Precarious Professionals: Non-Tenure-Track Faculty in Southern Ontario Universities

by

Louise Birdsell Bauer

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Sociology
University of Toronto

© Copyright by Louise Birdsell Bauer, 2018
Abstract

While precarious work is associated with non-professional workers, the emerging case of non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) calls for a new framework building on scholarship on both precarious and professional work. An in-depth case study of NTTF in southern Ontario shows how a new phenomenon of ‘precarious professionals’ is emerging. Drawing on sixty semi-structured interviews with faculty members, university administrators and union representatives across southern Ontario, I analyze workers’ experiences in temporary contract work in the academic profession, and their views on the way certain types of professional work are valued or devalued. Building off previous literature on precarious and professional work, this thesis defines precarious professionals as highly skilled workers who do professional work that is devalued. Their experiences in temporary contract work marginalize them economically and professionally in complex and compounding ways that trap them between identifying as precarious workers and as professionals. Union organizers and activists draw on a two-pronged approach that addresses both dimensions of precarious worker and professional identities. This thesis shows variation in workers’ experiences, suggesting that not all temporary contract workers become precarious professionals, and shows how that variation can be explained.
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Chapter 1
Precarious Professional Work, Austerity, and Organized Labour in the Academic Profession

In the last few decades temporary contract work has proliferated as employers seek to cut costs and maintain flexibility for their institutions. Though temporary work has often been associated with unskilled or low skilled non-professional work, such as warehouse workers or janitorial staff, increasingly high skilled professional workers are being hired on temporary contracts. Yet, we know very little about what this means for professional workers. Do professional workers on temporary contracts feel marginalized? Why or why not? Do professional workers on temporary contracts have similar or different experiences as permanently employed professionals? Do professional workers on temporary contracts have similar or different experiences across occupation and industry? Do some professional workers in temporary contracts receive greater recognition for their work than others, and if they do, how can we explain this? Finally, what, if any, forms of resistance emerge from precarious professionals and how do they extend our understanding of resistance among both precarious and professional workers?

While precarious work is a phenomenon often associated with non-professional workers, the case of non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) calls for a new framework building on scholarship on both precarious work and the professions. This thesis shows how a new phenomenon of ‘precarious professionals’ is emerging, drawing on a case study of NTTF in southern Ontario. NTTF include university teachers who teach on a per-course basis, who are not employed in the tenure stream, and who are not graduate students. They are often referred to as contract academic staff, sessional instructors, sessional lecturers, and adjunct faculty members. In the following chapter, I argue that in the context of austerity measures in Ontario, underfunded teaching at
universities and colleges became the site for a debate about temporary contract work in the professions, making it an excellent case through which to analyze how professional workers become precarious. NTTF are also an important case to examine with the respect to professional work because, like permanently employed TTF, they balance multiple professional activities – such as teaching, research and service – allowing us to better examine how professionals become associated with these different occupational practices. This allows for investigation into the extent to which temporary contract work in the professions is gendered, and the way colleagues, managers, employers, and students ascribe value to academic professionals. I argue throughout the thesis that this is best examined by looking at the lived experiences of workers at the micro-level.

By focusing on this case, I show how precarious professionals are different from both ideal-typical precarious workers, and ideal-typical professionals. Precarious professionals are workers who do skilled work that is professionally devalued: that is, not sufficiently recognized by colleagues, managers, and employers. Their work is subject to gendered values reinforced by occupational and industrial segregation. Similar to precarious workers, precarious professionals are subject to difficult working conditions. These working conditions put a strain on their professional development, putting them in a bind between surviving as precarious workers and developing as professionals. Precarious professionals therefore experience a trap: they are marginalized as professionals, which limits their ability to gain full-time permanent employment in their profession. This limitation reinforces their status as temporary contract workers. Like both precarious and professional workers, dimensions of social location of gender, race, and socioeconomic status influence precarious professionals’ experiences. As shown by worker resistance among NTTF in southern Ontario, some precarious professionals resist marginalization by building recognition of their work in the broader public sphere, mirroring
some organizing by precarious workers in the health care sector and reflecting debates in their profession about the value of teaching.

This thesis is organized as follows: in this first chapter, I provide an overview of my theoretical framework, describe the context for this research as the restructuring and use of temporary work in the neoliberal economy of Ontario, and elaborate on my methodology. I argue that in the context of austerity measures in Ontario, debates around the devaluing of teaching provide an excellent context to understand how professional workers become precarious. The research design employed in this thesis addresses dimensions intersecting with precarious professionals’ marginalization, including industrial segregation, and marginalization along gendered lines. I describe how my methods address the key questions posed at the beginning of this chapter.

In the second chapter, I build off scholarship on precarious work, and scholarship on gender and work, showing how temporary contract work can be feminized, as argued by Vosko (2000), but also masculinized, and that this distinction should be accounted for in analyzing precarious professionals. Drawing on processes of both occupational and industrial segregation, I show how certain types of professional work are given greater recognition by colleagues, managers and employers. Moreover, demonstrating the recognition all temporary contract workers receive from students, I show how the social relations of work matter. Further developing Rogers (2000) argument, I contend that the recognition of skilled work varies based on who is giving recognition. Thus the way skilled work is recognized – and by whom – should take centre stage, rather than skill, in understanding how workers become marginalized in their profession.
In the third chapter of this thesis, I argue that we need to examine the complex ways that economic and cultural conditions of work intersect to influence how professional workers are marginalized. In order to do so, I move beyond contemporary studies of precarious work that focus on issues of job security and working conditions. Drawing on interviews with NTTF and TTF, I outline the specific ways that working conditions at the micro-level impact NTTF’s professional development and integration, showing the complex intersections of everyday working conditions, professional identity, and also the ways that workers’ social location influences their experiences of temporary contract work. I argue that the working conditions of NTTF are generally not experienced by TTF, with a few exceptions. Rather, working conditions in temporary contract arrangements disadvantage workers in complex and compounding ways.

In the fourth chapter of this thesis, I argue that precarious professionals resist marginalization by reasserting the value of their feminized work, and show how this resistance is thus linked to processes of renewal in the academic profession. I argue that by reasserting the value of teaching, workers – primarily women in the Humanities – have led a movement of NTTF that has resulted in a wider public debate around precarious professionals and also made modest gains for NTTF across the province, in addition to making social links to broader labour movements such as the Fight for $15 and Fairness. This suggests a social movement unionism among precarious professionals. More specifically, it points to some of the ways that precarious professionals might work as key actors in labour movements in conjunction with students, non-professional workers, and community members outside of universities and colleges. Precarious professionals’ resistance may hold potential for renewal of the academic profession in ways that are unexpectedly in line with permanently employed academic professionals. Thus, in addition to building on the scholarship on social movement unionism and organizing, showing how these are
reflected in precarious professionals’ struggles for recognition and security, I show how resistance among precarious professionals is in line with professional renewal more generally.

This thesis brings together economic and cultural inequalities at work and synthesizes scholarship on precarious work, gender and work, the professions, and worker resistance. In this thesis, I extend the literature on precarious work by showing how the feminization of work (Vosko 2000) – a dimension associated with precarious work – intersects with professional values to reinforce workers’ marginalization. Prior research has not analyzed in-depth how feminization influences the way professional work is recognized by manifold actors. This omission is largely due to precarious work scholars’ focus on non-professional work. I also extend the precarious work literature by showing how work that might be considered precarious – i.e. temporary contract work – should be analyzed at the micro-level to understand the variation in how work is recognized, and how to further define precarious professionals.

Finally, drawing on workers’ lived experiences I show how, at the micro-level, economic insecurity and working conditions combine in myriad ways to marginalize professional workers economically and culturally, reinforcing their status as temporary workers. This has a compounding effect where they are constantly compromising one thing for another – for example, they sacrifice time to commute from campus to campus to gain money from a contract, or they sacrifice money from an alternate job to gain time and energy in attempt to apply for more full-time jobs, and so on. This compounding effect of working conditions in the professional realm is also absent from existing scholarship on precarious work.

This analysis is one of the first to explore the extent to which professional workers can be considered precarious workers. Professions scholars have often ignored professionals on the margins, with the exception of Armstrong (1993) who looks at the nurses’ struggle to
professionalize, and scholarship on the myriad ways racialized and indigenous professionals, are marginalized (See e.g. Wingfield 2009; Wingfield 2007; Wing Sue et al. 2007; Ramos 2012). Yet, certainly professionals are marginalized in multiple ways, including but not limited to dimensions of social location such as racialization. This thesis operates on the assumption that professionals can be marginalized both economically and professionally in myriad ways not considered in the professions literature.

Sociologists of work have focused on skill and the way deskilling works to disempower workers (See e.g. Smith 1998; Smith 1994; Steinberg 1990; Vallas 1990). However, in her study of temp workers in the clerical and legal industries, Rogers (2000) contended that recognition, not skill, should be of focus in understanding workers’ marginalization. Building off Rogers (2000) work, I argue that the recognition of skilled professional work varies by different social actors, and this recognition matters in terms of professional status. I echo Rogers’ point that the way skilled work is recognized – not the control over skill itself – is key to understanding how workers become marginalized in their profession. This is not to say control over skill is not important – indeed, in chapter four, I demonstrate how retaining skill is a prominent theme among all professional workers. But for temporary contract workers, the way skill is recognized by professional colleagues, managers, and employers is more important than control over skill. This is because colleagues, managers and employers’ recognition – or lack of recognition – is central to advancement and success in their profession.

Literature on union renewal and new forms of organizing has emerged suggesting that workers have created new alliances with social movements, and adopted some of the strategies and tactics of social movements. Increasingly, union organizers and activists have targeted the state and employment sectors, rather than single employers, bringing their struggles to a larger and more public stage. The fourth chapter of this thesis extends this literature to show how
Professional workers embrace social movement unionism to address key issues in temporary contract employment in their profession, including the ways this impacts their professional work. Precarious professionals’ resistance is about contesting the employment practices that they feel have degraded their professional work, but also about renewing the profession more generally.

In addition to contributing to literature on precarious work, professional work, and worker organizing, the empirical focus of this thesis contributes to the study of non-tenure-track faculty in Canada, a topic which has been sparsely researched, with the exception of Rajagopal’s study of non-tenure-stream faculty in Ontario published over 15 years ago (Rajagopal 2002).

Public debates in Canada on NTTF and their impact have emerged, yet they are grounded in very little empirical understanding of NTTF as a case (See e.g. Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations 2016a; Globe Editorial 2015; Basen 2014). Though research on NTTF in North America is limited, some scholars have examined the issue of job insecurity and professional identity of NTTF (Rajagopal and Farr 1992; Rajagopal 2002; Robinson 2013; Gappa and Leslie 1993; Stewart, Ornstein, and Drakich 2009), the educational ramifications of using NTTF (Figlio, Schapiro, and Soter 2013; Robinson 2013), and the attempts to organize NTTF (Tirelli 1997; American Federation of Teachers 2002; Rhoades 1998). Despite this body of research which raises questions about the impact of temporary contract hiring on the academic profession, there is relatively little contemporary research on NTTF in Canada and thus the impact of temporary contract hiring in the academic profession is unknown, though highly speculated upon in public debates. An empirical study of NTTF in Canadian universities is also important given the stronger autonomy of public universities in Canada to dictate hiring policies (Clark et al. 2009). Public universities in Canada are given latitude in hiring practices more so than in the US where the state has intervened on non-tenure-track faculty issues (House Committee on Education and the Workforce Democratic Staff 2014). That public universities in
Canada and Ontario have some autonomy in their hiring practices and policies, while also being constrained by a framework of collective bargaining and the threat of legal strikes, provides a unique site to research publicly funded, unionized employment in the academic profession. This thesis gives a glimpse into the experiences of NTTF, their working conditions and their resistance, providing some insights into the academic profession in southern Ontario, and informing broader contemporary public debates.

1 Precarious Work and Professional Work: Identifying the Gaps

Contemporary labour scholars have examined the emergence and persistence of precarious and nonstandard forms of work including part-time and temporary work (See e.g. Hudson 2007; Kalleberg 2003; Fudge and Vosko 2001; Duffy and Pupo 1992). Research has examined broad global and national trends toward precarious work (Standing 2011; Kalleberg 2009); the relationship between economic and organizational restructuring and precarious work (Cranford 2005; Rhoades 1998; Kalleberg 2003; Fox and Sugiman 1999; Smith 1997); precarious work and changing employment relationships (Vosko 2000a; Fudge and Vosko 2001; Cranford, Vosko, and Zukewich 2003; Bosch 2004). These contributions have laid out important context for understanding how precarious work is increasing at the level of the labour market, and is produced by a certain set of economic and organizational choices and constraints. Comparative work across global contexts has also informed our understanding of precarious forms of work as a global phenomenon intertwined with processes of restructuring, globalization and neoliberal political and economic transitions (Silver 2003; Agarwala 2013; Chun 2009; Standing 2011). However, what has not been explored is how economic and cultural conditions of work intersect at the micro-level to influence how professional workers are marginalized. In
order to do so, we need to examine professional workers’ lived experience in temporary contract work and contrast them with professional workers employed on a permanent basis.

In her foundational book, Vosko (2000) outlines how the notion of the Standard Employment Relationship (SER) was a *normative* model employed in post-WWII in which the working class compromised by “exchang(ing) its historic attachment to craft-based production for the promise of greater security in the mass production system.” (23). The SER in part emerged as an effort to get men jobs in the post-war economy, but as Vosko notes, unlike many commodities, labour is bound up with workers and thus also has a social character. That is, employment relationships are linked to gendered expectations and gendered trends such as the need for women to fill men’s jobs during periods of labour shortage. Vosko emphasizes how both change and continuity in gender relations influence employment relationships in contemporary society. The Temporary Employment Relationship (TER) is defined in contradistinction to the SER in that it usually involves several employers, has defined end dates unlike indefinite employment contracts, little job security, and is rarely unionized (30). The emergence of the TER was intimately tied to the emergence of a female-dominated Temporary Help Industry in the 1950s (Vosko 2000:30; Hatton 2011). Yet, it was also a corollary of women entering the labour market who had previously done unpaid work, and the historic devaluation of women’s work was taken advantage of by employers who sought flexibility in hiring practices based on fluctuations in the market. It is important to note that this was not a new phenomenon but one grounded in centuries of exclusion of women workers, racialized workers, and migrant workers (2000:75) from the SER.

Precarious work as a term and concept has been developed in favour of the ‘standard’ and ‘non-standard’ conceptual framework, which has been critiqued for being too narrow in how it
assesses work related dimensions (Cranford and Vosko 2006:44). Scholars define precarious work as “forms of employment involving atypical employment contracts, limited social benefits and statutory entitlements, job insecurity, low job tenure, low earnings, poor working conditions and high risk of ill health” (Cranford, Vosko, and Zukewich 2003:455). Precarious work encompasses multiple dimensions including employment status (full-time or part-time), form of employment (permanent or temporary), labour market security, social context, social location, and control and contingency (Vosko 2006:11; Cranford and Vosko 2006:44). As Cranford and Vosko (2006) emphasize dimensions of social location like race and gender shape experience in precarious employment. Yet, the role of gender segmentation in occupation in industry (Vosko 2000) remains unclear in the context of precarious professional work. What makes professional workers precarious – if at all? In addition to this, what role does the gendering of jobs (Acker 1992) play in making professionals precarious – or not? How do forces like occupational and industrial segregation reinforce professional workers’ status as temporary contract workers?

In the professions literature, there is little in-depth analysis of the impact of temporary contract work, and the working conditions associated with it, on professional integration, professional development, and workers’ professional identity. Literature on the professions has focused on how the content of professional work is maintained through the protection of professional jurisdictions (Abbott 1988) and professional projects (Abbott 1988; Freidson 2001; Leicht and Fennell 2001). Professionals who are on the margins are oft overlooked, in favour of analysis of those who define or transform their professional fields, or act as gatekeepers of professional jurisdictions (Gieryn 1983). Scholars have begun to ask how restructuring and the shifting organizational context of professional work have influenced the professions and professional work, but this work is preliminary. At the macro-level, scholars have identified how post-Fordist transformations and new forms of work organization have changed professional
work (Leicht and Fennell 2001; Leicht and Fennell 1997; Crowley et al. 2010; Freidson 2001; Weinbaum and Page 2014). Leicht and Fennel (2001) describe the proletarianization of professionals as “the loss of earnings, power and prestige that often accompanies the loss of professional prerogatives. Proletarianized professionals work in contexts where none of their prerogatives remain, and the content, control, and location of the work are managed by outsiders.” (Leicht and Fennell 2001:8). However, the authors do not delve into the micro- and meso-level processes of how professionals are marginalized, nor do they look in depth at the effects of these processes on professionals themselves. Moreover, these debates are not sufficiently informed by gender analysis, such as that of Vosko (2000) and Rogers (2000), which help understand to some extent the role of gendered occupations of industries in shaping which work is precarious and which is not. Thus, much remains to be done to understand the impact of temporary employment on professionals. What is needed is a synthesis of scholarship on precarious employment and gender with the professions literature to gain a more well-rounded understanding how professional workers, particularly those working in temporary contracts, become precarious professionals.

2 The State, Academic Labour Market and Unions in Ontario

This analysis of precarious professionals is situated within a context of restructuring and austerity in the public sector. In Ontario, the state has made considerable cuts to postsecondary education¹ in the past 20 years, particularly relative to other provinces. In Ontario, these cuts occurred primarily during the Mike Harris provincial government of the 1990s and 2000s (Jones 2004). In her research on NTTF Rajagopal (2002) argues that Ontario’s economic deficit during

¹ I use the term postsecondary education vs. higher education, except when cited in quotes or journal titles, since the former is specific to the Canadian and Ontarian context.
the 1990s explains budgetary problems and restrictions on faculty spending. Federally, postsecondary education in Ontario receives the least amount of transfers per capita (Rae 2005). Public university tuition for undergraduate students is also higher in Ontario relative to regional counterparts. In Ontario, the average undergraduate tuition is currently the highest in the country (Statistics Canada 2013), and Ontario universities also have the lowest per-student funding of all universities in Canada. This makes students (and therefore instructional staff) an important source of revenue. Furthermore, job cuts have occurred at smaller universities like Nipissing and Wilfred Laurier, where universities could no longer afford to employ faculty.

The market for university teaching has indeed undergone important changes in supply and demand, increasing competition for both temporary and permanent positions. Demand changes based on a variety of factors, like undergraduate enrolment as was seen in the 2003 “double cohort” year in Ontario (Jones 2004; T. Healy 2002), and the market requires varying degrees of teaching labour based on such fluctuating demands. On the supply side, there is a surplus of qualified workers in the contemporary academic labour market in Ontario. In 2006, the Premier of Ontario announced an additional 12,000 spaces for PhD students, an increase of 55%, promising to add 2000 more spaces by 2010. Much debate ensued. One of Canada’s national news outlets, The Globe and Mail, released a piece interrogating whether these increased spaces would also see increased hiring of PhD graduates into jobs (Chiose 2013). Thus, a debate emerged about the labour market outcomes for PhD graduates, and there was a subsequent focus on the prevalence of precarious work in academia in both media and scholarly discourse. Demand factors, such as the slow pace of growth of TTF positions, and the prohibition of mandatory retirement also should be taken as important context for understanding the academic labour market in Canada and Ontario.
Precarious work in Ontario has grown in multiple sectors, as shown by the Lewchuk et al. (2015) study on workers in the GTA. Their study found that only 51% of workers in Ontario have permanent full-time jobs, while 9% have permanent part-time jobs, and 40% have temporary part-time jobs. The latter category is defined as precarious because of the insecurity. Furthermore, Lewchuk found that insecure jobs increased in both low and middle-income categories. This gives further credence to the idea that precarious work was increasing not only in low-wage jobs such as those commonly found in the service sector, but also in the traditionally better paid professional jobs such as university teaching.

Yet, unlike in the US, social safety nets in Canada can mitigate the effects of precarious employment, and the state has a history of strong public sector unionism. As Zuberi (2006) asserts, Canada is a strong welfare state relative to the US. Compared to precarious workers in the US, workers in Canada can arguably build financial resources that can act protectively during economic downturns or during periods of unemployment or underemployment. This is also true for nonstandard workers who may work multiple jobs to piece together their income. The state context is also important in terms of the union’s role and position amidst other organizational factors. Canada has a high density of public sector unionism, remaining at about 71-72% over the past 20 years (Galarneau and Sohn 2013), compared to 34.4% in the United States (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2017). Thus, the support for unions and unionized employees is arguably more normalized that in the United States. Unionization among faculty is also higher in Canada at about 80% (Dobbie and Robinson 2008:131) and about 21% in the United States (Benjamin 2006:35). Graduate employee unionization is also higher in Canada than in the US\(^2\). In Canada,

\(^2\) Graduate employees were not interviewed for this thesis, but this is relevant context.
there are 24 graduate student unions (Coalition of Graduate Employee Unions 2015) and 50 doctoral-granting universities in Canada (Statistics Canada 2015), a unionization rate of approximately 53%. In the US there are 32 graduate student unions (Coalition of Graduate Employee Unions 2015) and approximately 258 doctoral-granting universities (National Centre for Education Statistics 2006), a unionization rate of approximately 12%. Higher unionization in Canada compared with the US means, generally speaking, that collective bargaining regimes and labour laws protect NTTF. Moreover, given their representation by unions, NTTF may feel more empowered to resist marginalization. Hence, this is a ripe site for analyzing both the working conditions, and union organizing and resistance of temporary contract workers.

Relative to the US, the Canadian labour relations landscape is one of strong public sector unionization and considerable welfare state supports. Yet, the relationship between the state and its public institutions further complicates this landscape in universities across Canada and especially in Ontario. The state considers universities to be self-governing institutions, and in the past has distanced itself from the hiring policies and practices of universities: according to a report released on postsecondary education in Ontario “universities act as autonomous institutions, and the provincial parliament does not interfere with their labor or hiring policies” (See also Clark et al. 2009:168). Thus, though the state is an important actor to target in terms of the general funding of universities and provision of social supports, it has limited power to change hiring policies and practices of universities. This is not to argue that the responsibility for this issue is entirely out of the state’s control, as state funding for postsecondary education has declined significantly. However, in terms of influencing the hiring practices of universities, at least in Ontario and Canada, the state does not tell universities to hire more full-time faculty or how to organize its budgets. When it has tried to in the past, there has been widespread backlash in the university community (see Clark et al. 2009). A key informant in the academic sector
confirmed there is no way for the province of Ontario to dictate hiring practices and argued this was one of the key challenges facing contract faculty. The state can release policy recommendations and pass laws on hiring practices such as the recently passed bill 148, which has rules regarding equal pay for contract, part-time, and temporary workers. However, it remains unclear how this legislation will be enforced in universities – particularly since historically, hiring practices have been determined by individual universities who have emphasized the importance of autonomy from the state for educational and academic freedom reasons (Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations 2017).

There is also variation in NTTF hiring across universities and this suggests that there is no singular labour relations landscape for temporary contract employment in universities. That this landscape varies is further supported by postsecondary education literature that underscores the autonomy of universities to make decisions about faculty hiring and salaries (Clark et al. 2009; Henry et al. 2017:11). Nevertheless, in a period of austerity measures and cuts in state funding to universities in Canada, instructional costs have been frequently cut – through the reduced collective cost of faculty salaries and benefits. In 2010, about 34% of Canadian universities’ teaching positions were filled by NTTF (Canadian Association of University Teachers 2013) and a recent report found that approximately 50% of all courses taught in Ontario universities are taught by part-time faculty, or per-course appointed faculty (Council of Ontario Universities 2018). Statistics Canada’s Universities and Colleges Academic Staff Survey of Part-Time Faculty (UCASS-PT) suggests that the number of part-time faculty in Canada
increased by 10% - from 25,700 in 1990-1991 to 28,200 in 1997-1998\(^3\). Temporary contract teaching work in universities across southern Ontario allows for unpredictable fluctuation in student enrolment. For example, during the double-cohort year in Ontario, in which grade 13 was eliminated and students in grades 12 and 13 graduated simultaneously, a surplus of instructors was required to take on the extra classes required for the influx of university students (Jones 2004; Healy 2002).

Current federal and provincial data is limited since Statistics Canada does not measure part-time non-tenure-track faculty, and cancelled its annual survey of academic staff in Canada in 2012 (the University and College Academic Staff System) due to budget cuts. The University and College Academic Staff Survey (UCASS) has only recently been reinstated and will resume data collection in 2017, and in future years plans to expand the survey to include part-time NTTF (See Samson 2016). As well, the Canadian Association of University Teachers launched a survey on contract faculty in 2017. One study found that at seven universities in Ontario, the number of NTTF increased by 69% from 2001 to 2010 (Brownlee 2015:58). Ontario shows a similar pattern: from 1992 to 2011, full-time tenure-stream faculty (TTF) increased by only 14% in both Canada and Ontario, but full-time NTTF increased by 149% in Canada and 46% in Ontario (Statistics Canada 2012). This increase in NTTF does not include part-time NTTF, who in some universities teach up to 60% of the courses (Basen 2014; Field et al. 2014). Data from the University of Toronto is limited but part-time NTTF appointments increased by 235% from 2001 to 2008 (Brownlee 2015:56). These statistics suggest a shortage of full-time academic jobs, in

---

\(^3\) The nomenclature and measurement of non-tenure-track faculty vs. part-time faculty is an ongoing issue that Statistics Canada is addressing in consultation with stakeholders like the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT).
favour of part-time and non-tenure-stream appointments. When contrasted with the growth in graduate enrolment, there is comparably little growth in full-time TTF appointments.

Unlike other Canadian regions, like southern Manitoba where there are only two or three universities within a limited region, southern Ontario comprises several universities in one relatively small geographical area. Due to the proximity of these universities to one another, many NTTF work at multiple universities, commuting between them. This makes southern Ontario an excellent site to analyze the extent to which temporary contract workers work at multiple institutions, and what the impact of this is on their economic and professional success. A similar effect has been noted in California, where several institutions exist within driving distance and NTTF often become “freeway fliers”, commuting between multiple campuses to do temporary contract jobs (Gappa and Leslie 1993; Coalition on the Academic Workforce 2012). Given the state context of austerity measures and strong public-sector unionism, coupled with competition in the academic labour market, the southern Ontario academic labour market is ripe to examine how a growing group of professional workers – temporary contract workers who teach undergraduate courses at universities on a short-term contractual basis – navigate this labour market.

In postsecondary education, most faculty members in Ontario are unionized, and are members of the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE). CUPE is a public service union that has identified precarious work as a key issue in the postsecondary education sector. Most NTTF in Ontario unionized from 1975 to 1994. From 1975 to 1980 certifications were issued for York University (now Local 3903 of CUPE), Ryerson (now 3904), Lakehead (3905), McMaster (3906) and graduate assistants at OISE (3907). From 1980 to 1994, faculty certifications were issued for Trent (3908), Manitoba (3909), Ottawa (which disaffiliated in 1992), Athabasca
(3911), Dalhousie (3912) and Guelph (3913). However, union organizing can be difficult in a sector where workers commute across multiple campuses in different geographical locations, and when precarious workers who are barely scraping together a living wage cannot find time to attend union meetings—a reality confirmed by union organizers I interviewed. Beyond CUPE, two organizations have been active in organizing around the issue of temporary contract work in academia in Ontario and Canada. The Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT), a union and advocacy organization, has run campaigns on Fair Employment Week, intending to raise awareness of NTTF working conditions across university campuses. It has also created a committee tasked with addressing issues specific to NTTF, and recently launched the first nationwide survey of NTTF in Canada. The Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations (OCUFA), a provincial organization, launched a “Contract Faculty and Faculty Complement” Committee to focus on the issues of NTTF and to raise awareness about the conditions of their employment. These two organizations have worked actively to try to gain professional and public recognition of NTTF.

During the course of this research, three significant labour actions took place. In March 2015, graduate employees at York University and University of Toronto, two of Canada’s largest universities went on strike. Though the striking members were graduate employees, not non-student NTTF, they raised important questions about temporary contract work in universities, and were the basis for organizing among NTTF to gain public recognition about temporary contract work in the academic sector (Birdsell Bauer 2017). In October 2017, NTTF at 24 colleges across Ontario went on strike for five weeks, the longest strike in the Ontario college system (University of Toronto Libraries 2017). They won through arbitration a 7.75 % wage increase over time, a one-time payment of $900 to full-time faculty and $450 to partial-load faculty, increased the permanency of partial-load faculty and for the first time in the history of
the Ontario college system, addressed the issue of academic freedom for part-time faculty (McGillveray 2017). These strikes brought increased attention to the issue of temporary contract work in universities and colleges across Ontario which, as discussed in chapter four, were central to building awareness of temporary contract work in universities and colleges across Ontario and in the broader public sphere. They also raised the public profile of the value of teaching in the academic profession. Though the latter issue can be viewed as separate from job security, it was an important component of NTTF organizing and mobilizing a variety of actors including TTF, students, and the broader public.

3 Postsecondary Teaching and Research in Ontario and Canada: Current Debates

A key current debate in Ontario and Canada addresses the extent to which teaching is viewed as less important to academic professional careers than doing research. In Ontario, the official line is that “each university is committed to both teaching and research, and the teacher-scholar is the faculty ideal. This is reflected in the widespread expectation that faculty will normally devote approximately the same proportion of their time to research as to teaching.” (Clark et al. 2009:150) Thus, officially, teaching and research are granted equal weight in the life of the postsecondary institutions and those who work in them. However, in a report conducted by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), one university president expressed frustration that institutional status is no longer built on teaching:

> The things that really determine the reputation of our institutions right now are research and attracting high-profile talent and big infrastructure. What doesn’t count is teaching, the local interests, engaging in civil society. (AUCC in Brownlee 2015:49).

A controversial paper written by the now defunct Ontario Council on University Affairs wrote
that: "the only way the university sector could accommodate a substantial increase in enrolment and give more attention to teaching without an increase in funding was to reduce the effort devoted to research” and they proposed that the state rather than the university, decide on funding allocation with regards to teaching and research. (Clark et al. 2009:15). This suggestion did not go over well in the university community and not soon after the OCUA was shut down (15).

Studies have also pointed to the ways that research is prioritized over teaching in tenure promotion in the academic profession in Canada (See e.g. Phaneuf et al. 2007). A recent report by the Ontario Confederation of Faculty Associations (OCUFA) found that only 78 per cent of faculty believed teaching was a priority for their institutions, in contrast to 93 per cent who felt that teaching was a primary personal value (Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations 2012:9). A study done by postsecondary education researchers found that two factors explain the prioritization of research over teaching. First, "the existence of large funds for research and related purposes has had the ironic effect of encouraging all universities to adopt research as a primary mission" (Clark et al. 2009: 45). The second factor was incentives to emphasize research over teaching as a measure of faculty members' performance – for example, the Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI) programs created in 1997 (2009:93). More recently, the Naylor report, a national-scale report on research at Canada’s universities stated that postsecondary institutions were absorbing costs of facilities and administration “by using tuition dollars and provincial grants that should be dedicated to their teaching and learning mission.” The report noted that “greater success in winning federal research funding leads to more intense budgetary pressure on the teaching and learning mission – a counter-productive arrangement.” (Advisory Panel for the Review of Federal Support for Fundamental Science 2017:13)
Hence, a rich debate exists in Ontario and Canada not only about the existence of temporary contract employment in the academic profession, but also about the professional priorities of faculty at universities in Ontario and Canada. Key commentators on the postsecondary landscape in both Ontario and Canada expressed concern that in a context where universities were underfunded, the teaching mandate of universities was being both underfunded economically, and given less recognition than its counterpart, research, in academic culture. Yet, there is very little empirical research to support claims made by actors in these debates. Moreover, little is known about any potential variation across academic disciplines. Do all academic disciplines experience the use of temporary contract employment in the same way? Do faculty in all disciplines feel the same about the prioritization of teaching? What variation, if any, exists?

