normative isomorphic forces as well as coercive isomorphic forces such as “right-to-work” legislation. Such stark differences based on state political context have profound implications for the employment conditions of contingent faculty in states with substantially different political environments.

Second, the results show a positive relationship between the number of prior contingent faculty unionization votes in the state and the odds of future votes (Hypothesis 2). This finding suggests that exposure to unionization activity among contingent faculty within the state can help mobilize future campaigns, presumably because later-adopters perceive that the unionization yielded favorable outcomes. This evidence of successful policy diffusion is all the more notable because some prior research has identified examples of “reverse” policy diffusion, in which adoption in one locale actively discourages diffusion nearby (e.g., Baker, 2019, Li, 2017). One natural channel for this diffusion is cross-employment among contingent faculty, who often simultaneously work at multiple institutions (U.S. House of Representatives, 2014). Importantly, though, the overall share of the state workforce that is unionized did not emerge as a significant predictor of contingent faculty unionization efforts, failing to support Hypothesis 3 and suggesting these efforts are not necessarily tied to broad-based union presence.

Third, despite being the two most detailed proxies for workplace experiences that this study examined, neither of the indicators of institutional composition—the number of full-time equivalent students and the number of part-time faculty (Hypotheses 4 and 5)—was significantly related to contingent faculty union elections. These results demonstrate some of the predictive

limitations of both isomorphism and institutional logics frameworks for contingent faculty unionization. The number of students is one of the most conspicuous indicators of institutional complexity that could result in market or corporation logics within a university, so the absence of a relationship on that dimension is quite surprising. Likewise, the null relationship for the part-time faculty count is noteworthy because it stands in contrast to prior studies indicating that greater density of social ties within a group can help achieve critical mass for social movements (Marwell et al., 1988). One alternative possibility is that the measure is too coarse to fully capture the relationship, since some contingent faculty work full-time for an institution.

Finally, the institutional classification measures affirm a role for both religious affiliation and Carnegie classification in explaining an institution's odds of contingent faculty unionization efforts (Hypotheses 6 and 7). The religiosity finding comports with the expectation that religiously affiliated institutions would be more likely to deploy institutional logics related to religion and family, which emphasize cohesion and solidarity rather than the formal negotiating processes involved in collective bargaining. The conspicuous exception is Roman Catholic institutions—in fact, 16 of the 22 religiously affiliated institutions that held a contingent faculty union vote during this period were Roman Catholic. One potential explanation for this distinction is that Catholic social teaching has historically emphasized the value of collective action in service of social justice efforts (Beyer, 2018). The results for Carnegie classification also broadly align with the expected institutional logics that would be deployed, with special-focus institutions (using logics of a profession, family, or religion) less likely to hold unionization votes than doctorate-granting institutions (using logics of the market or corporation).

Taken together, these findings suggest that unionization efforts hinge not only on the idiosyncratic, individual-level experiences of contingent faculty already working at an

institution, but also on environmental factors and institutional attributes that outsiders can observe and anticipate. In affirming several links between state context and institutional characteristics and the odds of contingent faculty unionization at private institutions, this study highlights that contingent faculty unionization efforts often conform to expectations based on isomorphism and institutional logics, with some exceptions worthy of future investigation.

Limitations

While this analysis offers insights into the emergence of unionization efforts at private universities, there are several limitations worth acknowledging. Most notably, it is difficult to interpret the reasons why a unionization vote has not taken place at an institution. The absence of a vote could suggest that the institution adequately addresses concerns among contingent faculty members, thereby obviating the perceived need for a union. Given the inherently precarious nature of these positions and the extent to which limited compensation and benefits are pervasive for contingent faculty (Childress, 2019), though, more common explanations may be a lack of resources to mobilize unionization efforts or an institution's efforts to deter faculty from forming a union without directly addressing the underlying concerns. Indeed, there is evidence of extensive campaigning on the part of institutions to deter their contingent faculty from unionizing, frequently invoking the logics of the family and religion as laid out in the theoretical framework (Pettit, 2019). A second limitation of this study is that it only identifies unionization efforts that received expressions of support from at least 30 percent of eligible workers, the threshold required for the NLRB to conduct a union certification election. This measurement constraint should not be interpreted as diminishing the importance of early-stage collective action among contingent faculty that has not yet reached the threshold for a union certification election. Indeed, some protracted unionization campaigns that began during the study period

have resulted in unionization votes in more recent years. Additionally, the measure of religiosity is rather coarse and may not fully capture underlying variation across denominations or by the extent to which religious affiliation actively guides institutional priorities. As a final limitation, while this study is informative about trends at private institutions writ large, it cannot predict with certainty if or when a particular institution will hold a union certification election.

