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A transformation is occurring in the American workplace. Beginning in the early 1980's, U.S. businesses began a corporate clearance on personnel. In vogue management terms such as de-layering, downsizing, rightsizing, restructuring and re-engineering translate into the reality of millions of unemployed individuals. Daily headlines announce the jarring statistics: 74,000 jobs lost at General Motors, 122,000 at IBM, 50,000 at Sears, and over 330,00 at AT&T and the Baby Bells (Cook and Cohen, 1992; Saltzman, Lord and Baig, 1992; Cook, 1993; Des Moines Register, 1993; Time, 1995; Pham, 1996). In just the four years between 1987 and 1991, more than 85% of the Fortune 1000 firms downsized their white-collar work force affecting over 5 million jobs (Cameron, Freeman, and Mishra, 1991). While most economists seem to agree that the country has been in recovery for at least four and a half years, downsizing appears to have become a way of life. The number of corporate staff reductions reported by one source for 1995 was approximately 420,000, down somewhat from a peak number of layoffs in 1993 of more than 615,000 (Pham, 1996) but according to Right Associates, the nation's second largest outplacement firm, in 1996, "major layoffs are likely to continue to hit insurance, financial services and manufacturing companies" (Franklin, 1996:G1). Nor is the public sector immune to the same economic, political, and social forces
that afflict the private sector. Private, non-profit corporations as well as public
government units and agencies have been faced with a spate of layoffs. In early
1992, General Colin Powell, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, announced
that approximately 74,000 men and women would be eliminated from the military
by September. More recently, 16,000 jobs were cut from the military reserves in the
third in a series of five major cutbacks, projected at over 500,000 by 1997,
designed to achieve new defense requirements (Van Voorst, 1992; Des Moines
Register, 1996). Similarly, the U.S. Postal Service, in order to streamline
operations and cut costs, announced staff reductions in the early 1990's of 55,000
(Byrne, 1994; Time, 1995).

It is abundantly clear that employment in the United States is undergoing a
profound and permanent structural change. Full-time, stable jobs that have been
cut during repeated force reductions are not being replaced. Many of the private
and public employees, forced from lucrative careers at a relatively young age will
have little opportunity for reinstatement to former positions even as the economy
improves. Instead, in addition to record levels of overtime, companies are now
relying heavily on temporary workers (Church, 1994). The largest private employer
in America is currently Manpower, Inc. With over 700,000 workers, it far outranks
previous industrial giants such as General Motors or IBM (The New York Times,
1996). This phenomena is not limited solely to the United States. Other
industrialized nations including Canada, Sweden, Great Britain and West Germany
have reported that part-time workers constitute a rapidly growing segment of their respective labor forces (McKie, 1992; Rathkey, 1990; Levanoni and Sales, 1990; Sundstrom, 1991; Schoer, 1987).

The growing reliance on temporary workers is shattering what has been an essential social contract between employees and employers. Jobs that provided not only wages, benefits and pensions but also a sense of identity and self-worth have given way to a transitory, unstable existence for many Americans. Consequently, the work force is becoming composed of two distinct groups: a core group of stable, full-time employees enjoying full benefits and a peripheral group of part-time workers with no benefits who are summoned by the employer as needed.

The core-periphery terminology used here is adopted from Immanuel Wallerstein's Modern World-System Theory (Wallerstein, 1974) and is usually linked to the ideas of inequality, dependence and exploitation between nations in the world economy. The purpose of this research is to use Wallerstein's macro-level theory to help analyze the development, characteristics and dynamics of the core and periphery segments of the work force. Moreover, role theory will be used to explore the employment relations and work expectations that exist between the core and periphery.

According to Stryker (1981:16), a fundamental aspect in interaction between person and society is that "behavior is dependent upon a named or classified world." The names core and periphery carry meaning in the form of shared
expectations by individuals who occupy these positions. The importance of position in society was addressed in an early essay by Kingsley Davis (1966) in which he stated that a person enters a social situation with an identity already established because of the status he occupies within the social structure. Further, people are continually evaluated to the extent that their role behavior conforms to the role expectations in a given situation. As the U.S. economy becomes increasingly dependent on a flexible work force, it is crucial to gain an understanding of the expectations that exist between the core and periphery in order to strategically manage these two groups most effectively.

Chapter 2 presents a general overview of the usage of core-periphery terminology and discusses the trends in temporary employment offering some explanations for the growth of part-time workers in the United States and outlining the various classifications of part-time workers. The use of part-time workers in higher education also is reviewed. Chapter 3 presents an examination of core-periphery relations and a review of the role theory literature expressly defining the basic terminology of status, role, and expectations--concepts central to the theory surrounding social roles. Hypotheses are developed from an integration of the core-periphery and role theory literature. The remaining chapters address the methodology and research findings of this study.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Utilization of the Core-Periphery Terminology

The origins of World-System Theory are found in the central concerns of Karl Marx, Max Weber and Emile Durkheim as they sought to explain the nature and consequences of a new kind of society, a modern society, that had emerged in Western Europe in the centuries after 1500. World-System Theory was developed as a response to the growing criticism of Modernization Theory in the late 1960's by a group of sociologists who sought to replace this theory with updated Marxian sociology (Shannon, 1989). As initially formulated by Wallerstein, the terms core and periphery were used to describe the geographical division of labor in the capitalist world economy as consisting of positions of core, semi-periphery, and periphery. Core areas, regardless of state boundaries, were locations for a variety of complex economic activities including mass market industries and differentiated forms of agriculture. The peripheral areas, by contrast, were monocultural with cash crops produced by coerced labor. The semi-periphery was in between (Wallerstein, 1979).

The unequal core-periphery image is closely linked to the ideas of economic and political dominance and dependence. In all representations of core-periphery analysis, "cores are depicted as advantaged and peripheries as disadvantaged"
(Wellhofer, 1988:283). Both Wallerstein (1979) and later Berger (1986) hold that the First World (core) has systematically impoverished the Third World (periphery) by exploiting the poor countries that support industrial societies via the provision of inexpensive labor and by acting as a market for First World products. By perpetuating Third World poverty, poor nations remain under the control of rich ones and in a state of dependency.

Wallerstein admits that in explaining the World-System perspective there is a certain amount of sloppiness in the use of the terms core and periphery. He explains that this pair of terms dates to the late 1940's and comes out of the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America. On a world scale these dyadic terms were used to divide the world into a complex set of paired opposites designating the participants in international commerce (Hopkins, Wallerstein and Associates, 1982). Difficulty occurs, Wallerstein (1982:91) explains, as "these two terms are nouns, but they are also adjectives." For instance, we may speak of core and peripheral states, areas, zones, products and processes.

The terms core and periphery also are used to discuss the uneven development of labor in the American capitalist economy (Tolbert, Horan, and Beck, 1980; Hodson and Kaufman, 1982; Baron and Bielby, 1984). According to the early work of Averitt (1968:1) the American economy has evolved into two distinct business systems that he argues comprise the "dual economy." Averitt (1968:7), describes one of the distinct systems as the "center," which consists of "firms large in size and
influence." These organizations are characterized by well established, bureaucratic structures, the ability to control critical raw materials, and as having highly diversified activities. Center firms have readily available financial support, serve national and international markets and use progressive technology.

The "periphery" is populated by relatively small firms dominated by a single individual or families and having "limited potential" (Averitt, 1968:87). Sales are limited to a restricted market, long-term borrowing is difficult and technology trails the industry leaders. In short, "the center firm is all that the periphery enterprise is not" (Averitt, 1968:8). Following Averitt's seminal work on dual economy theory, researchers have substituted many different names for the two sectors of the American economy (e.g., center/periphery, core/periphery, corporate/competitive, concentrated/unconcentrated, monopoly/competitive), but there remains a "basic agreement on the key characteristics" that distinguish the two groups (Hodson and Kaufman, 1982:728).

As with Wallerstein's World-System model, the dual economy is characterized by dependency between the two sectors. "Core firms exploit peripheral firms in a number of ways. They extract monopoly profits from the periphery firms to which they sell, and they demand "preferred" customer rebates from their suppliers. Indeed, many peripheral firms exist as satellites of center firms which are their only or main customers" (Hodson and Kaufman, 1982:728).
The dual economy is further complicated by a split in the labor market. The primary labor force of center firms is disproportionately white, male, and above average in skill levels. Peripheral employers draw heavily on the secondary labor market where women and minorities are over represented. Core firms tend to use advanced hierarchical controls such as establishing internal job ladders, paying higher wages, providing job related benefits and better working conditions, and promoting upward mobility, thus reducing the likelihood of turnover (Kalleberg and Sorensen, 1979; Hodson and Kaufman, 1982; Baron and Bielby, 1984). Labor employed by peripheral firms may possess lower educational and skill levels, be paid lower wages, have access to few or no benefits, employ older modes of production, and be limited as to mobility. According to Hodson and Kaufman (1982:729), perhaps "the most critical distinction which has been drawn between these two labor markets is the extent to which employment is relatively stable and secure in the core sector."

While dual economy analysis in the past has emphasized core stability, more recently within individual organizations, especially large employers, a core and peripheral set of workers is also developing. Core employees, regardless of formal rank or title are full-time employees. By contrast, the loss of many full-time jobs due to downsizing has resulted in the hiring of large numbers of temporary workers. Further, in most large corporations the rapid growth of administrative functions has led firms to organize some of their standardized operations, for example, typing
pools, along secondary market lines where "few opportunities for promotion exist, 
turnover can be high and virtually no on-the-job training takes place" (Gordon, 
Edwards, and Reich, 1986:201). These workers occupy peripheral positions within 
the organization.

The operational split within organizations is not necessarily new. Mintzberg 
(1979, 1983:12) described organizational structure in terms of the interrelationship 
among different parts. One of these basic parts, "the operating core, is the heart of 
the organization," the part that produces the essential outputs that keeps the firm 
alive. In turn, "the support staff exists to provide support to the organization outside 
it's operating flow" (Mintzberg, 1983:16). Thompson (1967) argued that various 
buffering mechanisms should be employed to protect the technical core from 
environmental uncertainty. The critical distinction is that these early organizational 
theorists describe the staffing or buffering activities provided in support of the core 
as being performed by full-time workers. They did not envision the bifurcation of 
the overall work force into core and periphery segments.

For generations, Marxists have forecast that class conflict between workers and 
capitalists would eventually lead to an overthrow of bourgeoisie society. 
Capitalists owned the means of production exploiting the workers who were forced 
to sell their labor power in order to earn a wage and survive. The revolution has 
not come about as predicted, in part because many corporate managers and 
professionals have aligned themselves with owners in 20th century capital
development. Skilled managers do not see themselves as being exploited or in any sense alienated by the experience of work. Moreover, it is argued that in post-industrial societies "skilled managers have displaced owners as the dominant economic actors in capitalist societies" (Gordon et al., 1986:5). Parsons saw this as a fundamental transformation of the 20th century in which the basic phenomena was the shift in control of enterprise from the property interests of the founding families to managerial and technical personnel. He therefore maintained that "we can no longer speak of a 'capitalistic' class" (Parsons, 1970:23). Likewise, popular economist, John Kenneth Galbraith (1971:xvii) has stated that, "the decisive power in modern industrial society is exercised not by capital but by organization, not by the capitalist but by the industrial bureaucrat."

The core, then, is not defined by ownership of the means of production in a true Marxian perspective. In fact, Braverman (1974:258) argues that in modern capitalism virtually no one individual owns the means of production. He states, "The corporation as a form severs the direct link between capital and its individual owner ... the two sides of the capitalist, owner and manager, formerly united in one person, now become aspects of the class." Therefore, the core will be typically equated with well-educated, full-time management and professionals who are able to exercise control over scarce and desired resources thus commanding greater power and prestige. The periphery will usually be composed of part-time,
Organizational theorists such as Perrow (1986) and Hall (1991), emphasize that there is a never ending struggle within organizations for values, goals, rewards and resources that are dear to participants and that conflicts inevitably arise when interests collide. Conflict between core managers and professionals and the peripheral work force also occurs because of the very nature of most bureaucratic structures which vests power in certain positions. Central to the thesis of Dahrendorf (1959:165), for example, is the idea that "in every social organization ... there is a differential distribution of power and authority" among positions. Social conflict invariably follows this arrangement because the social roles that accompany the positions are inherently endowed with a set of expectations concerning both domination and subjectation (Dahrendorf, 1959). Within organizations, core workers would normally occupy central, permanent positions implying formal authority and dominance while peripherals would occupy subordinate positions. It is important to emphasize, however, that the core can also be populated by non-management individuals who, due to their full-time employment status, can still have more access to valued resources and thus more power and prestige than peripherals. Kanter (1977), for example, discusses how even low ranking individuals such as secretaries can derive power by controlling access to the boss.
As predicted, it would seem inevitable that conflicts would arise between the core and peripheral groups, especially if expectations exist that relegate peripherals to subordinate roles within the organization. Current Secretary of Labor Robert Reich (1994) frequently writes and speaks about the sharp and growing division in society between the haves and have-nots stating that a society so divided can neither prosper nor be stable. This conflict of interest does not even have to be of a conscious nature. As Ritzer (1992:125) explains, "individuals do not have to internalize these expectations or even be conscious of them in order to act in accord with them. If they occupy given positions, then they will behave in the expected manner."

Trends in Temporary Employment

The following section will explore the growth in the use of temporary workers within organizations and examine several of the classification systems used to identify part-time workers.

Explanations for Growth of Part-Time Workers

The use of part-time workers is not a new phenomena. Traditionally, students, homemakers, and retirees have used shorter hour workdays or weeks to accommodate their life schedules. In the mid-1950's, voluntary part-time employment stood at about 8% of the at-work population. Over the next two
decades, growth in temporary employment was fueled in part by large numbers of women and young people who streamed into the work force. Since the mid-1970's, however, the increase in voluntary part-time employment has leveled off. What is changing are the numbers of involuntary part-time workers. Workers who would prefer full-time jobs account for most of the growth in part-time employment since 1970. Estimates of total part-time employment now range from 20% to 30% of the work force (Tilly, 1991; Feldman and Doerpinghaus, 1992b; Barker, 1993; U.S. Congress, Senate 1993; Lynd, 1994). There are projections that by the year 2000 up to one-half of the United States work force will fall into this category (Judd and Pope, 1994). A variety of specific reasons have been proposed for the continuing growth of part-time employment:

Demographics: Handy (1989), Feldman (1990), Tilly (1991), and Golden and Applebaum (1992) among others, point to the growing number of women in the work force as a source of increased part-time employment. Tilly states that two-thirds of part-time workers are women with a variety of home and family responsibilities who may be thought to actually prefer short-hour work weeks. In contrast, men's labor force participation from 1950-1980 gradually declined reflecting trends toward earlier retirement and the lack of permanent jobs due to industry restructuring (Kutscher, 1993). However, as the population continues to age, many "retired" individuals are now re-entering the work force on a part-time basis to supplement their incomes. Approximately one-fourth of Americans age 55
and older work part-time (Kahne, 1992). These demographic forces help explain voluntary part-time employment but do not adequately account for the growing involuntary sector. Polivka and Nardone (1989:13) present the flip side of this argument by stating that "a shortage of labor in an occupation may force employers to hire individuals who are unwilling or unable to accept permanent positions."

**Unemployment Rates:** Some analysts point to an increase in overall unemployment rates, especially during the 1980's, as a cause for the rise in part-time employment. A 1986 study cited by Tilly (1991:13), however, rejects this argument, stating that as much as "90 percent of the increase in the part-time share of employment remains even after controlling for changes in the unemployment rate." Furthermore, the entire unemployment rate argument may be suspect since Larson and Ong (1994:189) have reported that involuntary part-time work is ignored in the standard unemployment rate calculations. Consequently, "as IPT [involuntary part-time work] increases, the unemployment rate becomes less reliable as an indicator of divergence from full or high employment conditions."

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the most recent recession for the United States economy occurred in the period from approximately July 1990 to April 1991 (Kutscher, 1993). Yet the current recovery has been deemed by some as a "jobless recovery" (Lynd, 1994:22) in which corporations are both creating and eliminating jobs at almost a 1 to 1 ratio (Franklin, 1996). Kutscher (1993:19) speculates that some recession-sensitive sectors, particularly construction and
manufacturing may never recover their job losses but that one industry—temporary help—is flourishing, adding "more than 1 million jobs over the 1980-1992 period."

**Underemployment**: Closely related to the problem of unemployment is the more recent phenomena of underemployment in the American labor force. "Underemployment exists when employees possess education or skills which exceed normal job requirements ... or feel that their abilities are not fully utilized" (Kahn and Morrow, 1991:211). Underutilization of skills may logically be linked to lower job satisfaction and hence higher organizational turnover. In these cases, individuals will search for alternative employment, even part-time or temporary employment, that is more on target with their occupational aspirations. Likewise, highly educated individuals may actively seek part-time or intermittent employment while searching for a job that is more in line with their academic backgrounds. Recent government statistics indicate that underemployment is on the rise with at least 500,000 more workers being underemployed as compared to five years ago (Mandel, 1994).