4 Academic Disciplines and the Non-Academic Labour Market

In this research, I include faculty from two broad disciplinary areas: the Humanities on the one hand, and Engineering and Sciences on the other. The latter two are grouped together as disciplines that contrast with the Humanities in their relation to the non-academic labour market. There are four reasons to include Humanities and Engineering and Science faculty members in the sample. First, there is a difference in the labor markets they are in: NTTF in the Humanities have fewer alternatives outside of the academic labor market but still in their field of expertise than NTTF in Engineering and the Sciences. NTTF in applied fields like engineering and science tend to hold positions in industry such as consultant, technician or specialist. Moreover, they tend to have substantial alternative sources of income – for example some of my NTTF Engineering and Science participants were top executives in private companies. Engineering and Science NTTF are often sought after by industry, as well as to teach courses in upper-level
undergraduate or graduate courses, and are less likely than Humanities NTTF to teach lower level undergraduate courses (Baldwin and Chronister 2001; Kezar and Sam 2013). A pilot study conducted at the University of California, Berkeley revealed that those with fewer labour market alternatives tended to view academic work as their main occupation, whereas engineers who had additional work outside of academia tended to view academic work as secondary or complementary to their non-academic jobs. Many engineers had an industry job which paid a substantial income, yet also enjoyed the exchange of knowledge and engagement with the academic community resulting from teaching, and viewed it as a way to participate in the academic world while still having non-academic careers. This pilot study informed the incorporation of engineers and applied scientists alongside humanists in the research design.

Second, the employment of full-time NTTF also differs by academic field. For example, between 1987 and 1992, the proportion of full-time faculty in non-tenure positions increased in all academic program areas except business and engineering (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001:3). In humanities programs, there tends to be higher student enrolment than in engineering and sciences programs, and thus more pressure for departments to hire temporary contract workers. This is in part because more undergraduate students take humanities than engineering courses as general education requirements. Hence, the reasons for hiring temporary contract workers differ in these disciplines and this impacts professionals’ experience of temporary contract work.

The third reason to differentiate between these disciplines when analyzing temporary contract work is related to the previous two reasons. Given their labour market situation, the involvement of humanities scholars in organizing around NTTF issues has escalated in recent years - in contrast with Engineering and Science scholars (See e.g. Bousquet 2008; Rhoades 1998a; Schuman 2013). Levin and Shaker (2011) note that English departments and the MLA
have “expressed a special and longstanding interest in the roles, responsibilities, and rights of non-tenure-track faculty” (1466). Additionally, in their interviews with 45 faculty leaders, Kezar and Sam (2013) found that “contingent faculty in composition and the arts experienced poorer treatment than those in the professional areas” (71). Therefore humanities scholars may be more familiar with some of NTTF’s organizing and resistance. In Canada, the Association of College and University Teachers of English (ACCUTE) released a best practices guidelines for changing NTTF working conditions, asserting that

Inhumane working relations prevail within the institutional Humanities, and real change will only come when university-based faculty agreements, which differ from place to place, are opened for profound re-examination and rewritten with a view to genuine inclusivity and equity for scholars and teachers across the configurations of the post-secondary educational system.

Because of the involvement of humanities scholars and their associations in debates on university employment practices, I expected NTTF from the Humanities to have different experiences from those NTTF in Engineering. Specifically, I expected the former to have worse experiences than the latter, and to be more active in resisting their ‘temp’ status and participating in organizing temporary contract workers. Generally speaking, both hypotheses held true. In chapter two, I discuss how field-based differences influenced how temporary contract work was recognized differently in Humanities, Engineering and Sciences. In chapter three, I show how workers in these two fields experience working conditions differently. In chapter four, I show how these differences play out in worker resistance – NTTF in the Humanities are visibly much more active in union organizing than NTTF in Engineering and Science.
The fourth reason to incorporate these two fields into the research design is to examine how field and industry-based divisions reinforce gender inequities. Women are underrepresented in Engineering and Science fields in both Canada and the United States (See e.g. Syed and Chemers 2011; Burke and Mattis 2007; Beede, Julian, and Langdon 2011). Though there has been some progress over the past decades, the representation of women in STEM fields is still very low. For example, in Canada in 2016-2017, women represented only 15.5% of faculty in Engineering, Architecture and related Technologies, 20.6% of faculty in Mathematics, Computer and Information Sciences, and 46.3% of faculty in the Humanities (Statistics Canada 2017). Therefore, from the outset, women are underrepresented in Engineering and Science, and thus also have less access to the non-academic career alternatives to which NTTF in Engineering and Science have access. Importantly, the non-academic career alternatives in Engineering and Science tend to be better paid, and this is reflected in the distribution of income by gender of my NTTF participants, though it is a small sample. This underrepresentation of women in Engineering and Science is one key mechanism for income polarization between men and women NTTF.

Thus, to begin with, the industry or field that temporary contract workers work in is itself gendered in terms of the representation of women (Also see Table 4c. to see how this is reflected in the population of the focal institution). Through their underrepresentation in Engineering and Sciences, women also have less access to the well-paid non-academic career alternatives in their field of expertise. This disadvantage is one of the many ways that gender impacts professionals’

---

4 Data made available through the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT); available to members on website: https://www.caut.ca/members-only/collective-bargaining/academic-staff-salary-data

5 Subject categories are created by Statistics Canada and cannot be further disaggregated.
experience of temporary contract work, further strengthening the need to account for dimensions of social location when analyzing temporary contract work in the professions.

5 Social Location and Precarious Professionals

In this thesis, I analyze how gender influences workers’ experience of temporary contract work. Reflecting other work on social inequality (E.g. Hollander and Einwohner 2004; McCall 2005; McCall 2001; Choo and Ferree 2010; Chun, Lipsitz, and Shin 2013; Browne and Misra 2003), this thesis suggests that we need to expand our definitions of inequality to examine the multifaceted nature of marginalization in the professions. Scholars have argued that we cannot analyze precarious forms of work as if they are new without erasing the historic unpaid and low wage work of women and racialized people, which has historically been used as a tool of oppression (Chun 2008; Chun 2016; Vosko 2000b; Bonacich 1972). Women have traditionally been overrepresented in non-standard forms of work like part-time employment (Duffy & Pupo 1992). Contemporary precarious work is mainly done by women, racialized people and migrant workers (Cranford, Vosko, and Zukewich 2003; Vosko 2000b; Goldring and Landolt 2011; Zeytinoglu and Muteshi Khasiala 2000; Cranford 2005; Bean, Leach, and Lowell 2004). As Rogers (2000) notes,

considering the over representation of women and people of colour in contingent forms of employment, we should take warning that continuing increases in temporary employment may exacerbate existing gender & racial inequalities in employment, regardless of the skills one obtains through increased educational efforts. (2000: 37)

Vosko (2000) emphasizes this point as well – precarious work may constitute some changes in the landscape of labour, but is also characterized by continuity in the marginalization of women, migrant workers, and racialized people. Importantly, Vosko points to the persistence of gender
and racial inequalities even among highly skilled workers. The academic sector is no exception: in Canada, from 1999-2010, women represented 61.7-63% of temporary full-time and temporary and permanent part-time university professors, but only 25.7-39.5% of full-time, permanent university professors (Canadian Association of University Teachers 2014). Though recent data shows increasing gender parity, with almost 40% of women working as full-time, permanent university professors (Statistics Canada 2017), data on temporary full-time professors continues to show that women are over-represented in temporary work in this sector. Again, there is a gap in the data, since Statistics Canada has yet to incorporate a part-time, temporary category into its major survey of university and college academic staff.

In the academic sector, scholars have discussed the implications of women in postsecondary education and how they are re-routed into non-tenure-track faculty positions while their male counterparts dominate tenure-track faculty positions (Donovan et al. 2005; Sussman and Yssaad 2005; Baldwin and Chronister 2001). Research has pointed to the prevalence of women in NTTF positions and the existence of temporary and contractual assignments as a gendered phenomenon limiting professional development (Smithson 2005), particularly when women faculty have partners who obtain full-time, permanent positions in academe. In Canada, not much analysis has been done regarding NTTF’s desire for full-time permanent work. Research of faculty in the US suggests that women are more likely to be part-time temporary workers who want full-time permanent work. A recent study of NTTF at four-year colleges and universities in the United States found that though women were 53% of the study, 73% were involuntarily NTTF (i.e. 73% wanted full-time permanent academic work). The study also found that white NTTF reported significantly higher workplace satisfaction than racialized NTTF (Eagan, Jaeger, and Grantham 2015). Comparable research in Canada is needed to assess the desire for full-time permanent work among these groups.
Racialized and indigenous women in particular have been marginalized and de-professionalized in academia, and are often ‘presumed incompetent’ (Gutierrez y Muhs et al. 2012). One study of university faculty in Canada found that women of color only make up 7.5% of all full-time faculty positions in the US (Gutierrez y Muhs et al. 2012:449) – even though at the time of publication they composed 37% of the US population. In Canada, recent data is less available as researchers have pointed out (Henry et al. 2017). However, statistics do show underrepresentation of certain groups relative to the total labour force. In 2006, Black Canadians represented 2.2% of the total labour force, but only 1.6% of university faculty. Southeast Asian Canadians represented 0.7% of the total labour force but only 0.3% of university faculty, and Filipino Canadians represented 1.3% of the total labour force but only 0.2% of university faculty. As suggested by Henry et al. (2017), further research is needed to assess processes of exclusion that constitute ethnic and racially-based labour market segmentation linked to broader exclusion of racialized and indigenous people from the academic profession in Canada. I focus extensively on gender analyses in this thesis, but was unfortunately unable to centre race-based analyses, given limitations in recruitment discussed in the next section.

6 Methods

This thesis uses qualitative research to analyze temporary contract workers’ experiences and to build the concept of precarious professional. I draw primarily on semi-structured interviews with sixty faculty members and key informants at the University of Toronto; these

---

6 I use the term key informants to denote administrators and union representatives, who provided important context for the study and informed by analysis at the meso-level used in chapters one and four. Unlike key informants, primary study participants - both NTTF and TTF – shared in great detail their experiences at work, which informed my analysis of the micro-level throughout the thesis.
were conducted between May 2014 and August 2015. The people in my sample include non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF), tenure-track faculty (TTF), administrators, and union representatives. For the purposes of this thesis, NTTF and TTF are referred to as participants, and administrators and union representatives are referred to as key informants.

Non-tenure track faculty includes those who held the following position(s) at the University of Toronto (the focal institution) at some point during the 2014-2015 academic year: Sessional Instructor, Lecturer, and Sessional Lecturer (including levels I, II and III). I excluded graduate employees for methodological reasons: I wished to keep my analysis of graduate employee issues separate from this thesis for two reasons. First, I wanted to avoid any potential conflicts of interest. Second, as discussed in my other work, graduate employees’ additional student status means the analysis of their work comprises a specific set of issues and social relations of work (Birdsell Bauer 2017). This specific set of issues and social relations of work are better examined on their own and in comparison with other graduate employee struggles and certification drives (See e.g. Zinni, Singh, and McLellan 2005). Hence, the focus here is on non-student faculty.

Tenure-track and tenured faculty includes those who held the following position(s) at the University of Toronto at some point during the 2014-2015 academic year: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Full Professor. I am explicit throughout the thesis as to whether

---

7 This research was completed under Protocol 29907 with the University of Toronto’s Social Sciences, Humanities, and Education Research Ethics Board (REB). Original approval date: February 25, 2014.

8 Several but not all NTTF interviewed also worked in the college system, so I focus primarily on universities in this chapter.

9 It should be noted, though, that some studies of NTTF in Canada and the US, graduate employees are included (Dobbie and Robinson 2008; Robinson 2013; Foster 2016; American Federation of Teachers 2002).
participants were tenured or pre-tenure. I excluded faculty who are Emeritus. Furthermore, teaching stream faculty are not included in this sample\textsuperscript{10}. Faculty who work in the Department of Sociology, and in the social sciences more broadly, were also excluded in order to avoid potential conflicts of interest. Generalizations about teaching and research in the social sciences are therefore avoided as a general rule in this analysis.

Key informants include those holding an active role in an academic union – either as a union representative or rank-and-file member – or in the university administration. Though there was some insight gained from the interviews with university administrators, it was hard to get beyond the ‘official line’, reflecting a common methodological issue scholars have identified when interviewing elites and people in positions of power and authority (See Mikecz 2012).

Identifying a focal institution – the University of Toronto – allowed me to access NTTF in the precarious labour market in southern Ontario. Though I ask questions about work at multiple institutions, having a focal institution allowed me to identify some of the institutional constraints while also keeping this aspect of the research manageable. My focus, however, was on the marginalization of professionals in a broader labour market and not an organizational analysis. Since it is not an organizational analysis, I do not focus on variation in working conditions and experiences across universities, though such a study is needed. Additionally, precarious and temporary work inherently suggests that the number and use of workers changes over time, and thus generalizations about institutions’ use of precarious work may be truer

\textsuperscript{10} Permanent teaching-stream faculty are not temporary workers, so they do not fit my research design, which aims to explore the impact of temporary work on professional workers. Moreover, permanent teaching stream faculty are a relatively new category of faculty in Ontario universities, and the roles of teaching stream faculty in teaching, research and service are still to some extent in flux and under continued negotiation. Only a few universities in Ontario have started to incorporate permanent teaching-stream positions.
during certain academic years or terms. Instead of an organizational or comparative analysis, I focus on the working conditions across institutions in southern Ontario. It should be noted however that the TTF recruited for this study work only at the focal institution. This also reflects the reality of full-time, permanent employment in academia since TTF, by definition, almost always work for a single employer in a given period of time.

The interview data is the primary source of data for this thesis. However, I also complement this with archival data and field notes from participant observation. I took field notes at meetings, during strikes, and at conferences centered on the theme of non-tenure-track faculty or academic labour issues. The archival data includes review of media coverage, university websites, faculty association websites, union communication and literature including emails to the membership, past reports on bargaining priorities, meeting minutes, bargaining bulletins, and The Guardian, the union’s official monthly newsletter. I examined news coverage as well, searching editorials, opinion pieces, and news articles using key words such as precarious worker, job security, and words associated with temporary contract employment in academia such as ‘adjunct’, ‘sessional’ and ‘part-timer.’ I also draw on additional data from the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations (OCUFA), a provincial organization that has been active in promoting NTTF interests as discussed earlier. Participant observation data includes attending union meetings from 2013-2015, attendance at town hall meetings organized by unions and faculty associations, attendance at strikes and solidarity rallies, attendance at non-academic conferences focused on the subject of non-tenure-track faculty, and informal observation and discussion over several years with NTTF, TTF, university administrators, and union organizers. This secondary source of data informs the whole thesis, but is central to the analysis in chapter four.

Given my focus on workers’ lived experiences at the micro-level, this emerging case of
precarious professionals is best assessed through in-depth qualitative research, using broader literature and contemporary debates at the meso- and macro-levels as context. Interviews allow for in-depth analysis of participants’ complex experiences of marginalization, and how they make sense of them. For example, the experience of uncertainty in the context of job insecurity is something that is deeply personal and nuanced, and hence best analyzed via interviews. Furthermore, qualitative analysis allows us to examine industrial and occupational specializations and understand how they contribute to professionals’ marginalization by contrasting professional workers’ experiences across industry and occupation, which the research design makes possible. Finally, qualitative analysis of interviews and field notes/data from participant observation of worker resistance in the field over multiple years allows us to better understand the resistance of precarious professional by showing how workers contest cultural marginalization by constructing narratives that revalue feminized work and seek to regain recognition.

I employed a theoretical sampling technique at the disciplinary level, given the differences in discipline described earlier in this chapter. I interviewed 33 participants from Humanities departments and 22 participants from Engineering and Science departments across the University’s three campuses (See Table 1). Some key informants who are administrators also work as TTF, and thus were interviewed as both key informants and TTF. In the same vein, some key informants who are union representatives also work as NTTF, and thus were interviewed as both key informants and NTTF. The latter is simply an outcome of how administrative and union labour is organized in Ontario universities – some TTF do upper-level administrative work and some NTTF do union work. Out of the 23 TTF interviewed, 13 were tenured and 10 were pre-tenure.
The sampling for this research was done theoretically to include different areas of study in the university. As Becker (1998) states, the aim of theoretical sampling is to maximize the possibility of finding a negative case. Becker states that we should try to identify “the case that is likely to upset your thinking and look for it.” (Becker 1998:87) The ‘negative case’ in my research is the Engineers and Scientists who work in non-academic jobs and are therefore not usually working multiple academic contracts to make a living. In other words, I did not expect them to have the same issues as temporary contract workers in the Humanities, as discussed earlier in this chapter. This contrast between temporary workers in the Humanities and Engineering and the Sciences allows for insight into the ways industrial segregation figures into temporary workers’ experiences and resistance.

NTTF in the sample are well-educated professional workers. Twenty-five out of 32 hold PhDs as their highest level of education; seven hold a Master’s degree. In terms of overall socioeconomic status, eight NTTF have been on social assistance (seven out of eight in the Humanities) – compared to one TTF who had been on social assistance. Eleven NTTF have been out of work in the past (eight out of eleven were in the Humanities) – compared to four TTF. Participants’ incomes, measured both by annual income at the University of Toronto and Total Annual Income, also varied (See Table 2). Patterns of lower income among Humanities NTTF reflect broader national patterns of faculty salaries in Canada (see Table 6). According to a recent study, faculty in the Humanities have a net income of $7000 below the mean income of all faculty (Henry, Kobayashi, and Choi 2017). In the Humanities, the median annual income range at the University of Toronto for NTTF is $17,501-$35,000 and the median range for TTF is $140,001-$150,000. Once other sources of income are added, the gap closes only slightly: the median total annual income range for NTTF is $35,001-$52,000 and the median range for TTF remains $140,001-$150,000. Hence, NTTF remuneration is lower in the Humanities than in
Engineering. Though NTTF try to supplement this income with additional work, the income gap remains. In Engineering and Sciences however, the median annual income range at the University of Toronto for NTTF is $35,001-52,000 and the median range for TTF is $140,001-150,000. Once other sources of income are added, the gap closes considerably: the median total annual income range for NTTF in Engineering and Sciences becomes $105,001-122,500 and the median range for TTF remains $140,0001-150,000. This reflects the reality that Engineering and Science NTTF work at relatively high paying non-academic jobs such as consultants, company owners and managers. In contrast, Humanities NTTF in the sample work relatively low-paying academic and non-academic jobs such as server, administrative assistant, and freelance editor. Unlike the non-academic jobs worked by NTTF in Engineering and Science, these jobs were less reliant on NTTF’s expertise and training. At the outset, Humanities NTTF are thus much worse off than NTTF in Engineering and the Sciences, economically speaking.

Multiple job holding was very popular among NTTF participants. The majority of NTTF (30/32) concurrently held multiple jobs at the time of the interview (See Table 3). Given that NTTF academic work is usually by session, past second, third and fourth academic job categories are shown to convey where they have worked in previous academic years, going back five years. As can be seen, twelve NTTF had a second academic job, six had a third academic job, and two had a fourth academic job. In contrast, no TTF held non-academic jobs or worked at multiple academic jobs. More NTTF in the Humanities held multiple academic jobs compared to NTTF in Engineering and Science.

Tables 4a-4d show the number of NTTF (32) and TTF (23) recruited by discipline (Humanities or Engineering and Science). I show the sample vis-à-vis the population (all Humanities and Engineering and Science NTTF and TTF) by discipline (Table 4a), gender
(Table 4b), by discipline and gender (Table 4c), and by age (Table 4d). Twenty out of 60 participants are foreign-born; most foreign-born participants were born in the US. There are only seven racialized people out of 60 in my sample – four women and three men. Data was unavailable on the racial composition of faculty members at the University of Toronto, however the low number may be viewed as representative since there is a limited number of racialized faculty members in general in Canadian universities (Ramos 2012; Henry et al. 2017). I tried to oversample for racialized faculty, but unfortunately was not able to do so after several phases of recruitment. Others analyzing race and ethnicity among Canadian faculty have been faced with this small sample problem, but also point out that given scant representation of racialized faculty, “how could the sample be anything but small?” (Frances 2003 in Frances et al. 2017:21). The UCASS, the only Census-level survey of faculty, does not measure race and ethnicity, though stakeholders and researchers are currently lobbying for the inclusion of these variables in the survey. Thus, the study of racialized faculty, especially in quantitative terms, remains an ongoing issue in research on university faculty in Canada.

6.1 Research Instruments and Interview Questions

I developed four main research instruments for this research, including a survey questionnaire, and an interview guide for NTTF, TTF, and key informants (See Appendices A-D). Prior to starting the interview, all participants were asked to complete a survey face-to-face or via email (their choice). This was done with the aim of collecting demographic information on the participants (gender, race, age, income, education, marital status, immigration and citizenship status, and economic background). Surveys are useful in obtaining background data without having to ask the participant directly, and blank options allow for more open processes of self-identification – particularly with respect to gender, race and economic background. This
background information is useful in understanding the social location of participants – and how participants understand and conceptualize their social location – throughout the thesis.

Interviews were semi-structured and this allowed for both the systematic collection of data, and more spontaneous relaying of narrative. For example, Table 5 shows the frequency with which NTTF and TTF raised working conditions as a problem in their day-to-day work life. These issues were raised by participants independently of interview questions, except for those denoted by an asterisk, which are responses to direct questions (e.g. Collegial Environment include responses from the following question: *How satisfied are you with your department, in terms of support and collegiality?*). The latter questions about working conditions were asked regarding their work at the focal institution but also about any additional universities where they worked. In other words, I would first identify the institutions where they worked, then follow up each question about working conditions with a sub-question about the other institutions (“What about at X institution? And at Y institution? And at Z institution?). This was a highly involved process, but ensured that the data on working conditions extend beyond the focal institution.

Questions about NTTF working conditions were asked to NTTF and TTF; participants in both groups also raised issues around working conditions independently and the table is therefore a composite of both types of response. It should be noted that a few of the issues NTTF experience are also experienced by TTF and therefore not exclusive to NTTF work. I acknowledge this, but also point to how the issues around working conditions are experienced by NTTF in different ways and also vary among NTTF, showing a great deal of complexity in participants’ experience of working conditions and further specifying participants’ experience of precarious work in the academic profession.
In the interviews, questions focused on participants’ work histories. They also enquired about the value of teaching and research in the academic profession. Questions included whether they think teaching or research is more valued in their university, whether teaching is valued or devalued, whether research is valued or devalued, and whether teaching and research should be done jointly by all faculty members, or whether they felt the two should be done separately – or both. I chose ‘valued’ and ‘devalued’ because they are abstract terms, and they allowed for participants’ own interpretations and meanings to emerge. I also asked participants whether they preferred teaching or research personally, in attempt to assess whether personal preference might have an impact on their response to this question – it did not.

In designing my interview questions, I drew on Michele Lamont’s methodology on symbolic boundaries (1992, 2000). Specifically, I asked a series of questions about participants’ attitudes toward other workers, including ‘those above and below’\(^\text{11}\). Unlike Lamont, who focused on how workers constructed boundaries against those within hierarchies, I used these questions to uncover how workers attributed value to their work, and also the way this varied across industry. I found these questions allowed for flexibility in getting at what meanings workers attributed to their work. Though I was able to uncover different meanings of value – that had mainly to do with recognition – I ultimately found that boundaries was not a useful or reliable concept to understand and interpret precarious professionals’ experiences of temporary work and social relations within the work itself. However, this method proved fruitful in getting

---

\(^{11}\) Lamont uses the questions “Is there anyone who makes you feel inferior?” and “Is there anyone who makes you feel superior?” However, after a few interviews, I noticed both NTTF and TTF felt uncomfortable with these terms. Bonnie Fox suggested “uncomfortable” and “intimidating”, which are more accessible words, and this adjustment proved more useful in the interview process.
at the cultural dimensions of work and the experiences of both temporary contract workers and permanently employed professionals.

6.2 Recruitment, Interview Implementation and Coding

To recruit participants, I contacted NTTF and TTF via publicly available email addresses on department websites. This was done in three stages. First, I compiled an email list of all publicly available email addresses on department websites. Then, I used the blind carbon copy (BCC) function to email all participants a recruitment email (See Appendix E). This was done twice in the space of 18 months. I then asked the union if they would circulate the email to their listserv, and obtained most of my NTTF participants through this method. When this method had been exhausted, I posted posters on campus and in faculty-specific spaces (See Appendix F). Later on in the recruitment process, I used snowball sampling by asking participants if they knew any other individuals that would be willing to be contacted.

Once participants had been recruited, I scheduled interviews at a time and location of their choosing. Locations included the Sociology department, the participant’s office on campus, the participant’s home, or a public space such as a café. I began the interviews by getting participants to review and sign informed consent form, and to complete the survey. I generally followed the interview guide, but in some interviews, participants raised issues that allowed some divergence from the regular interview guide. Interviews ranged from 45 minutes to two hours in length. I recorded these interviews and later transcribed them verbatim. At times, the interview participants expressed emotions around the difficulties of being a temporary contract worker. One participant, for example, got upset in explaining what she felt was an unfounded dismissal. As the interviewer, I tried to reassure participants and cultivate an environment in which they felt comfortable to express their views. Pseudonyms were assigned to all participants.
For all quotes, I provide the participant’s pseudonym and position (e.g. NTTF, TTF, administrator or union representative). I also mention their field (e.g. Humanities, Engineering or Science), except in places where I omit the field to protect the participant’s confidentiality. In a few places, minor changes to quotations were made where those quotations might reveal participants’ identity.

When coding the interviews, I first conducted open coding using NVivo, and then further developed these codes inductively by reading through data. I developed several thematic open codes including Conditions of Work, Departmental Effects, Identity and Self, Macro-Meso Comparisons, Policy Suggestions, Structural Explanations and Accounts, Value and Recognition of Temporary Workers’ Work, Teaching and Research, Union and Faculty Association and University Culture. I coded participants’ views about the roles and priorities of their universities, especially teaching and research. I coded working conditions raised independently by participants, and developed some closed codes on working conditions that came in response to questions (e.g. about collegiality). As Bhattacharya states, coding – whether through software or other methods – is “personal, non-linear, and inherently de-stabilizing, inviting the researcher to return repeatedly to the data to re-view the ways in which the researcher engages with the data.” (Bhattacharya 2015:7) At several points, I returned to the coding and recoded the data to reflect new points of analysis. I coded demographic information collected from surveys for each participant using the Attributes feature in NVivo. The careful coding and recoding of these qualitative data allowed for flexibility in developing my analytical framework, while also grounding my analysis within a structure I developed based on previous studies on non-tenure-track faculty in public universities.

This chapter has shown how a context of austerity in the public sector has driven universities to hire temporary contract workers to teach in universities across southern Ontario,
and argued that this site is fertile ground to analyze how – and to what extent – temporary contract workers in the postsecondary education sector become precarious professionals. In the following chapter, I explore a key dimension in this process. I show how temporary contract work in the academic profession can be feminized, and devalued, but also masculinized and revalued through recognition by different actors including – but not limited to – students, colleagues, managers and employers.
Chapter 2
Precarious Professionals and Recognition: Feminization and the Social Relations of Work

To extend previous research on precarious work, we need to analyze workers’ lived experiences to get at the complexity and multifaceted ways that temporary contract workers are marginalized not only economically but also as professionals. This also means demonstrating variation among temporary contract workers and showing how occupational and industrial segregation persists and intersects with temporary contract work. Consider the following vignettes:

Kathryn is a 65 year-old white, Canadian-born NTTF in the Humanities who holds a Masters degree and an honorary doctorate. She has over thirty years experience teaching in her field as a part-time professor, and comparable experience in her field of study. She earns $30,000 teaching at one university, and supplements this income by working multiple jobs in her area of expertise. Kathryn is passionate about teaching and places emphasis on the fact that she thinks the teaching mandate should be more emphasized at research universities. She argues that her tenure-stream colleagues focus much less attention on teaching than her non-tenure-stream colleagues do. She said she felt devalued as a teacher but noticed a difference in how her colleagues and managers treated her after she was presented an award for her research. She recalls being invited for lunch by a senior administrator after receiving her award: “I suddenly became someone of value.”

Bill is a 64 year-old white, Canadian-born NTTF in Engineering who holds a Masters degree. He teaches a specialized Engineering course at one university campus in Ontario, and earns about $74,000, which helps supplement his retired spouse’s pension. Bill never wanted to be an academic – rather he spent most of his career in project management and was recruited by his university to bring his outside experience to the
classroom. He described his experience teaching as “more satisfying” than dealing with corporate clients because his expertise in the corporate world was valued by his university and his colleagues – not to mention the students in his field. In addition, he has so much familiarity with his topic that he only takes about an hour per class to prepare. His only complaint is that he would like to have more interaction with other faculty members in a social setting.

These depictions suggest that there is variation in the ways that temporary contract workers experience temporary contract work. In Bill’s case, he was recruited by his employer for his particular expertise in the corporate sector and teaches the same course every year, with minimal preparation time required. In Kathryn’s case, she applies every semester, competing with other NTTF for contracts, whereas Bill was hired in order that he could teach that course, and thus there are few, if any, additional workers applying to teach his course. Bill identifies as a researcher in Engineering, and he views his skill set as highly valuable to his department, in part due to the way he was recruited, but also sees this reflected in a higher salary than is usual for NTTF. Kathryn, a professional in the Humanities with similar amount of work experience, teaches a variety of courses related to her field of expertise. Though she enjoys her work very much, she feels as though her research is more highly valued than her teaching. It is also important to note that she earns less than half the income that Bill does, though she taught the same amount of courses in that year. These cases suggest the kind of variation Kathryn and Bill experience is gendered and shaped by different recognition and remuneration practices for differently valued work.

---

12 NTTF salaries are negotiated with a floor, but no ceiling, and hence some NTTF can earn more than the base salary outlined in the collective agreement if they negotiate with their employer.
This chapter is structured as follows. First, I provide an overview of previous literature on precarious work and temporary work, and describe how scholars have conceptualized temporary work, the feminization of employment norms, and processes of devaluing temporary work. Second, I argue that temporary contract workers feel devalued by colleagues, managers and employers through their association with a feminized occupation – teaching. Colleagues, managers, and employers cast teaching as secondary to research in terms of success in the academic profession. Third, I show how colleagues, managers and employers give temporary contract workers greater recognition in two masculinized fields - Engineering and Sciences. Fourth, I examine how NTTF reflect on the recognition by students of their work. I show that NTTF’s experiences with students suggest a key difference in the way temporary contract workers are recognized, highlighting the importance of the social relations of work. Building off Rogers’ (2000) notion of devaluing and Vosko’s (2000) concept of feminization as (in part) occupational and industrial sex segregation, I demonstrate the complex ways various actors value temporary contract work. In understanding the ways work is devalued by professionals, managers and employers we can more specifically hone in on what makes a ‘precarious professional’, aside from economic insecurity. Colleagues, managers and employers’ value and recognition is important because it is more directly linked to both their status as temporary workers, and their achievement in the profession.

7 The Global Feminization of Work, Gendered Jobs, and Devalued Temporary Work

Vosko argues that Temporary Employment Relationships (TERs) have evolved since the era of the Temporary Help Industry in the 1950s, which is intimately tied to what she calls the “global feminization of employment.” (2000:39-40). Vosko builds this theory following her four-part critique of Standing’s (1989) thesis of global feminization through flexible labour.
First, over the 20th century, there have been increasing levels of formal labour force participation among women, but Vosko draws on Tiano’s (1994) analysis to argue that this should not be seen as a “shift from economic inactivity to activity”, but as “groups of workers whose primary location of work has shifted largely from the informal to the formal sector, and whose workload (paid and unpaid) is intensifying due to the increasing marketization of tasks associated with social reproduction and the absence of adequate state supports in this sphere.” (2000:37) Second, instead of attributing the increased participation of women in the labour force to women taking men’s jobs, as Standing does, Vosko asserts that this is often the creation of new jobs for women “in regions where the majority of men are otherwise employed” (37).