Future Research

This line of research naturally extends to several avenues for future inquiry. In particular, subsequent studies could benefit from more recent data and additional measures. Given that contingent faculty unionization at private institutions was still relatively uncommon by 2018, each additional year of data would be especially instructive. If possible, it would also be desirable to obtain an indicator for the types of benefits that contingent faculty receive at a particular institution. Building on this study, future research could also explore the interrelationship between contingent faculty unionization and other labor movements across academia, such as those for graduate student workers (e.g., Lee et al., 2004), postdoctoral workers (e.g., Camacho & Rhoads, 2015), and other university staff (e.g., Selmo, 2004).

Additionally, future analysis could pay greater attention to the role of potential policy entrepreneurs, the extensively networked actors who champion a policy cause. For contingent faculty unionization, the most likely contender is SEIU, which has operated organizing campaigns in targeted metropolitan areas, most of which have been locations with multiple contingent faculty union votes (e.g., Boston, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Washington, D.C.). Yet the idea of SEIU as a policy entrepreneur presents a “chicken or the egg” challenge, since it is unclear whether SEIU primarily served as a facilitator for unionization efforts already inspired and directed through other networks, such as the New Faculty Majority organization and

the adj-l listserv. An extensive document analysis of materials from the SEIU's Adjunct Action and Faculty Forward campaigns, along with communications from the New Faculty Majority and campus unionization efforts, would provide more detail about the lineage of these efforts.

Conclusion

The types of efforts among contingent faculty that are catalogued in this study come at a pivotal moment for organized labor within the United States. Following a decades-long decline in union membership, just 6 percent of private-sector workers were union members as of 2021 (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2022). At the same time, a 2021 Gallup poll found public support for labor unions to be 68 percent, the highest approval rating since 1965 (Brenan, 2021). With broad support for unions yet low membership, private-sector unionization seems poised for expansion in the years ahead. Already, the recent groundswell of support for unionization has spurred a variety of highly publicized campaigns that have resulted in unions for workers at large multinational corporations, including Starbucks, Amazon, and Apple (Rosenbaum, 2022).

As unionization efforts continue within academia and in the private sector more broadly, it is critical to understand the conditions under which private-sector unionization is likely to flourish and what structural barriers constrain union formation. To that end, this study illustrates the value in considering state- and institution-level factors as antecedents to union formation. For both unions and individual faculty, this approach can bring into focus the sets of institutions where unionization efforts would be especially promising. It may also illuminate the need to re-imagine unionization strategies for institutions with certain organizational attributes. Ultimately, the success of emerging unionization campaigns will hinge on the ability to navigate the challenges and opportunities that these contextual factors represent.

References

- American Association of University Professors. (2022). Collective bargaining. Retrieved from <https://www.aaup.org/programs/collective-bargaining>
- Baker, D. J. (2019). Pathways to racial equity in higher education: Modeling the antecedents of state affirmative action bans. *American Educational Research Journal*, 56(5), 1861-1895. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831219833918>
- Battista, A. (2008). *The revival of labor liberalism*. Champlain, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Berry, W. D., Fording, R. C., Ringquist, E. J., Hanson, R. L., & Klarner, C. E. (2010). Measuring citizen and government ideology in the US states: A re-appraisal. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*, 10(2), 117-135. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/153244001001000201>
- Beyer, G. (2018). Research panel: Faculty unionization at religiously-affiliated institutions. *Journal of Collective Bargaining in the Academy*, (13), 36.
- Bornheimer, D. G. (1985). Conditions influencing faculty voting in collective bargaining elections. *Research in Higher Education*, 22(3), 291-305. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00974055>
- Brenan, M. (2021, September 2). Approval of labor unions at highest point since 1965. Retrieved from <https://news.gallup.com/poll/354455/approval-labor-unions-highest-point-1965.aspx>
- Brennan, J., & Magness, P. (2016). Are adjunct faculty exploited: Some grounds for skepticism. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 152(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3322-4>