**Cost Containment**: One of Porter's (1980:35) three basic generic competitive strategies for outperforming other firms is that of "overall cost leadership" where aggressive managerial attention to cost control becomes the theme of the entire organization. According to Lewis and Molloy (1991), the cost of temporary help is always lower than the costs associated with putting a permanent employee on the payroll. Handy (1989:32) argues that while organizations may like to have workers
around full-time; it is an extravagant use of human resources. "It is cheaper to keep them [the work force] outside the organization, employed by themselves or by specialist contractors, and to buy their services when you need them." Tilly (1991:13) agrees that is it possible that full-time workers are just too expensive. He reports that "part-timers earned about 58% as much per hour as full-timers in 1989," but this spread had not changed significantly since the mid-1970's. The wage gap between part-time and full-time workers is, however, often substantial. Williams (1989:3), citing a 1987 Bureau of Labor Statistics study of 600,000 workers, reports "wide variations in pay rates [among workers], reflecting the diversity of occupations, skill levels and assignments reported." Pay for individual temporary workers ranged from $3.35 to more than $20.00 per hour depending on the occupational group selected.

The escalating cost of fringe benefits is frequently cited as a reason for the rising use of part-time workers (Levitan and Conway, 1988; Polivka and Nardone, 1989; Tilly, 1991; Davis-Blake and Uzzi, 1993). Decreasing the number of full-time workers saves substantially, not only on the direct cost of wages and benefits and plant and office space, but also on burgeoning administrative costs as well. In addition, firms that have employed unionized labor, traditionally paying high wages and offering generous benefits, have been accused of using growing numbers of part-timers as an extreme form of union busting (Tilly, 1991).
Technology and Scheduling Flexibility: It has been proposed that technological advances, especially computerization, have spurred the growth of the part-time sector (Tilly, 1991). Concerns for prolonged work at video display terminals and the problems related to repetitive motion, such as carpal tunnel syndrome, have led some organizations to limit work to 4-5 hours at a stretch in order to maintain high levels of productivity and avoid potential medical claims or lawsuits.

Other firms have traditionally needed more workers during peak business hours (e.g., waitresses and busboys for high traffic mealtimes at restaurants and fast food outlets). Employers who are faced with unpredictable peak loads have little time or money allotted for traditional recruitment, hiring or training (Howe, 1986); therefore, temporaries are "plugged-in" as needed. Further, more and more businesses are now adopting twenty-four hour schedules. Among grocery stores, for example, the extension of store hours has meant that the rate of part-time employment rose from "35 percent in 1962 to 60 percent by 1985" (Tilly, 1991:16). Service organizations frequently maintain twenty-four hour phone banks to handle customer calls. Here, part-timers may be used during peak call periods or to staff the graveyard shift when call volumes are low. Part-time employees also allow organizations to respond to cyclical economic patterns such as those found in the construction industry (Feldman and Doerpinghaus, 1992a). Some firms even use flexible arrangements as a human resource management tool, screening job seek
order to identify good candidates for regular jobs" (Polivka and Nardone, 1989:12).

In short, Johnston (1987:61) concludes that part-time work has increased and will continue to increase because "services must usually be performed when and where the customer wants them; [therefore], the trend toward flexible schedules, part-time workers and shorter hours is likely to continue."

**Strategy and Structural Flexibility:** For the most part, the underlying impetus for the growth in the number of part-time jobs seems to be linked to "the changing needs and strategies of employers" (Tilly, 1991:14). Because of global competition and rapid technological change, large companies continue to search for ways to reduce inefficiencies. Reducing fixed labor costs, especially those costs associated with fringe benefits provides a way for companies to increase profits, strengthen the bottom line and avoid the burdens imposed by a growing plethora of government-imposed, employment rules and regulations. Further, in the past three decades the composition of U.S. employment has increasingly shifted away from manufacturing toward trade and services, industries that frequently employ large numbers of part-time workers (Tolbert, Horan, and Beck, 1980; Hakim, 1987; Kutscher, 1993). These firms have consciously adopted a low wage, low skill, high turn-over strategy built around the use of part-time labor. Companies have decided that cutting labor costs and enhancing staff flexibility are more important than maintaining a stable labor force (Tilly, 1991). These are strategic decisions formulated to enhance the long-run performance of a corporation.
How "strategic" employers really are in their approach to labor usage is, however, debatable. Is the increasing division of workers into core-periphery segments actually strategically planned to guide the long range performance of the firm or is it just a short-term reactionary response to such phenomena as continued high environmental uncertainty and rapid technological change?

In the early 1980's, the "flexible firm" model was introduced by John Atkinson and the Institute of Manpower Studies based at the University of Sussex. Their research suggested that firms were specifically looking for three kinds of flexibility. *Functional flexibility,* "so that employees can be redeployed quickly and smoothly between activities and tasks." *Numerical flexibility,* "so that headcount can be quickly and easily increased or decreased in line with even short-term changes in the level of demand for labour," and *financial flexibility,* "so that pay and other employment costs reflect the state of supply and demand in the external labour market" (Atkinson, 1984:28; Atkinson and Meager, 1986). Atkinson and others saw the flexible firm as a new employment model that made it possible to secure all three kinds of flexibility. Abandoning a traditional hierarchical structure, the new structure broke the labor force into "increasingly peripheral and therefore numerically flexible groups of workers, clustered about a numerically stable core group which will conduct the organisation's key, firm specific activities" (Atkinson, 1984:29). It was recognized, just as Wallerstein had described between nations in
the world economy, that within the new organizational form, cores would indeed be advantaged and peripheries disadvantaged.

The British flexible firm model has been at the center of much controversy since its introduction (Pollert. 1988a; 1988b) and has not been readily embraced by U.S. management writers or practitioners. In 1992, the British Employment Department reported that only one in ten organizations saw their company as being based on the flexible firm model and that factors such as the recession, increased competition, and uncertainty over output levels encouraged the use of peripheral workers (McGregor and Sproull, 1992). It was not directly attributed to any deliberate, long-term corporate strategy.

Whether the result of a comprehensive master plan or the reaction to day-to-day business realities, the use of part-time workers is increasing. Employers are continuing to downsize, replace permanent, full-time workers with a variety of contingent arrangements and outsource non-core operations. More people than ever are being pushed into the periphery.

Classification of Part-Time Workers

Exactly who are the part-timers, and what constitutes part-time work? "The term "part-time workers" evokes familiar images of teenagers flipping burgers, mothers arriving home from work in time to meet the bus, and semi-retired men and women lending assistance and expertise at the office" (Levitan and Conway, 1988:9). But
the economic realities of part-time employment are changing this picture. According to a recent series of articles published in *The New York Times* (1996:27), "blue-collar workers, particularly in manufacturing still make up a majority of the displaced each year, but lately only barely so." Widespread layoffs and corporate restructuring have also hit the middle layers of corporate America extremely hard. This former bastion of middle class, white males, is being dismantled. A recent review by Kahne (1994) underscores this fact as she reports that while involuntary part-time work among women grew from 16 to 24 percent between 1972 and 1992, the percentages for the same time period jumped from 33 to 40 percent for men. According to Greenwald (1992:65), middle management levels and whole functional divisions within business are now vanishing. He quotes Harvard economist James Medoff as saying that "white collar workers are feeling the pinch as never before."

In his book based on a report prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor in the late 1960's, Dean Morse (1969:5) defined the term "peripheral worker" as "those individuals who have had work experience of any kind other than full time for a full year." Morse made no provision for the question of whether the peripheral status was voluntary or not. Similarly, the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) defines part-time work "as work of less than 35 hours per week" (Levitan and Conway, 1988:10). This category excludes those workers who have short hours due to illness, holidays, or labor disputes. The BLS does differentiate between voluntary
and involuntary part-time work, but the distinction is not always clear cut. An unknown number of those counted among the voluntary part-time work force are actually willing to work full-time, but because of disabilities, lack of affordable child care, inadequate transportation, or other difficulties, they are unable rather than unwilling to secure full-time employment. Although the numbers are not clear, the BLS now estimates that "between 56 and 64 percent of contingent workers would prefer a more permanent arrangement" (Larson, 1996:30).

Labor market analysts often use the term "contingent work" to describe a variety of flexible arrangements including part-time work, temporary work, employee leasing, self-employment, contracting out, and home-based work (Polivka and Nardone, 1989). According to these authors, the phrase contingent employment was coined at a 1985 conference on employment security and was used originally to connote conditional and transitory employment relationships. However, the term has been identified with a wide range of employment practices since that time. "As a result the operational definition of a contingent job has become any arrangement which differs from full-time, permanent, wage and salary employment" (Polivka and Nardone 1989:10). Obviously, this definition is very broad and subject to much interpretation.

Conditionality implies a lack of attachment between the worker and employer. Yet many part-time workers are as attached to their jobs as are full-time workers. For instance, self-employment may be misclassified as a contingent arrangement.
"These workers, by definition, have no commitment to an employer but they may have long-term commitments to their occupations or businesses" (Polivka and Nardone, 1989:10). Transitory implies that some type of change in the working status is imminent. Yet self-employed doctors and lawyers have a great deal of employment security and are highly unlikely to contemplate changing careers. Likewise, workers employed by firms who provide services under contract, such as security guards, may work fewer than 35 hours per week and would be classified as contingent because they are not in full-time, permanent, wage or salary positions. Yet these same individuals may feel very secure in their jobs over the long run. Interestingly, Howe (1986) notes there are now many workers who have a fairly continuous attachment to a temporary agency; therefore, they would not view their jobs as contingent. To summarize, Daniel Feldman (1990) suggests that just as there are major differences between full and part-time workers, there are also many differences among temporary work arrangements such as temporary part-time versus permanent part-time and seasonal versus part-time, year-round workers.

Tilly (1991:11) has developed a part-time work typology involving three broad categories which he labels, short-time, secondary part-time, and retention part-time jobs. "Short-time employment occurs when, instead of laying workers off during a business downturn, an employer temporarily reduces workers' hours." This category fits the Bureau of Labor Statistics definition of anything less than 35 hours
of work per week. Secondary part-time jobs take on the form of "bad" part-time jobs. Found mostly in service industries, these jobs are characterized by low skill, low pay, lack of advancement opportunities, and high turnover. Retention part-time jobs are "good" part-time jobs created to retain or even attract valued employees where life circumstances prevent them from working full-time. These jobs involve high skill levels, high pay and productivity, and low turnover. Tilly emphasizes that by far, secondary part-time employment is the most common.

Especially important in the discussion and classification of part-time work is the issue of benefits. Typically part-time workers have not had access to fringe benefits. In testimony before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Labor in June of 1993, a laid off Honeywell employee who was hired back as a "consultant" told the committee she quickly discovered that being a consultant meant that she worked in the same building, did the same work, had the same schedule and co-workers as before the layoff--but had no benefits (U.S. Congress, 1993). Health insurance and pension coverage are also usually unavailable or much less than traditional full-time workers receive. Further, there may be a tendency to under invest in human capital development such as the training, skills development, and education of contingent workers (Belous, 1989; Davis-Blake and Uzzi, 1993; Kahne, 1994). Although the terms "part-time" and "contingent" seem to be used frequently, it is clear that the boundaries of both terms are not well established. In addition, there are a variety of words and phrases that are sprinkled throughout both the popular
and academic literature that add to the confusion. The following is a list of some of the terms encountered that seem to be used interchangeably:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>contract workers</td>
<td>interim workers</td>
<td>supplementals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>portable workers</td>
<td>day-laborers</td>
<td>occassionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leased workers</td>
<td>extra workers</td>
<td>rented workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondaries</td>
<td>migrants</td>
<td>temps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consultants</td>
<td>per-diems</td>
<td>marginals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freelancers</td>
<td>throw-aways</td>
<td>disposables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-contractors</td>
<td>call-ins</td>
<td>flexforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tangental workers</td>
<td>on-demand employees</td>
<td>expandables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>externals</td>
<td>non-standard workers</td>
<td>limited duration workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-employees</td>
<td>independent professionals</td>
<td>irregulars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>casual workers</td>
<td>life-of-the-project workers</td>
<td>guest workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>task employees</td>
<td>just-in-time workers</td>
<td>non-traditionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jobbers</td>
<td>on-call labor</td>
<td>co-employees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we read this list, the names evoke a variety of thoughts. The independent professional certainly must be accorded a higher status than the day-laborer. The freelancers must have more autonomy than the occassionals. Just-in-time workers are needed to somehow "save the day" whereas, temps or expandables are used to fill in when a full-time person is unavailable or too busy. Sub-contractors or consultants may run their own businesses but surely call-ins do not. A comparison
of many of these terms seems to entail the idea that what one group has, another has not and in comparison to full-time workers they can all be classified as have-nots. As a whole, these are individuals who occupy positions in the periphery.

The Use of Part-Time Faculty in Higher Education

Almost 40 years ago, Caplow and McGee (1958:4) declared the university to be "a fascinating specimen of social organization" since it had a simple and standardized hierarchical structure; yet within the academic hierarchy were found a "greater range of skills and a greater diversity of tasks than any business or military organization." Their book was written during a time of unprecedented growth in the academic labor market after the war years where concerns focused on the development of new services and disciplines. Employment trends seemed to relate to the immediate need to hire "additional junior men" (1958:210) to teach elementary courses. No mention is found relating to the use of part-time faculty.

But just as other segments of the economy have been impacted by downsizing, so too has the realm of higher education. Factors such as declining enrollment among traditional, college-age young adults, soaring costs, and new ideologies as concerns the educational process have contributed to the pressure for change within academic institutions. In the late 1970's, the National Center for Education Statistics reported that on average, 33 percent of the faculty across a variety of colleges and universities was employed on a part-time basis (Digest of Educational
Statistics, 1979). By the 1990's, after sharp cutbacks in state support for higher education, the figure is closer to 38-40 percent (Horwitz, 1994; Mydans, 1995). Some small community colleges use only part-time faculty. Andes (1981:8) has cautioned that, "significant variations in the use of part-time faculty occur by discipline and among individual institutions" but across the board the nationwide trend toward hiring more temporary faculty has increased and may accelerate with "the expected widespread retirement of professors who were hired in the 1960's" (Mydans, 1995).

It has been suggested previously that the underlying impetus for the growth of part-time jobs in the U.S. is linked to "the changing needs and strategies of employers" (Tilly, 1991:14). University administrators face many of the same environmental opportunities and threats as do their counterparts in the corporate sector; therefore, part-timers in academics are hired for the same reasons found in other segments of the economy. Economics and staffing flexibility have been among the most commonly cited factors for the continued employment of temporary faculty (Andes, 1981; Tuckman and Tuckman, 1981; Leslie, Kellams and Gunne, 1982; Gappa, 1984; Abel, 1984; Mortimer, Bagshaw and Masland, 1985; Biles and Tuckman, 1986; Rosenblum and Rosenblum, 1990; Mydans, 1995). Part-timers allow colleges and universities to handle large numbers of students in required undergraduate courses, meet unexpected student demands in high interest curriculum areas, or provide necessary expertise for rapidly developing specialty
concentrations. "Because part-time faculty can be hired and fired so easily, administrators have the power to [quickly] expand some educational programs and curtail others" (Abel, 1984:80). The use of temporaries may help free a full-time faculty member to either teach occasionally or engage in research activities, which may further enhance the institution's reputation. From an economic standpoint, part-time faculty is almost always paid much less than full-time faculty and receive few or no benefits. Colleges and universities are labor intensive institutions. Faculty salaries and fringe benefits account for a very high percentage of the operating costs; therefore, the use of part-timers can result in substantial savings. "Additional money is saved by denying adjuncts access to research funds, sabbatical leaves, promotions, office space, and secretarial assistance" (Abel, 1984:80).

Demographics also play a large role as the number of female academics has risen even more dramatically than the overall number of female workers (Tolbert and Oberfield, 1991; Lundy and Warme, 1992). The problem of underemployment is especially acute in this area as the supply of highly educated individuals in virtually all fields far outnumbers the demand (Solomon, Kent, Ochsner, and Hurwicz, 1981; Abel, 1984; Lundy and Warme, 1992; Mydans, 1995).

As with the business sector, definitions and divisions among part-time faculty in higher education are complicated. Stratification within colleges and universities begins with the institutions themselves. "At the top are a handful of private
universities (e.g., Harvard, Princeton, Yale), followed by elite private colleges (e.g., Amherst, Vassar, Dartmouth), state universities, state colleges and, at the base, the community colleges. The more highly ranked the institution, the higher are both its fees and standards of admission" (Hess, Markson, and Stein, 1993:378). Inversely related to institutional prestige is the proportion of students and faculty who are female, minority, or of working class origins. The use of part-time faculty shares this same relationship. In 1981, Andes (1981:8) reported that, on average, "in four-year colleges approximately 25 percent [of faculty] were part-time, and in universities the figure is under 20 percent." In community colleges more than 55 percent were part-time.