Third, instead of viewing sex segregation as a necessary part of feminization like Standing does, Vosko asserts that sex segregation can be a part of feminization along the lines of occupational and industrial segregation, but also contends that jobs and employment can be feminized even while sex segregation is declining. Hence, men can work in feminized jobs and/or experience the feminization of employment and income and occupational polarization can occur “both between women and men, and among men and women themselves.” (40) Similarly, increased participation of women in the labour force does not mean that women will have lower unemployment rates than men (37), a point which Standing also neglects. These last two points are central to Vosko’s thesis that global feminization of employment, while it affects women primarily, can also impact and ‘feminize’ men workers. This coincides with the decline of the SER as a normative model, a decline that “challenges us to deepen prevailing understandings of casualization and to expose its gendered character.” (42-43). However, what has not been examined is how temporary work can also become masculinized and ascribed value or recognition as such.
This thesis seeks to extend Vosko’s notion of the global feminization of employment by analyzing how, in the professions, the gendering of jobs persists and intersects with the casualization of professional work at the micro-level. In explaining the historical groundings of the TER and the social and economic processes shaping employment at the macro-level, Vosko privileges the macro level over workers’ own experiences of marginalization. Thus, a detailed account of how the global feminization of employment takes place at the micro-level is not of central focus for Vosko. Further investigation, using Vosko’s research as context can specify the social relations of work and provide more detail to our meso- and macro-level investigations. For instance, by assuming all temporary work is feminized, Vosko ignores the dual aspect of gender in shaping the recognition of work. Work can be both feminized, but also masculinized. Further developing Vosko’s concept of global feminization of employment as context, I argue that we need to focus on the processes described by Vosko at the micro-level in order to better understand how it marginalizes temporary contract professional workers, and how this dual process of masculinization and feminization can occur. Do these processes play a role in reinforcing workers’ ‘temp’ status? If so, what does this process look like from the perspective of professional workers? How do gendered assumptions about work and jobs shape how temporary contract work is valued and granted recognition by different actors?

To analyze the gendering of jobs in the context of temporary professional work at the micro level, I draw on Rogers’ (2000) notion of devaluing temporary work. Rogers (1995) distinguishes between deskilling and devaluing. Deskilling constitutes the “shifting of monotonous and low-skill tasks” to workers, while devaluing constitutes workers “performing highly skilled work with little recognition” (18). Rogers argued that the two processes have often been conflated in the work literature, but that unlike deskilling, which involves an actual separation of skilled work from workers, devaluing is a subtler process by which skilled work
becomes devalued (20). However, Rogers neglects to specify who is doing the ‘valuing’ or recognizing the work, and how this shapes temporary contract workers’ professional identity.

This chapter explores the ways in which colleagues, managers, and employers in the academic profession cast teaching as secondary to research in terms of success in the academic profession. Unlike deskilling, in which the workers are separated from their skill, precarious professionals continue to retain control over their skilled work – and gain recognition for it, especially from students – but the question in the context of precarious professionals is how their skilled work is valued in terms of their advancement in the profession. This suggests that professionals are precarious not simply due to their working conditions or job insecurity, but also due to the devaluing of the professional work that they do, a point not previously explored by precarious work scholars. This point is implied by Rogers but not fully explained. Rogers does not elaborate on how this ‘devaluing’ takes place through recognition and how it impacts workers. Moreover, she does not consider how work can be ‘revalued’ through masculinized values such as that of practical and/or technical experience found in Engineering and the Sciences. In what ways might value can be reattributed through the social relations of work such as with students and clients? Instead of posing these questions, Rogers focuses on how employing temporary workers benefits organizations (17-18). While acknowledging the importance of the latter, it is also important to understand how and why some workers performing highly skilled work receive less recognition than others, and who is recognizing the work. Rogers herself critiques a common assumption made by labour process theorists that “everyone on the ‘losing side’ is thought to lose in the same way.” (9) Yet, in her analysis of temporary workers, she does not flesh out the variation in how different temporary workers come to be valued or devalued more than others, or by whom. This is in part due to the unspecified
role of recognition, which Rogers acknowledges but does not theorize as playing an active role in temp contract workers’ professional identity.

8 Occupational Segregation and Gendered Jobs in the Academic Profession

Professional work often comprises a multitude of occupational tasks or jobs. For example, in the legal profession, occupational tasks include research, litigation, representation and services such as the provision of legal advice. In the academic profession, the three main occupational tasks are research, teaching, and service. As discussed in chapter one, there is substantive evidence from postsecondary education literature that teaching is increasingly viewed as having second-class status within universities, despite the official line that in Ontario the teacher-scholar devotes equal time to teaching and research. Nevertheless, critics have argued that teaching has been de-prioritized in favour of research (Robinson 2015; Robinson 2006; OCUFA 2013).

However, what this grey literature has not considered is how teaching is a gendered job within the academic profession, particularly in comparison with research. They have not examined the implications of teaching being a gendered job – and one that has been feminized relative to research – and thus demoted in terms of professional merit. Scholars in postsecondary education debates have largely ignored this dimension and consequently have lacked an understanding on how the second-class status of teaching is part of a broader trend in work and the professions.

Historically, teaching was one of the first jobs deemed socially acceptable to women and women remain more overrepresented in the teaching occupation more broadly (Fortin and Huberman 2009). Teaching involves regular student-teacher interpersonal contact and thus contains a considerable component of caring work and emotional labour (Hochschild 1983;

by considering gender as a social relation, rather than as a fixed identity or characteristic, (the feminization of employment norms) also incorporates the recent dynamics of the spread of precarious forms of employment beyond the competitive and service sector, beyond temporary and part-time employment contracts, and beyond women. By these means, this relational concept opens space for examining how other inequalities intersect with gender to perpetuate precarious employment. (64)

That gender is a social relation and not a fixed identity means that the gendering of jobs impacts both men and women, though it impacts women to a greater extent, as emphasized by Vosko (2000) and here (Cranford and Vosko 2006). Teaching is a ‘gendered job’ in that it is caring service work historically viewed as women’s work, and this further exacerbates the occupational segregation within the academic profession (See also Miller and Chamberlin 2000). NTTF are viewed by their TTF colleagues as teachers\textsuperscript{13} rather than professors, because teaching is their primary form of paid work even if they may do research and service on a paid or unpaid basis. Because teaching is viewed as less essential to advancement or promotion within the academic profession, this gendering of jobs marginalizes NTTF, reinforcing their status as temps – though this process is further differentiated along the lines of field or industry. Teaching as a professional activity has been devalued, in contrast with research, in the academic profession. In the following paragraphs, I draw on TTF interviews to show how teaching is viewed as less valuable professionally than research.

\textsuperscript{13} University teaching is not the same as teaching more broadly, yet it is nevertheless associated with the broader occupational category of teaching.
In the interviews, I asked what TTF participants think about teaching and research and how they are valued in the university. Questions included whether they think teaching or research is more valued in their university, whether teaching is valued or devalued, whether research is valued or devalued, and whether faculty members should do teaching and research jointly. I chose ‘valued’ and ‘devalued’ because they are abstract terms that allowed for participants’ own interpretations and meaning of value to emerge, and allowed them to give examples of what they meant. I also asked them whether they preferred teaching or research personally, in an attempt to assess whether personal preference might have an impact on their response to this question. It did not. Regardless of whether participants preferred research or teaching, or liked both equally, most felt that teaching was devalued in their professional context. Moreover, they argued that teaching, one of the three professional activities expected of university faculty, is devalued vis-à-vis research. This devaluation, they claimed, was not simply economic – related to pay and remuneration – but also professional – related to who was granted tenure and promotions and who was regarded as ‘star professors.’ These latter points – about whether teaching was less valued vis-à-vis research – were consistent across discipline.

When I asked TTF participants whether teaching and research held the same status or prestige at the universities where they worked, overwhelmingly they said no, and this varied very little across disciplines. For instance, Roger, a tenured TTF in the Humanities, said,

Oh, unquestionably no. Just no. That’s a great pity. We have never, in my department nor in any department I have ever heard about, seen a department go after someone who was reputed to be a great teacher. We only go after researchers. And if somebody says 'this is the worst teacher in the world', a fight will break out, and people will say 'he's not that bad, he's ok, he's minimally acceptable!' You would never hear that case made for
someone who is such a brilliant teacher that we can forget that their research is a load of crap.

Roger’s tone is quite insistent here. Those professionals who are truly valued – or sought after, in Rogers’ phrasing – are those professionals who focus on research, not teaching. Reflecting Roger’s point, Peter, a tenured TTF in the Humanities, maintained:

Research clearly has more prestige although on a formal level… On a pecking order and bragging rights level, it's clearly research. I mean if you have written a major book; if you are setting the conversation for a field or sub-field, clearly that takes you somewhere professionally that having good teaching reviews year after year won't do.

Peter’s language of ‘pecking order and bragging rights’ itself is masculinized, suggesting that teaching was not valued in the same way in the pursuit of prestige and professional recognition. Many TTF said that a great researcher was more likely to be hired for permanent employment than a great teacher – and this was consistent across disciplines. For example, Christopher, a tenured TTF in Engineering, stated:

a great researcher will always get tenure. A great researcher with a reasonable teaching record will get tenure; a great teacher with a reasonable but not great research record will not get tenure. I would be very surprised if somebody was - if somebody got tenure purely on teaching.

In terms of advancement in the profession, according to Christopher and others, research was much more important than teaching. Furthermore, in terms of recognition for one’s work by colleagues and managers, teaching was seen as less important. Lewis, a pre-tenure TTF in the Humanities confirmed that this was the case in his department:
I think research definitely gets more prestige; definitely is valued more and in fact when I first started here and I was having trouble balancing research and teaching, one of my colleagues said ‘teaching is always the first thing to go; whenever you're out of time you always let your teaching slide first and focus on your research.’ … I think people's reflective opinion about that might be more to say ‘oh actually we don't value teaching enough.’ I think people's initial judgment is always ‘research is more important’. And I think that's certainly where the glory is.

TTF from a variety of disciplines felt that though the official line was that teaching and research held equal status, teaching was somehow devalued or downgraded – that in terms of recognition – or “glory”, as Lewis phrases it – research was the important task to focus on. Because of this evaluation, teaching was sometimes ‘coded as research,’ as Terrance, a tenured TTF in the Humanities, argued:

I just don't think there's much value for the sort of day-to-day kind of teaching that most of us do, and that the teaching stream in particular do, and so I think that the status – the way that the status markers work at the university - is very much to the diminishment of teaching. There is a kind of 'teaching stain'… so even in the classroom we have these 'excellent' teachers - and they are, I mean, I've met them and they're great teachers and I admire that, but it's more just the way of sort of re-coding it, so it looks like research [laughs] so it fits into that rhetoric that really belongs to research and has been borrowed for teaching. Why not just say, “teaching is this incredibly valuable thing we do”?

Hence according to Terrence, teaching was viewed as something that needed to be ‘recoded’ as research by colleagues, managers and employers, instead of being seen meritorious on its own.
When asked whether research and teaching held the same status, eight participants – all men – said ‘maybe’, or provided a qualification. Todd, a tenured TTF in the Humanities explained that different departments valued teaching and research differently and explained that in the past research had greater status but that the department was making efforts to ensure that teaching was more highly valued, and that he now felt they were. Another TTF echoed the argument that efforts were being made to value teaching more highly. Ira, a tenured TTF and administrator in Engineering, said that it was common to hear from colleagues in general that research was more valuable, but said there were efforts to resist this preference:

I would still say that certainly, again, as I give a slight preference to teaching over research, I think it's easier to get through a tenure case or a promotion case on the strength of research over teaching... We've hired people who are not great researchers but are great teachers, and they get through the process and they get promoted. But they're – I think they have to be even better teachers than they would be as researchers. So, in other words, I'm saying, it's not that the bias doesn't exist but I think it's resisted to a certain extent.

Although agreeing that research holds more value in the general professional context of a university setting, Ira suggests that some degree of resistance by some faculty encourages valuing excellence in teaching. It is important to note that as an administrator Ira might not wish to say that teaching was devalued. Nevertheless, the efforts described by both Todd and Ira show that there is a pattern of valuing research more highly than teaching, but that this pattern was being resisted to some extent. Importantly, those who said ‘maybe’ to whether research was valued more highly than teaching implied that there was some truth to the statement that teaching and research didn't have the same status or prestige. Most of those who responded ‘maybe’ also
held administrative positions. As discussed in chapter one, the administrators may feel some pressure to reflect the official line that their university values teaching, though they did not deny that research was prioritized in the hiring and promotion of academic professionals. Overall, though, the consistent response from TTF was that research and teaching did not hold the same status, and that research indeed was viewed as more valuable to professional advancement.

The official line in the academic profession is that teaching and research should take equal amounts of time and resources from academic professionals. However, interview data revealed that this official line was not really reflected in day-to-day practices. For instance, Jay, a pre-tenure TTF in the Sciences revealed that:

I decided right at the start that teaching had to be something that was contained, meaning that in terms of time because there's no limit to how much I could put into preparing things. So, I really enjoy teaching, but I set strict boundaries around how much I put into it. So um, in practice it means I leave that to the last minute… The amount I spent on teaching would be let's say I have three hours of lecture, I start thinking about my lecture about 15 minutes before I have to give the lecture. I go and I read through my notes - or maybe half an hour. Half an hour to 15 minutes before and I'll read through, skim through that part of the book again or re-upload what I've done before; make sure I can – it's clear again in my head and then go and talk about it…

Jay explained that he felt that more preparation didn’t always translate to a better classroom experience, but he also said he felt that teaching was less important than research for advancement in his position. Though it is hard to ascertain whether the former reasoning is true, as more context is needed, it is important to note that Jay felt the pressure to set strict boundaries around the time he afforded to teaching, and so limited the time he spent teaching so he had more
time for research. As we will see in the next chapter, TTF unlike NTTF often teach the same course repeatedly and therefore Jay may have had less preparation than someone teaching a new course. Nevertheless, it is important that he felt the need to contain the time he spent on teaching in order to focus on teaching. It is also important to note that Jay is pre-tenure, and therefore felt the need to focus on research to support his tenure. Thus, the sense that teaching was less important to advancement was reinforced by some professionals’ own accounts of how they prioritized work.

Unlike TTF, NTTF are paid for their teaching work, not their research or service, and so within the academic profession they come to be known as teachers. Lewis, a pre-tenure TTF in the Humanities argued:

There's a strong bias toward thinking that people who are (NTTF) are less capable … in fact they're probably better teachers and worse researchers and it's only once I stop to think about people I know who are adjuncts that I correct that bias.

And this view of NTTF as ‘better teachers’ and worse researchers compared to TTF was reflected across disciplines and by both NTTF and TTF. For instance, Anne, a tenured TTF in Science, said that NTTF were “people whose research pedigree is less strong.” Even though NTTF may do research, they are labeled as teachers because teaching is what they are paid to do. Indeed, at one university, NTTF are meant to be supported in their applications for research grants, according to one participant, “because it all looks good on the university if your sessionals have active research programs”, and yet when this participant sought support for her research, she was told by her managers that was not part of her job. She said: “there's lots of signals sent to those of us who teach to ‘just stay in your place. You teach; we'll do the important research work.’” NTTF are often viewed as teachers only, not as researchers – even if they also
do research and additional service to the university. Since teaching is often viewed as less important than research to advancement in the academic profession, NTTF were devalued professionally. Though, as shown in the next section, the extent to which they were devalued also varied, in ways that were gendered, along lines of industry.

9 Feminized and Masculinized Temporary Contract Work and Industrial Segregation

Since all NTTF work on temporary contracts, and all NTTF teach, one might expect their work to be valued – or devalued – equally. However, that is not the case. In fact, NTTF in the Humanities on the one hand and in Engineering and Science on the other describe different levels of recognition from colleagues and employers for the work that they do. NTTF in the Humanities consistently describe a lack of recognition for their work by colleagues and managers, echoing the assessment of TTF that as teachers, they are devalued. Engineering and Science NTTF on the other communicated the value of their expertise and experience, and describe the ways that colleagues, managers, and employers recognize that value. For temporary contract professionals in Engineering and Science, value emanated mainly from their practical and technical experience in male-dominated fields. As discussed in chapter one, women are underrepresented in Engineering and Science, and this underrepresentation is an important part of industrial segregation. But even more important are the ways that gendered assumptions persist in traditionally male-dominated industries. Women are not only underrepresented because of segregation but also handicapped because of gendered assumptions in those occupations.

NTTF in the Humanities underscored how teaching was devalued, reflecting assessments by TTF in the previous section. They described how this impacted their experience of the work,
and how as temporary contract workers they felt on the margins of their workplaces. When asked about the value of teaching and research, Nina, a NTTF in the Humanities suggested:

I think research in our department is probably even a little bit more important (than teaching). If you don't have a viable living practice as an artist or a practitioner, you're sort of devalued a little bit.

And Samantha, a NTTF in the Humanities, reflected on how research was the priority for TTF and this explained, to her, why temporary contract workers were hired to teach:

I get hired as a sessional to teach these various courses; I guess in order to free up time for permanent faculty to do research. So there's I think various ways in which I feel that the university values research more than teaching.

Samantha suggested that temporary contract workers did work that was less valued than the research work done by permanent faculty. Some NTTF in the Humanities described how they had come to accept that research was more important to one’s career than teaching. Matt, a NTTF in the Humanities, admitted: “I've just always had the mindset – I've internalized it – that research is so much more important (than teaching).” And Angela, a NTTF in the Humanities, revealed that someone once told her “the best way not to get a tenure-track job is to win the teacher-of-the-year award.” Hence, messaging – whether direct or indirect – about the value of teaching work was clear for NTTF in the Humanities. Reflecting some of the statements by TTF above that research was more important than teaching, Frances, a NTTF in the Humanities, said

I published a collection three articles in peer review, and I went to a bunch of conferences and I got two lines in my evaluation that were 'we're happy you're still doing research' or
something like that... I got a raise, but it's not all because of my teaching evaluations; (it’s) because my research was better.

Hence, there were both negative signs of the value of teaching and positive signs about the value of research that led NTTF in the Humanities to feel like their teaching work was less valued. And Kathryn, a NTTF in the Humanities who described winning an award in the vignette presented earlier in this chapter said:

The only time teaching becomes an issue is when someone is going up for promotion and then there finagling ways to get that particular person a teaching award from the students or a nomination from students. That’s the only time you ever hear about teaching as, you know, of value.

Others suggested that the very use of temporary contract workers indicated that teaching was less valued in the academic community. Reflecting the way that temporary contracts workers were associated with work lower in a hierarchy of professional work Valerie, a NTTF in the Humanities, stated

We know this from the basic economic fact that we have people like me doing all this teaching on a barely liveable wage, like I mean if teaching were actually respected in the same way, then we would have teaching postdocs, for example. There are so many ways that hierarchy is elucidated… I think it's not good for your family and it's not good for your relationship and it's not good for your self-esteem.

Hence for Valerie, feeling devalued had deep, and personal impacts on her life. Others felt that the temporary label – or sessional instructor label – in itself had negative connotations. Tina, a NTTF in the Humanities, stated frankly: “if you are introduced as a sessional, there's no doubt
and quickly you're led to believe that you are a second class citizen and that your opinion frankly
doesn't really count cause you're not permanent.” Dana, a NTTF in the Humanities and union
organizer, contended:

I think the institution devalues sessionals, there’s a sort of sense that if you haven’t been
able to achieve fulltime employment in some capacity, be it teaching stream elsewhere or
tenured stream then there’s something missing within you as a candidate.

And Hector, a NTTF in the Humanities elaborated on this point:

There’s a general sense that you - since you're not tenured or tenure-stream that somehow
you're to blame for your position in life. I remember reading something somewhere and I
thought it puts this attitude in a nutshell that said that 'universities are very good at
making people who have not achieved tenure; tenure-stream to feel like they are at fault
for their position or their lack of position, so to speak.'

More generally, Darren, a NTTF in the Humanities, reflected: “over the years it's become very
clear how negative it is to not be included; to not be connected” and wished for a more collegial
work environment, reflecting themes in both chapter three and four.

In contrast with NTTF in the Humanities, who felt their expertise and work as teachers was
devalued, NTTF in Engineering and Science described a different situation – one in which they
felt their expertise and experience was highly valued by colleagues, managers and employers.
The value of Engineering and Science NTTF’s work was derived from their practical experience
and work outside universities, particularly through consulting and technical work with
corporations. This was reflected in managers’ and employers’ discourse: in one interview with a
university administrator, they stated their university took explicit action to hire “professors of
practice” with valuable knowledge from outside academia. Though there were a few NTTF in the Humanities with non-academic experience, the professors of practice were much more common in Engineering and Science, two male-dominated fields, as described in chapter one.

NTTF in Engineering highlighted how their practical knowledge brought value to the classroom and conveyed that this knowledge and expertise was generally valued by colleagues and employers. In some cases, NTTF in Engineering and Science described being recruited by universities based on their experience in the private sector. In contrast, no NTTF in the Humanities ever used the language of recruitment. Those NTTF in particular often taught small upper-year courses – referred to as “capstone courses” – and tended to teach only one specialized course, rather than an array of courses like those that Humanities NTTF often taught. NTTF in Engineering emphasized how their experience in industry made them valued assets to the universities and departments that hired them. Nelson, a NTTF engineer, said:

In Ontario there's three schools that offer degrees in (my area)... All three of those in the past years now have this requirement to teach (Course X). It's a specialized enough discipline that there aren't that many people who either practice or teach it, and so that requirement ends up creating difficulty for the universities because none of them wants to commit an full-time tenure position to a course that's really quite specialized... And so part of my consulting work is to cover those courses for the universities.

That this faculty frames their teaching work as part of their consulting is indicative of the way their temporary work is recognized as specialized knowledge that their employers sought out. This can be contrasted with the way NTTF in Humanities described their value to their employers: they placed greater emphasis on the feeling that their highly skilled work was not viewed as terribly valued. Kenneth, a NTTF in the Humanities, said he feels he is “replaceable at
any time.” This is in part due to the way their work is organized. NTTF in applied fields like Engineering and Science often teach very specialized smaller courses at the undergraduate level that are based primarily, if not entirely, on their experience in industry. Unlike NTTF in applied fields, Humanities NTTF often teach a wider range of courses at the undergraduate level, as noted by Robert, a tenured TTF and administrator in the Humanities:

> In the sciences, and in engineering the curriculum is rather prescribed and you need this set of courses to move on to second year, you need these courses to move on to third year in many of the humanities. And I think English would be the best example. Yes, there are first year courses, second year courses, third year courses and hopefully some capstone courses in fourth year. But they're kind of interchangeable. You could, especially if you had a strong background, you could go right into a second year more specialized English course or you could pick and choose across the curriculum.

Humanities courses are therefore particularly vulnerable to the use of temporary contract labour, due to the way they are viewed as more ‘interchangeable’ compared to Engineering and Science courses. Engineering and Science courses are ‘prescribed’ and based on the specialized knowledge of Engineering and Science professionals, who are viewed as having more specialized knowledge than Humanities professionals, even though they typically have similar training and education as shown in chapter one.

NTTF in Engineering and Science, unlike NTTF in Humanities, used the value of their ‘real world experience’ to assert value in their work. The value of this real-world experience is

---

14 In fact, NTTF in the Humanities tend to be more specialized, holding a PhD more often, than NTTF in Engineering and Science who tend to hold Master’s degrees as their most advanced level of education and training.
reflected in the official line about why temporary contract teachers are hired, and what judicious employment of NTTF entails, as Robert, a tenured TTF and administrator argued:

At [one department] many of the sessionals are not academics who haven't been able to find full-time work; they're professionals who are working for, you know, the [federal government agency] or they're working out in the field and they want to maintain the connection to the university. They're bringing back to us really important skills from the real world but they're also bringing us a connection to the [federal government agency] where many of us have placements.

Many NTTF engineers had their own external practice or company and emphasized the value of having work experience and working outside of the academy. And Christopher, also a tenured TTF in Engineering, reflected the value of having NTTF with practical experience teaching undergraduate courses:

(NTTF) are people who are working in industry and sometimes that's great because you know - especially in engineering you have somebody from industry coming in and that's actually a benefit for the students because you know you get to see that practical side of things.

Temporary contract professionals in Engineering and Science assert the value and worth of their work in the academic profession by drawing on non-academic experience. By contrast, NTTF in the Humanities felt their work was devalued – for them, being valued was an exceptional experience, usually associated with things outside of teaching like publications and awards. Though all NTTF interviewed are highly skilled specialists in a particular field, the recognition of Engineers and Scientists’ skills was much more apparent in accounts provided by NTTF of the
recognition they received, and in TTF and administrators’ accounts of the value of Engineering and Science NTTF.

10 Recognition in the Classroom: NTTF Experiences with Students

NTTF in all disciplines felt that students valued their work in a visible or obvious way. This contrasted with the way NTTF – especially those in the Humanities – viewed recognition from their colleagues and employers. Sue, a NTTF in the Humanities, said “I love the students, that's why I teach there, it's not because of the university, but yeah the students are great.” The sentiment that NTTF were committed to their students first and foremost was widespread across the sample. Sometimes NTTF even viewed their own commitment as detrimental to their ability to sustain themselves: Lisa, a NTTF said “you deal with interesting and interested people – students – so it makes it difficult to quit even when you realize that this is not a sustainable occupation. But I am good at what I do.” Hence even when they felt temporary contract teaching was unsustainable financially, NTTF derived a sense of value from teaching students. NTTF described a sense that students also valued their practical experience. Ray, a NTTF Engineer who also worked in the public sector, said:

I find that students respect me more because they do look at me as a different Prof. who has both the experiences of real world as well as who also has a sound educational background, and since I have a PhD, I think it also gives me an additional edge… (My course is) capped at 25, and some students have told me that it's very difficult to get into my course.

Jim, a NTTF in Engineering, said that although most academics valued research excellence, taking a student’s perspective allowed for a different evaluation.
The status for most people is based on the high research achievers. So, our university's not as good at promoting people who are very effective on the teaching side. On the other hand, the status that the students give is all based on the teaching side, and so the university has the – or people don't spot the fact that we have some research stars here who students think are absolute dregs. Now there's no penalty to the person. So, it depends what you value.

This notion of value emanating from students reflects some of the case studies on NTTF’s sense of dual professional identity described by researchers in the US and the UK (Levin and Shaker 2011; Abbas and McLean 2001). Even though NTTF in the Humanities feel devalued by colleagues, managers and employers along the lines of occupational segregation, ultimately they regain recognition in the classroom from their students. The recognition of students was more consistent for temporary contract workers, suggesting that workers retained their skill to some extent, but that the recognition of that skill was what varied for temporary contract workers in the academic profession. This focus on the recognition implicit in the social relations of work differs from prior analyses of deskilling. Unlike many forms of non-professional precarious work, precarious professionals retain a high skill level in what they teach. The question is how they are valued, as Rogers (2000) suggests. Moreover, who values their skill - or devalues it – is an important factor to consider.

To further understand value we need to specify the social relations of work and understand that value may emerge from different actors. This means including students because they are in essence the recipients of higher education delivered by teachers. In the health care sector, recipients or clients of a health care service such as home care or nursing shape workers’ experience on a day-to-day level, in addition to their own conceptualization of the work and how valued they feel as workers (Birdsell Bauer and Cranford 2016; Cranford, Hick, and Birdsell
Bauer, 2018; Clark and Clark 2006; Aronson and Neysmith 1996; Baines 2006). I therefore highlight Rogers’ (2000) focus on recognition but specify and extend it, since temporary contract workers can receive recognition in some contexts – such as in the classroom with students – but not others – such as in the context of colleagues, managers and employers. Precarious professionals’ experiences are thus highly influenced by the complex social relations of work, reinforcing the need to examine these processes at the micro-level and through in-depth qualitative investigation.

Nevertheless, teaching was viewed as devalued by NTTF’s colleagues, managers, and employers in terms of advancement and success in the academic profession. The feminization of teaching work puts temporary contract workers – paid to do primarily teaching – on the margins of their profession. However, this also varies based on professionals’ situation in masculinized fields like Engineering and Science. Temporary contract workers in the latter fields describe feeling that their expertise and experience are highly valued by colleagues, managers and employers. For both feminized and masculinized workers, recognition from students is a constant, and for some this recognition from students is at odds with the lack of recognition from colleagues, managers and employers.

11 Conclusion

In this second chapter, I argue that the concept of ‘precarious professionals’ pushes us to extend our frameworks both of precarious work and the professions. I suggest there is a gap in this literature in terms of explaining how, specifically, temporary professional work is recognized. Recognition is a complex factor grounded in the social relations of work. In order to fully flesh out a concept of recognition that works for professional, temporary workers, one must look at who is granting recognition – or not – to uncover how professionals are valued and
devalued. In contrast with the recognition of colleagues, managers and employers, which varied by industry and occupation, the recognition by students was more consistent for temporary contract workers.

Building on work about precarious work and by gender scholars, I argue in this chapter that the feminization of employment norms has been a key dynamic in precaritizing professional work. The feminization of employment norms has been recognized by precarious work scholars as a key dynamic, but not sufficiently by scholars of professional work. When scholars of the professions have acknowledged feminization of employment norms, they have not linked feminization to precarious forms of employment. Building off Vosko’s theory of the global feminization of work, I show how occupational segregation feminizes workers, devaluing their work vis-à-vis their colleagues, managers, and employers. Turning to industrial segregation, I show how, conversely, temporary contract workers can be both feminized and masculinized. That temporary contract work can be masculinized means that work is “valued” (Rogers 2000) in that it receives greater recognition from colleagues, managers, and professionals. This point is neglected by scholars of precarious work who assume that temporary work is always and already feminized (Vosko 2000). Though Vosko’s establishment of the TER as a gendered employment relationship is an important contribution, it must account for change in how temporary contract work is gendered, as shown in processes of masculinization and recognition described above.

Finally, showing the recognition all temporary contract workers receive from students, I argue that the social relations of temporary contract work matter. Building off Rogers’ (2000) argument, I contend that the recognition of skilled work varies based on the social relations of work, meaning that workers receive recognition from some actors, but not others. Because students’ recognition does not have as strong implications for advancement and success as that of
colleagues, managers and employers, I focus on the latter when explaining how recognition impacts precarious professionals’ economic marginalization. Therefore, the way skilled work is recognized – and by whom – is key in understanding how workers become marginalized in their profession, further extending and specifying Rogers’ thesis.

By examining the feminization and masculinization of temporary work at the micro-level, we can uncover the way that gendered occupations and industries marginalize temporary contract workers in the academic profession. I show how most academic professionals view teaching, a feminized job, as secondary to research. Since temporary workers are paid to teach and not do research, they are further marginalized in the academic profession. However, the degree of marginalization varies by industrial specialization. Indeed, not all temporary contract workers are marginalized in their profession, and that the marginalization of temporary contract workers in their profession is a complex and multifaceted process. The process of marginalization is predicated on the devaluing – or lack of recognition – by colleagues, managers or employers – of a feminized occupation, teaching. Temporary contract workers who work in highly masculinized fields such as Engineering and Applied Science do not experience this process to the same extent as those in the Humanities – in fact, the former receive notable recognition from colleagues, manager and employers for their teaching work. Hence in some cases, being hired on temporary contracts does not lead to professionals feeling of being devalued by peers and the institution.