ON THE TENUOUS TRACK

- Brown, W. W., & Stone, C. C. (1977). Academic unions in higher education: Impacts on faculty salary, compensation and promotions. *Economic Inquiry*, 15(3), 385-396.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-7295.1977.tb00482.x>
- Callaway, B., & Collins, W. J. (2018). Unions, workers, and wages at the peak of the American labor movement. *Explorations in Economic History*, 68, 95-118.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eeh.2017.08.003>
- Camacho, S., & Rhoads, R. A. (2015). Breaking the silence: The unionization of postdoctoral workers at the University of California. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 86(2), 295-325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2015.11777365>
- Chen, R. (2012). Institutional characteristics and college student dropout risks: A multilevel event history analysis. *Research in Higher Education*, 53(5): 487-505.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-011-9241-4>
- Childress, H. (2019). *The adjunct underclass*. University of Chicago Press.
- Chronicle of Higher Education. (2019). Tenure status of full-time and part-time faculty members, fall 2017. Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Tenure-Status-of-Faculty/246310>.
- Coalition on the Academic Workforce. (2012). "A portrait of part-time faculty members."
Retrieved from <http://www.academicworkforce.org/survey.html>.
- Currie, C. L. (2011). Pursuing Jesuit, Catholic identity and mission at US Jesuit colleges and universities. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 14(3), 346-357.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-160. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101>

Dinlersoz, E., Greenwood, J., & Hyatt, H. (2017). What businesses attract unions? Unionization over the life cycle of US establishments. *ILR Review*, 70(3), 733-766.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0019793916654926>

Dobbie, D., & Robinson, I. (2008). Reorganizing higher education in the United States and Canada: The erosion of tenure and the unionization of contingent faculty. *Labor Studies Journal*, 33(2), 117-140. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0160449X07301241>

Doyle, W. R. (2006). Adoption of merit-based student grant programs: An event history analysis. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 28(3), 259-285.

<https://doi.org/10.3102%2F01623737028003259>

Ehrenberg, R. G., & Zhang, L. (2005). Do tenured and tenure-track faculty matter?. *Journal of Human Resources*, 40(3), 647-659. <https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.XL.3.647>

Flaherty, C. (2014, February 10). "Double-Time." Inside Higher Ed.

<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/02/10/two-unions-court-adjuncts-philadelphia-market>.

Fording, R. C. (2018). State Ideology Data. Retrieved from <https://rcfording.com/state-ideology-data/>.

Freeman, D. S., & Kirkman-Liff, B. L. (1984). Trends in hospital unionization and a predictive model for unionizing success. *Hospital & Health Services Administration*, 29(6), 101-114.

Friedland, R., & Alford, R. (1991). "Bringing Society Back In: Symbols, Practices, and Institutional Contradictions." pp. 232–63 in *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis* (ed. W. Powell & P. DiMaggio). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gappa, J. M. (2000). The new faculty majority: Somewhat satisfied but not eligible for tenure. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2000(105), 77-86.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.10507>

Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1993). *The Invisible Faculty: Improving the Status of Part-Timers in Higher Education*. Jossey-Bass Inc.: San Francisco.