Within the university system, faculty is stratified on the basis of academic rank. The hierarchy consists of tenure and tenure track individuals such as distinguished, full, associate, and assistant professors, and a wide range of non-tenured faculty formally titled lecturer, instructor, adjunct, and so on. In contrast to the inverse relationship between the composition of the student body and faculty as compared to institutional prestige, the numbers in various academic ranks directly reflect the status of the institution. That is, elite colleges and universities almost exclusively employee full-time, highly credentialed professors versus part-time faculty (Leslie, Kellams, and Gunne, 1982). These professors, like corporate managers and professionals are members of the core.
The classification of part-time faculty in higher education is not quite as confusing as compared to the corporate sector, but still no uniform definition exists. In the hierarchy based on academic rank, instructors, adjunct faculty, lecturers, or any title that includes the word "temporary" occupy the bottom rungs and can be regarded as periphery.

In accordance with the Bureau of Labor Statistics definition, part-time faculty probably work less than 35 hours per week. However, Gappa (1984) cautions that this definition should be applied only in the most general way because full-time faculty members may often work well over 50 hours per week. She suggests defining part-time faculty by the number of credit hours they teach, but this definition varies from institution to institution. Some authors have attempted to classify part-time faculty members based on demographics and their reason for teaching such as the semi-retired, "Ex-full-time academics who scale down their activities to a part-time basis" or part-mooners, "Those with two or more part-time jobs of less than 35 hours per week" (Biles and Tuckman, 1986:11). Other classifications are based on the degree of attachment to the employing institution or other descriptive models (Biles and Tuckman, 1986). Gappa (1984:5) takes a more formal approach as she has defined part-time faculty as "anyone who (1) teaches less than the average full-time teaching load, or (2) has less than a full-time faculty assignment and range of duties, or (3) may have a temporary full-time assignment." All persons included in this definition are non-tenured and have little
or no job security. Leslie, Kellams, and Gunne (1982:1) add that "the terms of employment recognize the fractional involvement of the worker." Regardless of their title, their work may be described as "contingent" as it is both conditional and transitory. "Part-time faculty normally teach for one term at a time with a contract that promises nothing else" (Gappa, 1984:45).

In identifying who fits in the category of part-time faculty, Gappa specifically excludes graduate student teaching assistants (TAs) from her definition; Abel does not. Abel states that major research universities rely heavily on graduate students who perform and are treated in similar ways to adjuncts. These two groups frequently share office space and other scarce resources. Many undergraduate students currently have more contact with TAs and part-time instructors than with regular, tenured faculty. "The similarity of the two types of positions is underlined by the fact that they often are filled by the same people. Occasionally, TAs supplement their sparse earnings by picking up extra courses at nearby community colleges. More often, people enter the part-time circuit after their teaching assistantships have expired and they have been unsuccessful in the regular academic job hunt" (Abel, 1984:79).

Whether or not TAs are included in the academic pecking order, faculty who do not have access to traditional tenure track appointments fall within the part-time, peripheral classification. In addition to the list of terms used interchangeably with "part-time" or "contingent" which was developed earlier, the academic arena has
it's own colorful characterizations for temporary workers. They include: academic nomads, freeway flyers, itinerant academics, affiliates, marginal academics, and gypsy scholars. As in other parts of the economy, in comparison to the full-time, core worker, these peripheral employees remain disenfranchised and disadvantaged on a variety of fronts.
CHAPTER 3
THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

Inequalities in Core-Pheriphery Relations

Morse (1969) reports that there has been a long tradition of concern about workers in the peripheral labor force. He cites the work by Charles Booth in the late 1800's on the "casual" worker and a 1920 collection of essays by Carleton Parker published under the title *The Casual Laborer* as examples of early studies that focused on the immediate problems of less than full-time workers. With improved statistical techniques and the demand for crucial employment information in the late 1930's, the 1940 census began a systematic effort to collect data about the number of hours worked during the census week by employed workers. But as discussed in Chapter 2, after more than 50 years, definitions of what constitutes part-time work are still broad and subject to interpretation depending on the source of reference chosen.

The core-periphery terminology as used by Wallerstein entailed dyadic relationships that are characterized by inequality, dependence, and exploitation. Wallerstein (1979:49) pointedly states that it has never been a secret that in the modern world some countries have more than other countries. To the contrary, "world inequality is a phenomena about which most men and most groups are quite conscious." While the original focus of Wallerstein's work was aimed at the
capitalist world economy, Hopkins (1978:207) concedes that the end-terms core and periphery [have] become themselves "respective foci of attention, categories in their own right."

Whether between nations, communities, organizations, groups or individual workers, the dyadic relationship between the core and periphery is rife with conflicting interests. Core workers are somehow endowed with a sense of importance or distinctiveness. Peripheral workers may be assigned more routine, thankless, and demeaning tasks or even more hazardous work. According to an interview with Secretary of Labor Robert Reich, being a short-time worker may even mean having to put up with sexual or racial harassment because the employment relationship falls outside the traditional system (Castro, 1993).

Addressing this issue, the U.S. Congress Subcommittee on Labor (1993) attempted to deal with the question of just what constitutes an employee as there is now no legal recourse for temporary workers who are harassed or discriminated against. As asserted in testimony before the subcommittee "temps are an invisible work force with the toughest jobs in America and the least amount of respect" (Congress, Senate, 1993:4).

Work in the peripheral sector can lead to a vicious circle for employees. Part-time work imposes unstable work histories on individuals, which employers then point to as evidence of their undesirability for long-term, steady employment (Hodson and Kaufman, 1982). Peripherals are thus often seen as having less
commitment, affiliation, and loyalty to the organization. They are treated as second class citizens, not as colleagues and peers. According to Warme, Lundy and Lundy, (1992:3), “the term part time is not a neutral one. Rather, it is given negative connotations, implying weak commitment, lack of ambition and relative indifference to the material rewards of working.” Peripheral workers are perceived as lacking a sense of ownership in the company; therefore, even their basic work ethic is questioned. For example, Levitan and Conway (1988:15) quote the president of a large temporary service as saying, "You can't expect these people to have the same kind of work ethic that their fathers had." Belous (1989) asserts that contingent workers lack an implicit contract for long-term employment, consequently, they are seen as not being around long enough to count. Some permanent core employees exploit part-timers by feeling that peripherals are there to serve them. It has further been suggested that some core workers may hold the notion that peripherals should actively be used "to buffer full-time employees from unpleasant jobs or layoffs" (Feldman, 1990:111). A recent study by Barnett and Miner (1992:263) found that the hiring of non-promotable temporary workers may actually create a "hidden escalator" that favors core workers by reducing the competition they face for promotions.

Employers have little incentive to train workers who they hire on a temporary basis and part-timers have little choice in working hours, often receiving the worst odd-hour or split shift schedules. As with the dual labor market, workers within
organizations may feel resentful of the superior working conditions and opportunities afforded the core worker. Ironically, core employees may feel jealousy towards peripherals as they fantasize about the benefits of getting to pick their own hours or work only part-time (Kennedy, 1993). There have been contradictory studies as to whether or not employment status is a useful predictor of job satisfaction (Levanoni and Sales, 1990; McGinnis and Morrow, 1990; Feldman and Doerpinghaus, 1992a, 1992b). It has been noted, however, that part-time workers, in general, tend to lead more uncertain and stressful daily lives (Kennedy, 1993; Fierman, 1994). Because of low job security, peripherals and their families may suffer reduced income that ultimately affects basic housing, health, education, career and life choices (Bartkowiak, 1993).

In short, the core-periphery dynamics now existing in organizations presents us with a classic have and have-not scenario intensifying inequality within organizations as we further stratify the work-force using this two-tiered system. Core workers have stable work histories, receive full benefits, possess highly desirable skills and fill important, firm-specific positions in the organization. Peripherals, as the have-nots, perform less important tasks for the organization, receive few or no benefits, and may be reduced to serving at the whim of the core workers.
Core-Periphery Relations in Academe

To restate briefly, the core in higher education is defined as being composed, for the most part, of faculty members who occupy the academic ranks of assistant through distinguished professor and who are either tenured or on a tenure track appointment. Like corporate managers and professionals, the core faculty along with high ranking administrators would exercise control in the organization. The periphery is populated by individuals in a variety of part-time arrangements.

The same core-periphery dynamics which exist in other organizations also exist in academe—the relationships between these groups are characterized by inequality, dependence, and exploitation. Inequalities between core and periphery faculty are well documented. Wage and benefit disparity, lack of job security and legal standing, poor schedule assignment and heavy work load, and the lack of support services are among the issues frequently addressed in discussions of the inequalities in academic life. Abel (1984:117) describes the adjuncts as "the academic proletariat" who earn embarrassingly low wages, are sometimes treated with outright disdain, and who are "denied the visible signs of occupational success" such as office and parking space, telephones, secretaries, and mailboxes. Since Abel's writing in 1984, it would also be wise to add denial of access to information technology as a visible sign of occupational inequality.

Leslie et al., (1982:6) state that "by virtually all measures, the part-time faculty member is a truly marginal member of the academic labor force." They report that
some full-time faculty go so far as to see part-timers as competitors for available salary dollars or as threats to their own status and security referring to them as the "wetbacks" or "scabs" of academic life. Seldin (1987) has identified the increased use of part-time faculty as a stress producing factor for full-time faculty who view them as potential job threats. Gappa (1984) notes that the full-time faculty and their organizations are continually concerned about quality control and worry about their waning power as the use of temporary faculty increases. Andes (1981:10) also highlights the inequalities of the legal position of peripherals. "Part-time faculty are not mentioned in most state statutes, board policies, or institutional policies relating to tenure, promotion, or grievance procedures." Furthermore, most collective bargaining contracts specifically exclude part-timers from the bargaining unit. Widespread use of part-timers actually tends to undermine the power of faculty unions.

According to Wallerstein (1979:38), in the world-economy various areas are "dependent upon each other for their specialized roles." Further the core exploits the periphery because it provides a source of inexpensive labor plus acts as a market for core products. In academe, part-time workers provide a source of inexpensive labor to the institution. Professors depend on part-timers to lighten their workload by teaching multiple sections of introductory material or conducting what amount to remedial review sessions with undergraduate students. "Full-timers are pleased to keep their number of preparations to a minimum. This asset
[the peripheral workers] reduces intellectual fragmentation and permits them to focus more on their preferred specialities" (Leslie et al., 1982:99).

Part-timers are often employed temporarily to replace full-time faculty who are on leaves of absence. Peripherals also serve as "buffers for the long-range security of full-time staff as enrollments stabilize and decline" (Leslie et al., 1982:98). Further, part-timers are usually given the worst assignments in teaching hours. The core faculty is "given their choice of the prime times, places and overloads they wish to carry (for extra pay), before part-timers are considered for employment" (Leslie et al., 1982:98). Temporary faculty end up with the 8AM, noon, and after 3 PM slots, freeing the core to schedule their time most productively and profitably.

Conversely, the temporary faculty is also dependent on the full-time faculty. For instructors, professors provide a much needed supply of resources. Adjuncts depend on them to share text books, sample exams, and other basic teaching materials. Temporaries are seldom contacted by the bands of roving book representatives that make the usual campus rounds providing full-time faculty with the most up-to-date texts and literature. In order to develop any type of professional library in their field, the instructor must rely on the generosity of the core faculty.

Because instructors work on a piecemeal basis, they also depend on the core for recommendations for future work. It is common for administrators and
professors at one college to contact their academic counterparts at another in search of temporary workers to meet staffing requirements. Peripherals must maintain good working relations with the full-time faculty in order to secure future employment.

Teaching assistants suffer the same indignities as the temporary instructors, and in addition, they specifically fill the role of acting as a market for core products. Upper level students pay tuition and fill the graduate classrooms which full-time professors alone can claim as their domain. In this case, as Wallerstein (1979) hypothesizes, the core both exploits the periphery as a market for its products and at the same time is dependent on it for continued prosperity.

Wellhofer (1988:284) has stated that among nation-states, "the periphery is dependent on [the] core for decision making, having "little control over its fate," possessing a limited "opportunity structure" and [being] dependent on the core's approval for action." These same macro dynamics can be applied at the micro level. Part-timers do rely on the core professors for decision making as to course content and structure, textbook adoption, grading guidelines and so forth. As with nation-states, instructors are usually very dependent on the core's approval for action. Part-timers learn quickly to check with someone in authority before making any major course changes.

It has already been well documented that the periphery has little control over its own fate. According to Gappa (1984:1), "many within the tenured cloister regard
part-timer faculty like academic pariahs." Administrators and faculty alike exploit them with impunity. Part-timers are usually appointed for only one term at a time and virtually all jobs are conditioned on enrollment. Opportunity structure is limited. The core is careful not to allow even reliable, high quality, part-time faculty to become entrenched in the department due to tenure concerns. If temporary faculty are graduates of the same college or university for which they now teach, their work is viewed as being useful in the short term, but in the long run, educational institutions usually do not hire their own graduates due to fears of inbreeding. Permanent new hires are chosen from outside the institution in order to bring in fresh ideas and perspectives. Even Affirmative Action procedures may further serve to undermine the frail security of part-timers because administrators sometimes attempt to demonstrate compliance by hiring practices within the part-time ranks where women and minorities are over represented (Abel, 1984). In contrast, Lundy and Warme (1992:257) report that "the proportion of full-time [emphasis mine] female faculty rose only slightly from 12 percent in 1960 to 17 percent in 1985."

The core in World-System analysis is seen as the center or hub of communication and information dissemination and so it is with professors and adjuncts. Gappa (1984:68) addresses the problems of communication and participation for part-time faculty. "Contact with peers among full-time faculty is natural and free-flowing" but part-timers are essentially disenfranchised. Some
part-timers spend only a few hours per week on campus. Worse, the "campus" may be an off-site location such as a public school or other remote location. Office hours are by appointment only. Adjuncts meet with students in the hall or an empty classroom as needed. If they do not have an office or mailbox, communication with them is almost non-existent. As one part-timer complained, "I don't even have a phone extension. All I have is a mailbox, and it changes every term. Once it was a Cheez Whiz box, just a cardboard Cheese Whiz box. That was my home base" (Mydans, 1995:B6). Likewise, part-timers are not usually invited to participate in any formal departmental meetings, faculty development activities, or even informal social gatherings. In order to obtain valued information it must be via the core.

Another interesting dynamic of core-periphery interaction is the idea that "interaction with other peripheries and other cores is mediated by each periphery's own core" and that "while any core may interact with any other core, it must pass through another's core in order to have access to that core's periphery" (Wellhofer, 1988:284). This analysis can be extended to relationships between professors and part-timers, specifically as Abel (1984) discusses the case of part-time teachers who are also graduate students. Because TAs are also students, they are closely bound within departments to a certain group of faculty--their committee. It is likely that in addition to their own personal academic concerns, peripherals will use this core group as a means of communicating with other cores especially if a conflict situation arises. Further, departmental protocol would probably dictate that a core
A professor who is not directly linked to a graduate student would not ask the TA to do any work for her without clearing the request through at least one of the involved committee members. Likewise, a part-time faculty member will probably have at least one full-time faculty member upon whom they depend as a source for judging the legitimacy of requests from other core members.

Overall, the periphery in academe remains exploited and under the control of the core. Relationships between the two groups are tenuous and strained. Part-timers are viewed as being outside the system and have little hope of ever being admitted to the collegium. They are often resentful of the perceived inequities of part-time status yet remain silent because they love to teach. As Gappa (1984:9) notes, "With few exceptions, part-timers are regarded with neglected complacency in higher education. Like servants on the baronial estates of yesteryear, they are barely seen and hardly heard by their masters, and presumed to have no ears."

Work as a Social Role

Whether within the world-economy as described by Wallerstein or within organizations, individuals depend on each other for their specialized roles. Caplow (1954:4), whose approach to the field of occupational sociology is based heavily on the work of Emile Durkheim, defines the sociology of work as "the study of those social roles which arise from the classification of men by the work they do."
Role theorists then are concerned with the behaviors, attitudes, or beliefs about what role occupants should or should not do.

The work role has long been recognized as a crucial life role. "Sigmund Freud said that the basic requirements of human existence are to love and to work" (Pottick, 1989:488). What we do has a profound impact on our sense of self—our definition of who we are and what we are all about. The role of farmer, accountant, office manager, policeman and so forth have traditionally entailed a high degree of permanence. These roles and the expectations attached to the roles transcend the individuals. For example, the role of "teacher" exists from generation to generation, even though various people inhabit it at different times. Our expectations of the teacher may include that he or she have a college degree in the subject for which they are responsible and that they are able to convey course material to their students in an interesting manner. We will expect that they conduct themselves in a professional manner in the classroom, respect and listen to their students, attend school functions, meet periodically with parents and students, and keep accurate records. But the role expectations for peripheral workers are just being developed. Here the work roles, by the very nature of the jobs, are usually temporary and often ill-defined. Yet it is important to explore the dynamics of core and peripheral roles and relationships in order to better understand individual job attitudes and behaviors, identify possible sources of conflict between the two groups, and to be
able to successfully motivate and manage an increasingly heterogeneous mix of employees.