This analysis further complicates our understanding of temporary work and the way it intersects with gendered meanings, values and recognition of work across occupation and industry. I use this argument to show how the experience of precarious professionals is not simply about the economic challenges of working on temporary contracts, but also of cultural marginalization. In the next chapter, I show how their experiences of temporary work, examined
at the micro-level, operate in complex ways to further marginalize them economically and professionally.
Chapter 3
Precarious Professionals’ Experiences of Temporary Work

The aim of this chapter is to show how working conditions found in temporary work impact professional workers in myriad ways, impacting their professional development and integration, and trapping them between the worlds of precarious work and the academic profession. Consider the experiences at work of these two temporary contract workers:

Emma is a 35 year-old white NTTF in the Humanities who holds a PhD. An Eastern European immigrant with one child, she teaches two courses a year, earning $14,000, a salary under the poverty line. Her spouse worked full-time and with their combined income of $74,000, she described struggling to afford a home their family in Toronto. Emma had recently applied to several full-time positions after working for four years as a NTTF and also being unemployed, but had not been successful. Despite earning such a low income she described working twelve hour days regularly, preparing for her classes, applying for jobs, and commuting between the three campuses where she worked. When she was pregnant, she feared for her job security after an inappropriate comment was made by a senior male TTF. She worried she would be doing temporary contract work at multiple campuses for the rest of her life. She had lost interest in her research, and discontinued efforts to publish. In terms of her dreams of being an academic, she felt she ‘might as well give up’.

Nelson is a 56 year-old Canadian born man of mixed racial heritage who works as a NTTF in Engineering who holds a Master's degree. He teaches one highly specialized course at two university campuses, earning approximately $10,000 per course and, along with his non-academic practice, earns a combined income of $226,000. Nelson advises students on matters outside of his course contract because he says does not want to let

15 Self-assigned.
them down. He also tried to get faculty in these departments to include more input from the NTTF who teach specialized courses, but these efforts he felt were to no avail. However, at the end of the day he says he is happy to have the flexibility and be able to continue with his consulting practice simultaneously.

Emma and Nelson have fundamentally different experiences of temporary contract work. Both commute between two or three campuses. Yet, Emma experiences a gendered dependency on her husband’s income, reflecting classic conflicts between women’s domestic and childcare responsibilities and paid work obligations (E.g. Duffy & Pupo 1994). Nelson, who has additional income from his consulting practice, views his teaching income as supplementing his main source of income. Emma aspires to being a full-time professor on the tenure-track, while Nelson does not. Emma teaches a variety of courses, which change from term to term, while Nelson teaches one specialized class across campuses. Hence, even if on the surface they have the same job title, there are key differences at the micro-level, which make for very different experiences of temporary contract work. Furthermore, these differences impact their ability to advance as professionals: Emma works twelve hour days to prepare for a variety of classes – some in her area of expertise, and others that she was asked to do at the last minute because of a professor going on leave. Exhausted, she is ready to give up on her dream of being a tenure-stream professor, Nelson feels teaching this one specialized course adds some diversity to his professional life and allows him to transmit the knowledge gained in his field to a select group of students. Even if he views himself as ‘outside the faculty’, this does not impact him on a professional level. Hence, though there are some similarities in the type of contract work done by NTTF, there is considerable variation in how they experience it.
This chapter is structured as follows: First, I describe how precarious work literature has conceptualized economic insecurity and working conditions found in temporary contract work. Second, I show how working conditions in temporary contract work impact NTTF’s professional development – that is, their ability to focus on things that will advance them in the academic profession, such as research, professional development workshops, and conferences. Second, I show how working conditions in temporary contract work impact NTTF’s professional integration. Third, I argue NTTF are trapped in a bind between doing unpaid work in an attempt to advance in their profession, or not doing unpaid work, and losing key aspects of integration from their profession. In the fourth and final section I show how, given the impact of working conditions on NTTF’s professional development and integration, NTTF are trapped between the world of being a precarious worker, and the world of being a professional worker.

12 Economic Insecurity and Temporary Contract Working Conditions

One of the key issues described in the literature on precarious work is that of economic insecurity. Standing (2011:11) suggests seven dimensions of economic insecurity. These include labour market insecurity or a lack of adequate income earning opportunities in the labor market; employment insecurity or a lack of protection and regulations around hiring and dismissal; job insecurity or a lack of opportunity to move up a job ladder and gain upward mobility; work insecurity or a lack of protections against psychic and physical harms of work; skill reproduction insecurity, or a lack of opportunity to gain skills and use those skills; income insecurity, or a lack of stable income through employment or social assistance; and representation insecurity, or the lack of adequate representation through unions.
In this chapter, I look at how economic insecurity intersects with working conditions and experiences at work, shaping temporary contract workers’ career decisions, such as the need to take on additional courses for financial reasons. The latter decisions also impact precarious professionals’ ability to find additional work. Thus, the complex ways in which economic insecurity and working conditions overlap compound the effects on precarious professionals. Contrary to Standing’s suggestion that all workers are becoming more precarious, I argue there is complex variation in the economic and cultural marginalization that occurs among professional workers, building off my argument in chapter two. Specifically, NTTF in the Humanities are on the one hand economically devalued in the lower income category, and on the other, professionally devalued through the feminization of teaching. NTTF in Engineering and the Sciences experience both economic and professional value, by contrast. In this chapter I further expand and specify what this variation looks like by drawing on workers’ lived experiences with the working conditions found in temporary contract work.

Temporary contract workers experienced six of seven of Standing’s (2011) forms of economic insecurity, to varying degrees, meaning two things. First, NTTF experience some forms more acutely than others. Second, there is variation among temporary contract workers’ severity of experience. Labour market security is contingent on the availability of contracts, and at most universities in southern Ontario there is no guarantee a course will be offered from one term to the next.16 Most NTTF have no guarantee that the academic labour market will offer employment suited to them, and turn to other labour markets such as the service industry to supplement their income. But, as suggested in previous chapters, NTTF in the Engineering and

16 At a minority of universities, NTTF can obtain greater security over their assignments and become the “preferred candidate” for all positions in their Department for which they are qualified and apply. However, there is still no guarantee the relevant courses will be offered, and hence this is a limited form of economic security.
Sciences have more labour market security than those in the Humanities because they have full-time, well-paid permanent work in their field. Hence, at the outset, it is important to note that the experience of various forms of economic insecurity varies across temporary contract workers.

The way economic insecurity intersects with working conditions can be observed in other forms of precarious work where contracts are based on shifts or the availability of clients. Specifically, in homecare, personal support workers (PSWs) who work part-time struggle to get clients in order to get enough hours to make a living wage (Cranford, Hick, and Birdsell Bauer forthcoming; Cranford and Miller 2013; Baines 2004). Literature on precarious work has identified how precarious work is dependent on the availability of contract hours, and here contract hours can be understood as contracts for courses, obtained on a term-by-term basis. Moreover, even if NTTF decide to take on multiple courses each year, courses offered each term typically fluctuate, and NTTF struggle to obtain real job security. If universities choose not to run a course in one term, NTTF have no recourse to ensure that they have additional work and this makes them economically insecure. Indeed, when one university program was discontinued, a number of NTTF lost their contracts, because according to their employers they no longer held precedent over those courses even if they were offered in a separate department. This impacted their ability to retain priority-hiring status and many of them lost work.

The International Labor Organization defines working conditions as encompassing “a broad range of topics and issues, from working time (hours of work, rest periods, and work schedules) to remuneration, as well as the physical conditions and mental demands that exist in the workplace.” (ILO 2016, my emphasis). Here, I include low pay and little to no health benefits; multiple job holding and commuting; sexism in the workplace; and feelings of uncertainty, vulnerability and anxiety related to job insecurity. To some extent, these conditions
of precarious work have been identified in previous literature as key aspects of precarious work (Vosko 2000b; Kalleberg 2009; Cranford, Vosko, and Zukewich 2003). Yet, what has not been elaborated is how they marginalize professionals and force them to make choices between confronting economic insecurity or making sacrifices in terms of their professional development and integration. Building off Crowley et al.’s (2010) research on post-Fordist ‘flexibility’, temporary contract work has “intended and unintended consequences that increasingly impinge on the quality of professional work life.” (2010:422) Previous research has not examined in depth how these consequences play out and how, specifically, they are linked to the conditions of temporary contract work. In order to better understand the impact of the conditions in temporary contract work on academic professionals, I highlight NTTF working conditions not experienced by permanently employed professionals to better understand the unique challenges temporary contract workers face and to define whether and if so how they become precarious professionals.

13 Limiting Professional Development: Economic Insecurity, Uncertainty, and ‘Just-in-Time’ Contract Work

Before analyzing NTTF working conditions it is instructive to consider what permanently employed professionals’ (TTF) working conditions look like in order to better understand what temporary contract workers lack. Regular tenure-stream faculty at all ranks get paid a salary intended to remunerate their work done in teaching, research and service, rather than a course stipend that remunerates the teaching done in a single course. Unlike NTTF, TTF have an office, and engage in processes of professional integration like annual reviews at the institutions where they work. In terms of teaching, TTF usually teach a set amount of courses (often two in the fall term and two in the winter term, though this varies by institution). Unlike NTTF, they usually know what these courses are far in advance of their start dates, though this can vary if they decide to take sabbaticals or other forms of leaves, or work in administrative positions. Unlike
NTTF, TTF usually teach similar courses from year to year. Indeed, one TTF I spoke to had taught the same two courses for over 25 years. This is not to suggest that TTF do not face some of the same challenging working conditions as NTTF – indeed, common issues such as that of overwork and intensification are discussed in chapter four. A separate thesis could be written on the set of challenges faced mainly by TTF, however, since the aim is to understand specifics of how temporary contract work impact professionals, TTF conditions are not analyzed in depth to the same extent that NTTF conditions are analyzed here. In this chapter, I elaborate on NTTF’s experience of the working conditions in temporary contract work, and show how they limit workers’ development and integration in the academic profession.

13.1 Economic Insecurity, Uncertainty and Professional Development

Like most precarious workers, NTTF are paid less than full-time, permanent workers in the same sector and many experience income insecurity. At one university in Toronto for example, they are remunerated on a pay scale of $14,250 to $15,850 per course, and any additional income at other academic and non-academic jobs, so their annual pay depends on how many courses they teach, unlike TTF who have an annual salary that remunerates all teaching, research and service work and whose salaries range from 100,000 to 150,000 (See Tables 2 and 3). It is important to note that a floor but not a ceiling usually delimits the income range for NTTF, and therefore NTTF can negotiate higher salaries. This is particularly important in order to understand why some NTTF have higher incomes than others and as previously noted, Engineering and Science NTTF tended to receive higher salaries. Participants mainly in the Humanities argued that their pay was very low and it was difficult to survive solely on income

17 See Table 5 for further information about the working conditions raised as issues by both NTTF and TTF.
obtained doing NTTF work. Danya, a NTTF in the Humanities, said “I can barely scrape together a living.” Sue, a NTTF in the Humanities, said she loved students and said: “I do it for them… I certainly don’t do it for the money.” In Ontario in 2011, the poverty line was $19,930 for a family of one and $28,185 for a family with one child. The experience of having a salary below or at the poverty line was most acutely felt by NTTF for whom this was the sole source of income. They described having difficulties making ends meet. Other dimensions of temporary contract work and professional demands sometimes compounded this. Lisa, a NTTF in the Humanities, reflected on how difficult it was to work on temporary contracts, develop one’s professional work, and support children:

So when on paper we earn $42 per hour, that does not seem to be too much of a problem; if in fact it is around $20 per hour (because of the massive overtime I had to put in because of my late hire and new courses) paying $15 to the babysitter does not leave one with very much to go on. Also, every day that I teach or take part in professional development workshops, I have to spend three hours commuting, for which I have to pay the babysitter. So, when you start having children, it becomes even harder to hold on to your dream to be a professor.

For Lisa, it became difficult to balance childcare and commuting from campus to campus was difficult. This passage suggests the difficulty is not only financial or economic, but also difficult in terms of Lisa being able to maintain her progress towards her professional goal of becoming a permanently employed academic. By contrast, no TTF in the sample raised these issues. They did raise the issue of overwork, and work-life balance issues, but none of the TTF interviewed described balancing economic and professional responsibilities in the ways NTTF had.
Precarious workers often lack health benefits (Hudson 2007; Cranford, Vosko, and Zukewich 2003; Zuberi 2011). Many precarious workers have little or no health benefits and may pay for costs out of pocket. While Ontario’s health care system helps to alleviate this problem to some extent, not all costs are covered. Most NTTF felt their health benefits were lacking. For example, a NTTF who works for 99 hours at one university gets 275 dollars of benefits for their entire family. They argued that in Ontario this was insufficient to cover expenses not covered by provincial health care such as prescription medication\textsuperscript{18} and other medical professional services. Hence, some NTTF incur out-of-pocket costs, which is a further economic burden compared to permanently employed workers who have more complete health care coverage. Additionally, NTTF who have work permits and are not Canadian citizens face a greater challenge. Elizabeth, a NTTF in the Humanities who is an American citizen, describes how the length of her contract means she is not covered under health insurance:

I think it's frankly fucking ridiculous that we are hired on these four month contracts just shy of the six-month requirement for OHIP qualification and it puts people like me - and I have another colleague who's in the same position - in a really difficult position of not having any health insurance - and if you have a health issue, you're paying out of pocket almost entirely and we don't earn enough to be able to do that.

This quote reflects both the economic difficulty of not having sufficient health care coverage as well as the frustration NTTF feel about working on short-term contracts. As can be seen in other

\textsuperscript{18} In January 2018, more than two years after the interviews were conducted, Ontario prescription medication for children came into effect.
analyses of precarious work, workers are often hired on short-term and part-time contracts so employers do not have to pay the costs of health care coverage. Several NTTF described not being able to pay for medical treatments, and this was particularly true for NTTF without alternative employment. In the Humanities, some did have alternative sources of employment, such as working for a catering company, however this was often also part-time contract work that did not offer health benefits either. Hence, the extent to which temporary contract workers were impacted by a lack of health benefits in one contract was contingent on their employment in another. For some, this added stress onto an already difficult financial situation – one that made their experience as temporary contract workers difficult.

What needs further elaboration, then, is not just a simple account of the working conditions that exist, but also an elucidation of how temporary workers experience economic insecurity and how this impacts them as professionals. Scholars have described a variety of psychological impacts of precarious work, especially alienation and uncertainty (Rogers 1995; Hodson 1996; Zuberi 2011; Armstrong, Armstrong, and Scott-Dixon 2008; Anderson-Connolly et al. 2002). Similar to the workers described in these studies, NTTF in my sample felt their employment insecurity impacted their sense of security and certainty. For instance, Elizabeth, a NTTF in the Humanities, said:

For me the hardest part is the sense of profound vulnerability that I have at my job, which means that it's very difficult for me to think about the medium to long-term so what I end up doing when I'm teaching like this is like - ok I've got a short-term teaching gig, got a contract until the end of December, I throw myself into it, I work really hard at that, but I find it tremendously challenging to think about the medium-to-long term because it's just a big void that opens up in front of me, like, where am I going? And like I said the money
you earn teaching is enough to stay afloat, but barely. And so you just get the sensation that you're treading water ‘cause you are. So the hardest part for me is like, how can I do this and keep up with the relentless weekly grind of it, ‘cause it is constant, and still kind of separate a part of my mental space and emotional space to think about my own future.

What Elizabeth described – a constant feeling of insecurity and vulnerability – was part of her experience as a contract worker. Though she had worked hard to finish a PhD and had aspirations to work full-time as a professor, her ability to focus on this was limited by the experience of vulnerability and uncertainty, and the very real economic demands of needing to keep up with the “weekly grind” of work to support herself. This suggests a key theme of being trapped between the economic demands of being a precarious worker, and the professional demands of being an academic, and aspiring full-time professor. Matt, a NTTF in the Humanities, described how it impacted his life:

I think for me the most frustrating thing is the uncertainty - so not knowing if I am going to have work - so just that material insecurity is the main problem for me. Um, it's just very disorienting in terms of being able to plan my life - financially, personally, all of those kind of things. And it's just - having to worry about whether or not I'm gonna have money every three months - it distracts from my ability to concentrate on research.

Like Elizabeth, Matt indicated that the need to focus on material or economic security preceded the important work of doing research for his own professional development. Though there is some variation in how temporary contract members described the experience of economic insecurity, particularly when this was their sole source of income Dana, a union representative, underscored the collective sense of uncertainty. When describing the union membership, she said “Because we’re contract workers and because we’re precarious and because we’re not well paid
the fear of a loss of income for any short of time, I think, can actually be quite powerful.” Hence, the experience of economic insecurity – here described as income and job insecurity – loomed over temporary contract workers and acted as a continual and constant source of stress and anxiety. This stress and anxiety interfered with precarious professionals’ ability to focus on developing professionally and committing time to things like research, workshops and even job applications.

In some extreme cases, these feelings became more acute, as Tina, a NTTF in the Humanities, conveyed: “We live in a climate of fear and anxiety now; everybody is always in high concern for losing their sessional work.” Tina’s mention of fear and anxiety indicated the intensity of the personal impact of being temporary and feeling like one’s job was always at stake. This intensity was not reflected in all participants, but what was common among most participants in the Humanities was a general feeling of uncertainty. Valerie, a NTTF in the Humanities, described feeling uneasy “cause there's 17 people lined up behind you ready to take your job like in an instant.” NTTF felt that TTF who were employed on a full-time permanent basis did not have to deal with these feelings. This feeling varied across disciplines. It was mostly Humanities NTTF who had little to no alternative sources of income who were negatively impacted. Nelson, a NTTF in Engineering, who had a full-time consulting practice, maintained that

Regular faculty… never have to worry about whether or not they get to do this again next year. And a lot of the adjunct faculty - I know adjunct faculty who are not in the same position as me - people who want to be academics and who agree to do adjunct work because it's the only thing on offer. And so they do good courses, they get great reviews from their students, they put their heart and soul in it, but in June of each year they don't
know if they're coming back in September. And that, that uncertainty in future employment isn't there with the regular faculty - especially if they're tenured; there's a high degree of comfort and security that comes from being part of the regular faculty.

Nelson indicated that he did not experience that uncertainty in the same way as temporary contract workers who, unlike him, wanted full-time permanent employment in the academic profession. But Peter, a tenured TTF in the Humanities, further elaborated upon the importance of the comfort and security afforded by having a secure position:

You know whether it's books… awards, a degree of public recognition even outside the academy, I mean these are all positive things that job security - I don't wanna say tenure necessarily - but job security allows people to work towards.

Peter’s suggestion that job security allows one to work towards professional rewards and accomplishments reinforces the point that job insecurity impedes NTTF's professional development. By contrast, TTF did not experience uncertainty or anxiety in the same way. If they described anxiety, it was usually related to balancing their manifold responsibilities, or the anxieties of getting tenure. In the next section I show how yet another dimension of temporary contract work – multiple job holding and commuting – place a tax on temporary contract workers, further impacting their professional development.

13.2 Multiple Job Holding, Commuting and Professional Development

Reflecting previous literature on precarious work, many NTTF have multiple jobs. As seen in Table 2, the majority of NTTF (30/32) concurrently held multiple jobs at the time of the interview. Out of these 30, 17 currently have non-academic jobs, 13 have a current second academic job, and four of those 13 also have a current third academic job. Unlike TTF who work
at one university and work with one set of institutional rules, regulations, administration and curriculum, NTTF who work at multiple universities do additional work in dealing with the administration of a variety of institutions who may have different policies and practices regarding course administration and delivery. Temporary workers are often forced to commute between multiple jobs in order to piece together a living (MacEachen, Polzer, and Clarke 2008; Parry 2003; Milkman 2011). Most NTTF (30/32) work at jobs in the GTA and those who work at universities across southern Ontario have long commutes. David, a union representative, describes the lives of NTTF who commute:

We have members who are teaching five different campuses in southern Ontario. People go to Trent on Tuesday, or UofT on Wednesday, you know, then go out somewhere else on Friday - actually I'm working with a sessional this term, she comes in from Ottawa every week for her course – so it's been 10 hours of her term commute for - every Wednesday or whenever it is that she has class time.

Though 10 hours in a single day is an extreme in terms of the amount of time NTTF commute, and there is considerable variation in how much NTTF commute, there were many NTTF who felt this impacted them. Reflecting the time expenditures of commuting, Matt, a NTTF in the Humanities, described his arduous weekly commuting schedule in a previous term:

There was one semester towards the beginning where I had four courses at the same time and I think it was all in different cities. So I was in a different city every day of the week. So I was in Peterborough one day, Brantford one day, I was in Scarborough one day and I was in Toronto the next. So it's just such a ridiculously stressful experience of having to juggle so much! So I was working non-stop when that was happening. It was constant. And I never had free time; it was for work. I was working on the road - on the bus, on the
train… I was getting up at 5:30 in the morning to get on the 6:30 am bus. Getting out to one university was an hour each way; getting out to another university was an hour and a half each way; so there's 10, 15, 20 hours in that.

Matt was commuting between four cities in southern Ontario, which was the most commuting done by NTTF in the sample. Even 10 hours a week is a considerable amount of time devoted solely to getting to work. Yet, commuting significant distances is not uncommon. Many NTTF had at least one other academic job at another university. Even though, to be sure, permanently employed professionals commute from home to work, most do not commute between multiple workplaces – though they might commute between campuses. Commuting time was increased considerably when one job was in the GTA and another job was outside of the GTA. Those who worked at multiple campuses within the GTA commuted but the time tax was decreased. The time spent commuting further decreased the amount of time spent on teaching, research, or pursuing other avenues of employment as confirmed by those who commuted. Matt said:

   It’s just such a ridiculously stressful experience of having to juggle so much; dealing with the administration of a bunch of different institutions; commuting; um, the responsibility of emails for all of these different courses; the course preparation simultaneously happening for courses that I had never taught before.

Thus, commuting was an added tax on an already stressful situation. This theme of compounding working conditions – of dealing with the administration of multiple courses at multiple institutions and commuting, in addition to the uncertainty of getting a job from term to term, created considerable stress and anxiety for NTTF, making it challenging for them to focus on their professional goals. In the next section, I show how the phenomenon of ‘just-in-time’
temporary contract work also impacts professionals’ ability to develop as academic professionals.

13.3 ‘Just-in-time’ Contract Work and Professional Development

The way temporary contract work was organized also limited the ability of NTTF to excel professionally. NTTF were often asked to teach different courses each term. For example, one NTTF in the Humanities who taught two courses\(^\text{19}\) on an ongoing basis was asked two weeks before the term started – if they would teach a course outside of their area of expertise (though still in the same discipline) as a favour to the department, after a TTF was unable to teach the course. This involved her having to create course materials and syllabi in an area that she was not familiar with in a matter of days. As a result, little thought and reflection is attributed to the professional work of NTTF who are asked to teach these courses ‘just in time’, limiting the extent to which NTTF can develop and grow as professionals through their temporary contract work.

NTTF described how this impeded their development of pedagogy in teaching courses. In part, this is due to fluctuations in the availability of TTF to teach courses, but may also be influenced by student demand for particular courses. This ‘just-in-time’ system of course administration limits the extent to which NTTF can develop courses over time, and thus develop professionally as teachers. Sara, a NTTF in the Humanities, described the difficulty of this disruption in continuity to the practice of teaching:

One thing that's challenging for me is that I try to keep notes on a weekly basis of what I would do different next time and it can be challenging and a little frustrating doing that

\(^{19}\) Course names omitted to protect confidentiality.
when you have no idea whether you'll ever teach this course again. You know? And so I have done it for the most part on the off-chance that I do teach these courses again but you really never know and that can make it more challenging to think ahead about you know your teaching.

Reflecting some of the frustration described previously, Sara wished that there was more assurance that the work she was devoting to course development would be work she could continue to develop, as this was what she had been trained to do in her doctoral studies. This was the case across many interviewees – indeed, 14 participants had been asked to teach a course with less than one month’s notice, and eight participants were asked to teach a course outside their area of expertise. Building on Sara’s point, Danya, a NTTF in the Humanities, argued that because NTTF were assigned different courses every year she was not able to benefit from work completed at the front end:

I'm never able to really perfect a course… a lot of the time I end up teaching something once, uh the courses where I've been able to teach them multiple times, I feel like the course gets better as it goes along because of course. I'm troubleshooting and figuring out what works; what doesn't work… the frustration (is) constantly writing new curriculum where my colleagues who are full-time not only get paid more but they get the benefit of being able to perfect a course and to really build um - to develop course material. Like I have courses that I would love to - ideas for courses that I'd love to develop and the opportunity just isn't there.

Danya points out how preparing a new course each term might entail a loss of capital in terms of the extent to which initial work would ‘pay off’ in the long term by positively influencing the quality of one’s teaching. While work allocated by NTTF to course preparation may not be
useful in the future, work allocated by TTF was useful as they often taught the same course for several years or more. TTF did not raise any issues about ‘just-in-time’ course administration, and generally described teaching a limited set of courses during their tenure at the focal institution. The way they described their courses was as a recurring process year to year. Vivian, a TTF in the Humanities, said

I built and designed a brand new course and taught it this semester for 100 students, which I will teach again next year. Luckily the other course is an upper-level course that is quite a bit smaller that I have taught on a regular basis.

Even when TTF developed new courses, they described a sense of continuity in that their course would be added to the curriculum and thus at least they would get to teach it once again, if not many times over.

In addition to the change of courses every semester, NTTF felt they did not get sufficient notice for their courses and described how this made planning difficult. Lisa, a NTTF in the Humanities, described how she was hired two weeks before the semester started, to teach two new courses that she had to create “from scratch”, doing a lot of work initially, but not getting to reflect on it or develop it further later on. Others lamented the short notice and felt it created an unreasonable workload in the weeks leading up to course delivery. In contrast, TTF usually had several months notice regarding which courses they would be teaching, and usually had prior experience teaching these courses unless it was their first or second year in their work at their institution. Getting sufficient notice that one will be teaching a course allows workers to prepare

---

20 ‘Limited’ here means about two to three different courses, in contrast with the extreme of 12 different courses one NTTF described teaching over the course of a few years.
and develop their courses and thus develop as professionals, something that was oft lacking in temporary contract work. The last dimension that impacted temporary contract workers’ professional development was limited help, input and support.

13.4 Limited Help, Input and Support and Professional Development

NTTF frequently described how they were not getting the help, input, and support they needed. Because their courses changed from one semester to another, and because some NTTF were hired ‘just in time’, any help, input or support that was offered did not enhance their professional development but focused on the practical aspects of course administration. Laura, a newly hired NTTF in the Sciences, described how a lack of basic information at the outset of her appointment led to a lot of stress and mistakes that could have been prevented:

> There was no introduction to the university... I didn’t know exactly who they were and there was no extended hand to say welcome to this community, it was just nothing... I was so cross by it but I wrote a detailed document of everything that I could have done (to welcome new faculty): you need to do these before your course starts.

At every step of the process, Laura felt that her foray into teaching was lacking adequate support. Other dimensions of professionalization, such as support for NTTF seeking research grants\(^2\), were difficult to access and/or required extra effort in order to secure them, as described by Tina, a NTTF in the Humanities:

> In terms of who has access to certain um opportunities for research, I was told clearly when I asked to apply for a SSHRC about a year ago from my department chair that

---

\(^2\) 15/32 NTTF described maintaining an active research profile including publishing journal articles, books, and attending academic conferences.
sessionals are not allowed to do that at this university, uh, and be supported by the university in that process. When I dug a little deeper, it is clearly stipulated in our collective agreement that we are to be supported by the university for our applications to places like SSHRC and NSERC, that they are supposed to support us in that way.

Hence, economic resources such as eligibility to apply for grants, were made less available to NTTF, even if they were part of the resources to which they were legally granted access. Hence, even if enshrined in collective agreements, NTTF’s requests to access resources for professional development could be denied through informal channels. And Robert, a tenured TTF and administrator in the Humanities, admitted the rules around support for NTTF research were not wholly clear:

> What we've tried to do here is make absolutely clear that if the research makes them a better classroom teacher, then it needs to be supported. And I don't just mean research on pedagogy. Like the kind of stuff you're doing now, this will qualify, but let's say your field wasn't education, let's say it was cell biology. Then it becomes a little bit trickier. And I think that um, this is a problem that can't be resolved on a divisional level, certainly not on a departmental level. It's really the university that needs to take the lead, but also the federal funding agencies need to really figure out what they need to do.

Hence, though in principle NTTF research is meant to be supported, there are no clear guidelines about precisely how this is meant to occur, and it is unclear what resources are allocated to supporting NTTF research. David, a union representative also confirmed that “there has been a large appetite to get things like the ability to use the university's name when publishing research.” Yet, as described later in this chapter, NTTF are not always permitted to affiliate in an official way with the universities where they teach courses. But the limited help, input and
support NTTF receive is not only due to a lack of informal support or unclear guidelines, but also engrained in organizational rules and regulations. Dana, a union official, describes how the lack of services to support NTTF in teaching is a current concern for union members at one university:

Sessionals don’t have any of the institutional support that regular faculty get. We’ve just learned this year, in fact, that the teaching centre will no longer offer sessionals access to their one-on-one services in terms of review dossiers and stuff like that. It came up because a member who has actually accessed that service before filled out the form and then got an email back that says, “I’m sorry, you’re not eligible for this service.”

Hence one’s temporary status as contract worker may limit the amount of professional support one gets for university teaching, including not simply because of informal barriers, but also due to formal exclusion through ineligibility engrained in organizational rules and regulations. Temporary contract workers therefore do not always have access to the same support that permanently employed workers do. This varies across organizations and so some NTTF receive more support than others. Most NTTF and union representatives underscored the need for help, input and support. TTF, in contrast, did not communicate that there was limited help, input and support for their professional development.

NTTF may receive input on their teaching if they are evaluated for future employment. Samantha, a NTTF in the Humanities, had mentioned she wished there was more than this one opportunity to get support from regular faculty:

I receive the occasional support from faculty, but I have to reach out to them, unless it's the time of year where somebody comes knocking and says ‘I have to observe your
teaching, when is your class?’ …and then either something productive comes of that afterwards when you start talking about teaching in general or research in general, or not, and other than that there's very little in terms of exchange with faculty.

Others maintained that the criteria for evaluation was much too ambiguous. Neil, a union representative, revealed more detail on the absence of clear criteria and how it impacted NTTF:

The collective agreement explained the criteria - like 'superior teaching' and currency and mastery. So members are told, you know, 'these are the standards,' but they're not given any sense of how those concepts are being understood by their committee, right? So there's a lack of transparency in terms of what is expected from the sessional in terms of what you need me to show in my submissions, in my teaching philosophy, in my classroom visits.

Participants argued that it was not always clear exactly what criteria were used in their evaluation process, which limited their ability to improve and develop as professionals. Evaluation varies across different institutions, but generally, participants critiqued the process as opaque and lacking clear criteria. Dana, a NTTF and union representative, elaborates how the criteria can be unclear:

The collective agreement says that the criteria are you have to demonstrate superiority in teaching, mastery of whatever field is that you teach in, as well as fair and ethical dealings with students. They don’t really play around with the fair and ethical dealings with students, that’s a fairly cut and dry sort of thing. But how does one define superior and how does one define mastery? This is where we’ve had problems, and it’s not necessarily that departments have played around maliciously but we’ve had people
(negatively evaluated) on the grounds that, “Oh well, the collective agreement says you have to be superior, you don’t have the best teaching evaluations of everybody in the department, therefore you’re not superior.

Regardless of whether ambiguity in evaluation is deliberate on the part of departments or not, it negatively impacts NTTF’s ability to identify areas for improvement and clarify goals in their professional development. Danya, a NTTF in the Humanities who was given a less favorable evaluation, argued that the evaluator critiqued her on elements unrelated to her teaching such as her choice of lighting in the class. The lack of support can have a compounding effect on NTTF’s ability to develop and improve as professionals. Danya described how this situation led to her not getting another contract:

it was really frustrating because the second year, the course went much better, but I never - they didn't base their decision not to hire me back on my teaching evaluation or on my year-end results from the students, um, so, you know that was a situation where I felt really disadvantaged by being a sessional instructor where if I'd been a full-time instructor, I think I would have had more faculty support because I would have had - I would've been able to be attending meetings in that department, and would have had - you know I think instead of sort of getting slapped down, I would have had someone saying 'wow, you're doing something really innovative here, and yeah it's gonna take a few years to figure out, how do you teach this?'