Garcia, R. J. (2019). Right-to-work laws: Ideology and impact. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 2019(15), 509-519. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-101518-042951>

Gehrke, S. J., & Kezar, A. (2015). Supporting non-tenure-track faculty at 4-year colleges and universities: A national study of deans' values and decisions. *Educational Policy*, 29(6), 926-960. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0895904814531651>

Goldey, G., Swank, E., Hardesty, C., & Swain, R. (2010). Union professors: Framing processes, mobilizing structures, and participation in faculty unions. *Sociological Inquiry*, 80(3), 331-353. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.2010.00337.x>

Harris, S., & Lumsden, D. B. (2006). Tenure policies and practices of American evangelical colleges and universities. Part 2: Institutions granting tenure. *Christian Higher Education*, 5(4), 341-364. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15363750600932916>

Haveman, H. A., & Rao, H. (1997). Structuring a theory of moral sentiments: Institutional and organizational coevolution in the early thrift industry. *American Journal of Sociology*, 102(6), 1606-1651. <https://doi.org/10.1086/231128>

Hemmasi, M., & Graf, L. A. (1993). Determinants of faculty voting behavior in union representation elections: A multivariate model. *Journal of Management*, 19(1), 13-32. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639301900102>

Hurlburt, S., & McGarrah, M. (2016). The shifting academic workforce: Where are the

- contingent faculty. Delta Cost Project at American Institutes for Research. Retrieved from <https://www.tiaainstitute.org/publication/shifting-academic-workforce>.
- Hurlburt, S., Peek, A., & Sun, J. (2017). Delta Cost Project database 1987–2015: Data file documentation. Retrieved from <https://deltacostproject.org/delta-cost-project-database>.
- Jaschik, S. (2015, January 2). “Big Union Win.” Inside Higher Ed. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/01/02/nlrb-ruling-shifts-legal-ground-faculty-unions-private-colleges>.
- Jenkins, S. (2008). “Survival Analysis with Stata.” Retrieved from <http://www.iser.essex.ac.uk/survival-analysis>.
- Kemerer, F. R., & Baldrige, J. V. (1981). Senates and unions: Unexpected peaceful coexistence. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 52(3), 256-264.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1981.11780141>
- Kezar, A., & Bernstein-Sierra, S. (2016). Contingent faculty as nonideal workers. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2016(176), 25-35. <https://doi.org/10.1002/he.20207>
- Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (2012). The changing faculty and student success: National trends for faculty composition over time. Pullias Center for Higher Education. Retrieved from <https://pullias.usc.edu/download/national-trends-faculty-composition-time/>
- Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2013). Institutionalizing equitable policies and practices for contingent faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 84(1), 56-87.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2013.11777278>
- Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2014). Governance as a catalyst for policy change: Creating a contingent faculty friendly academy. *Educational Policy*, 28(3), 425-462.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0895904812465112>

- Kochan, T. A., Yang, D., Kimball, W. T., & Kelly, E. L. (2019). Worker voice in America: Is there a gap between what workers expect and what they experience?. *ILR Review*, 72(1), 3-38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0019793918806250>
- Kroeger, T., McNicholas, C., Wilpert, M. V., & Wolfe, J. (2018). The state of graduate student employee unions: Momentum to organize among graduate student workers is growing despite opposition. Economic Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.epi.org/publication/graduate-student-employee-unions/>
- Lee, J. J., Oseguera, L., Kim, K. A., Fann, A., Davis, T. M., & Rhoads, R. A. (2004). Tangles in the tapestry: Cultural barriers to graduate student unionization. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 75(3), 340-361. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2004.11772259>
- Li, A. Y. (2017). Covet thy neighbor or “reverse policy diffusion”? State adoption of performance funding 2.0. *Research in Higher Education*, 58(7), 746-771. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-016-9444-9>
- Marwell, G., Oliver, P. E., & Pahl, R. (1988). Social networks and collective action: A theory of the critical mass. III. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(3), 502-534. <https://doi.org/10.1086/229028>
- McClendon, J. A., Wheeler, H. N., & Weikle, R. D. (1998). The individual decision to unionize. *Labor Studies Journal*, 23(3), 34-54. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0160449X9802300302>
- McNaughtan, J., García, H. A., & Nehls, K. (2017). Understanding the growth of contingent faculty. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2017(176), 9-26. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.20241>

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340-363.

<https://doi.org/10.1086/226550>

Mintzberg, H. (1980). Structure in 5's: A Synthesis of the Research on Organization Design.

