Journal of International Research &
Multidisciplinary Innovation

Precarious by Design: Labor Insecurity in the Academic Research Workforce — Adjuncts, Postdoctoral Researchers, and Contract Scientists

Author: Prof. Shashank Diwakar

Affiliation: North Eastern Hill University

Email: drshanshank@nehu.in

Submitted to: Journal of International Research & Multidisciplinary Innovation (JIRMI)

Date: 10 May 2026

Abstract

The modern research university increasingly relies on a stratum of workers—adjunct instructors, postdoctoral researchers, and grant-funded contract scientists—who perform essential intellectual labor without the employment security historically associated with academic careers. This paper argues that such precarity is not an incidental byproduct of budget constraints but a structural feature of the contemporary research enterprise, produced by the interaction of soft-money grant funding, an oversupplied doctoral labor market, and a legal framework that has struggled to classify knowledge workers consistently as "employees." Drawing on National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) jurisprudence, National Science Foundation (NSF) labor-force data, and comparative statutory regimes in Germany and the United Kingdom, the paper examines how legal indeterminacy about employment status enables institutions to externalize risk onto individual researchers. It identifies a research gap in existing scholarship: sociological accounts of "adjunctification" and the "gig academy" have not been adequately integrated with labor-law analysis of how classification doctrine itself facilitates precarity. The paper's critical evaluation weighs efficiency-based justifications for flexible academic staffing against equity and scientific-integrity costs, concluding that unionization gains since 2016 represent partial but insufficient remedies. Recommendations include statutory minimum-term protections modeled on Germany's Wissenschaftszeitvertragsgesetz, grant-portability reforms allowing funding to follow researchers rather than institutions, and clarified federal guidance affirming postdoctoral employee status. The paper concludes that meaningful reform requires treating research labor precarity as a labor-law problem, not merely an institutional budgeting or career-development issue.

Keywords

contingent academic labor; postdoctoral precarity; gig academia; adjunctification; NLRA employee classification; soft-money funding; academic labor law; fixed-term research contracts

1. Introduction

Scientific research in the twenty-first century is produced overwhelmingly by workers who are not permanent employees of the institutions where they labor. Adjunct instructors teach the majority of undergraduate courses at many U.S. institutions; postdoctoral researchers perform the bulk of hands-on laboratory science; and contract scientists, often funded through discrete grants, move between institutions as funding cycles dictate. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has repeatedly documented that more than 70% of instructional staff positions in American higher education are off the tenure track, a shift with direct analogues in the research workforce more broadly. This paper treats that shift as a labor-market phenomenon structurally comparable to the platform-mediated "gig economy," in which risk, benefits administration, and continuity of income are transferred from institutions to individual workers, even though the legal category of "gig work" has not formally been applied to research labor. The purpose of this paper is to examine how employment law, funding architecture, and institutional incentives jointly produce this condition, and to evaluate the adequacy of existing and proposed remedies.

2. Research Objectives and Research Questions

2.1 Objectives

1. To characterize the structural mechanisms producing precarity among adjunct faculty, postdoctoral researchers, and contract scientists.

2. To analyze how U.S. labor law has classified (and reclassified) these workers as employees.
3. To compare U.S. regulatory treatment with statutory regimes in Germany and the United Kingdom.
4. To evaluate the sufficiency of unionization and recent policy reforms as remedies.
5. To propose targeted legal and policy interventions.

2.2 Research Questions

- RQ1: What structural and legal mechanisms sustain precarious employment in academic research labor markets?
- RQ2: How has NLRB and judicial doctrine shaped the employment status of graduate and postdoctoral researchers?
- RQ3: What can comparative regimes (Germany, UK) offer as alternative regulatory models?
- RQ4: Are current reform trajectories—unionization, agency salary floors—adequate to address the underlying structural drivers?

3. Literature Review and Research Gaps

Sociological scholarship has extensively documented the "adjunctification" of the professoriate. Kezar, DePaola, and Scott's The Gig Academy (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2019) is the most direct scholarly precedent for this paper's framing, explicitly analogizing non-tenure-track academic labor to platform gig work and arguing that higher education has adopted labor practices—reliance on contingent, disposable workers—that mirror the broader neoliberal "gig economy." The National Academies' 2014 report The Postdoctoral Experience Revisited similarly documented that postdoctoral positions had shifted from short transitional apprenticeships toward prolonged, insecure employment without a corresponding expansion of permanent research faculty positions.

A distinct body of labor-law scholarship has analyzed NLRB doctrine on graduate student and postdoctoral employee status, but this literature has developed largely in isolation from the sociological "gig academy" framework. Legal scholars examining Columbia University (2016) tend to focus narrowly on collective-bargaining rights, without connecting classification doctrine to the funding-structure analysis that sociologists of higher education have developed.