Danya’s experience was perhaps more challenging than others because she felt the evaluation was deliberately harsh and unfair, as opposed to simply unclear or opaque, as other NTTF had described. Nevertheless, many experienced a lack of help, input and support both in terms of the daily labour process as they started teaching, and throughout the process as they felt any
feedback they did get was related to obtaining future employment and not to their professional development. When they did receive feedback, it was not always viewed as constructive or clear; rather it was viewed as a gatekeeping function to greater job security. This dimension further limited their ability to develop as professionals, in addition to their experiences of just-in-time work, multiple job holding and commuting, and economic insecurity. Though there was, as discussed, variation in the extent to which these factors impacted NTTF. Nevertheless, NTTF usually experienced some combination of these factors and described the complex ways that they compounded on one another, limiting their ability to focus on professional development. Their experiences in temporary contract work also limited their integration into their workplaces.

14 Limiting Professional Integration: Invisibility, “Uncollegiality”, and Sexism in the Academy

14.1 Invisibility, Physical Space and Professional Integration

Invisibility at the university was a key issue for NTTF in the sample. This included invisibility of NTTF in the physical locations of their workplaces – for example, an absence of their names on department signs, doors, and also virtually, such as on departmental websites. Lara, a NTTF in the Humanities who had worked in both TTF and NTTF positions, describes feeling less visible when she became a NTTF:

When I made the transition from the part-time assistant professor position to a sessional it was a very stark transition, um things like my name, and contact information being taken down from the website and, you know, my name removed from a mailbox and you know moved into the sessional - things like that that are you know - it's - they're little but at the same time those things really matter to people; like it's really important to like, you know, make those distinctions in a very material way. Like, you know, whose name gets to be
on an office door, like I had a name plaque and now I share an office with three other people.

The impact of not having one’s name on the door despite working for a department contributes to NTTF’s feeling of invisibility and sense of belonging in a work environment. Indeed, Lara’s case shows that even as a part-time TTF replacement\textsuperscript{22} she had more visibility than when she was a full-time NTTF. Moreover, this lack of visibility may further reinforce NTTF’s position in the academic labour market by not making visible their professional contributions in a way that is comparable to the way TTF’s contributions are made visible. As Valerie, a NTTF in the Humanities pointed out:

You could search the entire (university) website and find no trace of me... it's actually really serious when you're on the job market, you know? It’s like 'what do you mean you work at (this university); there's no trace of you anywhere here,'

This lack of visibility was a problem for NTTF who were looking for employment, which many were, given the temporary nature of their employment contracts. This problem of invisibility thus limited their integration into the academic profession, as there was no evidence of their work in the profession to potential employers, managers and colleagues.

A lack of office space was another key issue raised by NTTF. NTTF are usually provided a shared office, or no office space whatsoever. The number of people in a shared office varied, and usually there was a designated schedule so that NTTF would not be in the office at the same time. Lisa, a NTTF in the Humanities, had to develop strategies to find available workspaces:

\textsuperscript{22} This person was temporarily replacing a TTF through a one-year Assistant Professor position, but described how the working conditions were better even in a temporary TTF position compared to a NTTF position.
I share an office with five people, two of those occupy the office on the same day as me. Last year, there was no computer in the office in the first two months of the semester. Now, I could use a computer in the mailroom if really necessary, so I cannot claim I had no access to any computer at all. But since I can't commute every day for three hours in order to do my work in any of those spaces, I actually have to ask my friends to provide me access to their apartments when I am not bothering them, or work in a cafe. So, in fact, to enable me to work, my husband has to support me, my mother has to babysit for free, and my friends have to graciously share their living space with me.

Lisa had to find her own solution to obtain an accessible workspace, taking on the economic responsibility of finding office space. Furthermore, not having a centralized office space can contribute a lack of belonging in a workplace. Reflecting Lisa’s situation, Kathryn, also a NTTF in the Humanities, reveals the limitations of shared office space and the tacit expectation that NTTF use their own resources:

I do my own photocopying, I do my own letter writing, I'm expected to be on call 24-7, I'm sometimes expected to give the students - now I don't even have a phone in my office, I use my own cellphone-- I sometimes communicate with students on my own cell phone.

As with Lisa’s case, Kathryn was not provided with sufficient resources to do her job and took on the economic costs of doing so. Aside from using their own financial resources to subsidize undergraduate teaching, a lack of individual office space reinforces NTTF’s feeling of having a ‘temp’ status and in some cases, limits their ability to work in their workplaces and have a consistent physical presence in the workplace. For NTTF it reinforced their sense of not being integral to their workplaces. As Danya, a NTTF in the Humanities, describes:
I'm always in a shared office and this year our office is literally a room like this with no window and no computer; nothing; it's useless as a workspace. Well yeah I mean you can't work in it ‘cause it's being shared with different people and, you know, and there isn't even a computer. I mean it's ridiculous.

Expecting that a dedicated office space would be granted to professional workers, who regularly meet with students and colleagues, Danya expressed frustration, and further elaborated that this lack of adequate office space limited her ability to do her job properly. Dana, a NTTF and union official, reflects on how it limits her ability to have a consistent presence on campus:

I typically share an office with anywhere from four to six or seven other people and I’m only allowed to use the office for the set office hours that I signed up for on whatever day that was, so that the other seven people couldn’t – all that sort of stuff.

For both Danya and Dana, the office space is viewed as a shared temporary location where NTTF can meet with students on a limited schedule. Cohen (2013) argues that NTTF view spatial and work culture exclusion as a form of marginalization of NTTF, and a barrier to mobility in the academic labor market. The absence of office space for NTTF contributes to both objective inability to meet with students, hold office hours or interact with colleagues (Soares 2012; Cohen 2013), and the subjective feeling of being marginal (Rajagopal and Farr 1992; Levin and Shaker 2011). Literature on precarious work has not focused on how a lack of workspace can limit professional workers’ integration, largely because it has not focused on professional work.

Reduced visibility and lack of space in the workplace mean that NTTF usually have very limited interaction with their TTF colleagues. As one union official, David stated
You just don't have the natural networks that you do with graduate students or people in an industrial workforce - it's the same kind of situation that you see with anybody who's in a scattered workforce you know, home care workers who are working in individual clients' homes. Our sessionals coming in; they work their one course or two courses; they're there for their course; their two hours of office time; but then they don't have an office; they don't have their own office at least. So they have to leave so the next person can take their seat in the shared office.

Hence, according to David, the physical lack of space not only limited NTTF’s ability to do their job, as described by Danya and Dana, but moreover, limited their ability to develop networks with colleagues, limiting their integration. Eighteen NTTF and five TTF raised the issue of limited interaction when discussing their jobs. However, NTTF focused on it as something that contributed to their feelings of marginalization in the workplace, whereas TTF did not. This was true across discipline, gender, and age. Most NTTF said they were not invited to social events such as end-of-term or Christmas parties. However, beyond being invited to social events, NTTF placed emphasis on needing more regular day-to-day interaction with their colleagues to foster a sense of connection and belonging in their workplaces. Samantha, a NTTF in the Humanities, described how not knowing faculty made the experience feel anonymous:

It’s already like on the level of just knowing people that I don't feel really a connection because I've never felt that I was introduced to a whole lot of people, and you kind of meet the (other) sessionals by chance, and so yeah the university feels very sort of big and anonymous in that regard… I don't feel like I have lots of people to talk about certain experiences or struggles or - just like knowing people and just exchanging experiences; sharing experiences, I guess, that kind of isolation is - I wouldn't say it's the worst aspect
of it, but that's definitely something that I feel just in terms of the comfort level of being there that is something that is not great.

The sense of not sharing experiences and feeling isolated was very common across the sample of NTTF. Feeling isolated and not sharing experiences with colleagues was something that NTTF felt further limited them in terms of integrating into their workplace. Valerie, a NTTF in the Humanities, reflected Samantha’s sense that the workplace was big and anonymous, when she conveyed a feeling of disconnection from the faculty in her department: “I would guess 70% of faculty members here don't know I exist. I'm not saying this out of bitterness. I'm just like totally honest about it.” And this was common across discipline. Rita, a NTTF in Engineering, reflected on how this limited interaction was reinforced through the limited involvement of NTTF more generally:

I usually don’t go to the meetings that faculty have because sessional lecturers basically don’t go because they’re not part of faculty, and they are not allowed to go to those meetings. And if you don’t go to those meetings, there’s no other place to meet other faculty.

Therefore, limited interaction was sometimes a taken-for-granted part of NTTF, but other times it was formally enforced by rules like disallowing NTTF from faculty meetings. Similarly Emma, a NTTF in the Humanities, had been interested in participating in the external review of the department, but was told she could not because it was strictly for TTF participation.

NTTF participants also emphasized how this limited interaction reduced the professional connections they were able to make and the networks they were able to develop while they taught. This was true both for NTTF who hoped to get full-time jobs and NTTF who held full-
time, non-academic positions. For example, Bill, a NTTF in Sciences, who was also a full-time consultant for a private firm, said:

> You’re just on your own. It’s a lonely life. You show up, you teach your course, you go home… my course is being administered by a department there's no contact unless I ask them something administrative… some sort of professional connection would be good.

Even NTTF in Engineering and Science – who are recruited for their expertise and generally are more valued by their colleagues, managers and professionals than NTTF in the Humanities – find that doing temporary contract work can be lonely as there is very little interaction with colleagues. Mirroring Bill’s point, Matt, a NTTF in the Humanities, said

> I have no personal interaction with the department at all. They've tried to do this in the last year: have more events in the last year to get people out. But because it's at Scarborough and I'm downtown, chances are it's happening when I'm not there and so it's hard for me to go all the way out there. So it makes it very hard to develop professional connections and a professional network… There's been no rapport with the department and faculty at all. Um, so I just feel like I'm a mercenary. Put it that way. I don't really feel connected to the program and the faculty and the department at all. And I don't know how much of that is due to my own inaction, or whether or not it's within my rights or within my territory, or if I'm even expected to do that, or if they don't want anything to do with me at all. They really just want me to be invisible. So I think it's a huge thing, where I really feel invisible and I dunno if that's just what they expect and prefer.

Here, Matt’s limited interaction is compounded by multiple job holding and commuting 10-20 hours a week as described earlier. Matt also suggested this negatively impacted his ability to
develop professional networks. Limited interaction with colleagues also related to the ability to consult other faculty about their work, and thus obtain input on their professional work as described previously. Furthermore, the interaction that did exist between NTTF and TTF was not always viewed as collegial.

14.2 “Uncollegiality” and Professional Integration

Collegiality, or the sense of shared responsibility and respect among colleagues, was a key issue NTTF felt was lacking in their experiences. Out of 32 NTTF, four said their department was very collegial, five said it was somewhat collegial and the remainder said it was not collegial. This contrasts with TTF who found their departments very collegial or somewhat collegial. Importantly, all of the four NTTF who found their department “very collegial” had been graduate students in the department prior to working at the department as a NTTF, or worked in very small departments (with fewer than 15 faculty members). These explanatory factors do not negate the possibility of collegial relations for NTTF more broadly, but rather contextualize the finding and help reveal what factors might contribute to a collegial environment for NTTF. Though I acknowledge the positive aspects of collegiality for a few participants, I will focus on those who answered “somewhat collegial” or “not collegial” with a view to understanding how this impedes NTTF’s professional integration in their workplaces.

NTTF’s first interactions with the department were described by some NTTF as not collegial, and even ‘chilly’. At the extreme, some participants felt fearful for their jobs and described their working environments as expressly not collegial. Describing her department, Tina said “there's sort of this whole culture again of fear and a growing sense of ‘uncollegiality.’” Not all NTTF reflected a sense of fear, but many felt their departments were not collegial places. When I asked
her about what was lacking with respect to her arrival in the department, Valerie, a NTTF in the Humanities, said:

Any sort of even introductions around the department, you know, I'm teaching four courses over three terms; that's actually a pretty significant amount of the undergrad program… But no, like no even sort of effort to introduce you to somebody, introduce you to the faculty, to the program director. She [the program director] walks by here once in a while and finally one day she stuck her head in and said 'who are you?' um, and like again I'm not saying that out of ego, I just think it makes for a nice collegial atmosphere if those things happen… I'm not an overly outgoing person; I'm not really the person to be out there always pouffing myself out but you know you sort of take a breath and you do it because you work here and you wanna have a collegial atmosphere. So I make the effort to sort of introduce myself to the people I see standing beside me who clearly work here, but it's not really reciprocated.

Valerie’s sense was that, though she was not necessarily expecting much in terms of an introduction, there was nevertheless a lack of acknowledgement by her colleagues. Others reflected that they felt obligated to take the first step in fostering a collegial relationship. For example, Hector, a NTTF in Humanities, noted how collegiality was usually brought forth by an effort on his part:

There are some (TTF) I get along with, that I have good working relationships with or social relationships ‘cause they usually don't work with them per se. And then there are the rest of them who are sort of aloof or maybe they don't see me because they know I'm a sessional and they don't want to see me, and I have a difficult time sometime discerning
what it is, so I just leave them alone. I find that, by and large, the efforts to socialize or be
nice or be collegial I should say are made by me, not them.

Though not all NTTF feel they have to make a one-sided effort, many do in hopes that it will be
reciprocated. Yet, this one-sided effort was a risk that sometimes reaped few rewards. Emma, a
NTTF in the Humanities, had also made efforts to attend department meetings, but described
feeling unwelcome because the chair didn’t remember her name:

I used to go to the departmental meetings but I don't do that anymore because to me it's a
waste of time, right. The chair couldn't remember my name for an entire term…

Interactions at the micro-level – such as remembering someone’s name, and valuing their voice –
can influence professional integration such as NTTF’s participation in service activities where
they are allowed or encouraged to participate. Indeed, Emma, whose economic and professional
situation was described at the outset of this chapter, was considering abandoning her professional
work permanently. Though Emma’s situation cannot be solely attributed to the comments or
exclusion by a single colleague, these indignities did not help her feel like indeed, she did belong
and were an important part of her workplace experience. Nelson, the NTTF in Engineering
described at this outset of this research, had similar feelings about being excluded by colleagues,
but knowing his livelihood was not at stake, was less concerned about how this might impact
him professionally. When describing his relationship with TTF, Nelson said: We don't have great
conversations together. I wouldn't feel that I had lost anything if I just said ‘ok I'm not doing it
anymore, I'm done with this.’” NTTF’s experience of uncollegiality varied based on their relative
economic security or insecurity. For those who were economically insecure, uncollegiality was
an added barrier to professional integration and therefore potential economic security. For those
who were economically secure, uncollegiality was perhaps unpleasant, but not particularly stressful.

Finally, participants described a more abstract sense of hierarchy between NTTF and TTF. This ranged from conversations, body language, and subtle comments to more general feelings of relative insignificance. Warren, a NTTF in the Humanities, said:

I would point to conversations - not just kinda subtle body language - but comments people make where there really is a sense among tenured faculty that sessionals are not as uh well-educated as strong in their field, not as strong in the class, and don't and shouldn't have a voice -- a position in meetings about hirings and promotions and budgets and committees. Like I really feel concretely that people change the conversation, if there are tenure-track people in the photocopier room and you come in, or I come in…I think that is also truly a sense that you aren’t one of us; you aren’t good enough… there's a little bit of the attitude from the faculty of ’we're inviting you to the big table; we're inviting you to the adult table.’ …As much as it sounds like sour grapes, there are very concrete ways in which conversations work a certain way about certain topics among certain people; body language works a certain way that you just are excluded.

Thus, feelings of exclusion or uncollegiality were not simply viewed by some as a bad attitude on the part of a few select colleagues, but some tied these to a much deeper sense of ‘not being good enough’, not having a voice, and even being patronized. This was the case with Kathryn, a NTTF in the Humanities, who felt that a lack of involvement emphasized her feeling of difference between herself and TTF:
Slight comments, not getting invited to certain things, not being allowed to be on certain committees, because apparently you weren't smart enough – I'm smart enough to teach here, but I'm not smart enough to evaluate - so what that says is ‘you're not a peer. These people are different than you.’

Thus not feeling respected, feeling different or inferior to permanently employed professionals was a common experience among NTTF and reinforced the sense of not being a peer or colleague that belonged. When I asked Tina, a NTTF in the Humanities, whether she attended department meetings she responded that she did, but did not feel welcome:

Certainly the times I've tried to go to department meetings, I always feel a little out of place. Even though again, I know lots of people in the room. But I think the feeling's always like ‘why are you here.’ ...It doesn't feel like we're equal partners in the process … It feels like, uh, we are being told to do the grunt labour and then completely ultimately ignored when it comes to the important - I'll put this in quotation marks - the 'important' decisions.

Like Tina, most NTTF felt that there was a subtle distinction made by TTF who sat on committees. NTTF also described comments that were less subtle. For instance, Warren, a NTTF in the Humanities, described this sense of not having a voice at the department level, adding that there were remarks that made him feel less welcome: “if you go to those meetings, as ridiculous as it sounds, tenure-track people make weird jokes about 'us and them' but you know you're in the room.” Warren also described how a TTF made a comment equating NTTF with janitors.23

23 Details omitted and paraphrasing used more explicitly in this section and the following section to protect confidentiality.
Importantly, comparing NTTF to janitorial staff reinforces their sense of exclusion from not only the workplace but also the academic profession as a whole, drawing on distinctions between professional work and service work to belittle temporary contract workers. And indignities such as the one described above were not always simply a matter of uncollegiality.

14.3 Experiences of Sexism and Professional Integration

Scholars have identified how harassment and bullying infused with sexism and racism negatively influence people’s experiences at work (Welsh et al. 2006; Das Gupta 2006; Baines 2006; Baines and Cunningham 2011). Yet, they have not sufficiently addressed the ways in which temporary contract workers in particular are limited in their recourse to address these experiences. This research on temporary contract workers in the academic profession suggests that precarious workers have limited recourse to address these issues in their workplaces. NTTF experienced incidents of sexism, as did TTF, but I argue that given NTTF’s precarious position, sexism is experienced differently. Specifically, a lack of employment security makes NTTF feel powerless to report sexism or take action against it.

The most common form of bullying and harassment described by NTTF in the interviews came in the form of sexist comments made by male TTF against female NTTF. This included casual use of sexist language, for instance, one male TTF told a female NTTF to “suck it up, buttercup.” There were also more serious incidents such as the following conflict between a male TTF who criticized a female NTTF’s behavior:

He said that I was too - basically the typical thing with females - that I was too 'brash' or 'outspoken' or 'argumentative' because when we had staff meetings, and I disagreed with something, I would say that I disagreed with it, um, and he said what I should have been doing is more along the lines of 'that's true, Mr. X, that's one way of looking at it, but
have you thought of this other way of looking at it?' as opposed to just saying 'no I don't agree; I think we should do this' or 'I don't think this was done properly' and anyways apparently I was too outspoken and too argumentative… and he actually had the gall at one point to say something along the lines of - cause I said 'well, you know if I was a guy, there wouldn't be any issue with me talking like that' and he goes 'that's true, but as a woman you're expected to be more conciliatory' or something along those lines.

This NTTF said she ended up deciding not to work in this department, despite the availability of contracts, because of the unwelcoming climate that was characterized by sexist judgments such as the one described above. This speaks to the way that such comments can limit women’s full participation in professional life. Reflecting prior research on workplace “chilling” and climates that are less favourable toward women (Kezar and Sam 2013; Burke and Mattis 2007; Vallas 2001), these women’s experiences with sexism can exclude women, both by marking them as ‘the other’, and by making them ‘choose’ to leave a workplace or find other work. Being the subject of sexist comments was unfortunately a relatively common experience. Emma, the NTTF described at the outset of this chapter, disclosed a troubling response by a male TTF to her announcement of pregnancy:

When I got pregnant the departmental chair… was a man at the time - so when I came in to break the news and he is someone who has a child himself and he had a young child at that point, the first thing he told me was 'congratulations, you're unemployed.' So I guess that's the only time when I felt like 'really? That’s what you say? I thought you simply say congratulations and you stop at that.' you know regardless of how you feel…

As stated at the outset of this section, some working conditions, including incidents of sexism, are not exclusive to NTTF. Yet, a female NTTF who becomes pregnant has much less
employment security than a female TTF who becomes pregnant, thus worsening the impact of employment insecurity. I also wish to highlight how on top of working conditions that are exclusive to NTTF, NTTF also experience workplace issues experienced by permanent workers – indeed, that are experienced by the broader population of workers – such as sexism, bullying and harassment. These issues can be further compounded when NTTF have little job security and may feel pressured to stay quiet about such incidents. As shown in the following section, women NTTF not only experienced incidents of sexism but also felt they were excluded from professional circles in ways that their male colleagues were not.

Women – especially NTTF and TTF in Engineering and Science – felt excluded from their professional environment. Shari, a NTTF in Engineering, describes her experience:

you're in grad school you know there's the old boys club and getting into postdocs… I think just their sort of their outlook or the way that they do things is more rewarded just like I know that the male postdocs would collaborate and work together so they would get twice as many papers and all this kinda stuff.

Hence, while male engineers collaborated and advanced in the field, Shari felt that via sexist exclusion she was limited in terms of the professional sphere of activity and the resulting productivity. Importantly, women in Engineering and Sciences highlighted how the sexism they experienced was a product of being in those fields. Shelly, a tenured TTF in the Sciences, argued that women and racialized people within the sciences are limited in their opportunities, and often become tokenized or given traditionally feminized service responsibilities:

To be more inclusive, I think there could be more events and it could be structured such that things are not so top down and hierarchical. That we have committees that the
females don’t get certain – you know, what I mean? I don’t want to be on the traditionally female committees.

Like sexism, racism is something that impacts both NTTF and TTF. As discussed in chapter two, the experience of temporary workers in Engineering and Science compared to Humanities was one of being valued for their practical expertise. Yet, women in Engineering and Science did not necessarily experience this in the same way as men did. Reflecting sexist expectations of what a ‘real’ professional looked like, Shari, a NTTF in Engineering, described her experience when meeting a department director:

He is a sexist engineer, and so he said about this guy who came in, he goes, 'now that's - you know when I think of a professor, that's what I picture.' you know 'an old guy, a guy in a suit and glasses' or something along those lines. You know? 'Not someone like you.' I'm like 'ok, thank you...'

As Joan Acker (1990) argued, the gendered division of labour and income in organizations are produced and reproduced through organizational practices, symbols and imagery that form our commonsense notions of gender (140). Acker suggested that a gendered definition of work and of the worker is presumed in organizations. Some women participants described how being women engineers and scientists was particularly challenging, not only because of a sexist environment, but also due to sexist associations informing our notions of gender and gendered professionals. These experiences impact women NTTF in the Engineering and Sciences in terms of their sense of belonging and integration into the professional field. Due to their temporary status, they felt disempowered to speak up about these incidents and so usually ignored them, reflecting a “coping” orientation described by Rogers (2000:82). Nevertheless, these incidents transpired and shaped the working life of NTTF, and were described as situations that made them
feel further marginalized, instead of respected professionals in their field. In the next section I turn the focus from the ways that working conditions limit professional development and integration, to NTTF’s efforts to advance in the profession.

15 Unpaid Work and the “Participation Bind”

Participation in the academic profession involves teaching, service, and research. Yet, NTTF are employed on contracts based on a single course, unlike TTF permanent employment in which an annual salary is meant to remunerate work in all three spheres. Nevertheless, NTTF engage in professional work that goes beyond that single course and extends to their broader curriculum, research, and the governance of the university at multiple levels. I argue that, given the constraints of temporary contract work described above, NTTF are compelled to choose between doing unpaid work in service, research and teaching, which adds an economic tax to their precarious circumstance in terms of lost time and wages, and refusing unpaid work, risking further professional marginalization and contributing to their own sense of de-professionalization. Well-executed temporary work can be viewed by some as a pathway toward permanent work, as Rogers (2000:34-35) notes. Whether or not it is reflected in an actual payoff in terms of eventual permanent, full-time employment, this view incentivizes temporary workers to go ‘above and beyond’ the duties outlined in their contract. Out of the 32 NTTF interviewed, 15 said they did unpaid work. Women more often than men did unpaid work in teaching and service, while the men who did unpaid work tended to focus on research.

NTTF – usually women – described unpaid work in teaching they did, including the kind of preparatory work for new courses at the beginning of term described earlier in this chapter. Sue, a NTTF in the Humanities said “I'm not officially an advisor, because the tenure-track faculty are assigned students, but over the years I've been a thesis advisor for a Master's thesis
and I've been a mentor to a number of students.” As Dana, a union representative pointed out, “most departments require that to apply for a job you had to submit a full syllabus; and that’s a huge amount of unpaid labor upfront for a course that you may or may not get.” Compared to TTF work, where an annual salary is expected to cover the various additional elements of teaching a course, NTTF work is calculated on a per course basis, and any elements that fall outside of that particular course will be unpaid – including preparation for a new course that one ends up not teaching, advising students on matters apart from the course material, or doing administrative work that is separate from the course altogether or any work done after an academic term has ended. Refusal to do this work can negatively impact the course, and subsequently impact NTTF’s teaching evaluations by students and colleagues.

Fifteen of 32 NTTF advised students on matters they considered to be outside their course contract. Many NTTF who advised students about the program and their career described this wish to help students, particularly enthusiastic students, though there was no obligation in their contract to do so. Indeed, at most if not all universities there is no obligation for NTTF to advise students outside of course material, and many NTTF described this as a problem given that course material is situated in a broader undergraduate curriculum and program. When asked about the unpaid work she described doing in the past, Lara – who had a more permanent position prior to being an NTTF in the Humanities – said:

I have mixed feelings about it. I was perfectly comfortable doing it when I was at the assistant professor part-time, because it was part of the position; I was paid for it. Um so it's a little bit awkward now because I think the department kind of got used to me doing service that - I don't think anyone's trying to exploit me and I do feel comfortable saying no when I think it's above and beyond what I need to be doing, but there are grey areas. Like if a student is asking for, you know, a student who's not in one of my courses wants
some sort of guidance, you know, in an kind of unofficial capacity, I'm gonna say yes to that because it's um, I'm an educator; it's what I want to do. But if they want me to sit on a committee that's going to involve a lot of meetings; I'll probably say no to that.

Lara expressed that there were grey areas in terms of what she would do above and beyond the contractually required work. Hence, even though there was unspoken pressure to do activities stemming from a professional ethos, some NTTF still felt comfortable saying no to doing tasks that were not part of their paid contract. Yet, this unspoken pressure, stemming not just from professional aspirations but also love of the job, compelled many to help, especially when students’ success was on the line. When asked why he did this kind of unpaid work, Nelson, a NTTF in Engineering and Sciences, said:

I'm aware that I didn't sign up for that [laughs] and you're just kind of adding it on, taking advantage of um my willingness to help, and my fondness for the students. I don't wanna - I've got them all excited about something that I know a lot about - I don't wanna let them down and say 'well I'm not gonna advise you because I'm not getting paid for it.' So there is add-on stuff at both schools that kind of goes beyond being in the classroom and teaching and marking assignments.

Hence, out of the professional commitment to students, many NTTF did work beyond what was contractually required. Laura, a NTTF in the Sciences, described her conundrum when asked to help the department with an activity meant to attract graduate students:

They invite, they kind of talk to two or three from every course across Canada to come for a weekend here, so we can try and pinch the best student to get into our graduate program. And that kind of thing is like an all weekend event and I often will be part of
that, that’s kind of an unpaid service. So I’ll help kind of organize part of it or I’ll come and sit in the panel for non-academic career trajectories and things like that. But the upside of that is I get more integrated into the – I always try and kind of mimic what the faculty are expected to do in some of those things. But I think that there’s a down side of that, is that I have to remember that, actually they’re getting a decent salary and security in return for having to do all those extra things… and I’m not.

Importantly, Jennifer, who wanted a permanent job as a professor, tried to mimic what the faculty around her did. Aspiring to be a permanently employed faculty, she did unpaid work and hoped that this would demonstrate her worth as a professional to her colleagues and managers. Hence, temporary contract workers sometimes do unpaid work as part of their professional ethos, but also in hopes that it will improve their standing vis-à-vis their colleagues, which they think might help them in their endeavor to be hired on a permanent basis.

The tendency of women doing more academic service work than men is reflected in much of the literature on academic workplaces (Mason, Wolfinger, and Goulden 2013; Todd et al. 2008; Winslow 2010). For instance, a recent study by Mary Ann Mason and colleagues found that women academics in the US do more service work than men, to the detriment of their professional careers (Mason, Wolfinger, and Goulden 2013). One UK study also found that women academics are more likely than men to work over hours because of teaching workload, despite having the same workload and having the same evaluation of the overall importance of teaching (Todd et al. 2008). This combination of the tendency of women to do service and overwork in permanent and tenure-stream faculty jobs is also found among NTTF women who hope to advance toward jobs that are more permanent. This includes sitting on department committees, governing council or senate of a university, hiring committees, and so forth. Many
NTTF may feel that doing additional unpaid work may help to increase their visibility in the department and therefore increase their chances of being hired again. Moreover, this puts NTTF in a bind: on the one hand, if they do take unpaid work as described above, they may be overworked and may not pursue other avenues of employment. On the other hand, if they do not do this work, they may miss opportunities to integrate professionally into their workplaces, improve their teaching and research, and build a record of service that may help them in future applications.

Women more often than men described feeling pressured to do unpaid work. Tina, a NTTF in the Humanities, describes this pressure to do unpaid service work:

When I last year kind of put my foot down, I was made to feel guilty that I wasn't doing more. In addition, we have to um collaborate by participating in on-campus interviews for those coming into the program. Last year I spent from 9 o’clock in the morning through till about 8:30 at night working on interviews. But again, I felt that I could not say anything openly about that because I feel that I’m putting my future work - especially at such a tenuous point in both[(my department] and my own personal history, that I would be putting it really at severe risk.

Unlike the women NTTF in this study, men usually refused to do unpaid service. The one woman NTTF who did refuse describes her decision as a very difficult one that had come after years of doing unpaid service work for the university at which she worked. Sadly, it came after realizing that her professional aspirations were not coming to fruition. Among men, there was a gendered attitude to doing unpaid work that was focused on the need for recognition. For example, Darren, a NTTF in the Humanities, stated he would like to have a role in governance “if there was remuneration; if it was done with dignity… not unpaid work or doing things to
make yourself look good. You know pro bono, hopefully I’ll be hired kinda work – no. it’s not on the table.” Reflecting literature on gender and work and men’s tendency to do visible unpaid work versus invisible unpaid work that received little recognition (Fox 2009; Acker 1990), this pattern persisted among precarious professionals, highlighting gendered responses to being trapped between the worlds of precarious worker and professional.

In addition to unpaid teaching and service work, 15 of 32 NTTF maintain an active research profile. Unlike unpaid work in teaching and service, which was more common among the women interviewed, unpaid work in research was more common among men NTTF. Kenneth, a NTTF in the Humanities, describes how this research is viewed vis-à-vis his temporary contract:

I also was told when I was hired that research was to be done on my own free time, so it's funny, because I keep on publishing quite regularly... well that's also the problem, you have to keep a research profile if you want to get hired as tenure-track, when you're in a non-tenure, temporary position. I guess it's different from a continuing appointment.

Those NTTF who maintained research profiles were also applying for full-time permanent jobs and still had hopes of making it in the academic profession. Unlike other NTTF who kept an active research profile despite not being paid to do research, Emma felt that since research was not paid, there was no point in doing it. She also said she had more or less abandoned the idea of doing a TTF job. One NTTF in the Humanities, Warren, described how his research profile was more active than some tenure-stream faculty:

I try to do at least ten to 15 hours (of research) a week, so I don't have a fixed time each day. I try to but it's a bit ridiculous. Like that teaching load has uh created huge gaps
where I stopped applying for funding. I haven't published um a lot, but I try to keep up publishing, I try to keep up going to conferences.