Management Science, 26(3), 322-341. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.26.3.322>

Monks, J. (2007). The relative earnings of contingent faculty in higher education. *Journal of*

Labor Research, 28(3), 487-501. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12122-007-9002-5>

Myers, C. B. (2011). Union status and faculty job satisfaction: Contemporary evidence from the

2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, 34(4),

657-684. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2011.0028>

National Council of State Legislatures. (2020). “Right-to-work resources.” Retrieved from

<http://www.ncsl.org/research/labor-and-employment/right-to-work-laws-and-bills.aspx>.

National Labor Relations Board. (2022a). “Election reports.” Retrieved from

<https://www.nlr.gov/reports-guidance/reports/election-reports>

National Labor Relations Board. (2022b). “What we do – conduct elections.” Retrieved from

<https://www.nlr.gov/about-nlr/what-we-do/conduct-elections>.

National Science Foundation. (2019a). Doctorate recipients from U.S. universities: 2017. Table

46: Employment sector of doctorate recipients with definite postgraduation commitments for employment in the United States, by broad field of study: Selected years, 1997–2017.

Retrieved from <https://nces.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf19301/data>.

National Science Foundation. (2019b). Table 12-1. U.S. residing employed doctoral scientists

and engineers, by field of doctorate and sector of employment: 2017. Retrieved from

https://ncesdata.nsf.gov/doctoratework/2017/html/sdr2017_dst_12-1.html.

- Pache, A. C., & Santos, F. (2013). Inside the hybrid organization: Selective coupling as a response to competing institutional logics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(4), 972-1001. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0405>
- Pashman, M. (2016, January 26). "Students, faculty fight for unions on Catholic campuses." *Chicago Tribune*. Retrieved from <http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/ct-catholic-union-organizing-met-20160125-story.html>
- Patton, S. (2012, May 6). "The Ph.D. now comes with food stamps." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/article/From-Graduate-School-to/131795>.
- Pettit, E. (2019, March 29). "In Urging Faculty Not to Unionize, Marquette Cites Catholic Identity." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/article/In-Urging-Faculty-Not-to/246022>.
- Ponak, A., Thompson, M., & Zerbe, W. (1992). Collective bargaining goals of university faculty. *Research in Higher Education*, 33(4), 415-431. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00973764>
- Porter, S. R. (2013). The causal effect of faculty unions on institutional decision-making. *ILR Review*, 66(5), 1192-1211. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F001979391306600508>
- Rhoads, R. A., & Rhoades, G. (2005). Graduate employee unionization as symbol of and challenge to the corporatization of US research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76(3), 243-275. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2005.11772282>
- Rhoades, G. (2017). Bread and roses, and quality too? A new faculty majority negotiating the new academy. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 88(5), 645-671. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2016.1257310>

- Rhoades, G., & Rhoads, R. A. (2003). The public discourse of US graduate employee unions: Social movement identities, ideologies, and strategies. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26(2), 163-186. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2002.0035>
- Rosenbaum, E. (2022, June 2). The Amazon, Starbucks, Apple union push is capturing what a majority of all American workers now say they want. CNBC. <https://www.cnbc.com/2022/06/02/majority-of-american-workers-want-more-unionization-at-their-own-jobs.html>
- Selmo, B. J. (2004). *Perceptions of unionization: A study of female support staff at Harvard University and the HUCTW*. Harvard University. Unpublished dissertation.
- Service Employees International Union. (2019). "Faculty Forward." Retrieved from <http://seiufacultyforward.org/about-us/>
- Shulman, S., Hopkins, B., Kelchen, R., Persky, J., Yaya, M., Barnshaw, J., & Dunietz, S. J. (2017). Visualizing change: The annual report on the economic status of the profession, 2016-17. *Academe*, 103(2), 4. <https://www.aaup.org/report/visualizing-change-annual-report-economic-status-profession-2016-17>
- Singer, J. D., & Willett, J. B. (2003). *Applied longitudinal data analysis: Modeling change and event occurrence*. Oxford University Press.
- Skelcher, C., & Smith, S. R. (2015). Theorizing hybridity: Institutional logics, complex organizations, and actor identities: The case of nonprofits. *Public Administration*, 93(2), 433-448. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12105>
- Urban Institute (2021). Education Data Explorer. Retrieved from <https://educationdata.urban.org/data-explorer/>.