According to Jerold Heiss (1981:95), "all role theories start from the assumption that roles are variable and tied to social characteristics." A problem arises, however, in that different authors use various labels for the same phenomena. In 1945, Ralph Linton drew a distinction between status and role. Status was used to refer to "the position of an individual in the prestige system of his society" (Linton, 1972:112). Linton proposed five different kinds of positions common to all societies: 1) age-sex (e.g., young woman or old man), 2) prestige (e.g., chief or slave), 3) occupational, either as a specialist, for example, carpenter or as designated by vague terms such as skilled laborer, 4) family, clan or household group (e.g., member of the Smith family) and lastly, 5) association groups such as the Lion's Club, Garden Club, or Girl Scouts (Newcomb, Turner and Converse, 1965). Associated with every position is a body of common societal expectations. These expectations consist of shared attitudes, beliefs, values, and behaviors ascribed by the society to any and all persons occupying the status. Linton (1972:112) defines role as the "sum total of the culture patterns associated with a particular status." In short, status refers to a recognized social position and role is the dynamic expression of a status.

In a later formulation, Turner (1990:88) made less of a distinction between status and role, grouping social roles into four types: "basic roles, like gender and age
roles ...; structural status roles ... that are attached to position, office, or status in particular organizational settings; functional group roles, like the "mediator" and "devil's advocate," which are not formally designated or attached to particular group positions or offices, but are recognized items in the cultural repertoire; and value roles like the hero, traitor, criminal, and saint."

According to Newcomb et al., (1965:325), from a social psychological standpoint, society can be viewed as consisting of a complex organization of positions. The personal identity of the particular individuals who occupy them is irrelevant. "When the people are subtracted ..., what is left is a great network of positions, all the elements of which are more or less related to and consistent with one another." Every position that is recognized contributes in some way to the purposes of the group. Individuals occupy some positions based on factors over which they have little or no control such as age and sex. These are ascribed statuses. "Other positions ... are accorded largely on the basis of individual achievement" (Newcomb et al., 1965:326), technically known as achieved statuses. Membership in association groups is more than likely a matter of choice while other positions are occupied simply due to chance or luck. Not all statuses are enduring ones. Some are held for indeterminate or intermittent time periods—for instance, student, friend, or clerk. Others are held but once in a lifetime—for instance, the bride on her wedding day or the mourner at a loved one's funeral. "The same individual can and does occupy simultaneously a series of statuses each of which
derives from one of the systems of organization in which he participates" (Linton, 1972:112).

In a review of the literature on social roles, both Heiss (1981) and Biddle (1986) discuss the confusing and arbitrary ways in which the basic terms status and role have been used. Heiss acknowledges that social scientists have not settled on generally accepted meanings. Linton's early work drew a definite distinction between status as a recognized social position and role which he described as the dynamic aspect of status. Turner's classification of the four basic types of roles corresponds closely to Linton's five status categories. Hunt (1976:282) thinks that "a role represents the content of a position or the behavioral implications of positional occupancy." As reported by Heiss (1981:94), Coulson proposed that "sometimes role is used to refer to a social position, [or] sometimes to the behaviour associated with a position." An early work by Lieberman in 1956 defined role only as "a set of behaviors that are expected of people who occupy a certain position in a social system" (Lieberman 1993:61). Heiss believes that this definition is too narrow preferring to define roles in terms of more general expectations about what one should do versus actual behaviors. Biddle (1986:69) adds that role theorists are alternately concerned with roles "as characteristic behaviors, parts to be played and scripts for behavior."

Biddle (1986:69) further stresses that there are serious disagreements by role theorists over the concept of expectations. Are they prescriptive norms, subjective
beliefs, preferences, attitudes, or some combination of all? And whose expectations do we have in mind—the actor's, society's, or involved others? "Each mode of expectation generates roles for somewhat different reasons [therefore], different versions of role theory result." Due to this confusion, Biddle (1986:86) contends that "a few role theorists avoid the expectation concept altogether."

Despite this debate, most role theory presumes that expectations, no matter what assumptions are built into the basic concept are the major generators of roles. Further, it seems to be generally agreed that expectations are directly linked to social categories, are often defined by context, and are learned through experience.

For purposes of this investigation, Linton's basic definitions of role and status will be used. To restate, in his early usage of the terminology, status refers "to the position of an individual in the prestige system of his society" (Linton, 1972:112). Status is, in essence, fixed by the organization of society. Role "is the dynamic aspect of a status: what an individual has to do in order to validate his occupation of the status" (Linton, 1972:112). The two terms, although definitionally distinct are commonly used interchangeably. The more fluid concept of role entails the existence of expectations, the sum of such things as attitudes, values, beliefs, rights and duties, and expected behaviors which, interpreted broadly, comprise the role. Role expectations vary in their clarity or ambiguity, in their generality or specificity, in their degree of consensus, and in their significance to our lives (Sarbin, 1954).
The expectations held by the position occupant may be quite different than the expectations held by other persons or society in general. Although there is no firm societal consensus on most roles, an actor is likely to have some conception of a particular role, and therefore, an opinion as to what he and others should do as they find themselves occupying a variety of societal positions. Thus, the statuses we occupy and the roles we enact play a major part in the development of an individual's sense of self; they provide a solid basis for how we define who we are.

A problem frequently addressed by role theorists is one in which actors find themselves in situations in which they are unsure or unfamiliar with the role expectations (Biddle, 1986; Ruben, 1986; Lieberman, 1993). The peripheral worker occupies one such position. Lifelong socialization helps individuals prepare for an enormous variety of situations. The educational system and other social institutions prepare young people for a place in the economic system from an early age. However, for generations workers have continued to equate jobs with the idea of a long-term commitment. Careers begun as entry level positions or with apprenticeships, would proceed by hard work and merit to raises, promotions, and the trappings of success, eventually culminating in a comfortable retirement. Within the last ten to fifteen years, however, these expectations have been crushed. Due to rapid changes in the structure of the American workplace, peripherals are increasingly replacing full-time workers. Spending thirty or forty years with one company now seems highly unlikely. Employers will no longer be benevolent and
paternalistic. Employees are on their own and must constantly change and adapt in the global market place.

Even with a growing understanding of these changing work expectations, the peripheral position is still unique. It represents a fundamental shift in our society from viewing occupation as an highly significant achieved status, a master status which may shape a person's entire life, to more of an ascribed status over which individuals have little or no choice. Workers who occupy peripheral positions for any number of reasons are not just transferring from one full-time position to another, they are entering truly new, uncharted waters where expectations may be unclear, unrealistic, or worse, stereotyped by the very classification.

Stryker (1981:17) proposes that persons who act in the context of social structure name one another in order to recognize each other as occupants of positions. These names "invoke expectations with regard to each others' behavior." The earlier work of Ralf Dahrendorf (1959:177) also concluded that, "the notion of role expectations ascribes an orientation of behavior to social positions," not individuals. And even when individuals do not consciously internalize these expectations, if they occupy given positions within the social system, then they will behave in the expected manner. The very classification of individuals as peripheral versus core workers, therefore carries with it serious implications as to status, roles, expectations, and the potential for conflict.
Dahrendorf's (1959:174) words, in this type of dichotomous association the two groups will be certain to hold interests "contradictory in substance and direction."

As previously noted, an individual's basic self image is also greatly impacted by the positions they occupy in social systems. Tajfel (1978) and later Tajfel and Turner (1986:16) state that social categories or groups provide individuals with a sense of identification about themselves. "Social identity ... consists of those aspects of an individual's self image that derive from the social categories to which he perceives himself as belonging." Social identity can be either positive or negative according to the evaluations the individual makes. Positive social identity is based on a favorable comparison between an in-group and some relevant out-group. In the case of peripheral workers, comparison to the core workers would most likely produce an unsatisfactory social identity since the two groups are so dissimilar. A more realistic comparison would be to other peripheral workers. In either case, when social identity is unsatisfactory, it is proposed that the individual will be motivated to change the relationship (Tajfel and Turner, 1986).

Linking Core-Periphery Analysis to Role Theory

According to Wellhofer's review in 1988, core-periphery analysis commonly identifies three features that distinguish cores from peripheries. The following paragraphs describe the distinct characteristics, exchange relationships, and interaction patterns that differentiate cores from peripheries.
Distinct characteristics

First, there exists a set of attributes characteristic of each. In World-System analysis the core dominates in all areas; political, economic, cultural, and social. With regards to core-periphery relations in general, "in all representations, cores are depicted as advantaged and peripheries as disadvantaged" (Wellhofer, 1988:283).

The work of Eagly and Steffan (1984, 1986) has been used to demonstrate that people's occupational roles are a strong determinant of the traits ascribed to them. Within organizations and institutions alike, the role of peripheral worker would be seen as less advantaged than the core. Expectations would be that peripherals would possess less education, fewer skills, and be less familiar with current technology. Fierman (1994:33) quotes a part-time secretary who graduated from Williams College in 1992 as stating that what she "dislikes most about temping is how quick people are to assume that temps are know-nothings." This statement is supported by research conducted by Humphrey (1985) and Eagly and Steffan (1986) on how work roles influence perception. In Humphrey's (1985:242) experiment he found that those individuals who were randomly assigned to a high position in the organizational hierarchy were "perceived more favorably on selected role-related traits than are others of equal ability." Humphrey (1982:242) maintains "that our impressions of our co-workers and managers are not solely
based on their abilities and dispositions, but are instead heavily influenced by the roles they play."

Within the realm of higher education, these same types of role-related expectations exist. Temporary instructors or adjuncts are seen as being less committed, less reliable, and less ambitious than full-time faculty, even when they have high academic qualifications. Part-timers who genuinely buttress the university by carrying heavy teaching loads are still denigrated as lacking serious academic intent. Trustees and administrators in all types of academic settings continue to "praise teaching and reward research" (Lundy and Warme, 1992:266). The prestige hierarchy which exists among colleges and universities is maintained by a research imperative. Gappa (1984:8) concludes that hiring part-time faculty, is generally viewed as being "at the expense of program quality"; moreover, a larger concern is that the prestige of the entire institution can be undermined by the employment of a high proportion of part-time faculty (Lundy and Warme, 1992).

In addition to the conclusion that people's occupational roles influence the traits ascribed to them, Humphrey (1985:245) also proposes that organizations actively "attempt to control their workers' initial definitions of the situation by providing ready-made labels for the role occupants ... and for the activities that they carry out." For example, a secretary may perform exactly the same duties as the administrative assistant but in general our expectations of the administrative assistant will be higher. An adjunct instructor may teach the same course as the
temporary assistant professor but again our expectations are influenced by the role label. No matter the type of organizational setting, Eagly and Steffan (1986) conclude that even as part-time employment rates increase, fairly negative stereotypes of these workers will persist.

Following this reasoning, a major premise for this study is that people who are placed in a peripheral organizational position will immediately be faced with a set of defining expectations associated with that status. These expectations may take the form of attitudes, beliefs, and/or expected behaviors concerning how the worker is to perform and behave as a peripheral employee. Role-related expectations may pertain to either specific work role performance or more general role assessments concerning the anticipated characteristics and social behaviors of peripherals as a group. In turn, the individual's social identity will be impacted by this evaluation. Based on this perspective, an initial set of hypotheses is developed exploring the expectations of individuals occupying core and peripheral positions in an academic setting.

H1: Core faculty will rate themselves as being more assertive than they rate peripheral faculty.

H2: Core faculty will rate themselves as more hard working than they rate peripheral faculty.
H3: Core faculty will rate themselves as being more professional than they rate peripheral faculty.

Professionalism is believed to be exhibited in both attitude and appearance. Professionals are characterized by the possession of theoretical knowledge obtained through extensive, formal schooling and training and through regular interaction with others in the field. Professionals are identified as possessing high levels of autonomy, adhering to professional norms and codes of conduct, having feelings of identification and affiliation with others in the profession, and demonstrating high devotion to and concern for their work (Wilensky, 1964; Freidson, 1984; Ritzer and Walczak, 1990; and Abbott, 1991). In this study, professionalism will be based on traits such as professional appearance and attitude, high job involvement, and maintenance of high personal standards for performance. Additional hypotheses related to characteristics attributed to core and peripherals faculty because of their occupational status include:

H4: Core faculty will rate themselves as having more opportunity for challenging work than they rate peripheral faculty.

H5: Core faculty will rate themselves higher as concerns organizational commitment than they rate peripheral faculty.
H6: Core faculty will rate themselves higher on leadership ability than they rate peripheral faculty.

H7: Core faculty will rate themselves as being more dependable than they rate peripheral faculty.

In the study of organizations, both the areas of organizational commitment and leadership have been extensively examined. Organizational commitment is conceptualized as a combination of identification with the organization's goals and values, willingness to invest effort in the organization, and loyalty to the organization (Morrow, 1993). Research on formal leadership has examined a myriad of components such as traits, skills, behaviors, and situational factors (Mintzberg, 1975; Zaleznik, 1977; McGregor, 1986; Fiedler, 1986; Hall, 1991). For this analysis, subjects will be asked directly to rate categories of workers on the trait "leadership ability" without further description as to what this concept may entail.

Exchange Relationships

The second identifying feature which distinguishes cores from peripheries is the nature of exchange relationships (Wellhofer, 1988). Hopkins, Wallerstein, and Associates (1982:48) state that the fact of unequal exchange operates "through a set of mechanisms ... that continually reproduce the basic core-periphery division of labor itself." The nature of this set of mechanisms is the subject of ongoing debate,
but one perspective presented by Hopkins et al., (1982:48) views unequal exchange as working "through the distribution of gains from technical progress [increases in productivity]." For the core these gains, for various reasons, usually result in higher wages rather than in lower prices; for the periphery the opposite holds true. It is further argued that differences in wage levels can be translated into differences in well being. This argument generates the following hypotheses.

H8: Core faculty will rate themselves as enjoying a greater sense of well being than they rate peripheral faculty.

H9: Peripherals will perceive higher levels of job related stress than will core faculty.

Stress may be defined as a "state of tension experienced by individuals facing extraordinary demands, constraints or opportunities" (Schmerhorn, Hunt, and Osborn, 1985:651). The causes and consequences of faculty stress for both full-time and part-time faculty have been investigated by previous researchers such as Seldin (1987), Gmelch (1987), and Gappa (1987). Stress is related to individual desires and exists when the outcome of events is perceived to be both uncertain and important (Schuler, 1980). Stress can be both constructive and destructive and manifests itself in a variety of ways from enhanced effort and creativity to absenteeism and depression.
Exchange relations often entail a differentiation of power between those engaged in the transaction. Blau (1964:117) defines power as "the ability of persons or groups to impose their will on others despite resistance." He further notes that power relies on the recurrent ability of individuals or groups to either supply or withhold rewards or to administer punishment. It should not be expected that exchange relations between core and peripheral workers would inevitably result in overt power struggles. Core workers would be expected to occupy traditional, central positions within the firm while peripherals may be used to fill in throughout the organization as needed. This arrangement may lead to a variety of conflicts of interest; however, a peripheral worker does not necessarily depend on any one specific core worker for all rewards. Extrinsic rewards such as pay and benefits do come from the core, but they come from the management or administration in general.

According to Blau (1964), there are four factors which can magnify power differences in exchange relationships.

1. The lack of strategic resources. There is a power imbalance when one of the parties in the exchange lacks the resources to protect against becoming dependent. In organizations, power differentials between core workers and the corporate management would not be so extreme. Core workers do possess valued resources in terms of technical skills, high education levels, career background, length of service, company training, and union protection. Peripherals may
possess some of these resources, but not to the same extent as core workers. In higher education, in comparison to the temporaries, core faculty possess a very valuable resource—tenure. Overall, as compared to the core faculty, peripherals may perceive themselves as having fewer of the resources needed in the exchange relationship with the university. Considering differences in the possession of strategic resources, the following hypotheses are specifically formulated:

H10: Core faculty will rate themselves as being more competent than they rate peripheral faculty.

H11: Core faculty will report higher educational levels than will peripheral faculty.

For this analysis, competence is equated with ability, being well-qualified for the position as to skill or knowledge.

(2) The absence of equally preferable alternatives. The lack of equally preferable alternatives will make an employee dependent on his employer (Blau, 1964). Due to stable work histories and the possession of strategic resources, core workers would likely feel there were a variety of alternatives open to them in the economic arena. Part-time workers know that they can be easily replaced.
Peripherals may feel they are stuck with what comes along, hence making them highly dependent on the core in order to keep their present temporary jobs, get good referrals for future work or be considered for full-time employment with the same company. The absence of equally preferable alternatives generates the following hypotheses.

H12: Core faculty will rate themselves as having a wider variety of alternatives available to them within the institution than they rate peripheral faculty.

H13: Peripheral faculty will rate themselves as having less demand for their job skills/services in the larger economy than they rate core faculty.