Research gap: Existing literature does not adequately integrate (a) the legal-doctrinal analysis of employee classification with (b) the funding-structural analysis of soft-money research economics, treating these as separate literatures rather than mutually reinforcing mechanisms of precarity. This paper addresses that gap by analyzing classification doctrine as itself a product of, and contributor to, soft-money funding architecture.

4. Research Methodology

This paper employs a doctrinal-analytical methodology, examining primary legal sources (NLRB decisions, federal statutes, agency guidance) alongside secondary empirical sources (AAUP data snapshots, NSF/NCSES Survey of Doctorate Recipients data, National Academies reports) and comparative statutory analysis of the German and UK regimes. Given the constrained scope of this paper, the analysis is qualitative and interpretive rather than based on original empirical data collection; where quantitative claims are made, they are drawn from cited government or professional-association sources rather than independently generated.

5. Detailed Analysis

5.1 The Legal Architecture of Precarity: NLRB Classification Doctrine

Employment status determines access to collective bargaining, minimum-wage protections, and unemployment insurance—yet U.S. labor law has vacillated on whether graduate researchers and postdoctoral scholars qualify as "employees" under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). In Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York, 364 NLRB No. 90 (2016), the Board held that student assistants who perform services under the direction of a university, for which they receive compensation, are statutory employees entitled to organize, reversing Brown University, 342 NLRB 483 (2004), which had held the opposite on the theory that the relationship was "primarily educational" rather than economic. This oscillation—turning on which political administration controls Board appointments rather than any change in the underlying labor relationship—illustrates the doctrinal instability at the heart of research-labor classification.

A related line of authority addresses medical trainees. In Boston Medical Center Corp., 330 NLRB 152 (1999), the Board held that house staff (interns, residents, and fellows) are statutory employees, rejecting the argument that their status as trainees precludes employee status where they simultaneously perform compensated clinical services. This precedent is analytically relevant to postdoctoral researchers, who likewise occupy a dual status as both trainees and productive laborers, though the NLRB has not issued a postdoc-specific analogue to Boston Medical Center.

By contrast, NLRB v. Yeshiva University, 444 U.S. 672 (1980), held that full-time faculty at a private university may be excluded from NLRA coverage as "managerial employees" where they exercise substantial authority over academic governance—a holding with little application to adjunct faculty or postdocs, who typically exercise no such governance authority, yet the case's reasoning has occasionally been invoked by institutions resisting non-tenure-track organizing on the theory that all faculty share a common managerial character.

5.2 Soft-Money Funding as a Structural Precarity Engine

Beyond classification doctrine, the material architecture of research funding independently generates precarity. Federal research grants (NIH R01s, NSF awards) are typically awarded for three-to-five-year terms to a principal investigator, not to the institution as a continuing employer of the researchers the grant supports. When a grant ends or is not renewed, the postdocs and contract scientists it funded typically lose their positions, regardless of the scientific merit of their ongoing work. This funding architecture means employment continuity is structurally decoupled from institutional need or individual performance and instead tracks the grant cycle—a dynamic functionally similar to platform gig work, where task-based payment structures determine income continuity rather than an ongoing employment relationship.

5.3 Comparative Jurisprudence

Germany offers the most direct statutory counter-model. The Wissenschaftszeitvertragsgesetz (Academic Fixed-Term Contract Act, WissZeitVG), first enacted in 2007 and substantially amended in 2016, specifically regulates fixed-term contracts for academic and research staff, imposing maximum cumulative fixed-term employment periods (generally six years pre-doctorate and six years post-doctorate, subject to exceptions) intended to force institutions toward a decision point: convert researchers to permanent status or release them, rather than permitting indefinite renewal of short-term contracts. The law has been criticized by German early-career researcher associations for producing its own perverse incentive—non-renewal at the statutory limit regardless of scientific productivity—illustrating that maximum-term regulation alone does not eliminate precarity but rather reshapes its timing.

United Kingdom fixed-term researchers are covered by the Fixed-term Employees (Prevention of Less Favourable Treatment) Regulations 2002, which generally convert an employee's status to permanent after four years of continuous fixed-term service absent objective justification for continued fixed-term status. UK universities have in some cases relied on the "objective justification" exception—citing the fixed-term nature of external grant funding itself—to avoid conversion, a pattern that mirrors the U.S. soft-money dynamic and suggests that formal conversion rights are only as effective as the strength of the justification exceptions courts and tribunals are willing to accept.

6. Critical Evaluation and Counterarguments

Institutions and some economists defend flexible academic staffing on efficiency grounds: research funding is inherently uncertain, and permanent employment commitments would require universities to either decline grants or absorb researchers' salaries after grant expiration, reducing overall research capacity and the number of positions available to early-career scientists. There is a coherent economic logic to this argument—forced conversion could reduce headcount rather than improve job quality, an outcome documented as a partial effect of Germany's WissZeitVG term limits.