ON THE TENUOUS TRACK

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2020). “Data Retrieval: Labor Force Statistics (CPS). Table 5: Union affiliation of employed wage and salary workers by state.” Retrieved from

<https://www.bls.gov/webapps/legacy/cpslutab5.htm>

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2022). “Data Retrieval: Labor Force Statistics (CPS). Table 3. Union affiliation of employed wage and salary workers by occupation and industry.”

Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/cps/cpslutabs.htm>

Waltman, J., Bergom, I., Hollenshead, C., Miller, J., & August, L. (2012). Factors contributing to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among non-tenure-track faculty. *The Journal of*

Higher Education, 83(3), 411-434. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2012.11777250>

Zhang, L., Ehrenberg, R. G., & Liu, X. (2015). Changing faculty employment at four-year colleges and universities in the United States (No. w21827). National Bureau of

Economic Research. <https://www.nber.org/papers/w21827>

ON THE TENUOUS TRACK

Table 1

List of certification elections for contingent faculty unions, 2001-2018

UNITID	Institution Name	State	NLRB Case	Vote Date	Outcome
165662	Emerson College	MA	01-RC-21313	2001-06	PASS
190770	Dowling College	NY	29-RC-09859	2002-08	PASS
194310	Pace University	NY	02-RC-22795	2004-05	PASS
131469	George Washington University	DC	05-RC-15624	2004-06	PASS
168005	Suffolk University	MA	01-RC-21965	2006-02	PASS
144281	Columbia College Chicago	IL	13-RC-21249	2006-04	PASS
192864	Marymount Manhattan College	NY	02-RC-23102	2006-06	PASS
192323	Le Moyne College	NY	03-RC-11778	2007-12	PASS
195173	St. Francis College	NY	29-RC-11842	2010-03	PASS
148627	St. Xavier University	IL	13-RC-21897	2010-03	FAIL
192749	Manhattanville College	NY	02-RC-023568	2011-02	PASS
144883	East-West University	IL	13-RC-022017	2011-05	PASS
148627	St. Xavier University (2)	IL	13-RC-022025	2011-06	PASS
131159	American University	DC	05-RC-070027	2012-01	PASS
212106	Duquesne University	PA	06-RC-080933	2012-06	PASS
131496	Georgetown University	DC	05-RC-100905	2013-04	PASS
117520	Life Chiropractic College West	CA	32-RC-106833	2013-07	PASS
164739	Bentley University	MA	01-RC-104671	2013-09	FAIL
168148	Tufts University	MA	01-RC-109106	2013-09	PASS
236230	Pacific Lutheran University	WA	N/A	2013-10	WITHDREW
125763	Whittier College	CA	21-RC-115867	2013-12	PASS
166452	Lesley University	MA	01-RC-118179	2014-01	PASS
117140	University of La Verne	CA	21-RC-115880	2014-02	WITHDREW
131520	Howard University	DC	05-RC-123970	2014-04	PASS
163295	Maryland Institute College of Art	MD	05-RC-123986	2014-04	PASS
167358	Northeastern University	MA	01-RC-124413	2014-04	PASS
118888	Mills College	CA	32-RC-125058	2014-04	PASS
236595	Seattle University	WA	19-RC-122863	2014-05	PASS
122454	San Francisco Art Institute	CA	20-RC-126147	2014-05	PASS
173665	Hamline University	MN	18-RC-127335	2014-06	PASS
215442	Point Park University	PA	06-RC-127553	2014-06	PASS
174914	University of St. Thomas	MN	18-RC-129281	2014-07	FAIL
245883	Antioch University Seattle	WA	19-RC-128561	2014-07	PASS
117168	Laguna College of Art and Design	CA	21-RC-128268	2014-07	PASS
110370	California College of the Arts	CA	32-RC-134175	2014-09	PASS
195234	The College of Saint Rose	NY	03-RC-133447	2014-09	PASS
230825	Burlington College	VT	01-RC-138050	2014-11	PASS
230852	Champlain College	VT	01-RC-138052	2014-11	PASS
162654	Goucher College	MD	05-RC-139478	2014-11	PASS
231059	St. Michael's College	VT	01-RC-138466	2014-12	PASS
113698	Dominican University	CA	20-RC-140506	2014-12	PASS