NTTF hence tried to continue doing research, but with varying levels of success. And yet, research was highly prioritized by permanently employed professionals, as discussed in chapter two, so it was viewed as important to continue doing, as Peter, a tenured TTF in the Humanities, acknowledges:

although the NTTF are not paid to research, most of them do because they realize that if they don't have an ongoing research agenda that they might be passed over next time there's a job on offer and a more attractive person with an active person with a research agenda applies, even though the sessional is not actually paid to do research as such.

The incentive to do work not formally associated with paid contract work was ever present, especially for NTTF who were applying for full-time permanent academic jobs. And yet, despite this incentive, some NTTF felt that they should not do unpaid work out of principal.

On the other side of the ‘participation bind’ were 17 NTTF who did not do unpaid work. Men NTTF in particular felt they were missing some aspect of professional life – whether it be deeper impact on students outside of the courses they taught, being involved in the university community, and especially having a say in decision-making processes in the departments and universities in which they worked. Some felt they should do the bare minimum, reflecting other studies of temporary contract work and “soldiering” (Braverman 1979). But unlike some workers “soldiering” in factories, precarious professionals were more inclined to insist on the importance of being involved, and responsible, for their work, and the broader impact it had. Kenneth, a
NTTF in the Humanities, identified himself as someone who loved to be involved but felt he was not able to do this in his current position:

What's important for me is to be involved in what's going on. If you're not involved and you have no responsibility, no accountability, you don't share these feelings of trust, of gratefulness, well you're just... you're paid. So that's really what's missing.

When Kenneth did make efforts to get involved, he describes having felt pushed out of this by other faculty members. Indeed, Kenneth told me that by participating in the interview he felt he was getting a kind of ‘exit interview’ that he felt should have been conducted by the department in order to learn from his experience and expertise -- so the department could potentially learn something from his experience as well:

Whenever I got involved it's like 'he shouldn't', and like a really clear looks that were just 'just shut up' or 'just listen, don't get involved in that, you have no right to be involved in that'. So involvement, I think, is not expected and not wanted. …I stopped being invited this year because I told people my contract is over. I'm not waiting for renewal; I'm just moving and doing something else because otherwise I'll just keep waiting and I don't want to be doing that.

This is a vividly described experience of exclusion and one might think that Kenneth would want nothing to do with people who told him to ‘shut up.’ Yet, Kenneth expresses that he has a lot to contribute and views this as a missed opportunity. In a similar vein, Darren, a NTTF in the Humanities, said that doing research was important. But without institutional recognition and support for that research, he felt it was difficult to justify spending time on it:
I certainly have the uh time for more research. If it's something that's really important to me. But it becomes more difficult to do that psychologically if it's not embedded in a larger professional environment. That’s the reality. Without being kind of institutionally recognized for that, it doesn't tend to have a higher profile.

The need for recognition of the professional work of temporary contract workers is in part due to their extensive training and education, but was also gendered in that men described their refusal to do it whereas women described their (sometimes begrudging) participation in it. NTTF described three main forces constraining their participation – the lack of pay, the lack of time – especially for those working multiple jobs – and a culture that might not value their voices were they to participate. I asked Kenneth, a NTTF in the Humanities, how things would be different if he held a permanent position, he said:

I would probably fight more to be there. I would get involved, and I would get more responsibility. That's also the drawback of being temporary: you don't get assigned responsibility - I mean long term, or even mid-term - something that's not exactly long term but let's look at the next three years, I've never been involved in that kind of thinking.

Others felt that things like research that were unpaid but tacitly expected to be part of NTTF work should not be done out of principle.

Sceptics might say that NTTF are in no way obligated to do unpaid work and so any time invested on their part is a result of a bad decision. And yet, when consulting with permanently employed professionals, interviews revealed that TTF were torn on how and whether temporary contact workers should orient themselves in this regard. On the one hand, TTF emphasized the
importance of participation and involvement in the academic profession, and noted how NTTF
lost out on this dimension of the academic community by not participating. Ira, a tenured TTF
and administrator in Engineering, described how this lack of participation in decision-making
limited the spectrum of the NTTF experience in the broader university context:

I think one of the huge things that you lose with non-tenure-track appointments is the
participation in the regular sense of discussion and involvement in all the things to do
with educational governance… The sessional has one group of students that they see in
one course; they see the evaluations in that course; they're not available to the students
for outside consultation nearly as readily as making an appointment with me or any other
faculty. So the only analogy that comes to mind is it's a kind of limited or restricted or
even crippled - a kind of set of interactions. It’s not a full spectrum - there's another
analogy for you - it's almost like a black and white world versus a colour world.

Hence for Ira, participating in educational governance was a key dimension that NTTF were not
allowed, and this restricted their experience of being in the academic profession. On the other
hand, it would be unfair to explicitly ask NTTF to sit on committees. As Elsa, a tenured TTF in
the Humanities, put it: “we don’t put them on committees; which is fair to them. But it leaves
people, kind of, out of things.” And Vivian, also a tenured TTF in the Humanities, rightly
suggested that even if they were included they might not be heard:

I'm not sure what actually would happen if a sessional said 'hey I think we should totally
re-vamp the way the curriculum is designed' - unless it happened to coincide with some
tenure-stream faculty member's views. I don't think it would go very far, so I don't think
they have any input into the bigger decisions.
TTF admitted that even if NTTF were to participate in departmental activities, their views might not be given much weight. Indeed, for NTTF who may not teach in a department in the future, it might not make sense to take part in curriculum development. But for some who had been working temporarily for the same contract for many years, this exclusion made less sense. Hector, a NTTF who had been repeatedly hired on temporary contracts for over ten years, called into question the logic of temporary contracts: “In (my department) there are five [(NTTF) downtown and we've been there for a long time and we're not going anywhere.” Hector’s point that NTTF are “not going anywhere” suggests another reason NTTF feel this is a missed opportunity: despite the temporary nature of NTTF contracts, many are employed in a repeated fashion by universities and thus a considerable number of NTTF gain long-term experience in a particular department teaching undergraduate courses.

Hence, a ‘participation bind’ exists for NTTF whereby they would like to feel more welcome to participate in department life and committees, and to be recognized for that participation. Given their extensive training and experience in the classroom, NTTF feel they have important knowledge and experience to impart. At the same time, they are not paid to do so, and are stretched thin trying to balance multiple jobs and heavy teaching loads. This puts a strain on their professional identity because although they gain valuable experience teaching a variety of courses in the university, their experience and expertise is not really valued in their workplaces, nor is it remunerated by the university. NTTF are thus in a difficult position to gain experience that might help them secure a TTF job. One long-term NTTF who had done a
considerable amount of service work had recently gotten very involved with the union and became a major force in mobilizing non-tenure-track faculty in her department. She said:

For the very first time this year, we are starting to say, 'we're not prepared to do unpaid work.' But as you can imagine, with 110 or so sessionals (here), there's a whole range of responses to that. People here feel very strongly that they are dedicated educators and they do what their managers ask them to do. And that goes back to – for many of them - their work in the schools. There's many things that teachers are required to do that are unpaid as well. And that's just part of the job. And we feel that as professionals, we should be doing that.

Reflecting the positioning of NTTF as both precarious workers and professionals, an organizing strategy had to accommodate a variety of responses to not doing unpaid work. These twin positions – that of being a precarious worker and a professional – meant that precarious professionals were caught between two worlds.

16 Trapped Between Two Worlds: Precarious Professionals’ Professional Identity

Precarious professionals are trapped between two worlds – the world of the precarious worker, and the world of the professional. The first world is comprised of the demands of being a precarious temporary contract worker, such as commuting to multiple workplaces, accepting temporary contract work to make ends meet, and making last-minute efforts to construct a syllabus for a course, given just-in-time hiring processes at the universities where they work. At the same time however, many NTTF strive to fulfill the expectations of being a professional –

24 Pseudonym and field omitted to protect confidentiality.
for example, by being excellent teachers, doing research, publishing papers, presenting scholarly work at conferences, and participating in the life of the department by doing service work. Though they are not usually paid to do all these activities, many of them strive to acquire permanent work in the academic profession and therefore participate in this world as much as possible. They are high skilled, highly educated workers who have undergone extensive training in their profession, yet they are not paid to carry out many of the professional activities they have trained to do and in many cases do. The demands of precarious work also put a strain on what they are able to accomplish professionally, though many of them still continue to publish, participate in professional conferences, and contribute to their department and university life.

Differences in field, and ramifications for women vs. men NTTF, had several implications for this precarious professional bind. First, Engineering and Scientist NTTF tended to display outward confidence in their status in the profession, and were also less likely to describe feelings of precarity. This does not mean that they did not experience the same working conditions as Humanities NTTF, but rather these conditions seemed incidental to them as opposed to having an impact on their ability to find secure and meaningful employment in their chosen field. However, this also differed by gender. Women in Engineering and Science did experience feelings of precarity, with regards to the experiences of sexism described above. Though women Engineering and Science NTTF felt proud of their professional accomplishments, they also expressed dismay at not having permanent work that would ultimately make them feel more secure. Hence, the process of precaritizing professionals is gendered in multiple ways. The process of precaritizing professionals involves associations and assumptions made about work, like the feminization of teaching described in chapter two, but also experiences that marginalize women, and limit women’s ability to make connections and integrate professionally in their fields.
Furthermore, temporary contract workers in the academic profession do unpaid work. A gendered expectation to do unpaid work is exacerbated by precarious professionals’ desire to gain permanent positions in their fields, especially in the Humanities where they are less likely to have non-academic jobs as their primary source of income. Nevertheless, women in both fields did more unpaid work and it impacted them economically (in time and unpaid wages) and professionally. Unfortunately, their leadership and service to the academic community is not reflected in full-time permanent employment in their profession, to which many of them aspire.

17 Conclusion

In this chapter, I examine how workers experience the conditions of temporary work. I show how the working conditions in temporary work further devalue precarious professionals’ work, and also limit their professional development and integration. Analyzing precarious professionals’ experiences of the working conditions found in temporary work, I show how they marginalize NTTF, limiting their ability to develop in ways that permanently employed professionals do, and also limit their integrate in the academic profession. There are some parallels with the literature on precarious work in the sense that job security, and working conditions like pay, health benefits and commuting are key issues for NTTF. What my analysis adds is to show the compounding effect where temporary contract workers must compromise one thing for another – for example, they sacrifice time to commute from campus to campus to gain money from a contract, or they sacrifice money from an alternate job to gain time and energy in attempt to apply for more full-time jobs, and so on. For those NTTF who work at multiple institutions, having to learn multiple institutional rules and regulations shapes the more micro-level working conditions, which in turn affects professional development. This further allows us
to understand the specific situation of precarious professionals that has not been fully addressed in the literature of precarious work, or the literature on professionals.

NTTF experience anxiety and uncertainty in the face of economic insecurity, which negatively impacts their development as professionals. Multiple job holding and commuting limit the amount of time and energy they can devote to professional development. Efforts to develop and improve pedagogy are limited by the process of ‘just-in-time’ course administration, where NTTF teach a variety of courses, at times outside of their field of expertise, and with little notice. This leads to self-reported negative impacts on their professional work. NTTF do not get the support they need to excel in their profession and receive little feedback with which to improve professionally.

The working conditions in temporary contract work also negatively impact NTTF’s professional integration. Reduced levels of visibility, space, and interaction with colleagues contribute to NTTF professional marginalization by downgrading their status as employees of a university and by overlooking professional contributions. Related to the lack of recognition addressed in chapter two, NTTF felt that this lack of acknowledgement – to be expected in the context of professional work – was disappointing. A climate of “uncollegiality” – as one participant called it – means NTTF do not feel like a welcome part of the professional community or network. Experiences of sexism in the context of job insecurity marginalize women workers.

These factors push us to think differently about precarity and the complex ways that professional and economic marginalization intersect. Economic marginalization of temporary workers, particularly those with lower overall incomes and/or who work multiple jobs, depletes workers of time, energy and money required to further invest in their search for full-time
permanent work and/or to look for career alternatives. Moreover, working conditions in temporary contract work *themselves* limit professional development and integration according to participants. Beyond the economic impact of temporary contract work, these data suggest that temporary contract work at the micro-level, has negative effects on professional workers’ ability to do their jobs and advance in their profession. Because precarious professionals are susceptible to demands made by the profession, they are trapped between the demands of being a precarious temporary contract worker, and fulfilling the expectations of being a professional. A key example of this is that many NTTF do unpaid work, yet they do not reap professional and economic rewards from these efforts relative to their permanent counterparts. Therefore, they lose earnings through a time and money tax even while attempting to maintain their influence and input in the academic profession. This element of professional marginalization plays a role in why these workers get stuck in temporary contract work, further sharpening our understanding of the complex ways that employment status and professional success are intertwined in the context of precarious and professional work.

NTTF deal with the professional need to go ‘above and beyond’ and do some of these activities other than teaching, while also trying not to take on too many unpaid responsibilities. As such, they are forced to choose between doing unpaid work that might benefit them professionally and not doing unpaid work and missing “opportunities to perform” (Kezar 2013), and thus contributing further to their marginalization in the academic profession. I argue that NTTF’s response to this bind is gendered. Specifically, women NTTF tend to do unpaid work in teaching or service, while men tend to do unpaid research work, and focus on obtaining additional academic and non-academic work. Men more than women emphasized that the benefit of doing temporary work was having fewer responsibilities, and described taking advantage of that.
Though precarious professionals work very hard in attempt to make up the gaps in professionalization in the context of temporary employment, many end up staying in part-time employment, reflective of prior work on “precarity traps” (Standing 2011; Goldring and Landolt 2011; Kerfoot and Korczynski 2005). This chapter showed how the trap of precarity goes beyond being ‘trapped’ in temporary contract employment economically speaking. Adding to this definition, they are also ‘trapped’ between the worlds of precarious and professional work. They are often forced to choose between economic survival as precarious workers, and their professional goals and aspirations, and these choices are related to dimensions of location, industry, and level of economic security.

The marginalization of temporary contract workers in the academic profession described in this chapter occurs at the micro- and meso-levels, is multifaceted, and is gendered both in terms of the assumptions made about the value of professional work along lines of occupation and industry, and at the micro-level in terms of interactions and experiences. In the next chapter, I explore the ways in which precarious professionals resist marginalization. How does this resistance seek to address employment insecurity? Does it gain recognition for workers who feel devalued in their professional contexts?
Chapter 4
Social Movement Unionism and Precarious Professionals’ Resistance

In this chapter, I turn to precarious professionals’ resistance to economic and professional marginalization. I focus on their participation in union organizing in southern Ontario on the one hand, and professional renewal on the other. I extend the research on social movement unionism by assessing how precarious professionals resist marginalization by challenging employment practices, but also by highlighting the impact of temporary contract working conditions on the quality of their professional work. Consider the following descriptions of three women who became active union organizers and officials:

*Tina is a 50 year-old, white Canadian born NTTF in the Humanities who holds a PhD. Though her experience and resume in her field were impressive, and she was sought out by numerous organizations outside the university to do additional work, Hilary felt devalued by the university. She felt that even though she brought considerable experience to the table, she was often overlooked at work. When her courses started to be cut, Hilary decided ‘enough was enough’ and got involved in organizing NTTF at her campus(es) and became an active member in multiple rounds of bargaining and a strong advocate for job security among NTTF.*

*Angela is a 60 year-old, white Canadian born NTTF in the Humanities who holds a PhD. She is passionate about teaching and quickly became active as a union steward after filing a grievance related to her course not being renewed. Angela argued that, in the Humanities, the situation for NTTF had gotten “really bad”, to the extent that there was too much competition for single-course contracts. But she also did not feel her hard work was appreciated by tenure-stream colleagues and administrators, and wished there was more recognition – professionally and economically – for NTTF’s hard work.*
Shira is a 41 year-old racialized woman who taught for several years in the Humanities before becoming a full-time union organizer. After working as a NTTF and travelling between multiple campuses, Shira described teaching on a sessional basis as “horrifying.” She described feeling “always under the gun” and never having any sort of job security as quite difficult. She said that at all the institutions where she worked, she never felt teaching was valued “as it should be”, and that this fact cemented her decision to move into full-time union work representing university teachers. She continues to work in this sector and is now a senior union official at the national level.

Women who taught in the Humanities – who arguably felt the most devalued, as shown in chapter two – were also the most active in union organizing and resistance. The following vignettes describe three participants – all women who worked in the Humanities – who became active union organizers or union officials, in the academic sector during the time of this research. They all describe feelings that their work was devalued – either by colleagues or by employers. These three individuals have much in common: they are women who work (or worked) as NTTF in the Humanities, and felt their own work experiences had led them to become active in union organizing, either as rank-and-file activists, representatives or, union officials. NTTF in the Humanities bring narratives similar to those described in chapter two and three – about the value of their work, but also the challenges of temporary contract work – into their resistance. They leverage them to gain support from multiple actors including colleagues, students, media and the broader public.

This chapter is structured as follows: First, I outline previous debates about resistance among temporary contract workers and professional workers, which identifies two key aspects: alliances between precarious professionals’ union organizing with broader social movements, and an emphasis on targeting the state and employment practices rather than a single employer. Second, I look at NTTF’s narratives of resistance and engagement, showing that NTTF in the
Humanities are much more prominent in union organizing and resistance than those in Engineering and Science. Third, I argue that union organizing among precarious professionals in southern Ontario used a two-pronged approach, addressing the fact that precarious professionals are trapped between the worlds of precarious worker and professional. Fourth, I show an unexpected confluence in the way NTTF and TTF raise issues of workload, control and individualism in the academic profession.

It is important to note that union organizing and worker resistance are not the same. Where I am talking about formal union organizing by union activists and members, I use the term ‘organizing’, and where I discuss more broadly workers’ strategies to resist marginalization in their profession, including but not limited to union organizing, I use the term resistance. I focus on union organizing in the first two sections and then turn to workers’ more informal forms of resistance.

18 Organizing Precarious Workers and Social Movement Unionism

Researchers have examined how, with the decline of the Standard Employment Relationship – that of full-time, permanent work through a single employer – worker organizing has had to change (Vosko 2000a; Fudge and Vosko 2001; Smith 1998, Vallas 2016). Organizers, trade unionists and activists have worked to revitalize unions, drawing from social movement repertoires (Voss and Sherman 2000; Murray 2002; Cranford 2007; Chun 2009), and new forms of worker organizing, such as worker centers and workers’ associations, have emerged (Fine 2006; Voss and Sherman 2000; Cranford et al. 2006; Chun, Lipsitz, and Shin 2013). In processes of union revitalization and the emergence of new forms of worker organizing, discursive and rhetorical tactics have emerged based on community needs, social justice, immigration status, geographic location and occupational status. But how might professional workers adopt these
themes? What narratives do they employ at the level of union organizing and are those narratives informed by professional workers’ goals – and if so, how?

Scholars have documented the expansion of worker resistance to a wide variety of repertoires. Chun & Agarwala (2013) point to the importance of micro-politics in worker resistance and in struggles for redistribution and recognition. They call for an analysis of “the micro-politics of organizing – that is the rhetoric, persuasive techniques, social interactions, spatial and temporal logics, affects and feeling states, and embodied experiences that convince workers and their advocates to wage collective struggles.” (2013:646). Analyses at the macro- or even meso-level can omit important details about affect and feeling states, including how those feeling states influence the collective identities needed to organize actors. Chun (2009) examines how, amidst employer and state offensives against unions, marginalized workers managed to obtain symbolic leverage in struggles for recognition and redistribution. New discourses and identities have emerged in the context of an eroding middle class, increasing unemployment and underemployment and new forms of precarious work globally (Standing 2011; Rogers 1995; Sayce, Ackers, and Greene 2007; Chun and Agarwala 2013).

Chun and Agarwala (2013) argue that expanded collective action and new organizational repertoires are key to understanding the micro-politics of labor struggles under these conditions. Given that precarious work is an issue faced across multiple employers, and that multiple employers and temporary agencies hire precarious workers, scholars have argued that their resistance should target the broader labour market and not simply a single employer. Hence, new scholarship should examine how workers “recast labour disputes as broader issues of economic and social justice” and “the primacy of communities and social identities as key vehicles for building collective solidarity” (Chun and Agarwala 2013: 642-645). But what do issues of economic and social justice look like for precarious professionals? And do dimensions of
‘professionalism’, professional ethics or mandates intersect with the way labour issues are cast?

In the union organizing literature, there is very little examination of professional workers’ participation in union renewal (Kessler and Heron 2001). Kessler and Heron (2001) develop a framework to address renewal among professionals that comprises workplace activity, workplace issues and workplace relationships (2001:370). But how does professional renewal, often internal to the profession, translate into campaigns and resistance targeting the state and broader employment practices? To what extent do precarious professionals’ resistance suggest alliances between temporary contract workers and permanently employed workers?

Scholarship on worker organizing has also shown how unions need to account for the gendered social relations of work in understanding how to best organizing workers (Birdsell Bauer and Cranford 2017; Yates 2011; Boris and Nadasen 2008; Baines 2010). This scholarship, focusing on caregiving, home care, and domestic work, has argued that the social relations of work influence how workers experience unionism. For example, union campaigns and strategies must account for workers’ ethos of care, while also understanding the complex experiences of racialized workers (Birdsell Bauer and Cranford 2017). Yet, researchers have not explored the influence of the social relations of professional work on organizing, with the exception of Armstrong’s analysis of nurses’ organizing (1993). For example, the micro-politics of the home-workplace inform the social relations of work in dimensions that are gendered and racialized in care labour and domestic work (Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001; Anderson 2000). In professional work, what does resistance to the feminization of work look like? To what extent does organizing precarious professionals require a specific set of strategies and how do these mirror or depart from strategies in organizing non-professional precarious workers? What dimensions of the professional work itself do unions try to account for and to what extent are these strategies successful in mobilizing professional workers?
19 Organizing and Resistance at the Micro-Level: Feminized Workers Fight Back

At multiple levels, there was a presence of feminized workers in organizing – not simply due to organizers’ gender, but also based on their experiences as devalued teachers, described in chapter two. Though feelings of being devalued varied among my sample, all the women who were in organizing felt to some extent that colleagues, managers and employers devalued their work as teachers in that it was not recognized as important professional work. These women became active members of their union and advocates for NTTF. In contrast, none of the Engineering or Science NTTF I interviewed had become active union organizers – even if they had positive union attitudes. Interviews with key informants confirmed that, relative to NTTF in the Humanities, NTTF in Engineering and Science were not as visible in union organizing. Men NTTF in the Humanities were not as visible as women in union organizing; they described themselves mainly as inactive in their unions. They tended to have more individualized responses and resistance, whereas women took more of a leadership role, particularly in union organizing in the academic sector among temporary contract workers. These patterns were not just evident among my sample, but key informants also remarked on them, indicating a broader trend. Marla, a union representative, reflected on women’s willingness to participate in union organizing:

Women can kind of get to that structural analysis a little faster. If men can't get to the structural analysis they can at least live off, 'I'm a failure.' or, if they can't live off that they can cope with being a failure… women I would call on, you could kind of get them to a point of 'ok, here's what we need to do'… I think women could adapt; they could say 'ok so I'm a teacher because being a teacher, and a woman, is not really bizarre, right? It’s
a classic profession for women. Men say ‘I was gonna be the hot shit whatever prof, and now I'm just a teacher.’ they had a hard time with that.

Marla characterized women as easier to organize because, she interpreted, they were more attuned to structural inequalities at work than men, who individualized their experiences as temporary contract teachers. Importantly, Marla tied the fact that teaching was a feminized profession and that women felt more comfortable embracing the narrative of being a devalued teacher. Though there is likely variation in the way men and women NTTF organize, this pattern was visible during the time of this research, and confirmed by a key informant who had contact with multiple NTTF over a course of over ten years. Marla’s point also suggests the salience of gendered understandings in her efforts to understand specific organizing characteristics and outcomes.

Women NTTF in the Humanities who were active in union organizing described bringing their feelings of being on the margins economically and professionally into union spaces. They described how this became a central motivation in becoming involved with their unions as rank-and-file activists, representatives or in some cases eventually as union officials. NTTF from the Humanities brought stories about their work – such as feeling “under the gun” – into organizing spaces. Not all narratives were the same, though there was an emphasis on making clear that the conditions of work for temporary contract teachers were indicative of a devaluing of teaching.

20 Social Movement Unionism and Precarious Professionals: A Two-Pronged Approach

The following section argues that precarious professionals’ organizing was characterized by a two-pronged approach. First, precarious professionals organized along lines of social
movement unionism\textsuperscript{25}, making links to broader social movements, and aligning on issues of economic insecurity, and thus were able to garner the attention of multiple actors. Union organizers and activists launched a media campaign on the issue of precarious employment, arguing it was a negative employment practice seen across sectors. This allowed for broader alliances across sectors and a growing public awareness about the issue of precarious work. The second prong of this approach was to focus on the negative impact of precarious work on higher education. A key informant confirmed that messaging deliberately centered on the ways that having temporary contract workers as teachers impacted the quality of higher education. One key slogan in this vein was “our working conditions are students’ learning conditions.” In sending this message, precarious professionals drew attention to the specific ways that temporary contract work prevented them from providing quality teaching, therefore making an argument for the negative impact of temporary contract teaching. This dimension was also key in gaining recognition for their temporary contract teaching work.

My observations in this section stem from interviews with NTTF and TTF, but also participant observation at union meetings from 2013-2017, attendance at town hall meetings organized by unions and faculty associations, attendance at strikes and solidarity rallies, attendance at two non-academic conferences held by union organizers and faculty associations on the subject of precarious academic work, media reports of three labour actions in southern Ontario, and informal observation and discussion over several years with NTTF, TTF, university administrators, and union organizers. During this research three labour actions took place in the postsecondary sector in Ontario – one among college faculty (October 2017) and two among

\textsuperscript{25} I use Voss and Sherman’s (2000) definition of social movement unionism, a process by which local unions have developed new goals and tactics used in social movements, the use of new leaders from outside the union ranks, de-emphasizing of the top-down service model, and new strategic directions and building community alliances.
graduate employees (March 2015). Narratives deployed in the graduate employee strike reflected a focus on economic insecurity and who took on the identity of precarious worker (Birdsell Bauer 2017), as did the college strike. NTTF were active in both strikes, playing a supporting role in the graduate employee strikes in solidarity, and an active role as the members seeking job security and academic freedom in the college sector strike.

During the course of this research, thousands of union organizers and members across Ontario mobilized to raise awareness about universities’ use of temporary contract work, organized across campuses, and some made active attempts to involve activists from campaigns that addressed economic insecurity more broadly, especially the Fight for $15 and Fairness campaign. The college sector strike also drew media attention to the issue of temporary contract work and precarious work. Participation at various rallies and events for the Fight for $15 and Fairness campaign revealed participation by rank and file members of unions, not just union representatives and organizers. During two conferences with the theme of precarious work in Ontario universities held in 2016 and 2017, organizers from the Fight for $15 and Fairness campaign spoke, bringing to light that NTTF issues of economic insecurity were part of the broader struggles of labour movement in Ontario. At a series of town halls organized by union activists, NTTF and organizers spoke about issues alongside janitorial staff at universities in attempt to build solidarity on the fact that temporary contract work and contracting out was an employment practice used in different sectors and workplaces across southern Ontario. These stakeholders connected the issue of temporary contract work in the academic profession to broader restructuring and declining public funding of universities. During this mobilizing period, actors outside of the bargaining units – like students and janitorial staff – joined forces with union organizers in the academic sector in Ontario. Recent coverage by the CBC describes how students have become increasingly aware of the role contract faculty play:
From the student perspective, salaries for university presidents and vice-presidents seem to be on the rise at the same time as tuitions are increasing and "while contract academic staff suffer," says Jessica McCormick, chairperson of the Canadian Federation of Students. (Davidson 2015)

A key informant confirmed that in recent years student awareness regarding this issue had grown. This informant argued that, though labour disputes meant the disruption of their classes by an entire term – as was the case for the OPSEU college strike in October and November 2017 – there was also a marked amount of support from students. This support, the informant maintained, was based on the assertion that the use of temporary contract workers was a bad employment practice. This was also reflected in the graduate employee strike, in which undergraduate students wrote critical pieces targeting the issue of precarious employment among university teachers (See e.g. Schwartz 2015).

NTTF who were active in union organizing also launched a highly successful media campaign to make the issue of non-tenure-track faculty working conditions a high-profile issue. This media campaign was key for NTTF in aligning with broader social movements such as the Fight for $15 and Fairness, in terms of creating solidarity based on common issues. Moreover, it was also important in terms of highlighting the employment practices in southern Ontario universities and colleges more broadly – which were important to target as a whole. This was in part because many NTTF worked at multiple institutions and thus targeting the employment practice was key to moving towards improving working conditions described in chapter three. Indeed, a key informant confirmed that “targeting the sector is what we need to do”, because of the multiple job holding of sessionals who faced similar issues across institutions.

A key piece of media coverage was a documentary by a journalist and NTTF focusing on contract faculty, which aired on the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (Basen 2014). This
media coverage of contract faculty issues was also bolstered by graduate employee strikes at two of Canada’s largest universities, York University and the University of Toronto. Titles of news coverage citing the strike included: “Academia has to stop eating its young” (Yazdanian 2015); “Striking Grad Students on What It’s Like to Live on $15,000 a Year” (Yelland 2015). These articles highlighted both job insecurity and income insecurity as key issues. One piece in the *Globe and Mail*, a national newspaper, stated that

> Universities should create a permanent roster of salaried teaching positions, resorting to contract faculty only when desperate. Institutions such as McMaster University and the University of Waterloo have already moved in this direction, having recognized that professors need time, resources and a modicum of security to deliver the continuity, relevance and attention to detail that world-class postsecondary instruction demands.

(Yazdanian 2015)

These public narratives reflected not only the language of precarious employment, but also the question as to how they impacted academic professionals’ ability to deliver high quality postsecondary education. Indeed, one of the key dimensions of NTTF’s activism in southern Ontario from 2013-2017 involved highlighting that their working conditions were students’ learning conditions. This made clear the impact of job insecurity on the actual work of teaching, placing the impact of students at centre stage. When asked what strategies unions were using to raise awareness of the value of NTTF’s work as teachers, Marla, a union organizer and former NTTF in the Humanities, said “to make sure everyone understands the connection between learning conditions and teaching conditions. Because that’s what it is – their (NTTF) working conditions directly impact the quality of higher education.” This campaign thus linked their working conditions to students’ experience of postsecondary education, showing how temporary contract work impacted the ability of them as professionals to develop courses – much like the
issues discussed in chapter three – but from the perspectives of students and their families. At a town hall held in 2015, a union organizer from a non-academic union suggested that a key pillar for organizing would be that NTTF rally “for fair employment and quality education.”

The media campaigns championed by NTTF also suggested a much more visible profile of their issues was building in Ontario. As one TTF in the Humanities noted, these campaigns succeeded in creating more awareness than in the past:

I think there’s quite a strong awareness of a situation of part-timers and sessionals out there. And the awareness is out there in large measure because part-timers and sessionals have been so strongly agitating and so strongly organizing themselves the last number of years. I would say, around the problem of part-time sessional employment in universities, there is a much bigger awareness; and it’s been an awareness created largely by part-timers and sessionals themselves. [Precarious work in universities] is now a much higher profile issue in the academy, than it was even five years ago. People now know, use the term precariat. I was very fascinated by the press coverage of the strikes… it was really the stuff about precarious employment and the precariat that was getting a lot of press coverage. We would never have seen this five years ago.