(3) The inability to use coercive force. Blau (1964:120) states that the inability to use coercive force may be due in part "to weakness or to normative restraints that effectively prohibit resort to coercion." One source of weakness lies in the fact that peripheral workers are not likely to be unionized. Historically, union membership has been quite low in the service sector, the segment of our economy now employing by far the highest number of part-time workers. Some have suggested that companies actually use contingent workers to undermine unions (Levitan and Conway, 1988; Tilly, 1991). In academics, the National Labor Relations Board has previously stated that part-time and full-time faculty "do not share a community of
interest, ... and therefore should not be included in the same bargaining unit" (Biles and Tuckman, 1986:115). Most part-time faculty have no union affiliation.

With regard to normative restraints, the core is more likely to be comprised of well-educated, white males. The periphery will be composed of much higher numbers of black and Hispanic men and women who "have historically experienced much higher rates of involuntary part-time employment than whites" (Levitan and Conway, 1988:12). These groups are recognized by law as being socially disadvantaged in many respects including having less power and being subject to more social control than those in the majority. Society, in a variety of subtle and not so subtle ways, encourages these groups to stay in their proper place. The inability to use coercive force due to weakness or normative restraints suggests that:

H14: Peripheral faculty will be less likely to belong to a union than will core faculty.

H15: Core faculty will perceive their work as having greater autonomy than will peripheral faculty.

(4) The high need for the services provided. Blau concludes that a strong need for the services provided (in this case, basic employment) is the fourth condition which magnifies power differences in exchange relationships. To do without basic
employment, workers would need to make a fundamental value change. For example, they would have to resign themselves to unemployment or consider self-employment. While some workers may possess the resources and determination to make this major life change, most do not. Since it does not seem reasonable that either core or peripheral workers would be willing to completely abandon the employment relationship, no hypotheses are developed to represent this factor.

A natural extension of Blau's discussion of exchange relations leads to the idea of equity/inequity. As outlined by Adams (1965:276), a distinguishing characteristic of the basic exchange process is that "whenever two individuals exchange anything, there is the possibility that one or both of them will feel that the exchange was inequitable." But as noted by Mowday (1987:92), "inequity is a relative phenomenon." Inequity exists based on an individual's perception that his ratio of outcomes to inputs is unequal to a comparison other's ratio of outcomes to inputs. The "other" can be the person with whom he is in a direct exchange relationship or any other individual with whom he compares himself when the exchange relationship involves a third party, such as an employer (Adams, 1965). In the case of core and peripheral workers within organizations, the exchange relationship is inherently unequal. Just as Wallerstein describes the relationship between the core and periphery in the world economy as exploitative, and characterized by domination, dependence and inequality; so it is within organizations and
institutions. The following four hypotheses are developed to explore the exchange relations which may exist between core and peripheral faculty.

H16: As compared to other core faculty members, individual cores will perceive that they are equally benefited.

H17: As compared to the peripheral faculty, the core faculty will perceive that they are over benefited.

H18: As compared to other peripheral faculty members, individual peripherals will perceive that they are equally benefited.

H19: As compared to the core faculty, the peripheral faculty will perceive that they are under benefited.

Interaction Patterns

"Interaction patterns are the third feature distinguishing cores from peripheries" (Wellhofer, 1988:284). As previously noted by Wellhofer (1988:284) "the periphery is dependent on the core for decision-making, having "little control over its fate."

The periphery lacks opportunity and depends on the core's approval for action. The core is at the hub for communications and information dissemination.

The lack of opportunity for temporary workers and the feeling of having little control over their own fate has already been well documented. Polivka and Nardone (1989:10) have stated that "probably the most salient characteristic of
contingent work is the low degree of job security." Peripherals are usually hired as needed. "Once the work is completed, however, the employment relationship is severed" (Polivka and Nardone, 1989:10). In academics, most part-time contracts specifically state that adjunct assignments carry no obligation for renewal from term to term.

Just as core countries occupy central positions in the world-economy, so too can core workers be expected to dominate within organizations. Kennedy (1993:11) suggests that in organizations employing a mix of permanent and part-time workers two distinct grapevines operate. Each group of workers gets "their gossip strictly from their own kind, because their agendas are so different." Core workers are concerned with promotions, benefit packages and stock options. Peripherals "care only about issues that directly affect status and pay," because politically they are not considered as players (Kennedy, 1993:11). Hypotheses to be tested are:

H20: Interaction between core and peripheral faculty will be limited.

H20a: Core faculty will interact less regularly with peripheral faculty members than they do with other core faculty.

H20b: Peripheral faculty will interact less regularly with core faculty members than they do with other peripheral faculty.

H21: Peripheral faculty will feel more isolated within the institution than will core faculty.
Throughout this discussion and development of hypotheses, the core and periphery have been treated as distinct groups with role expectations and the potential for conflict inherent in their respective positions within the organizational social structure. However, per Dahrendorf's (1959) analysis, it is only true interest groups, who recognize and share common modes of behavior, thereby meeting the definition of groups in the strict sociological sense, who are the real agents of group conflict. This perspective agrees with the approach of World-System Theory as to structure and dynamics. It may be found, however, that peripherals do not see themselves as a group per se. That is, they do not interact regularly, even via agents, do not possess a recognized structure nor do they see themselves as united by common, potentially permanent characteristics. Dahrendorf (1959:180) states that "just as all doctors, or all inhabitants of Berlin, do not as such constitute social groups, the occupants of positions with identical latent [role] interests are not a group." These latent role interests are simply predetermined for the role occupant for the duration of incumbency in the role but "are independent of his conscious orientations" (Dahrendorf, 1959:178). In this case and perhaps in the case of the peripheral workers, it may be found that the incumbents of positions with similar role interests are at best a potential group—what Dahrendorf terms a quasi-group. From an organizational standpoint, this means that core-periphery conflict is not inevitable.
Summary

Core and periphery analysis has been used traditionally "to account for within-nation as well as global differences in levels of economic and political development" (Wellhofer, 1988:281). But models of core-periphery dynamics may be useful for examining the attributes, nature of exchanges and interaction patterns between core and periphery segments of the work force as well. In his study of the capitalist world-economy, Wallerstein (1983:18) notes that historical capitalism is that social system in which those who have operated by its rules can "create conditions wherein the others have been forced to conform to the patterns or suffer the consequences." In organizations and institutions alike, the core defines the rules of the game. The concerns of the full-time workers parallel those of the corporate management with slightly different twists based on their own interests. Both groups remain ambivalent toward the role of peripherals who are expected to simply appear when needed, follow orders, and do their jobs without complaint. As stable jobs in the United States continue to disappear, workers are being forced to adjust to a changing economic order. British consultant, Charles Handy (1994:36) likens the new organizational arrangement to an apartment block rather than a home, where temporary residents gather for mutual convenience. Corporations will still conduct business but "to do so they will no longer need to employ."

Chapter 4 now addresses the methodology applied in this study.
CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the data collection methods used in this study including a review of the population and sample selected, a description of the survey instrument, and a discussion of variable operationalization. A brief summary of the statistical methods employed in this research and an overview of the sample's descriptive characteristics are also included.

Data Collection

The sample used for this study was selected from a population that included all faculty members employed at Iowa State University during the Fall of 1995. Iowa State University is a mid-sized, Midwestern University located in Ames, Iowa. It is a broad-based university offering more than 120 majors and pre-professional programs to over 26,000 students. Because it was not possible for the researcher to access university payroll records due to cost and employee privacy concerns, the 1994-95 Iowa State University telephone directory provided the sampling frame. A manual count using this list identified a population of 1886 faculty members. Using a random start, a stratified sample was systematically selected (every $k^{th}$ element) which contained 443 tenure track faculty (core) and 268 non-tenure track (peripheral) faculty. Stratification of the faculty members into core and
Peripheral groups was determined based on job title. Core faculty members held the rank of distinguished, full, assistant and associate professors. Peripheral faculty job titles included lecturer, instructor, adjunct, and any identification prefaced by the word "temporary." In selecting the sample, some individuals were excluded. Deans and high ranking administrators were excluded because it was felt these individuals would not necessarily have the same day-to-day experiences or share the same basic concerns as other faculty members who occupied non-administrative positions. Also excluded were the researcher’s own graduate committee members.

The research instrument was printed on standard 8 1/2 x 11 white paper with an attached cover letter on university department letterhead, which explained the general goals and purpose of the study. Respondents were assured that their individual responses would be completely confidential. Identification numbers were used only for follow-up purposes and participation in the study was voluntary.

The questionnaire itself contained two sections. The first section asked respondents to rate the extent to which a given list of words or phrases described their working situation. Questions in this section asked subjects to rate not only the extent to which terms such as "boring", "challenging", or "fun" described their own work, but also the extent to which listed traits such as "hard working" or "confident" described the characteristics of both the core (tenure track) and peripheral (non-tenure track) faculty. The list of traits presented on the questionnaire were
compiled by the researcher during the general review of the literature. A British study by Rathkey (1990) on time management and work preferences was especially helpful at the beginning of this process. Furthermore, each respondent was asked a series of questions about their opportunity for interaction with other faculty members and their feelings concerning the availability of information at Iowa State. Also included in section one was a question designed to explore perceived equity or inequity, as concerns the work situation, between the tenure track and non-tenure track faculty.

The second section of the survey was constructed to gather a variety of basic demographic information such as age, sex, and marital status. Open ended questions in both sections provided respondents an opportunity to elaborate on their answers in several areas. The questionnaire had been previously approved by the Iowa State University Human Subjects Review Committee and pretested on a small group of representative subjects. A copy of the questionnaire and accompanying cover letter are contained in the Appendix.

A total of 711 questionnaires were printed and mailed using the intra-campus mail system on October 23, 1995. Respondents were instructed to return completed questionnaires via the campus mail. The back cover of the survey was pre-addressed to the researcher in care of the Department of Sociology at Iowa State University. Three follow-ups were subsequently mailed. According to
Dillman, Christenson, Carpenter, and Brooks (1974) the importance of intensive follow-ups to increase mail questionnaire response cannot be overstated.

Following the Dillman model, the first follow up letter was mailed to 525 faculty members on November 2. On November 18, 1995, a second follow-up letter and replacement questionnaire was mailed to 441 subjects. The last follow-up letter was sent on December 11 to the remaining 324 sample members who had not yet responded to the questionnaire. Table 4.1 shows the cumulative response rates to the four mailings used in this study. Copies of all follow-up material is contained in the Appendix.

The sampling procedure was a major limitation of this study and its affect was felt in the return rates. Since it was not possible to use current university personnel records, the telephone directory provided a convenient sampling frame from which

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mailing</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Core n = 443</th>
<th>Periphery n = 268</th>
<th>Total n = 711</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. First mailing</td>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. First letter follow-up</td>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Replacement questionnaire</td>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Second letter follow-up</td>
<td>Week 8</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to select respondents. But because the directory was not completely up-to-date, a high percentage of surveys were returned indicating that the respondent had either left the university, was on leave, or had retired. This problem was especially evident in the peripheral subset where over 25% of the questionnaires sent, were returned for this reason. The directory listing themselves, also proved to be problematic. That is, some of the respondents identified as being in the core population subset answered as peripheral faculty and vice versa. Sixteen individuals, almost 6%, out of 268 identified as peripheral faculty according to their directory listing, returned their questionnaires indicating they were tenure track faculty members. Only 9 individuals, just 2%, out of 443 identified as core faculty according to their directory listing, returned their questionnaires as non-tenure track faculty members. Another 23 respondents returned their questionnaires but indicated that they refused to participate in the study for a variety of reasons ranging from confidentially concerns to lack of time and or interest. The remaining surveys were not returned. Taking into consideration these anomalies, the overall response rate from core faculty members was found to be 51.4%. The response rate from peripheral faculty was 48.4%. Table 4.2 indicates how these revised response rates were calculated.
Table 4.2 Calculation of revised response rates per subgroup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Periphery</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original number of respondents identified in each subcategory</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned as left university/retired/ or on leave</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>-69</td>
<td>-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent as core, returned as periphery</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>+09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent as periphery, returned as core</td>
<td>+16</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted number of respondents</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed/usable questionnaires</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised return rate</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operational Measures

For the most part, the variables in this study were measured by single items. As discussed previously, variables were established based on the review of the literature. The initial concepts of core and peripheral faculty were operationalized by the respondent’s self identification as seen in section two of the questionnaire.

Questions in the first section of the survey instrument asked about various aspects of the respondent’s everyday working experience. The concepts of Stress
Autonomy (H15) and Isolation (H21) were operationalized by using the ratings for the corresponding words in question 1, page one. Question number 1 asked, "To what extent do each of the words listed below describe YOUR work?" A five point Likert-type scale was used to rate twenty-one items. Values on the scale were specified as: NOT AT ALL = 1, TO SOME EXTENT = 3, and TO A GREAT EXTENT = 5. An open ended question also gave respondents the opportunity to add any other words that they felt would describe their work.

The concepts of Assertive (H1), Hard working (H2), Has opportunity for challenging work (H4), Committed to the university (H5), Has leadership ability (H6), Dependable (H7), Enjoys a sense of well being (H8), Competent/well qualified for position (H10), Alternative jobs are available within the university (H12), and Job skills/services are needed in the larger economy (H13) were operationalized by using the ratings for the corresponding words in question 2, pages two and three of the questionnaire, which continued to ask respondents about their working situation. Specifically, question 2 asked, "To what extent do each of the traits listed below describe the characteristics of the tenure track and non-tenure track faculty at Iowa State University?" Respondents were asked to rate both categories of ISU personnel. The same 5 point scale as described above was used consistently to rate twenty-nine items.

The concept of Professionalism (H3) was operationalized by combining four items found on pages two and three of the questionnaire. Professionalism was
believed to be exhibited in both attitude and appearance. Four items (highly involved with the job, displays a professional attitude, has a professional appearance, and maintains high personal standards for performance) were combined to measure professionalism. The standardized Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were 0.81 for tenure track faculty and 0.78 for non-tenure track faculty. Cronbach’s alpha is used to determine the internal consistency or stability of the items and is reported to be a conservative measure of reliability (Carmines and Zeller, 1970).

The concept of Belonging to a union (H14) was operationalized using the responses to question 9 found on page four of the questionnaire. The question simply asked, “Are you presently a member of a union?” If the question was answered as, “Yes,” space was also provided for the respondent to state the name of the union.

The concept of Interaction regularity (H20a and H20b) was operationalized using responses given to questions 4 and 5 found on page four of the questionnaire. Question number 4 asked, “To what extent do you actually interact regularly with the non-tenure track faculty?” Question number 5 asked, “To what extent do you actually interact regularly with the tenure track faculty?” For both of these questions respondents were to continue using scale values specified as: NOT AT ALL = 1, TO SOME EXTENT = 3, and TO A GREAT EXTENT = 5.
Question 10, on page five of the questionnaire, was used to operationalize Equity/inequity (H16, H17) as perceived by tenure track faculty. The question specifically stated, "Tenure track faculty members, please consider what YOU put into and get out of your working relationship at Iowa State University. AS COMPARED TO OTHER FACULTY MEMBERS, how would you evaluate your work situation?" Respondents answered based on the 7 point scale shown below:

As compared to other tenure track faculty: __________
1. They are getting a much better deal than I am.
2. They are getting a somewhat better deal than I am.
3. They are getting a slightly better deal than I am.
4. We are all getting an equal deal.
5. I am getting a slightly better deal than they are.
6. I am getting a somewhat better deal than they are.
7. I am getting a much better deal than they are.

As compared to the non-tenure track faculty: __________
1. They are getting a much better deal than I am.
2. They are getting a somewhat better deal than I am.
3. They are getting a slightly better deal than I am.
4. We are all getting an equal deal.
5. I am getting a slightly better deal than they are.
6. I am getting a somewhat better deal than they are.
7. I am getting a much better deal than they are.

This seven point scale was adapted from the Hatfield (1978) Global Measure of Equity-Inequity. Equity researchers developed this scale to measure men and
women's general impressions about the perceived fairness in relationships
(Hatfield, Utne, and Traupmann, 1979).

Question 11, on page six of the questionnaire, was used to operationalize
Equity/inequity (H18, H19) as perceived by non-tenure track faculty. The question
specifically stated, "Non-tenure track faculty members, please consider what YOU
put into and get out of your working relationship at Iowa State University. AS
COMPLETED TO OTHER FACULTY MEMBERS, how would you evaluate your work
situation?" Respondents answered based on the 7 point scale shown below:

As compared to other non-tenure track faculty: __________

1. They are getting a much better deal than I am.
2. They are getting a somewhat better deal than I am.
3. They are getting a slightly better deal than I am.
4. We are all getting an equal deal.
5. I am getting a slightly better deal than they are.
6. I am getting a somewhat better deal than they are.
7. I am getting a much better deal than they are.

As compared to the tenure track faculty: __________

1. They are getting a much better deal than I am.
2. They are getting a somewhat better deal than I am.
3. They are getting a slightly better deal than I am.
4. We are all getting an equal deal.
5. I am getting a slightly better deal than they are.
6. I am getting a somewhat better deal than they are.
7. I am getting a much better deal than they are.
This seven point scale was adapted from the Hatfield (1978) Global Measure of Equity-Inequity previously described.