However, this efficiency defense understates two costs. First, it treats researcher turnover as costless to scientific output, when in fact loss of institutional and tacit knowledge upon non-renewal imposes real scientific costs that are difficult to quantify but are not zero. Second, and more fundamentally, the efficiency argument assumes the current funding architecture (short-term, PI-held grants) as a fixed constraint rather than a policy choice; funding agencies could restructure grant mechanisms to support portable, researcher-held funding, which would preserve flexibility for institutions while reducing precarity for individuals. The efficiency counterargument is therefore strongest as a critique of poorly designed reforms (e.g., blunt maximum-term rules) and weakest as a defense of the status quo funding architecture itself.

7. Recent Developments and Emerging Trends

Postdoctoral and academic-worker unionization has accelerated substantially since Columbia (2016). The University of California postdoctoral researchers, represented by UAW Local 5810, and MIT postdoctoral researchers, who voted to unionize with the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America (UE) in 2023, represent significant expansions of collective bargaining coverage into the postdoctoral research workforce. Separately, the National Institutes of Health has periodically raised minimum stipend levels for National Research Service Award (NRSA) postdoctoral fellows, a salary-floor approach that addresses compensation without resolving underlying employment-status or contract-duration precarity.

8. Challenges, Limitations, Findings, and Recommendations

8.1 Challenges and Limitations

This paper's scope precludes original empirical data collection and a comprehensive survey of state-level labor law variation, which materially affects public-university researchers differently from those at private institutions. The analysis is also necessarily limited to jurisdictions with accessible, verifiable primary sources (U.S., Germany, UK); a fuller comparative account would benefit from analysis of additional regimes.

8.2 Findings

- Employment classification doctrine for research labor has been legally unstable, turning substantially on NLRB composition rather than a settled doctrinal test.
- Soft-money funding architecture is an independent, non-legal driver of precarity that persists regardless of classification outcomes.
- Comparative maximum-term regimes (Germany) address contract renewal abuse but can produce earlier, rather than fewer, job losses absent complementary permanent-position funding.
- Unionization has expanded bargaining rights but has not altered the underlying funding architecture that generates precarity.

8.3 Recommendations

6. Federal agency guidance (Department of Labor, NLRB) should issue a postdoc-specific standard affirming employee status, extending the Boston Medical Center trainee-employee reasoning explicitly to postdoctoral researchers, to reduce doctrinal instability across NLRB compositions.
7. Federal funding agencies (NIH, NSF) should pilot portable, researcher-held funding mechanisms allowing continuity of support independent of a single PI's grant cycle.
8. Any U.S. adoption of maximum fixed-term limits should be paired with dedicated permanent-position funding streams, avoiding the German experience of term limits producing earlier non-renewal absent expanded permanent posts.
9. Institutions should be required to disclose non-tenure-track and postdoc renewal/non-renewal rates in a standardized format, comparable to existing IPEDS reporting, to enable empirical monitoring currently absent from public data.

9. Conclusion

Labor precarity among adjuncts, postdoctoral researchers, and contract scientists is not a peripheral inefficiency of the research enterprise but a structural outcome of the interaction between unstable employment-classification doctrine and soft-money funding architecture. Comparative regimes demonstrate that statutory intervention can reshape—but not by itself eliminate—this precarity, particularly where reforms address contract duration without addressing the underlying funding mechanisms that make short-term employment economically rational for institutions. Meaningful reform requires treating the research workforce as a labor-law and science-funding-policy problem simultaneously, rather than allowing either domain to be addressed in isolation.

References

1. American Association of University Professors. (2018). Data snapshot: Contingent faculty in US higher ed. AAUP. https://www.aaup.org/news/data-snapshot-contingent-faculty-us-higher-ed
2. Boston Medical Center Corp., 330 NLRB 152 (1999).

3. Kezar, A., DePaola, T., & Scott, D. T. (2019). The gig academy: Mapping labor in the neoliberal university. Johns Hopkins University Press.

4. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2014). The postdoctoral experience revisited. National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/18982

5. NLRB v. Yeshiva University, 444 U.S. 672 (1980).

6. Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York, 364 NLRB No. 90 (2016).

7. Brown University, 342 NLRB 483 (2004).

8. Fixed-term Employees (Prevention of Less Favourable Treatment) Regulations 2002, SI 2002/2034 (UK).

9. Wissenschaftszeitvertragsgesetz [Academic Fixed-Term Contract Act], Apr. 12, 2007, BGBl. I at 506 (Ger.), as amended.