It is telling that a TTF, who had been working in the university for over 20 years, and who had held various administrative positions, noted both media attention to the issue of temporary contract work and the prevalence of the precarious employment narrative. Importantly, she noted that NTTF and unions were not only targeting their employer but also developing a social movement unionism that addressed the broader issue of precarious work. Yet, as also discussed in chapter three, precarious professionals were torn between the challenges of precarious work and their goals as professionals, and thus unions could not simply centre their messaging around the identity of precarious worker but also needed to highlight how this work was impacting their
goals as professionals – to be excellent teachers – and provide quality postsecondary education. The latter also allowed them to gain recognition in the public sphere. But precarious professionals’ resistance was not simply about narratives deployed in union organizing but more broadly about professional renewal in the academic sphere.

21 Precarious Professionals’ Resistance and Renewal in the Academic Profession

Precarious professionals’ resistance through union organizing showed that unions representing them linked workers’ experiences of job insecurity to broader issues of precarious work, and made connections to broader social movements like the Fight for $15 and Fairness campaign in Ontario. NTTF in the Humanities were involved in formal union organizing and built connections with non-academic organizations and actors. But how did workers resist on an individual level? And did their experiences resonate with those of permanent employees in their profession? In the next sections, I show how both temporary contract and permanently employed workers’ experiences suggested potential for alliances regarding professional renewal and change along three lines: workload, control, and individualized work cultures.

21.1 Workload Issues: Resisting Work Intensification and Speedup

In addition to union organized resistance, which connected with social movements, and created targeting messaging around precarious worker identities, some NTTF engaged in more direct resistance, speaking out against unpaid work NTTF regularly did in their departments. Danya, a NTTF in the Humanities, had felt this pressure in previous years but later decided not to take on this unpaid work:

Our department head there sent around a request saying, you know, 'we're doing the student at risk meeting' and I emailed him back and said 'well, my contract actually says
specifically I'm not being paid for this.' And then suddenly there were funds available to pay us to come to the meeting, which hadn't been mentioned before... So I'm actually finding it really does pay off to say, you know, 'I'm not being paid for this in my contract; I'm happy to do it, but it has to be paid.' I've really been making a point of not doing service, you know, I've stopped writing - I used to write letters of recommendation... and what I've been doing the last year or two is just saying no.

Though pay for additional service work is not always enshrined in collective agreements\textsuperscript{26}, Danya discovered pay was available for tasks if she requested it. Yet, it should be emphasized that not all NTTF feel comfortable requesting additional funds for their work and it may not be clear when it is appropriate to do so. Many NTTF were critical about how this wish to help students was taken advantage of as the university obtained free labour. After years of contributing many hours of unpaid service work, Danya felt she had to draw the line.

Importantly, Danya noted that her TTF colleagues were not happy about pressure to do additional work or overwork and this was reflected in interviews with TTF. Jason, a TTF in the Sciences, said the hardest part of his job was simply “Getting the time to complete tasks. I find that I’m constantly having to drop something to do something else.” And feeling overburdened with tasks was reflected in nearly all the interviews with TTF, including with those TTF who were tenured. Elsa, a TTF in the Humanities, complained of “work speed up and intensification.” When asked what the hardest part of his job was, Christopher said, “juggling all the various pulls and pushes and keeping all the balls up in the air. Sometimes it just gets overwhelming especially when you're teaching a new course.” Different participants dealt with this pressure

\textsuperscript{26} This issue is ongoing and changes on a yearly basis and varies across employers and collective agreements.
differently. Jay, who earlier in this thesis described the need to limit the time he committed to teaching to focus on his research, said: “the hardest thing about the job is not being able to put as much time into things that I'd like. So it's my own sort of personal sense that I'd like to be able to do some things better and there just isn't a way to do it. That’s the part that's hard.” The sense of being crunched for time was difficult in terms of Jay’s professional goals, such as the goal to be a good teacher. Even though Jay described this as a “personal sense” of what he would like to be doing, this sense of not being able to do what was required within the given time was reflected by nearly all TTF. In line with recent debates about overwork in academia such as reflected in the popular book *The Slow Professor* (Seeber and Berg 2016), these professionals felt that overwork was distracting from the broader professional goals of university professors to reflect on contemporary issues, and some pointed out that overwork was detracting from some of those goals (See also e.g. Menand 2010; Cote and Allahar 2007; Cote and Allahar 2011; Readings 1995, who make similar critiques).

Work intensification for permanently employed professionals and unpaid work done by temporary contract workers are not exactly the same phenomenon, yet these data clearly suggest a similar source of frustration with work intensification that the two groups held in common and wanted to change. Thus, temporary contract workers and permanently employed workers held this view that work intensification and expectations to do unpaid work needed to be addressed at the meso-level in order to feel they could focus on their professional goals – such as teaching or researching contemporary issues at a pace more in line with reflection and less in line with intensification. They also highlighted the way their work was increasingly controlled by senior administrators and expressed the need to resist and maintain autonomy over their professional work.
21.2 Control and Autonomy: Resisting Managerialism

Interviews with both NTTF and TTF revealed claims of increasing managerial control by senior administrators, like Deans, Vice-Deans, Provosts, and Presidents. Elsa, a tenured TTF in the Humanities who had previously held administrative positions described how senior administration had grown at her university:

[There's been a] development of a huge separate administrative superstructure. um, and erosion of peer governance - so you know, this is not just some personal feeling of my own; you know, I think um opportunities for faculty - even quite senior faculty being meaningfully involved in directing the future of the university and its directions are diminishing. And that's the case in - I would say - in most postsecondary institutions.

There’s constant constant waves of 'we're gonna do this! We’re gonna do that! Now we want you to change this! Now we're putting in place a new system!' - that nobody was ever consulted about. And so it means that faculty are less involved in those decisions.

Elsa reflects not only the intensification of work through new system implementation but also that this intensification took place through the development of senior administrative cadre. Both TTF and NTTF took issue with the extent to which senior administrative personnel controlled their work, and NTTF raised the issue of lack of input repeatedly as discussed in chapter three.

Marla, who after teaching sessionally for several years, decided to become a full-time union representative because she felt that she had little control over the course curriculum:

Two years after the implementation work basically they gave me a three-word description about (my) course and said, “Here you go, this is what you're doing now… we're just changing the curriculum” – no communication; no consultation. Two years later they said, “Well, this is not working” – and I said “What were you trying to do, why didn't you
ask me; you can't do that in this course. And here's why... you need to split it into two courses.” “Oh! Well we should have talked to you two years ago.” Yeah you should have right?

Professionals emphasize their need to retain some control over their course content in order to provide a quality higher education. NTTF like Marla felt that her control over the course content was diminished after the curriculum was changed without her consultation. Even though NTTF were formally and informally excluded from decision making while TTF were not, it is important to note that both NTTF and TTF explicitly expressed concern that the university administration had too much control over their work, or used a top-down approach that did not allow for input. For example, Todd, a tenured TTF in the Humanities, problematized senior administration's attempts to make claims on TTF intellectual property through Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs):

When I was acting chair they were already trying to bring in these MOOCs which I was not comfortable with cause I thought it's just trying to replace faculty with electronic media, you know and policies like anything that we put on any university server is automatically intellectual property of the university so anything that's on Blackboard they can just take and do whatever they want with it.

For both NTTF and TTF, the issue of being able to control the content of what they were teaching was of prime importance. Warren, a NTTF in the Humanities, argued administrative control put limitations on what faculty could do as educators:

I also still think that the negative side is that we're still boxed in like there are still certain economic and professional constraints and as much as I talk about you know incubating
my research in undergraduate classes and trying to publish and research, I still am dependent on the whims; the economy of an administrator.

Other participants gave more specific examples of administrative control and described how it impacted their ability to carry out the day-to-day work required by their profession. Shelly, a tenured TTF in the Sciences, described how an administrator intervened in a situation where students had cheated in a final exam and expressed frustration that she wasn't consulted and didn't ultimately retain control over her final grades. She asserted

The other thing is the way this place is structured; I’ve never seen anything like this where it’s so hierarchical. We are kept in the dark and we are just a little people, we don’t know anything, they know better than we do and this is not how you should be treating your talent. You got people here who often spent their entire careers here. This is not engendering any love but also it’s not a good way to run a place, it’s very ineffective, it doesn’t build morale. People here very sincerely do their job and they feel like they are treated like human garbage... I feel like they couldn’t give a hoot about you and that they are just patronizing you which would be a lot the administration because to me that kind of person wielding that much power is a very corrupt situation.

Here Shelly is not simply complaining about a hierarchy engrained in the bureaucratic structures of the university, but expressed a lack of open communication between the faculty and the administration. If even a tenured faculty member feels this way, this is an indication that temporary contract workers were not alone in expressing the need for change. There were very strong feelings expressed here about the need to respect professional autonomy and control over one’s work. In a similar vein Terrance, a tenured TTF in the Humanities felt that the administration made top-down demands of his department that were impersonal and expressed:
I'm frustrated with... impersonal very top-down structures, in a context that is named as collegial... we were asked to produce a self-study on short notice so a number of us dropped everything and spent a lot of time working on it. We got it on the Monday of the first week of classes and were supposed to turn it around by Friday *laughs* ... that's very top-down and very impersonal.

Hence, participants in various positions described how increased administrative control impacted various aspects of their work, including their teaching, the hiring and promotion of colleagues, and professional development. Both NTTF and TTF viewed administrative control of their work as an issue, even if the degree of administrative control varied between and across groups. Elsa felt that this accretion and expansion of administration brought new procedures and new demands for accountability and reporting that were very challenging and led to work intensification for faculty:

not only is there this huge you know separate managerial infrastructure, but because you have that, the sort of mandates and the accountability procedures are just you know increasing sort of exponentially - so this has incredible you know - what's often called 'mandate creep' right? "now we should do this; now we should do that; now we should do this to improve the student experience; now we have to do this because of accountability; now we want these kind of reporting structures in place" and so on. And so the work intensification um is enormous I think across the board.

Faculty in both the NTTF and TTF groups felt that there was an expansion of administration and they felt this expanded administrative control was impacting their professional work. While resistance by professionals wanting renewal and union organizing were largely separate at the focal institutions, they were fused during the recent strike in the college system. Indeed, one
union organizer, speaking to the fact that NTTF in the college sector were not involved in grade appeals, said: “When even the grades are in the hands of managers, not faculty, then academic standards clearly suffer” (Canadian Association of University Teachers 2018). Importantly, this union executive member pointed to the importance of full-time faculty’s support in making this a key issue during the strike. This parallel, along with that of work intensification described in the first section, were key points of convergence in terms of what NTTF and TTF felt needed to be changed in order to renew the academic profession in the context of their workplaces.

21.3 Community and Democracy: Resisting Individualism

Given the lack of recognition given to some NTTF, described in chapter two, and the impact of NTTF’s working conditions on their professional integration described in chapter three, it is no surprise that they criticised a sense of individualism and a lack of community orientation in their workplaces. But what was interesting and important about these critiques was that both NTTF and TTF were concerned that this professional culture of individualism and isolation more broadly was harmful in terms of professionals’ work. Andre, a tenured TTF in Engineering, argued that a spirit of community was important but not present at the university: “Sometimes I wish that some of our leaders would maintain a focus on community… I think one of the issues is we get so caught up in all the things we have to do, we don't connect enough.” Other TTF expressed a more explicit sense that community was not fostered enough in the university. Terrance, a tenured TTF in the Humanities, states that he wishes decisions were made more by the community which participants felt was an issue on campus. Elizabeth, a NTTF in the Humanities, stated that the problem was not simply about a NTTF-TTF split but a more general lack of collegiality in her department:
In general, fostering any sense of community is very challenging for my department. We don't do events together; we don't socialize; there's nothing. Any attempt to integrate sessionals into a wider departmental culture presupposes that there is one, and there isn't really one in my department.

She expressed frustration at being disconnected from decision-making given her impact on course delivery in the department:

I really would appreciate a chance to feel like I'm a member of the department and like I am contributing to the work of the department, because I am…

Here Elizabeth implies that despite her contributions, the feeling of community and inclusivity was lacking. Expressing her belonging was one way of resisting marginalization. Matt, a NTTF in the Humanities, said “they hire you on paper and you have this really huge responsibility and these huge pressures to be 'excellent', and they don't even know who you are. And you don't even know who they are.” Precarious professionals expressed the need to build a sense of community in order to improve as professionals more generally. Kenneth, a NTTF in the Humanities, reflected this sense when he said:

I like people who also get involved in the community so that's something that's really missing where I work now, we never disclose on how we work, and it's a real taboo; it's like talking about your sex life; it's something that shouldn't be happening at school.

Everything is very very individualistic and also very secretive.

This need for community in order to improve one’s work was not just expressed by NTTF, but also TTF. Josie, a pre-tenure TTF in the Sciences, said: “it would be nice to see more people, and interact a bit more outside of sort of preparing for lecture a bit.” Others expressed concern that
this lack of community orientation negatively impacted the university. And Darren, a NTTF in the Humanities, reflected on how a “rugged individualism” impeded a collective process of thinking more deeply about the purpose of undergraduate education:

I wonder 'shouldn't we rather collectively as educators be deepening our own pedagogical culture and be talking about what we should be doing?' Which we don't do. It's this rugged individualist approach and no one wants to talk about it; no one wants to be exposed about what they're doing in their classroom, you know. There's this fear actually. So let's instead of relying on these evaluations so much - and they are relied on, you know? - these nice handy numbers that the administration can then use -- uh they're very tempting. Uh but as a surrogate for a real culture of pedagogy they're terrible. You know? And I think that's what's happened… that internal conversation should be vigorous and robust and encouraged and cultivated. It isn't.

Both NTTF and TTF described how creating a sense of community might allow them to flourish as professionals. It should be noted that NTTF were more overtly critical about the lack of community, but TTF also acknowledged the need to build community and create more of a sense of community in the academic profession. Nelson, a senior NTTF in Engineering, stated that universities need to create community if they are going to retain NTTF.27 As argued in the next section, this sense of community was key also to mobilizing TTF alongside NTTF.

27 Nelson came from a place of privilege in terms of wanting to be ‘retained’, relative to other NTTF who were concerned their contracts would simply not be renewed.
22 Potential Allies? Temporary Contract and Permanently Employed Professionals

At a provincial meeting of faculty associations, one representative, a TTF, said “if you pull the thread of the increase of sessional work it reveals a desire to undermine faculty power”. At the core of this argument was shared experiences described by NTTF and TTF’s increasing workload and work intensification, administrative control, and a sense of individualized work cultures. In raising awareness about temporary contract work, some NTTF recognized that temporary contract work was part of a larger movement that could also involve TTF. Lara, a NTTF in the Humanities, stated that with ongoing campaigns to raise awareness about issues faced by NTTF, more and more faculty recognized the need to build community and also resist marginalization in the academic profession:

I think more and more people are actually becoming kind of aware of how, uh, how difficult the situation is and how precarious, you know, people are who are employed as adjuncts [are]. And I think maybe communicating more with, um, tenure-stream faculty because I think there's actually a lot of room for allies and I think tenure-stream faculty are - there's a lot of them who are very concerned about what's going on with adjunct labour.

Lara described needing to ally on this issue with TTF and administrators to address the collective situation of NTTF. This narrative, in contrast with the more individualistic critiques and strategies, serves to bring temporary and permanently employed academic professional workers together on the basis of quality education and can find parallels with literature on quality care and community unionism (Folbre 2006; Jacoby 2006; Worthen and Berry 2002). It showed up as well in more formal union and faculty association organizing. At one meeting at the provincial
level, one organizer, speaking about one university’s organizing drive said both NTTF and TTF “want to do the best job we can” – and argued this framing emphasized structural divisions over collegial restraints. Another union leader encouraged NTTF to find allies among the TTF “rather than appeal to employers’ divide-and-conquer strategies.” Hence, the potential for temporary contract workers and permanently employed professionals was beginning to be acknowledged in union and formal organizing spaces.

However, given the sense of ‘uncollegiality’ and challenges for NTTF’s professional development and integration described in chapter three, work needs to be done to mobilize the majority of temporary and permanently employed academic professionals, for reasons limiting solidarity described in chapter three. Narratives consisting exclusively of “us vs. them”, which divide temporary and permanently employed professional workers, limit the possibility of solidarity with permanently employed professionals, such as overwork and work intensification described in the higher education literature (Chandler, Barry, and Clark 2002; Geiger and Heller 2011; Smelser 2012; Cross and Goldenberg 2009). And as Angela, a union representative pointed out, changing an academic culture that was competitive and uncollegial was difficult from a union perspective:

In terms of looking at the relationship within the departments, I mean, it's very hard to change a culture, it's not like you can have a clause in your collective agreement, saying 'you have to acknowledge my existence'. And you know, it's six and one-half-dozen the other. For some people the last thing they want to do is be on a committee cause they have to get over to Guelph and it's hard enough to do office hours, to get there and the sort of 'benign neglect' has its advantages. But certainly I think people are aware that they aren't treated with much respect or much interest.
Angela highlights that cultural issues such as the “uncollegiality” and invisibility described in chapter three are much harder to address through union channels. Moreover, a culture of ‘benign neglect’ was easily maintained and thus cultural change, she argued, would be difficult.

However, as suggested in this chapter, TTF experienced some issues that were similar to those NTTF did – like overwork and time crunches, and increasing managerial control over their work. Though some TTF were more critical than others, this might be seen as an important basis for solidarity, especially for TTF who feel that the same cultural issues need to be addressed for the betterment of the profession as a whole. These narratives reflect not only a broader resistance to marginalization in the academic profession, but are also in line with narratives of professional renewal that have emerged in the academic context, in southern Ontario and beyond.

The extent to which TTF acted as allies, or suggested being allies, to NTTF, varied across institutions, associations and individuals. Those TTF who made such arguments were in the minority, though they were a vocal minority. And there was also considerable variation among NTTF who believed that TTF were their allies. The relationship between NTTF and TTF was therefore complex: on the one hand, NTTF experienced ‘uncollegiality’, invisibility, and lacked integration into their profession. These factors created division from NTTF and TTF both in terms of how NTTF were professionally integrated – or not – in their workplaces. On the other hand, NTTF shared similar views as TTF about key issues at the meso-, or organizational, level, that needed to change in the academic profession. These issues, though less visible in formal union organizing, suggest more convergence than expected in NTTF and TTF’s views toward their profession.
23 Conclusion

This analysis extends literature on union organizing to precarious professionals and to further explore how professional workers’ resistance goes beyond simple bread-and-butter issues like wages and benefits and incorporates the impact of temporary contract work on their professional work. Extending previous debates about resistance among temporary contract workers and professional workers, I show how union members and organizers who worked at multiple jobs targeted temporary contract work as a bad employment practice in the academic sector and made alliances with broader social movements like the Fight for $15 and Fairness campaign. Building off the findings of chapter two, I suggest that NTTF in the Humanities bring their experiences of being devalued into their union organizing, and act as vocal advocates in organizing and mobilizing academic professionals.

Organizing addressed the issue of precarious employment rather than targeting individual employers, fostering a shared sense of identity between NTTF and precarious workers more broadly across the province and identification with related social movements, like the Fight for $15 and Fairness Campaign in Ontario. But also, union organizing emphasized the impact of precarious working conditions on students’ learning conditions, reflecting the impact many workers felt temporary contract work had on their professional development, as described in chapter three. This two-pronged approach was a form of social movement unionism that drew on precarious professionals’ experiences of marginalization, but also their desire to provide quality higher education as professional workers.

The re-centring of teaching, and importance of providing a quality postsecondary education in NTTF’s union organizing reflects and extends the union renewal literature that calls for attention to devalued work along lines of gender, race immigrant and other forms of inequality (Briskin 2011; Cranford 2007; Colgan and Ledwith 2002; Foster 2014; Healy,
Bradley, and Mukherjee 2003). Moreover, that TTF issue similar cultural and structural critiques as NTTF is a point of solidarity between temporary and permanent professionals, and emphasizing the importance of this may be key to advancing existing mobilization of NTTF and TTF. Though there is some indication that unions have attempted to gain recognition for the feminized work of teaching, it remains to be seen whether this strategy will result in better pay or job security for precarious professionals – though a recent strike by college teachers in Ontario did make modest wage gains and secure more permanency for temporary workers. Further research should examine how different forms of value translate into union organizing and resistance. If these workers are successful in making gains in the professional context at work, precarious workers everywhere might benefit from understanding how emphasizing the value of work can be leveraged to gain better working conditions and creating better policies.

Moreover, unexpected convergence in the narratives of NTTF and TTF about meso-level practices suggest that, despite barriers to collegiality described in chapter two, similarities in temporary contract and permanent workers’ views on meso-level practices in their workplaces suggest that potential for alliances between the two groups aiming towards a common goal of renewal in the academic profession. I suggest that precarious professionals – though marginalized and on the fringe in their workplaces – might also be powerful catalysts in renewing the academic profession, particularly if they ally with permanently employed professionals. The shared views about faculty power and professional autonomy are key to the confluence of temporary and permanent workers’ resistance. Narratives of resistance by temporary contract workers are in many ways in line with permanently employed professionals’ concerns about overwork, control, and individualism. These narratives suggest that precarious professionals’ resistance is not only relevant to union organizing but also to professional renewal.
The political context of Ontario universities is crucial to understanding what messages are relevant, and which ones can be leveraged to gain solidarity in line with professional renewal. In other national contexts, we might see varied results. For instance, in the US, where the rate of unionization is lower, one might see fewer campaigns on the part of NTTF that aim to build solidarity with other labour organizing and in other sectors, and perhaps more resistance on a cultural level. Unlike many precarious workers, the workers in my sample are unionized, so they do have some protections and leverage against employers that non-unionized workers do not. Given the context of union representation and a social safety net that is relatively strong compared to the US, these precarious professionals do have some power. This in part explains their willingness to speak up and re-assert the value of their work through social movement unionism, and through professional renewal, as shown in this chapter.
Chapter 5
Towards a New Framework of Precarious Professionals

At the outset of this thesis, I argued that underfunded university teaching became the site for a debate about temporary contract work in the professions, and that this makes it a key site for developing a framework of precarious professionals. Considering the analysis developed in chapters two, three and four, this new framework for precarious professionals should account for several dimensions. First, it should unpack the ways in which temporary contract work is gendered along the lines of occupational and industrial segregation. The devaluation of teaching, a feminized job, is a key way that professionals become devalued. Moreover, not everyone experiences devaluing in the same way. Some temporary contract workers’ experience and expertise is masculinized, and granted greater recognition by their colleagues, managers and employers. Feminization thus created the conditions for the devaluation of NTTF in the Humanities in particular, in contrast to masculinization in Engineering and the Sciences that was reflected in recognition of temporary contract workers’ experience and expertise.

Hence a new framework for precarious professionals must analyze the way work is feminized and masculinized, but also the ways certain types of work is recognized in professional communities – and by whom. The recognition of work is part of complex social relations that include not only multiple actors, but also multiple meanings about work. For example, precarious professionals might feel their skilled work was valued by students but not by their permanently employed colleagues, managers and employers. A framework of precarious professionals would account for the variation in how professionals are granted recognition by their colleagues, managers and employers but also explore the value gained through recognition
by service recipients or clients – in the case of postsecondary education, students. Furthermore, as shown in chapter four, working to gain recognition is a key form of resistance for precarious professionals.

The second dimension a framework of precarious professionals should address is the way working conditions in temporary work impact professionals’ development and integration. As shown in the third chapter, working conditions intersect in complex ways to marginalize temporary professionals economically – in terms of reduced earnings and time taxes – but also impact the extent to which they can develop their practices as professionals, and limit their integration with colleagues and professionals in their fields. For NTTF in Humanities this work was about survival employment and being a second-class citizen in the workplace, whereas this was less the case for NTTF in Engineering and Sciences. For the latter, temporary contract work was a ‘side’ job and not their main source of income. This highlights the relationship between economic and professional marginalization – but also economic and professional success.

Future research should examine the ways precarious professionals are susceptible to demands made by the profession, such as the unpaid service work described in the third chapter of this study, yet do not reap professional and economic rewards from these efforts in the ways that their permanently employed counterparts do. In line with previous analyses of precarious work that sought to bring out the complexity of different dimensions of both precarious work and social location, analyses of precarious professionals should not seek to isolate one factor – e.g. part-time status – but should account for the manifold complex dimensions of work and social location that influence precarious professionals’ lives. This thesis has contributed new insights by focusing on these complex dimensions at the micro-level. Future analyses of precarious
professionals would ideally do so as well, while also keeping in mind the meso- and macro-
levels as important mediating context.

Finally, a framework of precarious professionals should investigate workers’ resistance. Specifically, the scholarly community needs to better understand how resistance involves revaluing feminized work, and whether this can act as a basis of solidarity between temporary contract and permanently employed professionals. This chapter shows on the one hand, unexpected solidarities between precarious professionals and the minimum wage worker, two very different groups. On the other hand, it shows convergence between precarious professionals and permanently employed professionals. Their insightful comments on the shifting conditions of managerialism, control and overwork in the neoliberal university suggest potential alliances between precarious professionals and permanently employed professionals, which have been underemphasized in the literature on worker organizing, and literature on higher education. The next three sections explore the implications of this new framework for three areas of research: the professions, precarious work, and resistance.

24 Implications for the Study of Professions

The analysis presented here suggests that the literature on the professions must examine marginalized professionals. The professions literature has focused largely on who maintains professional jurisdictions, competitors in professional fields, and how professional projects define the scope and activities of the professions. This literature, with a few exceptions (Crowley et al. 2010), has not sought to examine professionals on the margins, and the few exceptions have focused on the meso- and especially the macro-level, theorizing how processes such as neo-Taylorism, restructuring and outsourcing might change the professions. They have largely
neglected to hone in at the micro-level to see how these changes actually play out in professionals’ lived experiences.

If we are to understand how professionals are marginalized we need to unpack the gendered assumptions and associations in different industries and occupations in order understand how temporary contract are marginalized – or not. Building off Vosko (2000) and Rogers (2000), more work is needed in order to better understand how, specifically, feminization marginalizes professionals. I show how the conditions of temporary contract work, along with gendered assumptions about industrial and occupational specializations, devalue feminized work. Feminized work receives less recognition in the profession, and that this traps workers in temporary employment, which limits their ability to advance professionally. Conversely, masculinized work is granted considerable recognition, even if workers face similar conditions. This argument has implications for future research. One could hypothesize, for example, that within the legal profession, litigation might be viewed as more valuable than legal aid services, given the demand for services and the de-professionalization of social service work more generally. In my study, this devaluation process varied for workers with different industrial specializations, which are gendered. In law, one might investigate the ways that family law is devalued or feminized while corporate law is masculinized, broadly, in the legal field. In what ways does professional work in those specializations garner recognition – or not? Moreover, who grants that recognition, and what implications does the recognition of particular actors have for professionals? In the case of academic professionals, feminization and masculinization refer to both quantitative representation (the percentage of men and women professionals in a field), and to the ways that gendered assumptions and meanings are attributed to work, as theorized by Vosko (2000). This thesis expands Vosko’s conceptualization by showing how some work is devalued, and other work is revalued based on these gendered assumptions and associations.
This thesis thus advances our understanding of the complex ways that professionals become marginalized, meaning the way they become precarious professionals. As such, it clarifies and examines in greater depth this marginalization process in ways that the professions literature has not.

NTTF become precarious professionals through a complex set of working conditions that intersect with and compound one another, marginalizing NTTF economically and professionally, as shown in the third chapter. Their experiences of these working conditions vary in myriad ways. But the key contribution for the professions literature in this chapter is to show how working conditions in temporary contract work themselves limit professional development and integration according to precarious professionals lived experiences. Beyond the economic impact of temporary contract work, this suggests that temporary contract work at the micro-level has negative effects on professional workers’ ability to do their jobs and advance in their profession. Because precarious professionals are susceptible to demands made by the profession, they are trapped between the demands of being a precarious temporary contract worker, and fulfilling the expectations of being a professional. A key example of this is that many NTTF do unpaid work, yet they do not reap professional and economic rewards from these efforts relative to their permanent counterparts. Therefore, they lose earnings through a time and money tax even while attempting to maintain their influence and input in the academic profession.

Professionalization is limited by temporary contract work and the conditions associated with it, as suggested in the third chapter. Though precarious professionals work very hard in attempt to make up the gaps in professionalization in the context of temporary employment, many end up staying in part-time and temporary employment. This reflects some prior work on temporary and part-time employment (Duffy and Pupo 1992), and “precarity traps” (Standing
2011; Goldring and Landolt 2011; Kerfoot and Korczynski 2005). This chapter showed how the trap of precarity is twofold for precarious professionals: professional workers become ‘trapped’ in temporary contract employment, as suggested in prior literature, but are also ‘trapped’ between the worlds of precarious and professional work. They are often forced to choose between economic survival as precarious workers, and their professional goals and aspirations. Unlike permanently employed professionals, who do not face these same choices, temporary contract workers describe being ‘under the gun’ in the words of one participant. More broadly, they do not have the resources required to excel as professionals.

This thesis does not imply that professional workers should always be bound to permanent work. Indeed, the presumption of permanent full-time employment in the standard employment relationship (SER) has been critiqued as a male model, one that “gave a systematic character to the emerging labour policy platform and its exclusions” including precarious employment (Vosko 2006:7). However, if professionalization is considered a desirable aim, the prevalence and ramifications of temporary contract work is a key dimension that will need to be addressed by scholars, organizers and policymakers alike. Indeed, when scholars and policymakers address issues that will impact women and racialized people in the professions, temporary contract work should be a key issue, as a complex set of working conditions, income inequalities across professions and disciplines, and gendering of jobs persist and compound on women and racialized people’s marginalization in the professions. The ways in which this occurs and impacts women and racialized workers in the professions should be further explored and fleshed out in order to understand how to promote equity for these groups within the professions, especially given the increasing prevalence of temporary contract work.
25 Implications for the Study of Precarious Work

The persistence of occupational and industrial segregation in feminizing temporary contract work in the academic profession is the focus of the second chapter of this thesis. What is new in this analysis is a depiction of the manner in which these forms of segregation reinforce temporary contract workers’ precarious status. Prior analysis by Vosko (2000) examined the nature of temporary employment relationships (TERs) as a gendered phenomenon, but had not considered how this intersected with professional values. Instead, my study shows how work is closely connected to professional values – such as research “getting all the glory”, teaching having a “second-class status”, and engineers being viewed as having “practical” or “applicable” knowledge. Though this latter intersection may have been implied by Vosko’s analysis, it was not fully fleshed out and shown at the micro-level how gendered dimensions in the labour market such as occupational and industrial segregation would come into play in temporary employment relationships. Moreover, Vosko viewed temporary employment relationships as always feminized, even when men do it, yet this analysis argues that temporary employment relationships can be masculinized and therefore some temporary contract workers receive greater recognition from their colleagues, managers and employers than others.

The third chapter uncovers working conditions that, to varying degrees, have been addressed in literature on precarious work. However, what this analysis suggests that prior research on precarious work has not is the complex ways that working conditions further marginalize professionals economically and culturally. This functions in two ways. First, the economic marginalization of temporary workers, particularly those with lower overall incomes and those who work multiple jobs, depletes workers of time, energy and money required to further invest in their search for full-time permanent work and/or to look for career alternatives.
This has a compounding effect where some professionals are constantly compromising one thing for another – for example, they sacrifice time to commute from campus to campus to gain money from a contract, or they sacrifice money from an alternate job to gain time and energy in attempt to apply for more full-time jobs, and so on. The second way that these myriad working conditions work to marginalize professionals is to create barriers to full-time permanent employment. The relevance of this to the precarious work literature is that the element of professional marginalization plays a role in why these workers get stuck in temporary contract work, further sharpening our understanding of the complex ways that employment status and professional success are intertwined in the context of precarious and professional work. Building off prior analyses of precarious work that seek to show complexity in the way workers become ‘precarious’, this thesis shows how conditions typically associated with precarious work intertwine with professional aspirations and limitations, further marginalizing workers – and marginalizing some more than others.