Educational level (H11) was measured by a question in the second section of the survey instrument which asked respondents to indicate their "HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED." Five response categories were provided: with 1 = High School, 2 = Associate or Trade, 3 = Bachelor's (B.A., B. S.), 4 = Master's (M.A., M.S., M.B.A.), and 5 = Doctorate (Ph. D., Ed. D., D.V.M.).

Summary of Statistical Methods

"The use of a t-test is appropriate to examine whether or not there is a significant difference in the mean for two groups, with regards to a quantitative (or continuous) dependent variable" (Sekaran, 1984:235). In this study, three types of t-tests were used to analyze the data. One tailed test significance was reported for all hypotheses except H16 thru H19 because all other hypotheses were directional. For H16 thru H19, which predict no difference from a specified test value, two tailed test significance was reported.

Paired samples t-tests were used to test hypotheses H1 thru H8, H10, H12, and H13. "This procedures tests the null hypothesis that your data are from a sample in which the means of two variables are equal. The two variables may result, for example, from an experiment in which the same person is observed before and after an intervention" (SPSS, 1996). For these hypotheses only one group was
tested, either the tenure track or the non-tenure track faculty. Within the selected group, t-tests were performed to compare means on the responses provided.

Independent samples t-tests were used to test hypotheses H9, H11, H14, H15, H20a, 20b, and H21. "This procedure tests the null hypothesis that your data are a sample from a population in which the mean of a test variable is equal in two independent groups of cases. It is restricted to a comparison of two groups" (SPSS, 1996). For these hypotheses, comparison of means were made for responses between the tenure track and non-tenure track faculty.

One sample t-tests were used to test hypotheses H16 thru H19. "This procedure tests the null hypothesis that your data are a sample from a population in which the mean of a variable has a specific value" (SPSS, 1996). These hypotheses were developed to investigate the degree of equity or inequity perceived to exist in exchange relationships. The specific value against which means were tested for both the tenure track and non-tenure track faculty was 4, indicating respondents felt they were getting "an equal deal" as compared to others.

Sample Characteristics

Some basic demographic differences between the subsets of core and peripheral faculty are described in this section. Peripheral faculty respondents were almost evenly split as to sex; 49.4% (n = 46) of the responses were received from men, while 50.5% (n = 47) were received from women. Among core faculty
members, a much higher proportion of men 73.9% (n = 162) than women 25.1% (n = 55) responded to the survey. Two core faculty members did not report their sex. The average age reported by the subgroups was 43 years for the peripheral faculty and almost 49 1/2 for core faculty. This sample was, of course highly educated. Of 219 responding tenure track faculty members, over 89% (n = 194) reported that they had earned a Doctorate degree; 10.6% (n = 23) had a Master’s degree. Two individuals did not provide an answer to this question. For those 93 respondents identified as non-tenure track faculty, almost 41% (n = 38) possessed a Doctorate, 50.5% (n = 47) had their Master’s degree, and another 8.6% (n = 8) had completed their Bachelor’s degree. According to job title, 39% (n = 85) of the core faculty were professors, 33% (n = 73) were associate professors, and 17% (n = 38) were assistant professors. Four individuals listed themselves as instructors and twelve individuals gave no answer to this question. The remaining seven respondents who answered as tenure track faculty listed a variety of job titles such as extension economist, instruction coordinator, and reference specialist. Among peripheral faculty, the majority, 47% (n = 44) listed themselves as instructors, temporary instructors, or adjunct instructors. Another 34% (n =32) listed themselves as adjunct associate or assistant professors, affiliate associate or assistant professors, or temporary associate or assistant professors. Five individuals gave no answer to this question. The remaining twelve respondents who answered as non-tenure
track faculty listed a variety of job titles such as advising coordinator, associate
director, and gallery assistant.

Chapter five now presents the results of the hypothesis testing. These findings
are further discussed in Chapter 6.
Chapter 4 discussed the methods used and operationalization of variables for this study. This chapter will present the results of the statistical analysis used to test the hypotheses presented in Chapter 3. For the most part, hypotheses were tested using either within group, paired samples or between groups, independent samples t-tests. Tables 5.1 and 5.2 present a summary of the hypothesis testing results using these two types of t-tests.

The first seven hypothesis in this study are linked to the assumption that individuals hold expectations of others based on status. It was theorized that workers who hold full-time, core positions within organizations will rate themselves higher, on a variety of characteristics, than they rate those who occupy peripheral positions. This series of hypotheses asked tenure track faculty to rate both themselves and non-tenured faculty members concerning the extent to which a given list of attributes described the characteristics of each group. Hypotheses were tested using within group, paired samples t-tests. Specifically these hypotheses state:

H1: Core faculty will rate themselves as being more assertive than they rate peripheral faculty.
Table 5.1 Results of hypothesis testing using paired samples t-tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypo</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Core Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Peripheral Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hypo</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S. Dev.</td>
<td>Hypo</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S. Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Non-tenured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>assertive</td>
<td>3.929</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td>3.082</td>
<td>3.841</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>3.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>hard working</td>
<td>4.169</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>4.164</td>
<td>3.643</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td>2.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>professional</td>
<td>3.879</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>3.766</td>
<td>3.961</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>3.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>challenging</td>
<td>4.341</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>3.519</td>
<td>3.790</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>3.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>committed</td>
<td>3.733</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>3.322</td>
<td>3.790</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>3.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>leadership</td>
<td>3.322</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>3.790</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>3.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>dependable</td>
<td>3.841</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>3.907</td>
<td>3.790</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>3.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>well being</td>
<td>3.643</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td>2.989</td>
<td>3.790</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>3.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td>competent</td>
<td>3.961</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>3.674</td>
<td>3.790</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>3.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12</td>
<td>available alts</td>
<td>2.103</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>2.414</td>
<td>3.790</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>3.296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: a t-value opposite the predicted direction
Table 5.2 Results of hypothesis testing using independent samples t-tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypo</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Peripheral Faculty</th>
<th>Core Faculty</th>
<th>t values</th>
<th>1-tail sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 93</td>
<td>n = 219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9:</td>
<td>stress</td>
<td>3.215 1.051</td>
<td>3.830 .985</td>
<td>(-4.94)A</td>
<td>(.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11:</td>
<td>ed levels</td>
<td>4.323 .628</td>
<td>4.889 .314</td>
<td>-8.27</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H15:</td>
<td>autonomy</td>
<td>3.604 1.191</td>
<td>3.654 1.026</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H20a</td>
<td>interact peri</td>
<td>3.581 1.126</td>
<td>3.287 1.265</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H20b</td>
<td>interact core</td>
<td>3.312 1.207</td>
<td>3.968 .967</td>
<td>-4.65</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H21:</td>
<td>isolating</td>
<td>2.323 1.134</td>
<td>2.545 1.126</td>
<td>(-1.58)A</td>
<td>(.057)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: a t-value opposite the predicted direction

This hypothesis was supported by the data. Tenure track faculty did rate themselves higher (mean = 3.929) than they rated the non-tenure track faculty (mean = 3.082). The means were significantly different (t = 11.16, p = .000).

H2: Core faculty will rate themselves as more hard working than they rate peripheral faculty.

This hypothesis was not supported by the data. Tenure track faculty did rate themselves higher (mean = 4.169) than they rated non-tenure track faculty (mean = 4.164) but the means were not significantly different (t = .08, p = .467).
H3: Core faculty will rate themselves as being more professional than they rate peripheral faculty.

This hypothesis was supported by the data. Tenure track faculty did rate themselves higher (mean = 3.879) than they rated non-tenure track faculty (mean = 3.766). The means were significantly different (t = 2.92, p = .002).

H4: Core faculty will rate themselves as having more opportunity for challenging work than they rate peripheral faculty.

This hypothesis was supported. Tenure track faculty did rate themselves higher (mean = 4.341) than they rated non-tenure track faculty (mean = 3.519). The means were significantly different (t = 10.29, p = .000).

H5: Core faculty will rate themselves higher as concerns organizational commitment than they rate peripheral faculty.

This hypothesis was supported. Tenure track faculty did rate themselves higher (mean = 3.790) than they rated non-tenure track faculty (mean = 3.296). The means were significantly different (t = 6.68, p = .000).

H6: Core faculty will rate themselves higher on leadership ability than they rate peripheral faculty.
This hypothesis was supported. Tenure track faculty did rate themselves higher (mean = 3.733) than they rated non-tenure track faculty (mean = 3.322). The means were significantly different (t = 7.11, p = .000).

H7: Core faculty will rate themselves as being more dependable than they rate peripheral faculty.

This hypothesis was not supported by the data. Contrary to prediction, tenure track faculty members rated themselves (mean = 3.841) as being less dependable than non-tenure track faculty members (mean = 3.907).

The finding of the first seven hypotheses support the premise that the occupancy of given social positions ascribes to individuals certain role expectations (Dahrendorf, 1959). The classification of faculty as either tenure track or non-tenure track did produce the same type of stereotypical expectations that had been suggested by previous literature and research.

Hypotheses 8 and 9 were designed to examine the general nature of exchange relationships which distinguish cores from peripheries. The first hypotheses addressed perceived differences in overall well being. Because core faculty members enjoy job security and higher wages, it was felt they would express higher levels of well being than peripherals. Hypothesis number nine examined the difference in levels of stress experienced by the two subgroups defined in this
study. It was anticipated that due to high levels of uncertainty caused by the circumstances of their positions within the organization, peripherals would report significantly more job related stress than core faculty members. Specifically these hypotheses state:

H8: Core faculty will rate themselves as enjoying a greater sense of well being than they rate peripheral faculty.

This hypothesis was tested using a within group, paired samples t-test and was supported by the data. Tenure track faculty did rate themselves higher (mean = 3.643) than they rated non-tenure track faculty (mean = 2.989). The means were significantly different (t = 7.84, p = .000).

H9: Peripheral faculty will perceive higher levels of job related stress than will core faculty.

This hypothesis was tested using a between groups, independent samples t-test. It was not supported by the data and was not in the predicted direction. Contrary to predictions, tenure track faculty members reported higher levels of stress (mean = 3.830) than non-tenure track faculty members (mean = 3.215). Although not expected, these results warrant further discussion because the difference in means reported was not ignorable. The higher stress levels reported by tenure track faculty seem to be related to factors such as the tenure track
process, perceived uncertainty depending on which department they are associated with, and the generally high pressure environment in which they work. In their written comments, one respondent stated that the, "job is highly demanding and stressful," adding, their "divorce was partly due to the job." Another full-time faculty member lamented, "faculty cutbacks have resulted in the loss of scholarship and development time. When I started, faculty depth was excellent. Over the years as cutbacks took place, the workload remained the same. It's no wonder I have an ulcer and drink so much!"

Hypotheses numbers 10 through 15 further examined the nature of exchange relations between core and peripheries by focusing on the factors which according to Blau (1964) tend to magnify power differences in exchange relationships. The first two hypotheses in this series were intended to examine the differences perceived as concerns the possession of strategic resources, such as high technical skills, between core and peripheral faculty members.

**H10:** Core faculty will rate themselves as being more competent than they rate peripheral faculty.

This hypothesis was tested using a within group, paired samples t-test and was supported by the data. Tenure track faculty did rate themselves higher
(mean = 3.961) than they rated non-tenure track faculty (mean = 3.674). The means were significantly different (t = 4.64, p = .000).

H11: Core faculty will report higher educational levels than will peripheral faculty.

This hypothesis was also supported using a between groups, independent samples t-test. Means of 4.889 for tenure track faculty and 4.323 for non-tenure track faculty were significantly different (t = -8.27, p = .000). No core faculty member in this sample had less than a master’s degree. Most, over 89%, held doctorates. By contrast, only about 41% of peripheral faculty held doctoral degrees and a small percentage, 8.6%, of peripheral faculty members had only completed their bachelor’s degree.

The next two hypotheses concerned the absence of equally preferable alternatives available to faculty members. Both were tested using within group, paired samples t-tests. Specifically hypothesis 12 states:

H12: Core faculty will rate themselves as having a wider variety of alternatives available to them within the institution than they rate peripheral faculty.

This hypothesis was not supported by the data. The tenure track faculty rated themselves as having fewer alternatives (mean = 2.103) within the institution than
they rated non-tenure track faculty faculty (mean = 2.414). It was presumed that
tenure track faculty would feel that there were more alternatives open to them due
to stable work histories and the possession of strategic resources such as high
education levels and noteworthy career backgrounds. However, since core faculty
members are indelibly bound to their respective departments due to the very nature
of their tenure track positions, they apparently feel there are fewer alternatives
available to them than to peripheral faculty within the university system.

H13: Peripheral faculty will rate themselves as having less demand for their
job skills/services in the larger economy than they rate core faculty

This hypothesis, like hypothesis 12, was not supported by the data. Non-tenure
track faculty rated themselves higher on this dimension (mean = 3.595) than they
rated the tenure track faculty (mean = 3.127). The data from these two hypotheses
suggests that members of both groups studied see peripheral faculty members as
having more opportunities, not only within the university system but also in the
larger economy.

The inability to use coercive force and being subject to more social control were
also cited by Blau (1964) as factors which may tend to affect core-periphery
relationships. Hypotheses 14 and 15 addressed these issues.
H14: Peripheral faculty will be less likely to belong to a union than will core faculty.

This hypothesis was not tested due to a lack of data. Of the 311 respondents who answered this question, only two tenure track faculty and five members of the non-tenure track faculty responded that they belonged to a union.

H15: Core faculty will perceive their work as having greater autonomy than will peripheral faculty.

This hypothesis was tested using a between groups, independent samples t-test and was not supported by the data. Means of 3.654 for the tenure track faculty and 3.604 for the non-tenure track faculty were in the predicted direction but were not significantly different (t = -0.37, p = .356). The two groups apparently did not perceive a difference in the amount of autonomy they were granted.

Hypotheses 16 through 19 sought to explore the relationship between core and peripheral workers in terms of how equitable they felt their working situation was as compared to the other group. All hypotheses were tested using one-sample t-tests. The specific value against which means were tested was 4, which corresponded to the questionnaire response, “We are all getting an equal deal.” The results of these four hypotheses are summarized in Table 5.3.
Table 5.3 Results of hypothesis testing using one sample t-tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypo Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Test Val.</th>
<th>S. Dev</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>1-tail sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H16: Core rel w/core</td>
<td>3.424</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.485</td>
<td>-5.55</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H17: Core rel w/peri</td>
<td>5.497</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.455</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H18: Peri rel w/peri</td>
<td>3.844</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.406</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H19: Peri rel w/core</td>
<td>1.854</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.345</td>
<td>-15.06</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: ^ 2-tail significance

H16: As compared to other core faculty members, individual cores will perceive that they are equally benefited.

Hypotheses number 16 was not supported by the data. As they compared themselves to members of their own group, tenure track faculty members reported that they were not equally benefited. Moreover, they felt less benefited as compared to their fellows. The mean reported by the tenure track faculty of 3.424 differed significantly (t = -5.55, p = .000) as compared to the specified test value of 4. Because the hypothesis predicted no difference from the test value this hypothesis was rejected.

The written comments provided by this group provide some insight into why these individuals seem to feel that others are getting a better deal than themselves. Differences in salary were mentioned. One respondent commented. "In terms of
salary other tenure track faculty get a much better deal than I am.” But this same subject also added, “In terms of other aspects of the position we all get an equal deal.” Others noted the differences between the emphasis on teaching versus the emphasis on research within the university system. One commented, “ISU does not value those faculty who place teaching at their highest priority. Research is overemphasized.” In a similar vein, another added, “ISU cares more about research success (especially grant money) than teaching success.” A third reason why individual cores may see themselves as not being treated equitably, as compared to their colleagues, seemed to relate to the department they were in. A statement which reflected this sentiment read, “Depends on your college and DEO. We are not treated equitably.”

H17: As compared to the peripheral faculty, the core faculty will perceive that they are over benefited.

Hypothesis number 17 was supported by the data. As compared to the non-tenure faculty, tenure track faculty did rate themselves as getting a better deal (mean = 5.497). There was a significant difference (t = -13.84, p = .000) as compared to the test value of 4. Core faculty members do tend to see themselves as over benefited as compared to peripherals. One tenure track respondent commented, “I used to be one—they are treated very poorly and do more work than tenure track.”
H18: As compared to other peripheral faculty members, individual peripherals will perceive that they are equally benefited.

This hypothesis was supported. Non-tenure track faculty reported that other non-tenure track faculty were getting about an equal deal as compared to themselves (mean = 3.844). Again the mean was compared to a standard value of 4 but in this case the difference was not significant (t = -1.05, p = .297). Since the hypothesis predicted no difference from the test value and since the mean reported was not significantly different from 4, the hypothesis is accepted.

H19: As compared to the core faculty, the peripheral faculty will perceive they are underbenefited.

As expected, as compared to the tenure track faculty, the non-tenure track faculty felt that the tenure track faculty was getting a better deal than themselves. Compared to the test value of 4, the reported mean of 1.854 showed a significant difference (t = -15.06, p = .000). Peripheral faculty members do see themselves as underbenefited as compared to the core faculty.