ON THE TENUOUS TRACK

123554	Saint Mary's College of California	CA	32-RC-139812	2014-12	PASS
179867	Washington University in St. Louis	MO	14-RC-141308	2014-12	PASS
120403	Otis College of Art and Design	CA	31-RC-139991	2014-12	PASS
164988	Boston University	MA	01-RC-139754	2015-01	PASS
168148	Tufts University (2)	MA	01-RC-142234	2015-01	PASS
164739	Bentley University (2)	MA	01-RC-141995	2015-02	PASS
215655	Robert Morris University	PA	06-RC-145392	2015-03	PASS
179894	Webster University	MO	14-RC-149541	2015-04	FAIL
191968	Ithaca College	NY	03-RC-150147	2015-05	PASS
131876	Trinity Washington University	DC	05-RC-151107	2015-05	PASS
195474	Siena College	NY	03-RC-150383	2015-06	PASS
195474	Siena College (2)	NY	03-RC-151213	2015-06	PASS
189097	Barnard College	NY	02-RC-154022	2015-09	PASS
144050	University of Chicago	IL	13-RC-162896	2015-11	PASS
165662	Emerson College (2)	CA	31-RC-162979	2015-11	PASS
144050	University of Chicago (2)	IL	13-RC-164309	2015-12	PASS
165015	Brandeis University	MA	01-RC-163352	2015-12	PASS
193900	New York University	NY	29-RC-163860	2015-12	PASS
123961	University of Southern California	CA	31-RC-164868	2016-01	PASS
123961	University of Southern California (2)	CA	31-RC-164871	2016-01	PASS
197230	Wells College	NY	03-RC-166366	2016-01	PASS
198419	Duke University	NC	10-RC-169472	2016-03	PASS
146719	Loyola University Chicago	IL	13-RC-168082	2016-03	PASS
115728	Holy Names University	CA	32-RC-170352	2016-04	PASS
164988	Boston University (2)	MA	01-RC-171016	2016-04	PASS
120184	Notre Dame de Namur	CA	20-RC-172076	2016-04	PASS
179159	St. Louis University	MO	14-RC-173981	2016-05	PASS
191968	Ithaca College (2)	NY	03-RC-173675	2016-05	PASS
164270	McDaniel College	MD	05-RC-175386	2016-05	PASS
147767	Northwestern University	IL	13-RC-177943	2016-06	FAIL
174127	Minneapolis College of Art and Design	MN	18-RC-182546	2016-10	PASS
173045	Augsburg College	MN	18-RC-186094	2016-11	PASS
129525	University of Hartford	CT	01-RC-187989	2016-12	PASS
211088	Arcadia University	PA	04-RC-194273	2017-04	PASS
179867	Washington University in St. Louis (2)	MO	14-RC-196901	2017-05	FAIL
221999	Vanderbilt University	TN	10-RC-193205	2017-06	WITHDREW
129941	University of New Haven	CT	01-RC-197669	2017-06	FAIL
175005	St. Catherine University	MN	18-RC-199024	2017-06	FAIL
191241	Fordham University	NY	02-RC-207806	2017-11	PASS
131520	Howard University (2)	DC	05-RC-208474	2017-11	PASS
193584	Nazareth College of Rochester	NY	03-RC-218093	2018-05	PASS

Note. UNITID refers to the unique institution identifier in IPEDS. Some institutions held multiple elections for contingent faculty unions (e.g., separate elections by employee classification or school).