26 Implications for Resistance

Literature on union renewal and new forms of organizing suggests that workers have created new alliances with social movements, and re-centred their targets on the state and broader sectors, rather than single employers, bringing their struggles to a larger, and more public, stage. The fourth chapter of this thesis builds on this literature to show how professional workers embrace social movement unionism to address key issues in temporary contract employment in their profession, including the ways working conditions in temporary contract work impacts their ability to provide quality professional services. Adding a key dimension to their professional ethos – to help provide students with a quality postsecondary education – precarious professionals have developed their own brand of social movement unionism. Coupled with resistance on an individual level, precarious professionals focus not only on the economic
marginalization they experience but also the degradation of their profession through the devaluing of teaching, and its impact on those who are supposed to receive the benefits of their professional knowledge and expertise – the students.

Precarious professionals’ resistance is about contesting the employment practices that they feel have degraded their professional work, but also about renewing the profession more generally. In contrast with prior literature on temporary workers’ resistance that underscored their limitations and “coping strategies” (Rogers 2000:82), this chapter suggests that professional workers can make important links with social movements on the ground, and are not simply limited to the confines of coping mechanisms – they can organize and be powerful catalysts in resisting precarious work. At the same time, however, professional workers turn to their own professional culture with hope that solidarity can be created for the betterment of the profession.

Unexpectedly, temporary contract workers’ and permanently employed professionals have similar views about what needs to change in their profession, and in their organizations. And yet, there exist significant barriers in professional culture in aligning these workers to create significant change. Though this research initially sought to examine the way temporary workers resisted vis-à-vis permanently employed workers, in the end it seems that both workers were resisting something broader – a culture of individualism that limited their sense of community and solidarity as workers who faced a variety of issues – some similar, some different. This thesis thus points to the strength of professional cultures in limiting resistance, but also suggests openings and opportunities for allied resistance by temporary contract workers and permanently employed professionals.
27 Limitations and Future Research

Several limitations of this study must be acknowledged. First, it should be noted that this is one case study limited to one profession within a given time and space, and therefore generalization to the broader labour market and professions are not statistical but rather conceptual. Conceptually, the analysis of this particular case allows us to look more in-depth at how value is ascribed to work, by whom, and how professional workers experience temporary contract work and resist marginalization. It thus both develops prior literature and sketches a new model of precarious professionals that can guide future research.

A key dimension of social location not sufficiently explored in this thesis is that of racism and barriers for racialized and indigenous faculty members. While the sample was insufficient to critically analyze the intersection of gender and racial inequalities, this research calls for further analysis of how the marginalization of the professions is linked to racialization. Scholars have examined inequalities of race in precarious employment (Das Gupta 2006; Zeytinoglu and Muteshi Khasiala 2000; Stasiulus and Bakan 1997). These scholars show how racialized and indigenous people tend to be over-represented in non-standard and temporary work. Furthermore, studies of racialized and indigenous people in the professions have examined how racialized and indigenous people in the professions have been marginalized.

In the academic sector, racialized and indigenous people are underrepresented (Ramos 2012). Though none of the NTTF participants described overt examples of racist behavior, this may very well be due to the limitations of the sample, as discussed in chapter one. Moreover, NTTF in my sample who experienced overt racism may not have wished to divulge this given their precarious position. Since I was unable to oversample for racialized NTTF after several phases of recruitment, I cannot speak to NTTF’s experience of racism directly. The lack of data
speaks to a methodological issue with sampling and suggests the need for more research. This is especially true given recent findings that Canadian racialized and indigenous faculty face significant barriers in their careers that white faculty do not (Henry et al. 2017). A recent survey found that racialized and indigenous professors were 14% fewer than the overall number who were tenured, and that it took white professors three years less to be promoted to full professor (2017:30). A qualitative analysis done by the same authors found that everyday racism is a part of many faculty members’ experiences (2017:115).

It is important to acknowledge that the professions are a white, male-dominated form of work. Focusing on the professions may mean the broader struggles of racialized and indigenous workers are in many ways left out of the picture. To some extent, that is true of this research. At the same time, however, the implications of this research are important for racialized and indigenous workers’ progression in the professions because of the ways sexist practices limit professional integration, which may also be occurring along lines of racialization. The ability to address sexism and racism in professional contexts may well be comparably limited for those facing economic insecurity and professional marginalization. Hence, this research underscores the urgent need for further investigation to uncover what racialized indignities occur and how temporary contract work further exacerbates workers’ ability to address them. Future research should assess how knowledge of the gendering and racialization of employment norms in the professions might help our ability to see more representation, recognition and remuneration for racialized and indigenous people in the professions (But see also Frances et al. 2017). This call to future research is in line with the broader aim to explore the complex social relations of work and the ways they impact temporary contract workers.
One of the challenges of linking quality services to quality work is the role of service recipients who have a stake in the quality of services and who can speak to the impacts of temporary work on the actual experience of service delivery. This is a complicated process and involves walking many fine lines that are implicit in the social relations of work, especially in the education and health care sector (Birdsell Bauer & Cranford 2017; Cranford, Hick & Birdsell Bauer, 2018). In postsecondary education for example, critics have already issued the concern that student evaluations are compromised when NTTF feel the need to cater to students in order to get good evaluations, especially if hiring is based in part on those evaluations. Hence, further research needs to be done to understand the complexities of including service recipients in resistance, though some clues can be found in union campaigns for quality education described here, and in campaigns for quality care found in the literature.

Neither universities nor the state have addressed the issue of non-tenure-track faculty working conditions in an open way. While university officials in this context often argue that they are working with limited resources and encourage activists to lobby government for more funding, the state argues that “universities act as autonomous institutions, and the provincial parliament does not interfere with their labor or hiring policies” (Clark et al. 2009:168). But presumably, this discourse, perpetuated by both the state and universities cannot continue ad infinitum. It is yet to be seen whether universities and the state will take collective responsibility for providing equitable employment and quality public postsecondary education.

---

28 National agencies and individual researchers alike have noted the absence of reliable data on non-tenure-track faculty. To some degree, universities have been uncooperative with the release of relevant data (See e.g. Brownlee 2015 who filed numerous access to information requests on faculty hiring that were rejected). Statistics Canada does not measure part-time non-tenure-track faculty, and cancelled its annual survey of academic staff in Canada in 2012 (the University and College Academic Staff System) due to budget cuts. However, the University and College Academic Staff Survey (UCASS) has only recently been reinstated. The UCASS will expand the survey to include part-time NTTF by 2020 (See Samson 2016), and in the meantime Karen Foster and I, in conjunction with the
The state context should also be accounted for, as social safety nets can mitigate the effects of precarious employment, and the strength of public sector unions varies by state, as discussed in the first chapter of this thesis. As Zuberi (2006) asserts, Canada – relative to the US – has a strong welfare state. Compared to precarious workers in the US at least, precarious workers in Canada can in theory build more financial resources that can act protectively during economic downturns or during periods of unemployment or underemployment. This is also true for those working multiple jobs to piece together their income. The state context is also important in terms of the union’s role and position amidst other organizational factors. As Zuberi reports, Canada’s unionization rate is twice that of the United States across all sectors (51).

Hence, future research would examine the extent to which non-unionized workers organize, resist and fight for precarious professionals’ right to provide quality education and become valued members of their profession through studies comparing different contexts such as Canada and the US. Despite these limitations, this analysis has shown the ways that temporary contract workers become precarious professionals through complex processes of valuing and devaluing along gendered lines. The working conditions found in temporary contract work marginalizes some workers both economically and professionally in complex and compounding ways that trap them between identifying as precarious workers and as professionals. Workers’ experiences vary, suggesting that not all temporary contract workers become precarious professionals, and shows how that variation can be explained. Furthermore, precarious professionals’ union organizing shows that devalued workers use their experiences to build

Canadian Association of University Teachers have conducted the first national survey of NTTF in Canada, with results to be released in March 2018.
solidarity and social movement unionism, while also remaining relevant to the professional renewal called for by their permanently employment colleagues.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Engineering and Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Institute for Aerospace Studies (UTIAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>Institute of Biomaterials &amp; Biomedical Engineering (IBBME)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian Studies</td>
<td>Engineering (IBBME)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Department of Chemical Engineering &amp; Applied Chemistry (ChemE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Department of Civil Engineering (CivE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Division of Environmental Engineering &amp; Energy Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Department of Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering (ECE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Department of Mechanical &amp; Industrial Engineering (MIE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>Department of Materials Science &amp; Engineering (MSE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near &amp; Middle Eastern Civilizations</td>
<td>Engineering (ECE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Department of Mechanical &amp; Industrial Engineering (MIE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of Religion</td>
<td>Department of Materials Science &amp; Engineering (MSE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic Languages &amp; Literatures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish &amp; Portuguese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Astronomy & Astrophysics  
Cell & Systems Biology  
Chemistry  
Computer Science  
Earth Sciences  
Ecology & Evolutionary Biology  
Mathematics  
Statistical Sciences

| Table 2. NTTF & TTF Annual Income at Focal Institution & Total Annual Income\(^{29}\) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Annual Income at Focal Institution | Total Annual Income |
| | NTTF | TTF | NTTF | TTF |
| | HUM | ES | HUM | ES | HUM | ES | HUM | ES |
| 0-17500 | 5 | 2 | | | | 4 |
| 17,501-35,000 | 6 | 2 | | | 3 |
| 35,001-52,500 | 1 | 2 | | | 4 | 3 |

\(^{29}\) Six NTTF participants and 11 TTF participants chose not to report their Annual Income at the University of Toronto; six NTTF participants and eight TTF participants chose not to report their Total Annual Income. Participants may have been reticent to report income to me in person, though might be more willing to report on an anonymous survey. This speaks to limitations of gathering income info through a pre-interview survey where the investigator is present.
Table 3. NTTF in Sample who hold Multiple Jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Engineering &amp; Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current non-academic jobs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current second academic job$^{30}$</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current third academic job</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past second academic job</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past third academic job</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^{30}$ NTTF held concurrent academic jobs at the following institutions: Brock University, Seneca College, McMaster University, OCAD University, Queens University, Ryerson University, Sheridan College, Trent University, University of Waterloo, Western University, Wilfred Laurier University, and York University.
Past fourth academic job | 2 | 2 | 0

Tables 4a-4d. NTTF & TTF by Discipline, Gender, Age in Sample & Population

### Table 4a. NTTF and TTF by Discipline in Sample and Population of Focal University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>NTTF</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TTF</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Science</td>
<td>NTTF</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TTF</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4b. NTTF & TTF by Gender in Sample & Population of Focal Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>NTTF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TTF</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td>306</td>
<td>820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4c. NTTF & TTF by Discipline and Gender in Sample (S) and Population (P) of Focal Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>NTTF</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TTF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Science</td>
<td>NTTF</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TTF</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4d. NTTF & TTF Age in Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>NTTF</th>
<th>TTF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-64</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Number of NTTF & TTF Raising Working Conditions as Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>NTTF (N=32)</th>
<th>TTF (N=23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advancement – Lack of Clear Guidelines and Transparency</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement – Lack of Opportunity to Perform</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balancing Responsibilities</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality – Not a Collegial Environment*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality – Somewhat Collegial Environment*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuting &amp; Travel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Change &amp; Variety</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 12 participants chose not to report their age.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Benefits</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help, Input &amp; Support – Limited</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidents (E.g. Bullying, Sexism, Sexual Harassment)*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Colleagues – Limited</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Insecurity</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Class Size*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Teaching Load*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Space Lacking*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniority Over Courses</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Takes Too Much Time</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Notice on Courses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluations Problematic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs more TA Support</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid Work – Research</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid Work – Service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid Work – Teaching</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Environment not Welcoming or Chilly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Salaries of Full-time Faculty Salaries by Rank, 2016-2017 in Canada (Statistics Canada 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Lecturer, Instructor</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>151650</td>
<td>121175</td>
<td>94075</td>
<td>88725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>149450</td>
<td>123125</td>
<td>93700</td>
<td>94175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150825</td>
<td>122100</td>
<td>93875</td>
<td>92025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Related Technologies</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>165900</td>
<td>134600</td>
<td>106650</td>
<td>109250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>160425</td>
<td>131925</td>
<td>104900</td>
<td>99450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165350</td>
<td>134100</td>
<td>106275</td>
<td>107075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and Life Sciences, and Technologies</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>160875</td>
<td>125600</td>
<td>102075</td>
<td>101625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>152325</td>
<td>125350</td>
<td>99100</td>
<td>96100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159400</td>
<td>125525</td>
<td>101100</td>
<td>99000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Full-time Faculty by Rank, 2016-2017 in Canada (Statistics Canada 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Lecturer, Instructor</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32 Since the UCASS was cancelled from 2012-2015, this is the data that most closely matches the period in which participants were interviewed, from 2014-2016.

33 Since the UCASS was cancelled from 2012-2015, this is the data that most closely matches the period in which participants were interviewed, from 2014-2016.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>1083</th>
<th>426</th>
<th>264</th>
<th>2331</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>2286</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>5037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Related Technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1731</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>3438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>4071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and Life Sciences, and Technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>3162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1284</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>4206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10827</td>
<td>9597</td>
<td>4269</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>26625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendices

Appendix A. Survey Questionnaire – Background Information

1. What is your gender?
______________________________________________________________________________

2. What race or ethnic group do you consider yourself a part of?
______________________________________________________________________________

3. What year were you born?
______________________________________________________________________________

4. What is your marital/relationship status is? (e.g. married, common-law, divorced, widowed, never married)
______________________________________________________________________________

   If you have a partner: Does your partner work? If so, what is their occupation?
______________________________________________________________________________

   If you have a partner who works: How much does your partner earn annually?
______________________________________________________________________________

5. Do you have children?
______________________________________________________________________________

6. What is your highest level of education?
______________________________________________________________________________

7. Were you born in Canada or elsewhere?
______________________________________________________________________________
If born elsewhere: Where were you born?

What year did you come to Canada?

Do you have your Canadian citizenship or not?

If no: Are you a permanent resident or do you have only temporary or some other type of status?

8. How much do you earn annually at the University of Toronto?

9. Do you have other sources of income?

10. What is your total annual income?

11. Have you ever been out of work and looking for work or wanting work?

If yes: When was that?
12. Have you ever been on Social Assistance?

______________________________________________________________________________

If yes: When was that?
______________________________________________________________________________

13. Is there anything else you would like to share with me about your background?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

Thank you!

Appendix B. Interview Guide [Key Informants]

Introduction: Work History and Job Description

1. To start, could you give me a brief description of your work history?
2. Describe your position with the union. What level of involvement do you have?
3. What organizations or departments have you been involved with, either through paid or unpaid work, that are part of the University of Toronto?
4. Are you involved in any other forms of worker organizing around academic labor?
Forms of Inequality and Social Boundaries

5. What are some of the recent issues that the union has been pushing for?

   Probe: Is this issue particularly prominent in one department(s)? If so, which department(s)?

   Probe: What is the ideal outcome with respect to this issue?

6. Do you think NTTF in different fields, like humanities and engineering, have different issues?

   Probe: How so?

   Probe: Between humanities and engineering NTTF, who experiences more inequality? Explain.

7. What forms of collective action (e.g. campaigns, petitions) has the union organized?

   Probe: Have these been effective?

   Probe: What are the strengths and weaknesses of these forms of collective action for NTTF at the University of Toronto?

   Probe: Are there any forms of collective action or collective action for NTTF, outside of what the union is currently doing, that would be effective? If so, what are they?

8. The following list includes some issues raised by NTTF in the literature. To what extent are these issues prevalent among NTTF at the University of Toronto? Are there specific departments in which this is a prominent issue?

   Probe: If this is a prevalent issue, what is the union doing or what does the union plan to do about this issue?

   a. Pay equality
   b. Health benefits
   c. Fringe benefits
   d. Job security
   e. Representation of NTTF on committees / university governance
f. Professional development

g. Academic freedom

h. Barriers to career advancement

i. Issues of status

j. Issues of collegiality

k. Gender or race issues

9. Do you have anything to add regarding NTTF issues at the University of Toronto?

**Claims to Equality and Inclusion**

10. To what extent is are rank-and-file members actively involved in the union?

   **Probe:** Do active members tend to work in particular departments or disciplines?

   If so, what are they?

11. In your experience, to what extent do rank-and-file members link some of their own issues we talked about (e.g. pay equality and job security) to the value of their work?

   **Probe:** Can you give an example?

12. In your experience, to what extent do rank-and-file members link some of their own issues we talked about (e.g. pay equality and job security) to their value to the broader institution?

13. What, if any, new strategies is the union using to mobilize the members?

   **Probe:** Why did the union decide to start using these strategies?

14. To what extent is the union forging links with other organizers around academic labor (e.g. New Faculty Majority, The Adjunct Project, COCAL)?

   **Probe:** If so, what is the nature of the relationship?

   **Probe:** Do the organizations provide or receive information from one another?

   **Probe:** Are there efforts at collective actions?

**Recruitment of Participants**

15. Do you know anyone – either who works in the union or as a faculty member – who would like to participate in this research? (Distribute Email Scripts; Business Cards where appropriate)

   Thank you for your participation. Please contact me if you have any questions.
Appendix C. Interview Guide [In-depth Interviews – NTTF]

Prior to interview, get participant to review informed consent and complete survey – note that survey is double-sided.

Introduction: Work History and Job Description

14. To start, could you give me a brief description of your educational background?
15. What kind of work experience did you have prior to taking this position?
16. Could you describe your current appointment at the University of Toronto?

   **Probe:** How long have you taught in your department?

17. How did you find this particular position?
18. Describe the first interactions with the department upon your accepting this position.

   **Probe:** Did you feel that the information you received was adequate?

   **Probe:** Did you feel welcomed by the department?

19. Was this the first job you found after completing your PhD?
20. Tell me about the job search process after completing your PhD.

   **Probe:** What were some of the challenges you faced?

   **Probe:** Were there any tenure stream positions available? Did you apply?

21. Do you currently have any other appointments at other academic institutions? (If yes, then use *Current Work Probes*)

   **Probe:** Which, if any, do you consider your primary job?

   **Probe:** How satisfied are you with the combination of appointments?

   **Probe:** What are some of the challenges, if applicable, of holding multiple appointments?

22. In the past, have you had other appointments at other academic institutions? (If yes, then use *Past Work Probes*)

   **Probe:** How satisfied were you with the combination of appointments?
Probe: What were some of the challenges, if applicable, of holding multiple appointments?

23. Do you have any other positions at other non-academic organizations or institutions? Which, if any, do you consider your primary job?

Probe: How satisfied are you with the combination of positions?

Probe: What are some of the challenges, if applicable, of holding these multiple positions?

24. What is a typical class size for your courses?

*Current Work Probe:* What about at your current job at X, Y, Z universities?

*Past Work Probe:* What about at your past job at X, Y, Z universities?

25. What is your teaching load this semester?

*Current Work Probe:* What about at your current job at X, Y, Z universities?

*Past Work Probe:* What about at your past job at X, Y, Z universities?

26. How many hours do you devote to teaching, research and administrative work, respectively?

*Current Work Probe:* What about at your current job at X, Y, Z universities?

*Past Work Probe:* What about at your past job at X, Y, Z universities?

27. Are you satisfied with this distribution of work? Explain.

*Current Work Probe:* What about at your current job at X, Y, Z universities?

*Past Work Probe:* What about at your past job at X, Y, Z universities?

28. How many hours do you devote to preparation for one class?

*Current Work Probe:* What about at your current job at X, Y, Z universities?

*Past Work Probe:* What about at your past job at X, Y, Z universities?

29. Do you advise students in the department?

Probe: If not, would you like to?

*Current Work Probe:* What about at your current job at X, Y, Z universities?

*Past Work Probe:* What about at your past job at X, Y, Z universities?
30. What kind of academic resources do you have for research and teaching? What, if anything could the university provide to make your job easier? What could the university provide to make your job more satisfying?

Current Work Probe: What about at your current job at X, Y, Z universities?

Past Work Probe: What about at your past job at X, Y, Z universities?

31. How satisfied are you with your experience at the University of Toronto?

Current Work Probe: What about at your current job at X, Y, Z universities?

Past Work Probe: What about at your past job at X, Y, Z universities?

32. How satisfied are you with your department, in terms of support and collegiality?

Current Work Probe: What about at your current job at X, Y, Z universities?

Past Work Probe: What about at your past job at X, Y, Z universities?

33. What are the most difficult or challenging aspects of your job?

Current Work Probe: What about at your current job at X, Y, Z universities?

Past Work Probe: What about at your past job at X, Y, Z universities?

34. If you were offered a permanent lecturer position, would you take it? Why or why not?
35. If you were offered a tenure-track position, would you take it? Why or why not?
36. What attracted you to teaching at the university level?
37. To what extent has working as a NTTF has affected your career trajectory? Explain.
38. To what extent has working as a NTTF has affected your family life? Explain.
39. What advice would you give someone who is about to start a similar position as yours?

Teaching and Research

40. To what extent do you prefer teaching or research?
41. To what extent should faculty members be required to do both teaching and research at once?
42. Do faculty members in your department get exemptions from teaching for research purposes?
43. Should faculty members in your department get exemptions from teaching for research purposes?
44. To what extent do you do the same teaching work as TTF? Please explain.

Probe: Do you feel that the department recognizes that you do the same teaching work?
45. To what extent do research and teaching have the same status and prestige at the University of Toronto?

   **Probe:** Should they hold the same status and prestige? Please explain.

   **Current Work Probe:** What about at your current job at X, Y, Z universities?

   **Past Work Probe:** What about at your past job at X, Y, Z universities?

46. What makes a good scholar?

**NTTF, Inequality and Status**

47. What do you think are key differences between TTF and NTTF?

48. To what extent do you think there is inequality between NTTF and TTF? Explain.

49. How integrated are you into department life? Please explain, giving an example if possible.

   **Probe:** Are you invited to faculty meetings?

   **Probe:** If so, do you go to faculty meetings?

   **Probe:** If not, would you go if you were invited?

   **Probe:** Are you invited to social events in the department?

   **Probe:** If so, do you go to these social events?

   **Probe:** If not, would you go if you were invited?

   **Current Work Probe:** What about at your current job at X, Y, Z universities?

   **Past Work Probe:** What about at your past job at X, Y, Z universities?

50. To what extent could your department create a more inclusive environment?

   **Probe:** Can you think of some ways in which it could do so?

51. Are there people in the university who make you uncomfortable? Please explain.

52. Are there people in the university who you find intimidating? Please explain.

53. Can you describe positive traits of your TTF colleagues? NTTF colleagues?

54. Can you describe negative traits of your TTF colleagues? NTTF colleagues?

55. In the university, what kinds of people appeal to you? Can you give an example?

56. In the university, what kinds of people do you try to avoid? Can you give me an example?

57. In general, what kinds of people appeal to you?

58. In general, what kinds of people do you try to avoid?
Union Experience and Union Attitudes

59. Are you involved in the union?

   **Probe:** Why or why not?

   **Current Work Probe:** What about at your current job at X, Y, Z universities?

   **Past Work Probe:** What about at your past job at X, Y, Z universities?

60. Do you know what the main issues that the union is working on?

   **Probe:** In your opinion, are these the most pressing issues? Explain.

   **Current Work Probe:** What about at your current job at X, Y, Z universities?

   **Past Work Probe:** What about at your past job at X, Y, Z universities?

61. What are the main issues that the union should be dealing with?

62. What, if any, forms of collective action (e.g. campaigns, petitions) union organized?

   **Probe:** Did you find their campaigns effective?

   **Probe:** If so, why? If not, why not?

   **Current Work Probe:** What about at your current job at X, Y, Z universities?

   **Past Work Probe:** What about at your past job at X, Y, Z universities?

63. Have you participated in any of them?

   **Probe:** Describe your participation. Was it a positive experience? Why or why not?

   **Current Work Probe:** What about at your current job at X, Y, Z universities?

   **Past Work Probe:** What about at your past job at X, Y, Z universities?

64. Does the union represent your needs? Are there any alternative measures that could be used to represent the interests of university instructors?

65. Is there anything the union could do to get more people involved?

66. The tenure-track faculty at the University of Toronto are not unionized. Do you think that they should be?
Probe: If so, why? If not, why not?

Thank you for your participation. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Appendix D. Interview Guide [In-depth Interviews – TTF]

Introduction: Work History and Job Description
67. To start, could you give me a brief description of your educational background?
68. What kind of work experience did you have prior to taking this position?
69. Could you describe your current appointment at the University of Toronto?
   Probe: How long have you taught in your department?
70. How did you find this particular position?
71. Was this the first job you found after completing your PhD?
72. Tell me about the job search process after completing your PhD.
   Probe: What were some of the challenges you faced?
   Probe: Did you have any non-tenure stream positions? If so, describe this experience.
73. How many hours do you typically work per week?
74. How many hours do you devote to teaching, research and administrative work, respectively?
75. How many hours do you devote to preparation for one class?
76. How satisfied are you with your experience at the University of Toronto?
77. How satisfied are you with your department, in terms of support and collegiality?
78. What are the most difficult or challenging aspects of your job?
79. What attracted you to teaching at the university level?

Teaching and Research
80. To what extent do you prefer teaching or research?
81. To what extent should faculty members should be required to do both teaching and research at once?
82. Do faculty members in your department get exemptions from teaching for research purposes?
   Probe: Should faculty members in your department get exemptions from teaching for research purposes?
83. To what extent do you do the same teaching work as NTTF? Or are there differences? Please explain.

_Probe:_ Do you feel that the department recognizes that you do the same teaching work?

84. To what extent do research and teaching have the same status and prestige at the University of Toronto?

_Probe:_ Should they hold the same status and prestige? Please explain.

85. [If they work(ed) at previous institutions]: to what extent do research and teaching hold the same status and prestige at the previous institutions where you work(ed)?

_Probe:_ Should they hold the same status? Please explain.

_Probe:_ How does this compare to any previous academic work experience you’ve had?

86. What makes a good scholar?

_NTTF, Inequality and Status_

87. What do you think are key differences between TTF and NTTF?

88. To what extent do you think there is inequality between NTTF and TTF? Explain.

89. To what extent could your department create a more inclusive environment?

_Probe:_ Can you think of some ways in which it could do so?

90. Are there people in the university who make you uncomfortable? Please explain.

91. Are there people in the university who you find intimidating? Please explain.

92. Can you describe positive traits of your NTTF colleagues? TTF colleagues?

93. Can you describe negative traits of your NTTF colleagues? TTF colleagues?

94. In the university, what kinds of people appeal to you? Can you give an example?

95. In the university, what kinds of people do you try to avoid? Can you give me an example?

96. In general, what kinds of people appeal to you?

97. In general, what kinds of people do you try to avoid?

98. What advice would you give to a NTTF who was hoping to get a TTF position in your department?

99. The tenure-track faculty at the University of Toronto are not unionized. Do you think that they should be?

_Probe:_ If so, why? If not, why not?
Thank you for your participation. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Appendix E. Email Recruitment Scripts

[Key Informant Recruitment Script]

Subject: Request for Interview Participants: Doctoral Research on Non-tenure track Faculty (NTTF)

Dear [ ],

My name is Louise Birdsell Bauer and I am completing a PhD in Sociology at the University of Toronto. I am seeking organizers with CUPE3902 to participate in interviews as key informants on non-tenure track faculty (NTTF) working conditions at University of Toronto.

These interviews are part of my PhD thesis research, which is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. Cynthia Cranford and with the support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC). The purpose of this project is to examine aspects of inequality for NTTF and how NTTF understand their academic work. This research also focuses on inequality and how NTTF understand and experience it. Key informants will be asked to provide a background and context for some of the issues particular to NTTF in a specific university context.

If you are interested in participating, please indicate a date, time, and location that is convenient for you. All research will take place from March to June 2014, with possible follow-up interviews in fall 2014. The date, time, and location are at your discretion. Respondents residing outside of Toronto will be asked to participate in phone interviews. Your confidentiality is
assured and there will be an informed consent form for you to review and sign, which is attached to this email. You have the option of waiving confidentiality, if you choose to do so.

Interviews will be conducted face-to-face. If you choose, I will maintain confidentiality and will give you a pseudonym and change other non-relevant identifying characteristics in my PhD thesis and other publications. Your participation is voluntary and you may refuse to participate and/or withdraw from the study (prior to publications) without negative consequences. You may also decline to answer any of my questions and request that your interview not be recorded. Interviews will take approximately 45-60 minutes to complete.

If you have questions about your rights as a research subject, please contact the University of Toronto’s Ethics Review Office at 416-946-3273 or email: ethics.review@utoronto.ca.

Please contact me via email (louise.birdsellbauer@utoronto.ca) if you would like further information on the study, or if you would like to schedule an interview.

Thank you very much for your participation in this research.

Sincerely,

Louise Birdsell Bauer (Principal Investigator)

PhD Candidate

Department of Sociology, University of Toronto
725 Spadina Avenue
Toronto, Ontario M5S 2J4
[In-depth Interview Recruitment Script]

Subject: Request for Interview Participants: Doctoral Research on Non-tenure track faculty (NTTF)

Dear [ ],

My name is Louise Birdsell Bauer and I am completing a PhD in Sociology at the University of Toronto. I am seeking non-tenure track faculty (NTTF) and tenure-track faculty (TTF) currently employed at the University of Toronto to participate in interviews. These interviews are part of my PhD thesis research, which is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. Cynthia Cranford and with the support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC). The purpose of this project is to examine how university instructors in a doctoral granting university understand their work in teaching and research as part of broader aims of the university. This research also focuses on inequality and how NTTF and TTF understand and experience it.

If you are interested in participating, please indicate a date, time, and location that is convenient for you. All research will take place from March to June 2014, with possible follow-up interviews in fall 2014. The date, time and location are at your discretion, however respondents residing outside of Toronto will be asked to participate in phone interviews. Your confidentiality is assured and there will be an informed consent form for you to review and sign, which is attached to this email. You have the option of waiving confidentiality, if you choose to do so.

Interviews will be conducted face-to-face. If you choose, I will maintain confidentiality and will give you a pseudonym and change other non-relevant identifying characteristics in my PhD thesis and other publications. Your participation is voluntary and you may refuse to participate and/or withdraw from the study (prior to publications) without negative consequences. You may
also decline to answer any of my questions and request that your interview not be recorded. Interviews will take approximately 60-90 minutes to complete. The file with the recording will be stored on a password-protected computer and will not be shared beyond the thesis committee and/or coauthors and research assistants involved in related publications.

If you have questions about your rights as a research subject, please contact the University of Toronto’s Ethics Review Office at 416-946-3273 or email: ethics.review@utoronto.ca.

Please contact me via email (louise.birdsellbauer@utoronto.ca) if you would like further information on the study, or if you would like to schedule an interview.

Thank you very much for your participation in this research.

Sincerely,

Louise Birdsell Bauer (Principal Investigator)
PhD Candidate
Department of Sociology, University of Toronto
725 Spadina Avenue
Toronto, Ontario M5S 2J4

Appendix F. Recruitment Poster
Participants Needed for Research on Academic Work at UofT

Currently looking for faculty members at the University of Toronto to participate in interviews on academic work from March to August 2015

Seeking faculty members from the following groups:

- Women who are tenure-track and tenured faculty members in Humanities departments
- Women and men who are tenure-track and tenured faculty members in Engineering and Science departments
- Women and men who are non-tenure-track faculty members in Engineering and Science departments

As a participant in this study, you would be asked to participate in a 45-90 minute interview scheduled at the time and location of your choosing. You will be asked to complete a short survey before the interview. Your confidentiality is assured and you will be asked to review and sign an informed consent form.

For more information or to volunteer for this research, please contact louise.birdsellbauer@utoronto.ca