Negative comments received concerning the status of non-tenure track faculty at Iowa State were quite pointed. For example, one person wrote, “the temporary instructor roles use up human resources and leave competent people without a future.” Another stated, “I am in my 4th year, carrying crucial responsibilities, continuously told I will become tenure track, but no sign of this—I feel screwed +
used + lied to. I am a work horse. This characterizes how my department treats non-tenured faculty--wrings us dry (incredible overwork), makes promises, then nothing." Several individuals commented on the pay inequities. For example, "There is something wrong when the take home pay of a Ph.D. is less than that of a QuikTrip manager. Granted our work situation and benefits are better, but we are still way underpaid (and under appreciated)."

The final set of hypotheses for this study addressed the interaction patterns that distinguish cores from peripheries. These hypotheses were tested using between groups, independent samples t-tests. The first hypotheses in this series specifically state:

**H20**: Interaction between core and peripheral faculty will be limited.

**H20a**: Core faculty will interact less regularly with peripheral faculty members than they do with other core faculty.

**H20b**: Peripheral faculty will interact less regularly with core faculty members than they do with other peripheral faculty.

Hypothesis 20a was supported by the data. Tenure track faculty members reported less interaction (mean = 3.287) with non-tenure track faculty than was reported by non-tenure track faculty (mean = 3.581). The difference in means was significant \( t = 1.93, p = .027 \). Several tenure track faculty members commented
that they didn’t even know any non-tenure track faculty. Others added that since their department didn’t hire any; it was not an issue.

When asked about interaction with the tenure track faculty, (H20b), the data also support the hypothesis. In this case, non-tenure track faculty members reported less interaction (mean = 3.312) with tenure track faculty than was reported by tenure track faculty (mean = 3.968). This difference was again significant (t = -4.65, p = .000). In general, these finding are supported by the old adage concerning “birds of a feather.” Each subgroup studied tended to interact with their own counterparts more regularly than with members of the other faculty group.

H21: Peripheral faculty will feel more isolated within the institution than will core faculty.

The final hypothesis was not supported by the data. Surprisingly, the tenure track faculty appear to feel somewhat more isolated (mean = 2.545) than the non-tenure track faculty (mean = 2.323). A key to interpreting these results might be that core faculty feel they are simply too busy to really interact with anyone. In the written comments, this group often complained about too much time spent in committees and on bureaucratic busy work.

The findings presented in this chapter are discussed further in chapter 6.
Contemporary American society is a society in transition. Beth Rubin argues that our entire society, along with many other industrial nations, is undergoing a fundamental social change. We are “changing from a social world characterized by long-term, stable relationships to one characterized by short-term, temporary relationships” (Rubin, 1996:4). This upheaval results from changes in the economy and is probably felt most acutely in our working lives. The new watchword for this era seems to be “flexibility.” Not only are organizations supposed to be flexible to the demands of the volatile global environments in which they operate but also workers are required to be flexible to ever changing economic realities. Since the mid-1980’s, flexibility for corporations has frequently translated into burgeoning profits; but for employees, flexibility has meant the loss of many full-time, stable jobs in favor of part-time work and uncertain futures.

Summary of Findings

The purpose of this research was to explore the employment relationships and work expectations that exist between core and peripheral workers. Expectations were broadly defined as the sum of such things as attitudes, values, and beliefs held by individuals. Work expectations were reasoned to be based, to a great
extent, on the positions which workers occupy within organizational settings. Core workers would occupy stable, permanent, firm specific positions while peripheral workers were more likely to occupy part-time, temporary and unstable positions. Previous research by Humphrey (1985) and Eagly and Steffen (1984, 1986) supports the thesis that the type of work done influences our evaluation of both self and others. In this study, twenty-one hypotheses were proposed and tested, twelve of which were supported by the data, to investigate the expectations which exist between core and peripheral workers at a state university.

As predicted, it was found that tenure track faculty, members of the core, rated themselves higher on a variety of characteristics than they rated non-tenure track faculty, members of the periphery. Core faculty rated themselves as being more assertive, professional, and committed to the university. They also rated themselves higher as to leadership ability and the opportunity for challenging work. These are valued characteristics traditionally associated with the work ethic of employees in full-time positions. Because part-time work has historically been linked to subordinate and disadvantaged groups in society, attitudes and actions toward these workers maybe based on old stereotypes which surround the “marginal” worker (Morse, 1969). Therefore, individuals in part-time, peripheral positions are not expected to have these same strengths (Levitan and Conway, 1988). As this study suggests, no matter what their academic background, past experience or skill as teachers may be, peripheral faculty is still devalued.
There were many other dimensions which were rated on this questionnaire but for which specific hypotheses were not developed. Out of 29 individual items for which each respondent was asked to rate both groups of personnel, core faculty rated themselves higher on 18 characteristics. For instance, the tenure track faculty felt they were significantly more respected, thorough, confident, successful, ambitious, and competitive as compared to their non-tenure track counterparts.

On the other hand, core faculty saw no difference or rated themselves lower on several dimensions. Core faculty felt they were slightly more hard working than peripherals but the difference was not significant. Further, the tenure track faculty viewed themselves as less dependable and less task-oriented than the non-tenure track faculty. It may be that the core faculty really do see the peripherals as "work-horses" especially when it comes to teaching. The use of part-time faculty has risen as educational institutions attempt to control costs and maintain flexibility in staffing (Mydans, 1995). Due to their heavy teaching loads and hectic schedules, full-time faculty apparently do view the part-timers as both dependable and hard working. Although no hypotheses were developed, core faculty also felt they were less warm, less flexible, less enthusiastic, and less of a team player than peripherals. Written comments support these findings. When asked if they would recommend Iowa State University as a good place to work, several of the core faculty wrote:
"No, [due to] lack of warmth among colleagues."

"Perhaps, my department is not a very friendly place. There are many factions and lots of unpleasant e-mail notes sent publicly by other faculty members."

"No, it is a very "cold" environment. Arrogant and somewhat backward."

"The work has declined in interest and fun over the last 10 years. It has become more tedious and frustrating."

"I have invested a great deal of myself into the department and continue to be a team player. New tenure track faculty do not—they are too busy establishing their research agenda."

Not surprisingly, an examination of the ratings as done by members of the non-tenure track faculty produced some contradictory results. Again, there were no specific hypotheses developed for these dimensions. Peripheral faculty agreed that they were significantly less respected than the core faculty. They also perceived themselves as less confident and successful. By contrast, peripherals rated themselves as being more hard working, more involved, and more trustworthy than core faculty. They seemed to agree with the tenure track faculty as they rated themselves higher on the dimensions such as warm, flexible, enthusiastic, and being a team player.

Overall, as the two groups rated themselves and each other on these characteristics, there were some areas where they each rated themselves higher
and others where they seemed to agree that the listed traits applied more to one group than the other. As Dahrendorf (1959) emphasized, social positions are significant above all in determining role expectations.

Work as a temporary/part-time employee can be very stressful. In testimony before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Labor in 1993, a temporary employee stated, "I was constantly stressed out, worrying how I was going to pay my rent and eat. Sometimes I skipped meals when money was low" (U.S. Congress, 1993:3). Furthermore, shorter work schedules mean lower compensation which often translates into lower standards of living. Levitan and Conway (1988:6) contend that part-timers must make do with "living on half-ration.

The results from this study showed mixed results concerning how core and peripheral faculty viewed the stress of their working situation and their ability to enjoy a sense of well being. Tenure track faculty did indicate that they enjoyed a significantly higher level of well being than non-tenure track faculty. Although not specifically tested, the data from the non-tenure track faculty agreed in this assessment.

One of the most striking findings of this study involved the levels of stress reported by the two groups. Core faculty reported their jobs to be more stressful than was reported by peripherals. This finding was opposite to predictions and may be unique to the groups studied as most of the literature continues to emphasize that overall, part-time work is highly stressful for individuals due to low
pay, no benefits, and the highly unstable environment in which they must function (U.S. Congress, 1993; Kahne, 1993; Rubin, 1996). Nevertheless, the reasons given by the tenure track faculty at Iowa State for their high stress levels track precisely with previous studies which specifically address faculty stress, hence, these findings warrant further discussion.

Peter Seldin (1987:14) summarized the existing research literature of the 1980's and listed five reasons why high levels of job stress are reported by full-time faculty. Seldin's list of reasons and a few corresponding Iowa State University tenure track faculty comments are presented below:

Seldin: 1. “Requirements for promotion and tenure are so stringent today as to be unrealizable for many academics.”

ISU comment: “Tenure process is very stressful. It is not an imposed stress but due to the subjectivity of the process.”

ISU comment: “I sometimes feel that expectations for tenure track as well as tenured faculty are unreasonable. I think we should support family life as well as work life and to do this we need to place realistic and reasonable expectations on employees.”

Seldin: 2. “Academic retrenchment, jobless faculty, inflation, and the changing composition of student bodies are altering the academic environment.”

ISU comment: “The quality of students and their interest in receiving quality education has dropped radically in the last fifteen years.”
ISU comment: “Unfortunately, all faculty are being asked to do a lot more in teaching and research without increases in resources.”

Seldin: 3. “Professors are more aware of the wide discrepancy between their hopes and expectations and the actual rewards offered by their professions.”

ISU comment: “Administrators are more interested in forcing faculty to bring in money, the larger the amount the better, particularly if it pays overhead, rather than on the quality of our research, teaching, or advising students.”

ISU comment: “I do not feel valued as an employee here at ISU. I do have to say I feel “nickeled & dimed” here, which is difficult since I work very hard in every aspect of my work life. It is hard to do what I do without adequate supplies ... we even pay for research related phone calls.”

Seldin: 4. “Fewer job-change opportunities are available, and many faculty members see themselves as imprisoned in their jobs with little chance to ascend the academic ladder.”

ISU comment: “At this point I am not marketable to other institutions--I have termed this the “ISU Syndrome” where faculty are so isolated so that the only place to work is here. It would help greatly if teaching received the same level of recognition and importance as research.”

ISU comment: “I enjoy teaching and administration, so I continue to do both even though I’ll never be promoted to full professor rank. I’m looking forward to an early retirement.”
Seldin: 5. "Many full-time faculty perceive part-time faculty members, who are growing in numbers, as a potential job threat."

ISU comment: "I have hard working colleagues, but we are forced to rely too much on adjunct and part-time faculty."

It is been noted that the hiring of part-time faculty is usually seen to be at the expense of program quality (Gappa, 1984). Whereas, temporary instructors are usually hired on a semester to semester basis with no rights of renewal, adjunct faculty may contribute to full-time faculty stress in a slightly different manner. Abel (1984:114) identifies adjunct faculty as "members of the middle class" in the academic proletariat. They are neither as marginalized as the temporaries nor as secure as the full-time faculty. At Iowa State University, adjunct appointments are budgeted positions at any academic rank. These are not tenure track positions yet in most respects the individual is considered a member of the faculty having longer appointments, renewal options, university wide voting privileges, and access to benefits. Due to their unique job status, full-time faculty may, in some cases, perceive adjuncts as an even greater job threat than other part-time faculty.

In addition to the five reasons for faculty stress listed above, a host of related stress producing factors have been identified. Armour, Caffarella, Fuhrmann, and Wergin (1987) list monotony, changing mission, stultifying reward structure, and lack of advancement, conviction, leadership, and community as major faculty stressors. In 1987, Gmelch reported the findings from the National Faculty Stress
Research Project which used a forty-five item index to explore faculty stress.

Seldin (1987:18) additionally identifies, "Inadequate participation in institutional planning and governance, too many tasks to do in too little time, low pay and poor working conditions, inadequate faculty recognition and reward, unrealized career expectations and goals, and unsatisfactory interactions with students, colleagues and the department chair" as stress producing factors. Comments received by various tenure track ISU faculty members tend to further substantiate these concerns.

As stated previously, although not predicted, the reasons given by full-time Iowa State University faculty members for high stress levels parallel earlier research by Seldin (1987), Gmelch (1987), and others. Various techniques have been suggested to cope with faculty stress. One recommendation given by Armour et al., (1987:6) suggests that faculty members must take individual responsibility for avoiding burnout. These authors contend that, "when the reward structure no longer motivates and the institutional climate no longer fosters productivity, ... faculty members must define vitality individually." To do this it is suggested that, "they work within the system to establish their own niche." These writers emphasize that a supportive institutional environment which encourages, recognizes, and rewards personal development is essential toward this end.

Although Gappa (1987) has identified additional stress producing factors for part-time faculty members such as the perception of second-class status, job insecurity,
and role ambiguity, the recommendations of Armour et al., seem appropriate for both groups at Iowa State University.

The nature of exchange relations between core and periphery workers was examined by focusing on the factors which tend to magnify power differences in exchange relationships. According to Blau (1964) the possession of strategic resources promotes independence. Core faculty were thought to possess strategic resources in the form of qualifications for their position (competence) and high educational levels. The results of this data showed that tenure track faculty did consider themselves more well-qualified as compared to non-tenure track faculty. Their high qualifications were borne out by the high educational levels reported. Over 89% of them held doctorate degrees. Although not tested by a specific hypothesis and not supported by the educational levels reported, the non-tenure track faculty rated themselves higher, as to competence, than they rated tenure track faculty. Perhaps the non-tenure track faculty was comparing themselves based solely on their efforts in the classroom. One peripheral faculty member commented that there is, "too much "dead weight" among some senior faculty members. Some teaching by them is terrible."

Blau (1964) maintains that a lack of equally preferable alternatives make an individual more dependent in social relationships. Interestingly, this study found that members of both the tenure track and non-tenure track faculty felt that peripheral faculty members had more opportunities both within the university
system as well as in the larger environment. Although unexpected, this finding tracks with the comments received by core faculty which relate to the stress producing factor of feeling “imprisoned in their jobs” (Seldin, 1987:14). Although part-time workers know that job security is almost non-existent, by contrast, full-time workers may feel trapped in jobs especially if they feel unappreciated and under rewarded. It is also theorized that full-time workers feel trapped because of what they have seen occur in their organization previously. The “survivor’s syndrome” has been characterized by feelings of anxiety, fear, guilt, and uncertainty (Archer and Rhodes, 1987; Brockner, 1990; Davy, Kinick, and Scheck, 1991) among workers who have witnessed past co-worker layoffs and are waiting for the “other shoe to drop.” The last questionnaire received in this study was from a tenure track individual who apologized for the delay stating that he had just received word that their department would be eliminated in 1996 and that this announcement to the faculty was completely unexpected. This individual and his colleagues are undoubtably anxious and highly uncertain about their alternatives at this moment.

It was hypothesized that core faculty members would feel they had more freedom within the institution, due to their status, than peripherals. The study results, however, indicated that members of the two groups of faculty did not see a difference in the amount of autonomy which they were granted. The word “creative” was used by both groups in describing their jobs and many positive comments were received especially from the tenure track faculty concerning the
freedom allowed in their positions. One stated, "teaching, research and service
opportunities unlimited--we are a university on the move!"

The questions on this survey that related to perceived inequity between the core
and periphery provided another revealing finding. Among the tenure track faculty,
several respondents wrote notes on pages two or three of their questionnaires that
they did not know any non-tenure track personnel; therefore, they would either not
complete or they refused to answer the questions on which they were asked to rate
both categories of faculty. One respondent wrote, "This is a stupid question. Some
tenure track faculty possess these traits, some do not. Some non-tenure track
faculty possess these traits, some do not." However, this same respondent and
most of the others who made similar comments about the inability to judge
individuals went on to answer the questions on pages five or six which applied to
the group. And in this case, as predicted, the core faculty did feel that they were
getting a better deal as compared to peripherals and the peripheral faculty felt they
were getting short-changed as compared to the core. Comments from the non-
tenure track faculty seemed to center on pay inequities and general treatment.
Words listed to describe their work, included, "underpaid, undervalued, underrated,
unappreciated, unobserved, and unrecognized." One peripheral faculty member
wrote, "The hours are not bad, I enjoy the students, but the pay rate for instructors is
still incredibly low compared to most universities. Instructors are not thought of
highly here."
As compared to members of their own group, the non-tenure track faculty felt they were getting about an equal deal as compared to others. Interestingly, members of the tenure track faculty thought that others were getting a better deal than themselves. This impression seemed to relate to salary inequities, an overemphasis on research versus teaching, and interpersonal relationships within departments and with the university administration in general. Comments received included, "The central administration is biased towards disciplines that bring in overhead funds." This respondent added [I am] "currently looking for alternate employment." A second tenure track faculty member noted, "In the College of Education we get paid much less than profs in sci. and engineering, etc." In the same vein another added, "Economic stress is the biggest problem at ISU. Salary discrepancies within specific colleges is demoralizing to those at the lower end of the pay scale."