Table 2

Descriptive summary of institution characteristics (2018), by contingent faculty unionization vote status

	All 4-year private, nonprofits	Held contingent faculty unionization vote?	
		Yes	No
Number of institutions	1,568	69	1,499
States/districts	51	14	51
Students (median)	1,109	2,991	1,031
Full-time faculty salary (median)	\$61,389	\$81,378	\$60,504
Share of faculty part-time	0.500	0.475	0.500
Roman Catholic affiliation	0.139	0.232	0.135
Located in right-to-work state	0.410	0.029	0.428
Carnegie classification			
Doctoral/research	0.075	0.324	0.062
Master's	0.253	0.412	0.245
Baccalaureate	0.341	0.162	0.351
Special-focus	0.331	0.103	0.343

Table 3*Survival analysis results – odds ratios*

Variables	Coefficient
State government ideology (higher = more liberal)	1.051*** (0.013)
Prior unionization votes in state	1.080* (0.034)
Percent of state workforce unionized	0.986 (0.039)
Full-time equivalent students (100s)	1.004 (0.002)
Part-time faculty members (10s)	1.002 (0.003)
Full-time faculty members (10s)	1.000 (0.002)
Religious affiliation (<i>ref.</i> = <i>no affiliation</i>)	
Roman Catholic	0.645 (0.260)
Other religious affiliation	0.147*** (0.081)
Carnegie group (<i>ref.</i> = <i>doctoral/research</i>)	
Master's	1.049 (0.548)
Baccalaureate	0.442 (0.253)
Special-focus institution	0.196** (0.120)
Observations	19,553
Year FE	Yes
Years observed	2001-2018
Log likelihood	-1167

Note. Standard errors in parentheses.*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

ON THE TENUOUS TRACK

Table 4

Robustness checks for survival analysis

Variables	(1) Excluding states that added right-to- work laws	(2) Prior votes in state as percent (rather than count)	(3) Adding control for urbanicity	(4) Removing all seminaries	(5) Excluding unsuccessful unionization votes	(6) Adding control for right-to- work law
State gov. ideology (higher = more liberal)	1.046** (0.014)	1.040** (0.014)	1.048*** (0.013)	1.050*** (0.013)	1.054*** (0.014)	1.031* (0.013)
Prior unionization votes in state	1.081* (0.035)	1.226*** (0.038)	1.076* (0.035)	1.078** (0.034)	1.103** (0.036)	1.105** (0.037)
Percent of state workforce unionized	0.988 (0.039)	1.011 (0.041)	0.994 (0.040)	0.994 (0.040)	0.981 (0.040)	0.962 (0.043)
Full-time equivalent students (100s)	1.004 (0.002)	1.005* (0.002)	1.004 (0.002)	1.004 (0.002)	1.005 (0.002)	1.005 (0.003)
Part-time faculty members (10s)	1.002 (0.003)	1.003 (0.003)	1.002 (0.003)	1.002 (0.003)	1.002 (0.003)	1.001 (0.003)
Full-time faculty members (10s)	1.000 (0.002)	0.999 (0.002)	1.000 (0.002)	1.000 (0.002)	1.000 (0.002)	1.000 (0.002)
Religious affiliation (<i>ref. = no affiliation</i>)						
Roman Catholic	0.665 (0.268)	0.627 (0.257)	0.635 (0.261)	0.649 (0.263)	0.647 (0.279)	0.609 (0.246)
Other religious affiliation	0.153*** (0.084)	0.148*** (0.078)	0.157*** (0.087)	0.159*** (0.088)	0.106*** (0.062)	0.169*** (0.091)
Carnegie group (<i>ref. = doctoral/research</i>)						
Master's-granting	1.044 (0.544)	0.974 (0.509)	1.123 (0.602)	1.041 (0.544)	1.274 (0.758)	1.111 (0.585)
Baccalaureate	0.449 (0.256)	0.395 (0.230)	0.615 (0.370)	0.439 (0.251)	0.601 (0.380)	0.466 (0.269)
Special-focus institution	0.196** (0.120)	0.195** (0.119)	0.189** (0.119)	0.278* (0.167)	0.262* (0.175)	0.205* (0.127)
“Right-to-work” law in state	-	-	-	-	-	0.085** (0.072)
Urbanicity (<i>ref. = urban</i>)						
Suburban	-	-	0.478* (0.168)	-	-	-
Town/rural/other	-	-	0.161* (0.114)	-	-	-
Observations	17,369	19,553	19,553	18,517	19,409	19,553
Log likelihood	-1159	-1117	-1135	-1156	-1084	-1147

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. *** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05