Among full-time faculty members the issues of race and gender also appeared to have an effect on whether or not individuals felt they were being treated equitably in comparison to other tenure track faculty. I will cite just two comments to support this point. One male faculty member stated, "Treatment of minority faculty and staff is demeaning and degrading to their professional futures and cultures." A female respondent stated simply, "Compared to other women, I'm doing OK. Compared to the majority of men, I'm not."
Adams (1965) specifies that when inequity is perceived in a social relationship, the disadvantaged party will attempt to restore equity through a variety of behavioral or psychological means. For example, individuals can actually reduce their inputs or try to increase their outcomes. In this case, faculty members may work less intensely or ask for a raise. Because faculty salaries are not readily negotiable, individuals will probably be more likely to reduce their inputs or may try to increase their outcomes through other means such as seeking alternative avenues for growth and development or even stealing from the institution. Adams outlines additional strategies to restore equity including altering the perception of inputs and outcomes, altering comparison points, or terminating the relationship. Any attempts to restore equity have direct consequences for the employing institution. This study reveals the high degree of inequity felt by tenure track faculty members at Iowa State University and highlights the need to address these faculty concerns.

This study found that interaction between core and periphery faculty was limited. Each subgroup studied indicated that they interacted more regularly with members of their own group. Some tenure track faculty members indicated that they did not even know any non-tenure track faculty. Tenure track faculty also stated that their work isolated them more from everyone than was reported by the non-tenure track group. Many core faculty members were complementary of their colleagues but complained that they were simply overtaxed by a demanding and stressful job;
complained that they were simply overtaxed by a demanding and stressful job; therefore, they apparently feel they have little time for meaningful interaction with others. One representative comment noted, “I like Iowa State because people here are hard working, serious, helpful to each other most of time and usually willing to listen to each other’s point of view. However, my responsibilities are so broad that I am continually “behind” or at least pushing deadlines to the limit. My work exceeds what I can do in any one day, week, month, or year!”

In reporting and discussing the results of this study, it was expected that inequality, dependence and exploitation would characterize employment relationships between the core and peripheral segments of the work force, just as Wallerstein (1974) contends these characteristics apply to between nation relationships in the world economy. Hypotheses were developed to explore the expectations of individuals occupying core and peripheral positions within organizations based on the premise that status would affect expectations. The faculty comments reported in this and the previous section support this premise. In reading these comments, it is easy to form the impression that the respondents are unhappy and disillusioned with their jobs, their departments, and the institution in general. But I would be remiss, if I did not also report that many faculty members, both tenure track and non-tenure track, reported that they were very happy at Iowa State University.
Peripheral faculty stressed above all, their love of teaching. One instructor commented, "I engage in this work ... because I love it. It is challenging, makes a difference in the lives of others whose career goals touch the lives of America's children. That is why I do this work---not for the money, tenure, or security."

Another said simply, "I do what I do because I love it and am good at it." Part-time faculty also enjoyed the flexibility of their schedules and a less pressured work atmosphere. Core faculty members cited opportunities for research, good benefits, and a collegial atmosphere in their evaluations of Iowa State. Both groups were very enthusiastic about the quality of life afforded them by living in Ames. Overall, this external factor seemed to be the one most often listed when strong, positive evaluations were given recommending Iowa State University as a good place to work.

Limitations of this Study

A limitation of this study may be in its generalizability. Most of the information gathered from the ISU faculty did tend to agree with the existing body of information which relates to work expectations based on status within educational institutions. Similar phenomena are also likely to be found in other organizations within the larger economy that employee both core and peripheral workers. In fact, work relationships between these two faculty groups could be used as a model for what we might expect in the private business sector since a core-periphery work force
split in academics has been in existence for a long time; whereas, this is a relatively new strategy in organizations. The sticking point may be the issue of tenure.

Core workers in other economic realms may enjoy full-time, lucrative positions but in our emerging flexible economy no one, other than tenure track faculty, enjoys the protection afforded by this unique aspect of academic life. The prospect of spending your entire working lifetime with one employer has suddenly become as obsolete as buggy whips. Yet in academia, people do. The tenure system, "originally instituted to protect and perpetuate academic freedom, is now being held responsible for stagnancy and rigidity in U.S. higher education" (Solomon et al., 1981:53). There have been calls to abolish the tenure system but these efforts are highly resisted by current faculty. The existence of tenure, in and of itself, should not make the results of this study non-generalizable to the larger economic sphere but we should be cognizant that this facet of working life in an academic setting could affect the responses gathered. Future research is needed in non-academic settings to further investigate core-periphery relationships.

Another issue which was discussed previously was the sampling procedure. The sampling frame used, the 1994-5 Iowa State telephone directory, was not up to date; therefore, not all members of the population could be correctly identified. Personnel records would provide a more accurate listing of employees in any institutional or organizational setting.
There were also problems connected to the survey instrument itself which were identified as returns were received. In addition to some minor complaints about format or wording, a small percentage of respondents were highly critical of the categories of faculty which were listed on the questionnaire. The two categories were given as "tenure track faculty" which was intended to capture the full-time, core faculty members and "non-tenure track faculty" which was intended to capture the part-time, temporary, peripheral faculty. Specifically, a few full-time faculty members noted that there were distinct differences in work circumstances between tenured faculty and tenure track faculty. Apparently, there is a status difference between these appointments which core faculty is well aware of--and it counts! To avoid this problem in the future, definitions should be provided to clarify what types of employees should be considered in each category.

Implications of this Study

This study seems a natural extension of research begun in the early 1980's concerning the affects of downsizing in organizations. Immediately following some of the larger layoff announcements there was a great deal of interest in exposing the hardships faced by those who had lost their jobs and in exploring the effects of downsizing on the organizational "survivors." In reviewing that literature, it seems that both individuals and organizations were expected to make adjustments to the
new, smaller work force but few predicted that this economic restructuring would mean not only a readjustment in terms of the size of the work force but also a readjustment in terms of its composition.

The intense focus on the effects of downsizing continues to garner the lion’s share of the press. *The New York Times* (1996) recently ran a full week of front page articles devoted to the “Downsizing of America” but in the early 1990’s, interest has also emerged in the larger issue of economic restructuring and the creation of a flexible work force (Burrows, Gilbert, and Pollert, 1992). Beth Rubin (1996:179) now contends that a fundamental difference between work in the past and work in the future will be “the shift away from long-term employment regardless of education or skill. Employers have restructured the employment relationship around a small core of relatively permanent but geographically mobile workers and a much larger work force of part-time, temporary, and contract workers”; a phenomena which *Time* magazine (1993) has dubbed “the tempting of America.”

If indeed, this change in the economy is a permanent structural change, then as a society we must prepare to deal with the consequences. A pessimistic view of the future workplace would pit core and peripheral workers against one another in a form of occupational apartheid. An optimistic view would see the core and peripheral working relationship as synergistic. In order that their working time together be both productive and mutually beneficial, an understanding of the
expectations that exist between these two groups of workers must be advanced.
The significance of this study, then, is that it makes an initial sociological attempt to
embark upon this course.
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APPENDIX

SURVEY INSTRUMENT, ACCOMPANYING COVER LETTER
AND FOLLOW-UPS
October 12, 1995

Dear Iowa State University Faculty:

A matter of vital concern for Iowa State University is the institution's ability to attract and maintain a diverse yet highly qualified faculty in the face of increasing economic pressures. Since the mid-1980's, factors such as falling enrollments and high financial aid costs have left many schools facing the same uncertain environment as the corporate sector. How our working environment will change and be structured in the year 2000 and beyond are questions which demand our attention.

The attached survey instrument has been designed to help secure information about how people at ISU work together. The study is being conducted by Linda Evans, doctoral candidate in Sociology, as part of her dissertation research. We fully support the research effort and are asking you to take approximately 20 minutes of your time to complete this questionnaire. Results of this study will be used to assess various aspects of the work experience at Iowa State University and to gain insight into issues of concern to the current faculty.

You have been randomly chosen to participate in this study and your participation is completely voluntary. Be assured your individual responses will be kept confidential. To protect this confidentiality, please do not write your name anywhere on the questionnaire. An identification number is used only to avoid sending you a follow-up survey.

We sincerely hope you will participate in this study. It may give you the opportunity to voice your opinion on issues that will be of concern not only to Iowa State employees but also to the larger American work force as we approach a new decade. If you have any comments or questions concerning the questionnaire, please address them to Ms. Evans at (515) 986-9554.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Motoko Y. Lee
Professor-Sociology
(515) 294-8440

Charles L. Mulford
Professor-Sociology
(515) 294-9897
SECTION ONE: ABOUT THE WORK SETTING

The following questions concern various aspects of your working situation. Please CIRCLE the most appropriate response based on your everyday work experience. There are no right or wrong answers. Just tell how you feel about each statement. Please answer every question.

FOR QUESTION NUMBER 1--PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT AT ALL</th>
<th>TO SOME EXTENT</th>
<th>TO A GREAT EXTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. To what extent do each of the words listed below describe YOUR work?

- Boring .................. 1 
- Challenging ............ 1 
- Varied .................. 1 
- Tedious .................. 1 
- Uncertain .................. 1 
- Important ............... 1 
- Repetitive ............... 1 
- Demanding ............... 1 
- Stressful ............... 1 
- Frustrating ............. 1 
- Rewarding ............... 1 
- Enjoyable ............... 1 
- Complex ................ 1 
- Exciting ............... 1 
- Interesting ............ 1 
- Autonomous ............ 1 
- Detailed ................ 1 
- Fast paced ............. 1 
- Isolating ............... 1 
- Fun ..................... 1 
- Routine .................. 1

Are there any other words you would use to describe your work? ____________________________
2. To what extent do each of the traits listed below describe the characteristics of the tenure track and non-tenure track faculty at Iowa State University? 

**PLEASE RATE BOTH CATEGORIES OF ISU PERSONNEL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Tenure track Faculty</th>
<th>Non-tenure track Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard working</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respected</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly involved with the job</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorough</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm in relations with others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays a professional attitude</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a professional appearance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has opportunity for challenging work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed to the university</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoys a sense of well being</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLEASE CONTINUE TO RATE BOTH CATEGORIES OF ISU PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT AT ALL</th>
<th>TO SOME EXTENT</th>
<th>TO A GREAT EXTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure track Faculty</th>
<th>Non-tenure track Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cold in relations with others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent/well-qualified for position</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-oriented</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has leadership ability</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative jobs are available within the university</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job skills/services are needed in the larger economy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal oriented</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains high personal standards for performance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solver</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team player</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BASED ON YOUR EVERYDAY WORK EXPERIENCE
PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS
CONTINUE TO USE THE SCALE AS SHOWN BELOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT AT ALL</th>
<th>TO SOME EXTENT</th>
<th>GREAT EXTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. In your present position, to what extent do you have the opportunity to interact regularly with other faculty members?
   1  2  3  4  5

4. To what extent do you actually interact regularly with the non-tenure track faculty?
   1  2  3  4  5

5. To what extent do you actually interact regularly with the tenure track faculty?
   1  2  3  4  5

6. Do you feel you have access to enough information to do your work well?
   1  2  3  4  5

7. Do you feel you have access to enough information to make informed decisions about your own future at Iowa State University?
   1  2  3  4  5

8. Do you feel you have access to enough information about this university in general?
   1  2  3  4  5

9. Are you presently a member of a union?
   1 Yes   (If so, please state the name of the union) _____________________________
   2 No
10. Tenure track faculty members, please consider what you put into and get out of your working relationship at Iowa State University. As compared to other faculty members, how would you evaluate your work situation? Using the blank space provided, please note your numeric choice from the statements listed below.

As compared to other tenure track faculty: __________

1. They are getting a much better deal than I am.
2. They are getting a somewhat better deal than I am.
3. They are getting a slightly better deal than I am.
4. We are all getting an equal deal.
5. I am getting a slightly better deal than they are.
6. I am getting a somewhat better deal than they are.
7. I am getting a much better deal than they are.

As compared to the non-tenure track faculty: __________

1. They are getting a much better deal than I am.
2. They are getting a somewhat better deal than I am.
3. They are getting a slightly better deal than I am.
4. We are all getting an equal deal.
5. I am getting a slightly better deal than they are.
6. I am getting a somewhat better deal than they are.
7. I am getting a much better deal than they are.

Overall, would you recommend Iowa State University as a good place to work? Why?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
11. Non-tenure track faculty members, please consider what **YOU** put into and get out of your working relationship at Iowa State University. **AS COMPARED TO OTHER FACULTY MEMBERS,** how would you evaluate your work situation? Using the blank space provided, please note your numeric choice from the statements listed below.

As compared to other non-tenure track faculty: 

1. They are getting a much better deal than I am.
2. They are getting a somewhat better deal than I am.
3. They are getting a slightly better deal than I am.
4. We are all getting an equal deal.
5. I am getting a slightly better deal than they are.
6. I am getting a somewhat better deal than they are.
7. I am getting a much better deal than they are.

As compared to the tenure track faculty: 

1. They are getting a much better deal than I am.
2. They are getting a somewhat better deal than I am.
3. They are getting a slightly better deal than I am.
4. We are all getting an equal deal.
5. I am getting a slightly better deal than they are.
6. I am getting a somewhat better deal than they are.
7. I am getting a much better deal than they are.

Overall, would you recommend Iowa State University as a good place to work? Why?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

SECTION TWO: ABOUT YOURSELF

Please complete this survey by providing us with some general information concerning your professional background and current work assignment. Please circle your response number or fill in the blank when indicated.

1. YOUR AGE (as of your last birthday) ______________ years

2. YOUR SEX
   1. Male
   2. Female

3. HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED
   1. High School
   2. Associate or Trade
   3. Bachelor's (B.A., B.S.)
   4. Master's (M.A., M.S., M.B.A.)
   5. Doctorate (Ph.D., Ed.D., D.V.M.)

   ****In what year was this degree received? ______

4. MARITAL STATUS
   1. Married
   2. Single
   3. Separated/Divorced
   4. Other

5. WHO ELSE BESIDES YOU LIVES IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD?
   (Please circle all categories that apply and note the numbers of children and dependent adults that are currently living in your household.)

   1. Spouse/household partner
   2. Preschool aged children
   3. Elementary aged children
   4. Middle school/High school age
   5. Dependent parent/other adult
   6. Other (please specify)

6. JOB TITLE
   ______________________________________________________

   ****In what year were you initially hired by ISU? ________________________

   ****What college are you currently associated with at ISU? ________________

7. JOB STATUS

   1. Non-tenure track faculty  (Please continue to questions 8, 9 and 10)
   2. Tenure track faculty  (Please skip directly to question 10)
8. Since you are not on a tenure track, is this your personal employment choice?

1. Yes  
2. No

Briefly explain your answer:  


9. Do you expect or would you like to be on a tenure track at some point in the future?

1. Yes  
2. No

Briefly explain your answer:  


10. Whether you are on a tenure or non-tenure track, are there any other comments you would like to add about your life situation that may help explain your work choices?


YOU HAVE NOW COMPLETED THIS SURVEY. FOR YOUR CONVENIENCE, THE BACK COVER IS PRE-ADDRESS. JUST FOLD, TAPE OR STAPLE, AND DROP IT IN THE CAMPUS MAIL. THANK YOU!
November 1, 1995

Dear Iowa State Faculty Member:

Within the past two weeks you should have received a short questionnaire, the results of which will be used to assess various aspects of the work experience at Iowa State University.

Your individual response to this study is very important. It should take no more than 20 minutes of your time to complete the survey and the results will be kept strictly confidential. If for any reason you did not receive a copy of the questionnaire, or if you have any questions or comments concerning the questionnaire, please contact me. If you have already mailed the completed questionnaire back to me, please ignore this letter and accept my appreciation.

I sincerely hope you will participate in this study. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Linda C. Evans
(515) 986-9554
November 17, 1995

Dear Iowa State Faculty Member,

During the month of October, I mailed a questionnaire to you in conjunction with my dissertation research in the Department of Sociology. The survey was designed to assess certain aspects of the work experience at Iowa State University and to give employees the opportunity to voice their opinions on various work issues.

To date, I have received a reply from many of your colleagues but your personal response to this study is very important to me. Therefore, for your convenience, I have included a second copy of the survey. I understand completely that your time is most valuable. The survey instrument itself is fairly short; it should take no more than 20 minutes to complete and, of course, the results will remain strictly confidential. If you have any questions concerning the study, you may contact me at the number listed below. If you have already mailed the completed questionnaire back, please disregard this memo and accept my heartfelt gratitude for your help. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Linda C. Evans

(515) 986-9554
December 7, 1995

Dear ISU colleague,

I am contacting you one final time to urge you to reply to a short questionnaire, copies of which you should have received during the months of October and November. The survey was sent to you randomly in conjunction with my dissertation research in the Department of Sociology here at Iowa State. I realize that this is a very busy and hectic time in the semester as we all struggle to tie up loose ends and meet a variety of deadlines. The survey instrument itself is fairly short, it should take no more than 20 minutes of your time to complete and of course, results are completely confidential.

Your input concerning our working environment at ISU is important to this research effort and should help gain insight into issues of concern to the current faculty. Should you choose to participate, please return the questionnaire by December 15th to the campus address listed above. If you have already completed the survey, please accept my appreciation for your time and effort.

Best wishes as you finish up the semester.

Sincerely,

Linda Evans
(515) 986-9554